ABSTRACT

"Daniel 11:2b–12:3: A Structural Proposal and Its Contribution to the Whole Book of Daniel"—This study is presented in two parts, with the current article focusing on the macrostructure of Daniel 11:2b–12:3. By analyzing the Hebrew text, this article aims to uncover the underlying literary structure of this passage, which is crucial for achieving a coherent interpretation. The proposed structure identifies seven sections within Daniel 10–12, forming a chiasm centered on the pericope concerning the Roman kings (11:16-30). This central section notably highlights the Messiah's death (11:22b), underscoring its pivotal role in the revelation and its significance throughout the entire book of Daniel.

Keywords: Daniel 11:2b–12:3, literary structure, preterism, futurism, historicism

RESUMEN

"Daniel 11:2b–12:3: Una propuesta estructural y su contribución al libro de Daniel"— Este estudio se presenta en dos partes, centrándose el presente artículo en la macroestructura de Daniel 11:2b–12:3. Mediante el análisis del texto hebreo, este artículo pretende desvelar la estructura literaria subyacente de este pasaje, que es crucial para lograr una interpretación coherente. La estructura propuesta identifica siete secciones dentro de Daniel 10-12, formando un quiasma centrado en la perícopa relativa a los reyes romanos (11:16-30). Esta sección central destaca especialmente la muerte del Mesías (11:22b), subrayando su papel fundamental en la revelación y su importancia a lo largo de todo el libro de Daniel.

Palabras claves: Daniel 11:2b–12:3, estructura literaria, preterismo, historicismo, futurismo

DANIEL 11:2B–12:3: A STRUCTURAL PROPOSAL AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE WHOLE BOOK OF DANIEL

Héctor Urrutia-Hernández

Introduction

At present, there is no consensus regarding the interpretation of Dan 11:2b to 12:3, nor are there definitive comments on its literary structure. Identifying clear literary markers or forms to segment this section poses a significant challenge. Likewise, discerning thematic or verbal parallels in comparable sections is difficult, given the recurrence of terms like "arise," "come," "return," "king," "north," "south," "power," "fortress," "forces," and others, as well as prevalent themes of wars, conquests, and monarchic succession throughout Dan 11.

Our approach is to align with the model of successive empires as presented in Dan 2, 7, and 8, culminating with the religious-political entity referred to as the "little horn" in Dan 7 and 8, and concluding with the messianic reign prophesied in Dan 2 and 7. We have therefore divided the primary sections representing each kingdom. These sections collectively form a chiasmus that lends coherence to the narrative. We have discerned that the central element of this chiasmus is the death of the Messiah in Dan 11:22b, which is consistent with the Messiah's centrality throughout the book.

The recognition of the Messiah's presence and central role in Dan 11 is crucial, as both preterist and futurist interpretations often overlook Him in this passage. The portrayal of the Messiah's death in Dan 11:22b is pivotal for the hermeneutic of this chapter, compelling an interpretation that universalizes the language from His first coming. This also underscores the Messiah's centrality in the literary macrostructure of the entire book. In our analysis, we have identified thematic and verbal parallels in the corresponding sections and unique language in the central section.

Our intention is to delve deeper into the literary nuances of the chiasmus's central section (Dan 11:16–30) in a future article. We plan to discuss the literary style of each block, propose a microstructure for each section of the chiasm, and explore the exegetical implications of our findings.

It is worth mentioning that our initial conclusions were reached independently before we became aware of other structural analyses with similar conclusions in certain aspects. For instance, scholars like Frank W. Hardy and Jacques B. Doukhan also identify Dan 11:22 as the structural center.[1] Our study of their work has enriched our understanding. However, our conclusions regarding the literary blocks themselves differ from these authors, underscoring the need for this publication.

Development—Daniel 10–12 within the Macrostructure of Daniel 7 **//** 8–12

The coherence and interconnectedness of the entire book of Daniel, encompassing both its narratives and visions, are widely acknowledged in academic circles.[2] The chiastic structure the Aramaic portion of the book (Dan 2–7), as proposed by Adrien Lenglet, has garnered near-universal acceptance.[3] However, the literary structure of the Hebrew section (Dan 8–12) remains a subject of ongoing debate, lacking a universally agreed-upon framework. Despite this, several macrostructural proposals, well-founded and sharing key elements, have been put forward. All these proposals integrate Lenglet's structure for the Aramaic part of Daniel. Among these, the perspective offered by David A. Dorsey is notable. Dorsey highlights the parallels between Dan 8 and chapters 10 to 12, positioning chapter 9 as the central pivot:[4]

I. Hebrew Introduction (ch. 1)
Daniel and his 3 friends in the king's court (ch. 1)

---

1. Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded: An Exegetical, Historical, and Theological Study* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2019), 70; Frank Wilton Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11," (Master's Thesis, Andrews University, 1983), 105.

2. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 16, ed. Frank Moore Cross (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 14–15; John J. Collins, *Daniel: With An Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20, eds. Rolf Knierim and Gene M. Tucker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 31–33.

3. A. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," *Biblica* 53, no. 2 (1972): 169–190. The only author who proposes a structure other than Lenglet's, considering the entire book of Daniel, is David W. Gooding, "The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and its Implications," *Tyndale Bulletin* 32, no. 1 (1981): 43–79.

4. Adapted from David A. Dorsey, *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis–Malachi* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 259–260.

II. Aramaic Section (ch. 2–7)
A. The vision of the <u>4 kingdoms</u> (in the human image) (ch. 2)
B. <u>The story of martyrdom</u>: God saves Daniel's 3 friends from the fiery furnace (ch. 3)
C. *<u>The pride of Nebuchadnezzar</u> and the <u>sovereignty of the Lord</u> (ch. 4)*
C'. *<u>The pride</u> of Belshazzar and the <u>sovereignty of the Lord</u> (ch. 5)*
B'. <u>The story of martyrdom</u>: God saves Daniel in the den of the lions (ch. 6)
A'. The vision of the <u>4 kingdoms</u> (represented by the beasts) (ch. 7)

III. Hebrew Section (ch. 8–12)
A. The vision of <u>2 kingdoms</u> (Persia and Greece; symbolized by the beasts) (ch. 8)
   B. *The vision of the 70 weeks (ch. 9)*
A'. The vision of <u>2 kingdoms</u> (Persia and Greece; symbolized by humans) (ch. 10–12)

Samuel Nuñez separates the revelation itself in chapters 9 and 10 to 12 (9:24–27 and 11:2–12:4) from the context in which the revelation is made (9:1–23 and 10:1–11:1), dividing Dan 8 to 12 into five parts with Dan 9:24–27 as the center:[5]

I. Hebrew Introduction (ch. 1)
History: Daniel and his 3 friends in the king's court (ch. 1)

II. Aramaic Section (ch. 2–7):
A. Prophecy: The 4 kingdoms and the kingdom of the stone (ch. 2)
B. History: The 3 friends of Daniel in the fiery furnace (ch. 3)
C. *Prophecy: The dream of the tree (ch. 4)*
C'. *Prophecy: The vision of the hand (ch. 5)*
B'. History: Daniel in the lions' den (ch. 6)
A'. Prophecy: The 4 kingdoms and the kingdom of the Son of Man (ch. 7)

III. Hebrew Section (ch. 8–12):
A. Prophecy: Medo-Persia, Greece, Division, Little Horn, and

---

5. Samuel Núñez, *Las profecías apocalípticas de Daniel: La verdad acerca del futuro de la humanidad* (México: Datacolor Impresores, 2006), 31–32.

cleansing of the sanctuary (8:1–27)

B. History: Daniel intercedes for his people: Introduction to the vision (9:1–23)

C. Prophecy: Death of Messiah the Prince (9:24–27)

B'. History: Daniel intercedes for his people: Introduction to the vision (10:1–11:1)

A'. Prophecy: Medo-Persia, Greece, Division, King of the North, Standing up of Michael (11:2–12:4).

The third proposal is mine,[6] integrating Dan 7 as a structural part of the visions (7–12), without denying their relationship to the Aramaic section (2–7).[7] This structure also has five parts, with the center in Dan 9:[8]

Prologue (ch. 1)
A. The earthly kingdoms and the KINGDOM of "the STONE" (ch. 2)
B. The Remnant **and their Defender** (ch. 3)
C. *The king of Babylon and the **Supreme Judge*** (ch. 4)
C'. *The king of Babylon and the **Supreme Judge*** (ch. 5)
B'. The Remnant **and their Defender** (ch. 6)
A'. The earthly kingdoms and the **Kingdom of "The Son of Man"** (ch. 7)
B. "Prince of the Host" as **High Priest** (ch. 8)
C. *"Messiah the Prince" as **Supreme Sacrifice*** (ch. 9)
B. "A Man clothed in linen" as **High Priest** (ch. 10)
A. The earthly kingdoms and the **Kingdom of "Michael"** (ch. 11:2–12:3)
Epilogue (ch. 12:4–13)

---

6. Héctor Urrutia, *Prophecies of Daniel: What Everyone Should Know* (Chile: 2022), 9; *Profecías apocalípticas de Daniel: Dios es mi Juez* (Santiago, Chile: Wandersleben Impresiones, 2012), 44–45. Soon in English.

7. Daniel 7 as an integral part of the Aramaic section (2–7) and also of the visions (7–12) is universally accepted. Example: Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision*, 14; Ernest Lucas, "Daniel: Book of," in *Dictionary Old Testament Prophets*, ed. Mark J. Boda, J. Gordon McConville (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 110; Michael Segal, *Dreams, Riddles, and Visions: Textual, Contextual, and Intertextual Approaches to the Book of Daniel* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016), 132, etc.

8. Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel: The Vision of the End* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), 3–7, and Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007), 29, propose a similar macrostructure, but see two centers in the vision section (Dan 7–12), for them, chapters 9 and 10.

The consensus among the three structural proposals for Dan 8 to 12, or 7 to 12, is that these chapters form a chiasm, with all three identifying Dan 9 as the central chapter. This central placement is significant due to its announcement of the death of the Messiah Prince. Given that Dan 11:2b–12:3 contains the final revelation in this series (7 // 8–12), which shows clear parallels with Dan 7, 8, and 9, it is fitting that the sacrifice of the Messiah forms its core (Dan 9:24–27, refer to 11:22), and the vindication of the heavenly sanctuary its climax (Dan 7:9–14; 8:14, refer to 12:1, 12).[9] Dan 11 unites all of the christocentric revelation of Dan 7, 8 and 9, completing the chiasm of this macrostructure.[10]

Major Divisions of the Revelation/Audition of Daniel 11:2–12:3

The structure of Dan 10 to 12 is broadly agreed upon among various scholarly groups, including critical scholars, conservatives, and dispensationalists. They generally concur on the division into three primary sections: the introduction of the revelation (Dan 10:1–11:2a), the revelation proper (Dan 11:2b–12:3 // 4), and the conclusion to the revelation (Dan 12:4/5–13). Scholars like John Goldingay and Carol A. Newson propose a slightly different division: introduction (Dan 10:1–19), revelation (Dan 10:20–12:4), and conclusion (Dan 12:5–13).[11] Both, however, further subdivide the revelation section, aligning with the general consensus.[12]

The angel clearly marks the beginning and end of the prophetic revelation. It starts with "And now I will tell you the truth" (Dan 11:2a) and ends with "But you, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the

---

9. The connections between Daniel 8 and 10–12 are numerous. Among the four sequences of kingdoms, only these chapters omit Babylon and explicitly mention the kingdoms of Medo-Persian and Greece. Additionally, only these chapters depict conflicts between empires; for example, a ram fighting a goat in chapter 8 and various kings battling each other in chapter 11. There are also exclusive shared language such as the "daily," "the end of the time," "abomination/rebellion devastating," "vision" and "apparition" (*ḥāzôn* and *mar'eh*), the heavenly "Prince" (*śar*), the "sanctuary" (*qōdeš*), the same interpreting angel, etc.

10. Furthermore, Dan 10–12 uses language from every chapter of the book. In this last revelation is the conclusion to every story and prophecy of Daniel. See John Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary 30, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019), 525.

11. Goldingay, 520–521; Carol A. Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 327–328.

12. Goldingay, 520–521; Newson, 337, 360.

book until the time of the end" (Dan 12:4a). This framing distinctly outlines the revelatory content.

The sequence of earthly kingdoms reaches its peak with the kingdom of Michael (Dan 12:1–3), emphasized through the use of poetic language, which is a stylistic shift observed in Daniel's earlier eschatological sections.[13] The narrative shift in Dan 12:4, transitioning from revelatory to narrative form, sets apart the climax of Michael's kingdom (Dan 12:1–3) from the subsequent narrative content.

The angelic revelation's internal structure is relatively consistent across critical scholarly and dispensationalist interpretations. It is generally seen as encompassing two earthly kingdoms: Persia (Dan 11:2b) and Greece (Dan 11:3–45), followed by Michael's intervention (Dan 12:1–3).[14] The extensive section on Greece is often further subdivided into Greece united (Dan 11:3–4), the wars between the kings of the North and South (Dan 11:5–20), and the period of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Dan 11:21–45).

While contemporary dispensationalists generally agree that Dan 11:21–45 pertains to Antiochus, they often view the narrative from verse 36 onward as typifying the final Antichrist.[15] However, they do not explicitly discuss the concept of a "Christian dispensation parenthesis" within Dan 11.

---

13. For example, while prose predominates in Dan 7, 8 and 9, Dan 7:9–10, 13–14, 23–27; 8:14, 23–26; 9:24–27, which represent the messianic climax in each revelation, switches to lyric verse. For a detailed analysis see Martin T. Pröbstle, "Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9–14," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2006), 439–465.

14. Louis F. Hartman y Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, Anchor Yale Bible 23 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 275–277; John J. Collins, *A Commentary of the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 371; Newsom, 328, 337, 360; André LaCocque, *The Book of Daniel*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018), 236, 250; Goldingay, 84, 520–521. Among the futurists see C. F. Keil and F. J. Delitzsch, *Daniel: Comentario al texto hebreo del Antiguo Testamento*, trans. Xabier Picaza (Barcelona: Editorial Clie, 2018), 415; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: Introdução e Comentário* (Brazil: Sociedade Religiosa Edições Vida Nova, 1983), 188; Ronald S. Wallace, *Daniel: El Señor es rey*, Comentario al Antiguo Testamento Andamio (Barcelona, Spain: Publicaciones Andamio, 2012), 222–230; Stephen B. Miller, *Daniel*, New American Commentary 18 (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 1994), 283; Tremper Longman III, *Daniel*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 31, 273–285; Paul R. House, *Daniel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 23 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 43, 170–181.

15. Leon Wood, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1973), 280, 304–305; Longman, 280–283; Miller, 313–314; Keil and Delitzsch, 475.

Overall, these divisions and interpretations represent a general agreement on the organization of Dan 10 to 12, offering a framework for comprehending the flow and thematic evolution within these chapters. In the following two charts, we outline the viewpoints of some notable scholars from these perspectives:

Preterist Authors			
John Collins[16]	**Carol Newson**[17]	**John Goldingay**[18]	**André LaCocque**[19]
11:2b: Persia	11:2b–4: Transition of Persia to Greece	11:2b: Persia	11:1–4: Persia and Alexander
11:3–4: Alexander	—	11:3–4: Warring king	—
11:5–6: Ptolemies	11:5–6: Failed alliance	11:5–19: North vs south	11:5–9: Ptolemies and Seleucids
11:7–9: Syria and Egypt	11:7–9: North vs south	—	—
11:10–19: Antiochus III	11:10–19: Antiochus III	—	11:10–19: Antiochus III
11:20: Seleucus IV	11:20–24: Seleucus IV and start of Antiochus IV	11:20: An oppressor	11:20: Seleucus IV
11:21–45: Antiochus IV	11:25–45 Antiochus IV	11:21–45: Last king of the north	11:21–45: Antiochus IV
12:1–3: Time of the end	12:1–3: Liberation	12:1–3: Liberation of the faithful	12:1–4: Michael

16. Collins, *A Commentary of the Book of Daniel*, 371.
17. Newson, 328, 337, 360.
18. Goldingay, 520–521.
19. LaCocque, 236, 250.

Futurist Authors			
T. Longman III[20]	**Joyce Baldwin**[21]	**Stephen Miller**[22]	**Keil and Delitzsch**[23]
11:2–4: Persia and Greece	11:2: Persia	11:2: Persia	11:2: Persia
—	11:3–4: Alexander	11:3–4: Greece	11:3–4: Alexander
11:5–20: North/south	11:5–20: North/south	11:5–20: Egypt-Syria	11:5–20: North/south
11:21–35: King of the north	11:21–39: Corrupt king	11:21–35: Antiochus IV	11:21–35: Evil king
11:36–45: Arrogant king	—	11:36–12:3: Time of the end	11:36–39: Evil king exalted
—	11:40–45: Antichrist	—	11:40–45: End of evil king
12:1–4: Salvation	12:1–4	—	12:1–3: Michael

The critical commentaries we reviewed tend to justify the internal divisions in Dan 11 hermeneutically rather than linguistically or literally. This is largely because these interpretations are based on the assumption that Daniel was written in the time of, and primarily about, Antiochus IV Epiphanes. We have not encountered academic articles or theses specifically addressing the internal delineations of the text in Dan 11. Critical scholars generally regard Daniel as an apocryphal[24] and pseudepigraphic[25] book, positing that its author describes the activities of Antiochus IV as the climax of his visions (Dan 7:8, 23–27; 8:9–14, 23–26; 9:24–27), especially in Dan 11 (11:21–45). Dispensationalist scholars, even those who believe in Daniel's historical existence and his authorship of genuine prophecies in the sixth century BCE, also often view Antiochus IV as the climax of these visions, particularly in this final revelation of Daniel.[26]

---

20. Longman III, 31, 245.

21. Baldwin, 188.

22. Miller, 283.

23. Keil and Delitzsch, 415, 437–438.

24. See for example: Collins, *A Commentary of the Book of Daniel*, 25–26; LaCocque, 3.

25. Collins, *A Commentary of the Book of Daniel*, 56–58; Lacocque, 5.

26. Example: Baldwin, 45–46, 62, 203–203; Wood, 294, 304–305.

Among conservative scholars, who view Daniel as containing predictive prophecy fulfilled historically from the sixth century BCE (Dan 10:1; 11:2b) to the final resurrection (Dan 12:1–3), there is relative agreement on which kingdoms are represented in Dan 11:2b to 12:3. However, there is no unanimity regarding the delimitation of each kingdom. These authors generally align the kingdoms mentioned in Dan 11 with those in the previous sequences (Dan 2, 7, and 8), except for Babylon, which is excluded from Dan 8 and 11. They identify the kingdoms in Dan 11:2b–12:3 as Medo-Persian, Greco-Macedonian, imperial Rome, Christian Rome, and the eternal kingdom of the Messiah. Typically, they do not provide detailed justifications for the internal divisions of the text. There is a master's thesis that explores this subject in some depth,[27] but it does not conclusively settle the debate. The following graph represents the positions of some principal conservative exponents, all of whom are seventh-day adventists:

Historicist Authors						
King-doms	Various Authors[28]	Mervyn Maxwell[29]	William Shea[30]	Frank Hardy[31]	Roy Gane[32]	Jacques Doukhan[33]
Medo-Persia	11:2	11:2	11:2	11:2	11:2	11:2
Greco-Macedonia	11:3–13	11:3–13	11:3–15	11:3–15	11:3–19	11:3

27. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective".

28. It is one of the proposals of the *Adventist Biblical Commentary*. See F. D. Nichol, *Comentario bíblico adventista*, trans. Victor E. Ampuero Matta and Nancy W. de Vyhmeister (Buenos Aires: ACES, 1995), 4: 888–902. Stefanovic, 396, with slight variations, visualizes imperial Rome in 11:21–30 and religious Rome in 11:31–45.

29. C. Mervin Maxwell, *El misterio del futuro revelado* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 1981), 282–297. Maxwell follows Edwin R. Thiele, *Outline Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, MI: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1953), 136.

30. William H. Shea, *Daniel: Una guía para* el estudio (Buenos Aires: ACES, 2010), 239–271.

31. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective," 145.

32. Roy E. Gane, "Religious-Political Papacy and Islamic Power in Daniel 11," *DavarLogos* 19, no. 2 (2020): 37–70.

33. Doukhan, Daniel 11 Decoded, especially chs. 5 and 6.

Historicist Authors						
King-doms	Various Authors[28]	Mervyn Maxwell[29]	William Shea[30]	Frank Hardy[31]	Roy Gane[32]	Jacques Doukh-an[33]
Imperial Rome	11:14–30	11:14–20	11:16–22	11:16–28	11:20–22	11:4–8
Papal Rome	11:31–45	11:21–45	11:23–45	11:29–45	11:23–45	11:5–45
Messian-ic king-dom	12:1-3/4	12	12:1-4	12:1-3	12:1-3	12:1

We have underscored the sections where consensus is lacking, particularly the central ones. It is evident that there is no difficulty in demarcating the Persian kingdom (Dan 11:2). Conversely, while there is no consensus on the precise endpoint of the messianic kingdom, there is agreement on its commencement (from Dan 12:1). This presents us with the challenge of determining the most appropriate demarcation between the Greek and pagan Roman empires (Dan 11:3 // 4; 13/ / 14; 15 // 16, or 19 // 20), as well as between pagan Rome and Christian Rome (Dan 11:4 // 5; 20 // 21; 22 // 23; 28 // 29, or 30 // 31). There is unanimity regarding the beginning of the Greek empire (Dan 11:3), and the same applies to the conclusion of the papal Roman era (Dan 11:45).

Daniel chapters 10 to 12 encompass the final revelation received by Daniel. As various experts acknowledge, this segment serves as a complement or extension to Dan 8, akin to Dan 9, but with a broader chronological scope and greater detail.[34] Comparing the revelation in Dan 11:2–12:3 with Dan 8, along with the explanation in Dan 9:24–27, aids in reliably segmenting these kingdoms, or at least in identifying where each one is clearly active. Below is a chart proposed by Elias Brasil de Souza,[35] in which alternating colors are used to delineate the activity of each of the four kingdoms preceding Michael's kingdom.

---

34. See notes 9 and 10. Strictly speaking, Dan 9 and 10–12 represent extensions of Dan 8. See Newson, 237; Goldingay, 517.

35. Elías Brasil de Souza, *El libro de Daniel* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 2019), 141.

Daniel 11	Daniel 8, 9
11:2: Persian kingdom	8:3, 20: Persian ram
11:2: Greek kingdom mentioned	8:5, 21: Greek goat
11:3: Mighty Greek king	8:5, 21: Great Greek horn, first king
11:4: Greek kingdom divided into four	8:8, 22: Greek kingdom divided into four
11:16: Conquest of the glorious land	8:9: Glorious land conquered by Rome
11:22: Prince of the covenant destroyed	9:26: Pagan Rome kills the Messiah
11:31: Removes the daily	8:11: Little horn removes the daily
11:40: The time of the end	8:17: The time of the end
11:45: King of the north destroyed	8:25: Little horn destroyed

While the Greeks engaged in conflict with the Persians as early as the time of Darius I (Dan 11:2), these battles were more about resisting Persian invasions than an attempt to conquer Persia, a then-dominant empire. The Greco-Macedonian Empire began its ascendancy with Alexander the Great, referred to as the "mighty king" in Dan 11:3.[36] This information is crucial in determining the beginning and end of subsequent empires, as the decline of one and the rise of another are often gradual and overlap chronologically. Similarly, as with the Persian kings, we should not anticipate a comprehensive list of rulers for the other empires.

The division into five sections or kingdoms, alongside the narratives in Dan 8, is corroborated by Dan 2 and Dan 7, which enumerate a total of six kingdoms, including Babylon. The prophetic sequences in Daniel provide ample evidence to justify this segmentation of kingdoms.[37] For a straightforward delineation, we propose the following sequence of the five kingdoms in Dan 11:2b–12:3:

    A. Kings of Medo-Persian (Dan 11:2)
    B. Kings of Greco-Macedonian (Dan 11:3–15)
    C. Kings of imperial Rome (Dan 11:16–30)
    D. Reign of papal Rome (Dan 11:31–45)
    E. Michael's reign (Dan 12:1–3)

---

36. Quotations are taken from NKJV, unless otherwise indicated.

37. You can see my comment on Dan 2, 7, 8 and 11 respectively at Urrutia, *Prophecies of Daniel*, 21–34, 97–114, 115–133, and 169–196.

The reasoning behind for these specific divisions will be explained as our analysis progresses. In the second part of our study, we will delve into a more detailed argument regarding these delineations.

One Basic Hermeneutical Principle

The interdependence of a text's literary structure and its meaning necessitates a hermeneutic principle widely recognized among conservative scholars. This principle posits that once the Messiah of the new covenant is introduced within any Old Testament prophecy, the language transitions from local to universal. In apocalyptic prophecy, literal interpretations take on symbolic significance.[38] This principle is evident in Dan 9, where the language is interpreted literally and locally before the Messiah's death and symbolically and universally afterward. For instance, the term *berît* in Dan 9:4 refers to the old covenant with literal Israel, whereas in Dan 9:27, it denotes the new covenant established by the Messiah with spiritual Israel, encompassing both Jews and Gentiles.

This hermeneutical approach is also apparent in Dan 11. Notably, both Dan 9:24–27 and 11:2–12:3 serve as explanations of Dan 8:1–14. Understanding the 70 weeks in Dan 9 symbolically involves applying the day-for-year principle,[39] and the covenant made by the Messiah as the new covenant aids in interpreting the shift from literal to symbolic language in Dan 11.

Furthermore, the sanctuary mentioned in Dan 8:14 refers not to the earthly sanctuary but to the heavenly one of the new covenant. Consequently, Dan 11, which addresses the time of the end (Dan 8:17, 19; 11:35, 40), must also point to the heavenly. In Dan 11, up to the point of "the prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22), "kings" are individualized and identifiable in history. However, post this introduction, it becomes increasingly challenging to specify individual kings, leading to a universalized narrative.

Periods before "the prince of the covenant" in Dan 11 are denoted in literal "years" (Dan 11:6, 8, and 13), but afterwards, they shift to symbolic "days" (Dan 11:33; 12:11, 12, and 13). The angel clarifies to Daniel that this revelation (Dan 11:2–12:3) concerns what will happen to "your people" [*amkā*] in the latter days (Dan 10:14). The phrase "your people" [*amkā*] in Dan 11:2b–12:3, initially understood literally

---

38. Hans K. LaRondelle, *Las profecías del fin* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 1999), 14–38.

39. Contrary to what some commentators argue, Dan 9 does not say that the seventy weeks are years, this can only be concluded by applying the year-day principle.

as Daniel's people, the Jews (Dan 11:14), later assumes a symbolic and universal meaning, representing God's people from all nations at the end of times (Dan 12:1).

Moreover, the phrase *bᵉʾereṣ-ḥāṣebî*, occurring only twice in Dan 11 and throughout the OT, refers in verse 16 to the land of literal Palestine, but in verse 41, it encompasses all locations where the remnant of spiritual Israel resides at history's end. After Dan 11:22, references to "the people of God" such as "the people who know their God" (Dan 11:32), "those of the people who understand shall instruct many" (Dan 11:33), or "the holy people" persecuted for 3 ½ times (Dan 12:7) shift to symbolize Christians, not Jews.

This principle challenges strict literal interpretations of Dan 11, as commonly applied by preterists and futurists. Doukhan's assertion that the king of the north and the king of the south are always symbolic from Dan 11:5 onward represents an opposite extreme,[40] suggesting that terms like "king," "sanctuary," "people," and "years" should also be interpreted symbolically in Dan 11:5–21, which is not tenable.

Daniel 10–12 as a Chiasmus

Returning to our structural analysis, it's essential to consider that the revelation/audition of Dan 11:2–12:3 is part of a larger section encompassing chapters 10–12. Therefore, it's necessary to include chapters 10:1–11:1 and 12:4–13 into the structure, which serve as introductory and conclusive elements, respectively, to the central revelation/audition of 11:2–12:3. The complete structure, without delving into the details of chapters 10 and 12:4–13, forms a chiasm:

A. INTRODUCTION: Appearance and dialogues of celestial beings (Dan 10:1–11:1)
B. Persian kings, beginning with Cyrus the deliverer (Dan 11:2)
C. Greek kings: North vs. South (Dan 11:3–15)
D. Roman kings: Death of the Messiah (Dan 11:16–30)
C'. Papal kingdom: North vs. South (Dan 11:31–45)
B'. Messianic kingdom, concluding with Michael the Deliverer (Dan 12:1–3)
A'.CONCLUSION: Appearance and dialogues of heavenly beings (Dan 12:4–13)

---

40. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 56 onwards.

Regarding the treatment of God's people, Jerusalem, and the temple by the dominant empires—a recurring theme throughout the book of Daniel—it begins in Dan 1:1–2 with God allowing the Jewish king, along with the people, Jerusalem, and the temple, to fall into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar.[41] This theme reinforces the chiasm of 11:2–12:3. In section B (Dan 11:2b), the Persian kings restore Jerusalem, the temple, and the people. The Greeks in section C (Dan 11:3–15) invade Jerusalem, desecrate the temple, and oppress the people. In section D (Dan 11:16-30), imperial Rome destroys Jerusalem and the temple, disperses the Jewish people (Dan 11:16), persecutes the Christian community (Dan 11:28–30), and is implicated in the execution of the Messiah (Dan 11:22). Christian Rome in section C' (Dan 11:31–45) tramples upon spiritual Jerusalem (Luke 21:24; Rev 11:2), defiles the heavenly sanctuary (Dan 8:11–12; 11:31), and persecutes spiritual Israel (Dan 7:25; 8:10, 12–13; 11:33–35). Finally, section B' (Dan 12:1–3) depicts Michael restoring God's people, their city, and vindicating His sanctuary. This structural analysis can be summarized as follows:

A. INTRODUCTION: Daniel prays for restoration (Dan 10:1–11:1)

B. Persian kings: Restoration of the temple, city, and people (Dan 11:2)

C. Greek kings: Desecration of the temple, city, and people (Dan 11:3–15)

D. Roman kings: Destruction of the temple, city, people, and the Messiah (Dan 11:16–30)

C'. Papal kingdom: Profanation of the temple, city, and people (Dan 11:31–45)

B'. Michael's kingdom: Restoration of the temple, city, and people (Dan 12:1–3)

A'. CONCLUSION: Daniel is promised restoration (Dan 12:4–13)

Positioning the Messiah and His sacrificial death (Dan 11:22b) at the center of the literary structure of Dan 11:2b–12:3 aligns naturally with the overall context of the book, where each chapter centers around the Messiah. The introductory (A) and concluding (A')

---

41. In the center of the book, the Son of man recovers the kingdom for the saints (7:13–14), and in Daniel 8:14 the sanctuary is vindicated.

sections, notably extensive, focus on the Messiah, represented by Michael and/or the Man clothed in linen. As highlighted in other place,[42] the "vision" (*mar'eh*) of the glorious "man clothed in linen" that appeared to Daniel (Dan 10:5–9) encompasses what the prophet contemplates throughout this oral revelation. Hence, Dan 10–12 can be seen as the "vision" (*mar'eh*) of Michael and the "audition" of the kingdoms. In Hardy's words: "What he heard was Dan 11, what he saw was Christ."[43] Thus, it is fitting for this revelation to find Christ not only at the beginning and the end but also at its core. He is central to both the content and structure of Dan 11:2–12:3.

Hardy further notes: "In any event, for us the task is to bring the two elements of Daniel's experience in ch. 11 together. We must study what he heard in the context of what he saw. We must learn the historical facts narrated in the prophecy, keeping Christ in view all the while."[44] Daniel's posture in chapter 10—fasting and mourning for his people—serves to elevate the central figure and His suffering for His people in Dan 11:22b. This is in addition to the implicit reference to the Passover lamb in the first month (Dan 11:2–4). Therefore, the mention of the death of "the prince of the covenant" in Dan 11:22 is intimately linked to the context of the prayer and revelation.

Hardy and Doukhan have also identified a chiastic structure in Daniel chapters 10–12, with the central focus being on Dan 11:22. Hardy's division comprises nine parts,[45] while Doukhan, building upon Hardy's structure,[46] opts for a thirteen-part division.[47] Our aim here is not to analyze these proposals in their entirety but to discuss the most apparent aspects.

Both authors perceive Dan 12:1–3 as parallel to the prologue in Dan 10:1–21 (according to Hardy) or 10:21b (as per Doukhan). However, they do not argue that Dan 12:1–3 is an integral part and climax of the revelation/audition that starts in Dan 11:2b. It would therefore seem more logical for Dan 12:1–3 to find its parallel within the revelation itself, rather than in the preceding section. Paradoxically, they

---

42. Urrutia, *Prophecies of Daniel*, 155–167, 197–204; *Profecías Apocalípticas de Daniel*, 329–347, 407–435.

43. Frank W. Hardy, "Chapter 2: Overview of Daniel 10–12," http://www.historicism.org/Documents/BkChap2_Dan10-12.pdf (Accessed January 25, 2024).

44. Ibid.

45. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective," 138–142, 105.

46. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 63.

47. Ibid., 68.

acknowledge that the revelation/audition includes from Dan 11:2b to 12:3.[48] Additionally, their consideration of the prophetic literary blocks representing each kingdom is incomplete. For instance, Hardy splits the papal kingdom into two sections: C' (Dan 11:29–39) and B' (Dan 11:40–45), whereas Doukhan divides it into ten smaller segments (from C' onward). Both view Dan 11:1–4 as a literary unit, yet this passage contains elements of three distinct literary blocks: part of the context preceding the revelation (Dan 11:1–2a), the Medo-Persian kings (Dan 11:2b), and the united Greco-Macedonian monarchy (Dan 11:3–4). Although the verbal and thematic parallels they present in the corresponding units are not consistently convincing, it is important to acknowledge that both Hardy and Doukhan offer significant contributions in various structural and contextual aspects, which have been instrumental in refining our proposal.

Comparison of the Parallel Sections

Now, we will demonstrate how the division of the pericopes within the chiastic structure is supported by thematic and verbal parallels, as outlined below.

A (Dan 10:1–11:2a) and A' (Dan 12:4–13)

The most striking aspect in the first and last sections (A and A') is the involvement of celestial beings, contrasting with the central sections (B, C, D, C', and B'), which focus exclusively on earthly kings. Unique to sections A and A' is the direct naming of Daniel by celestial entities and his interactions with them. In chapter 10, there's a specific period of fasting and prayer, quantified in weeks and days, whereas in chapter 12, three distinct prophetic periods are mentioned, measured in times and days. Furthermore, we observe verbal parallels in A (Dan 10:1–11:2a) and A' (Dan 12:4–13), absent in 11:2b–12:3. These include: the verbs *r'h* (10:5, 7, 7, 8; 12:5) *šm'* (10:9, 12; 12:7 8), *'mr* (10:11, 12, 16, 19, 19, 20; 12:6, 8, 9), *ng'* (10:10, 16, 18; 12:12); nouns *dānî'ēl* (10:1, 2, 7, 11, 12; 12:4, 5, 9), *'anî* (10:2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20; 12:5, 8), *śāphāh* (10:16; 12:5) *'îš* (10:5, 7, 11, 19; 12:6, 7), *lābûš* (10:5; 12:6, 7), *bad* (10:5; 12:6, 7), *'adōnî* (10:16, 17, 17, 19; 12:8), and the particle *māh* (10:20; 12:8). We will not delve further into the

---

48. Hardy wrote: "So the narrative proper extends from 11:2b–12:3, with 11:2a and 12:4 framing the narrative between them." See "Chapter 2," 3.

details of A (Dan 10:1–11:1) and A' (Dan 12:4–13), as the parallels are apparent, and our focus is primarily on the structure of the revelation/audition itself (Dan 11:2b–12:3).[49]

B (Dan 11:2b) and B' (Dan 12:1–3)

In section B, Cyrus II is implicitly recognized as the initial Medo-Persian king, given that the revelation occurred during his reign (Dan 10:1). The angel begins by stating, "Behold, three more kings will arise in Persia" (Dan 11:2), indicating successors after Cyrus. Cyrus represents a Messiah-like figure in both Testaments, a liberator of God's people (Isa 44–45;[50] Dan 9;[51] Rev 16:12–16). In B' (Dan 12:1–3), Cyrus symbolically parallels Michael, the liberating prince of God's people in the end times. Both Michael and Cyrus defeat the king of the north (Babylon), originate from the east, dry up the Euphrates, free God's people in Babylon, return them to the glorious land, and restore/purify the sanctuary. Christ, embodied in Cyrus and Michael, marks the beginning and culmination of this entire revelation (Dan 11:2–12:3).

The first of the three kings announced in Dan 11:2b is Cambyses II, who, like his predecessor Cyrus in conquering Babylon, subdued

---

49. Many commentators have pointed to the multiple verbal, thematic, literary, and structural parallels between Dan 10:1–11:1 and 12:4–13. We have done the same in our commentary. See Urrutia, *Prophecies of Daniel*, 155–167, 197–204; *Profecías apocalípticas de Daniel*, 329–347 and 407–431 respectively.

50. Cyrus is the only pagan king called Messiah in the OT, and it is God Himself who calls him "my Messiah" (Isa 45:1 JUB), and attributes to him the title of "shepherd" (Isa 44:28), a divine title in the OT (see Ps 23), that the true Messiah applied to himself in John 10:11 and 14. Furthermore, the section of Isa 40–55, based on the exodus from Egypt, announces a new liberation brought by the suffering Messiah (Isa 42, 49, 50 and 52:13–53:12), which will be illustrated in the medium-term liberation of Judah from Babylon by Cyrus, whereby Cyrus becomes a type and guarantor of the true Messiah. Also, the liberation brought by Michael in Dan 11:40–12:3 uses the language of the exodus from Egypt. See Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, "Daniel 11 and the Islam Interpretation," in *The Word: Searching, Living, Leaching*, ed. Artur A. Stele (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2015), 57–82. In addition to Cyrus, Dan 10–12 has been found to use language from Isaiah 40–55 more than from any other OT book, mainly from the last song of the Servant (Isa 52:13–53:12). See Goldingay, 517–518. This suggests that Dan 11 must also announce the suffering Messiah, which we find in 11:22.

51. It is implied at the end of the 70 years when Cyrus liberated Judah from Babylon. These 70 years from the beginning (Dan 9:1–2) are parallel with the 70 weeks from the end of Dan 9 (vs. 24–27). See the literary structure of Dan 9 proposed by J. Doukhan in *Secrets of Daniel: Wisdom and Dreams of a Jewish in Exile* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000), 155–156.

Egypt. Their conquests symbolize dominion over the world, a feat Michael will accomplish alone at history's end (Dan 12:1–3). While Michael will ultimately restore the city, people, and sanctuary, Cyrus initiated this lengthy restoration process. Darius I the Great, the second king mentioned in Dan 11:2b, completed the temple reconstruction, supporting the Jews with a second decree (Ezra 6). Xerxes I, the third king, plays a pivotal role in preserving God's people during Queen Esther's time, mirroring Cyrus' earlier liberation, and foreshadowing Michael's end-time deliverance (Dan 11:45; 12:1; Rev 13:15–17).

Artaxerxes I, the fourth and climactic Persian king in Dan 11:2b, not only waged war against Greece but also signed a peace treaty acknowledging Greek supremacy. This action paved the way for the next world empire. Significantly, Artaxerxes initiated the 70 weeks (Dan 9:25; Ezra 7), leading to the Messiah the Prince's death (Dan 9:26a, 27a) and the 2300 days culminating in the investigative judgment (Dan 8:14; 12:12), concluding as Michael stands (Dan 12:1). Thus, Artaxerxes links the beginning (Dan 11:2), the midpoint (Dan 11:22), and the conclusion (Dan 12:1–3) of this revelation. If Daniel 11 is an explanation of Dan 8, Artaxerxes should be recognized as the king who decreed the period intended to clarify this new revelation/audition. This interpretation aligns with the Christological focus of the entire vision (מַרְאָה) in Daniel chapters 10 and 12.

All these Persian kings collectively contributed to the liberation and complete restoration of God's people in the past (B Dan 11:2b), thereby serving as types of Michael, who is prophesied to bring about the ultimate liberation of His people in the future (B' Dan 12:1–3). The subsequent rulers, both from Persia and later empires, displayed a shift from indifference to hostility towards the Jewish people. Notably, Dan 9:24–27, which elucidates Daniel 8, foretells the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple during "troublesome times" (Dan 9:25), a prophecy fulfilled during the era of the Persian kings mentioned in Dan 11:2. In parallel, the restorative work of Michael on behalf of God's people at the end times is also predicted to occur in a "time of trouble" (Dan 12:1).

It is particularly intriguing that the adjective "great" (גָּדוֹל) is used to describe the fourth Persian king, Artaxerxes I (Dan 11:2b), as it is in the depiction of Michael (Dan 12:1).

C (Dan 11:3–15) and C' (Dan 11:31–45)

The introduction of Alexander the Great in Dan 11:3 employs the same phrasing as the depiction of the Papal exaltation in Dan 11:36 (וְעָשָׂה כִרְצוֹנוֹ).[52] Historically, both Alexander and the Pope are seen as self-deifying figures, and their respective demises are or will be abrupt and decisive (Dan 11:4, 45); both also aspired to establish Babylon as a global center. It is only in sections C and C' where the conflicts between the northern and southern kings, which endanger the existence of God's people and His sanctuary,[53] are predominant.[54] The term "king of the north" is exclusively mentioned in these sections within the scope of Dan 11:2b–12:3.

Although verbal parallels in Dan 11 are not as pronounced due to common terminology across sections, sections C and C' feature unique terms that do not appear elsewhere in the chapter. These include: the verbs לשׁמ (11:3, 4, 5 // 39, 43) and סור (11:12, 12 // 36); nouns מיהלָא (11:8 // 36, 37), בהָז (11:8 // 38, 43), כֶּסֶף (11:8 // 38, 43), הָדְמֶח (11:8 // 37), מֶרְכָּבָה (11:8 // 42, 43), וֹפֶצ (11:6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15 // 40, 44) הָמָדֲא (11:9 // 39);[55] phrases like "by captivity" יבְּשֶׁב (11:8 // 33),[56] "therefore he shall go out" אָצָ יְ וֹ l (11:11 // 44),[57] "overwhelm them, and pass through" רְבְעוּ תָטָשׁוּ (11:10 // 40).[58] These last sentences are exclusively shared between these two sections and appear only once in the entire book.

Furthermore, in the prophetic frameworks of Dan 2, 7, and 8, there are elements linking Christian Rome with Greece. In Dan 2, although brief descriptions are given for each kingdom, the bronze representing Greece is specifically noted to "rule [שׁלט] over all the earth" (Dan 2:39). Dan 7:6 about the Greek beast mentions "and dominion

---

52. These words appear only once more in Daniel 11 and it is in the rise of the Roman Empire (v. 16), but there are other words among them: וְעַשׂ הַבָּא אֵלָיו כִּרְצוֹנוֹ.

53. Ptolemy IV and Antiochus IV, mainly.

54. At 11:25 and 29 there is an attack on the king of the south, but it is not the king of the north who invades him.

55. "Earth," אֶרֶץ, is more prominent in 11:2b–12:3, see 11:16, 19, 28, 28, 40, 41, 42, 42. אֲדָמָה is also used in 12:2.

56. The term "captivity," שְׁבִי, only appears in these two verses in the entire book of Daniel, and on both occasions prefixed by the preposition בְּ, and in both texts as a singular, absolute noun.

57. The verb יצא appears in different forms in 8:9; 9:15, 22, 23; 10:20; 11:11, 44. In ch. 11 it only happens these two times and in the same way, *qal* perfect singular masculine third person, and they are the only occasions in all Hebrew Daniel that have the וְ.

58. This phrase appears in this form only in these two texts in the entire OT.

[שָׁלְטָן] was given to it." While all four empires were global dominions, this is explicitly stated only for Greece in Dan 2 and 7. In Dan 11, the Hebrew words מֹשֵׁל, מֹשֶׁל, מִמְשָׁל, and מֶמְשָׁלָה (equivalent to Aramaic שׁלט) are used solely for the Greek kingdom (11:3, 4, 4, and 5) and for Christian Rome (11:39 and 43), the only instances of this root in the Hebrew part of Daniel. Thus, these linguistic connections associate the Christian Roman and Greco-Macedonian kingdoms in Dan 2, 7, and 11.

The Christian phase of Rome in Dan 8 (vv. 10–12), which is expounded upon in Dan 11:2b–12:3, presents notable similarities with the Greek male goat. This comparison is evident in the use of specific verbs and thematic parallels:

1. Use of שׁלך (to cast down): This verb appears only thrice in Daniel. It describes the Persian ram being "*cast down* to the ground" (וַיַּשְׁלִיכֵהוּ אַרְצָה, Daniel 8:7) by the Greek male goat; the Christian phase of Rome is depicted as causing "the place of His sanctuary *was cast down* [וְהֻשְׁלַךְ]" (Dan 8:11); and "he *cast* truth *down* to the ground]" (וְהִשְׁלִיךְ אֱמֶת אַרְצָה, Dan 8:12).

2. Use of רמס (to trample): This verb is used only twice in Daniel. It describes the Greek male goat "trampling" the Persian ram (רמס, Dan 8:7), and the little horn of Christian Rome "trampling" the saints (רמס, Dan 8:10).

3. Descriptions as assassins: Both the Greek male goat and the little horn in its religious phase are depicted as assassins in this chapter.

4. The breaking of the horns: The "large horn was broken" (שׁבר, referring to Alexander, Dan 8:8, 22), and similarly, the little horn is prophesied to be "broken" (שׁבר, Dan 8:25) but "without human means."[59]

In addition to these linguistic and thematic parallels, the influence of Greek culture and philosophy on Roman Christian theology is significant. Since the second century, major Christian theologians and apologists, who were neo-Platonic philosophers (such as Justin

---

59. These parallels are mentioned by Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded,* 43.

Martyr, Clement, and Origen of Alexandria),[60] incorporated Greek philosophy into Christianity. This incorporation continued through the neo-Platonic theology of Augustine of Hippo and the neo-Aristotelian theology of Thomas Aquinas.

Moreover, the sacrilegious and inquisitorial character of Christian Rome had its antecedent in the Hellenistic period under Greek rulers, first Ptolemaic and then Seleucid. In Rev 13:1–2, Christian Rome is symbolized by a beast possessing traits of all four beasts from Dan 7, but the beast itself is described as "like a leopard" (Rev 13:2), a direct reference to the Greek-Macedonian empire, which in Dan 7 is represented by a beast "like a leopard" (Dan 7:6), uniquely characterized by having more than one head.

D (11:16–30)

This section centrally focuses on the Roman kings, paralleling the depiction of Rome as the fourth and most formidable beast in Dan 7. The crucial element here is the prophecy of the death of "the prince of the covenant" at the hands of Rome (Dan 11:22b). The Hebrew term for "prince" here is נָגִיד, the same word used in Dan 9:25 to predict the death of "Messiah the Prince," who, by dying, "shall confirm a covenant with many" (Dan 9:26–27). Thus, both in Dan 9:25–27 and 11:22b, the term "covenant" (בְּרִית) is associated with "the prince" (נָגִיד).

Furthermore, the phrase "the Anointed One will be put to death" (Dan 9:26 NIV) is translated from the Hebrew כרת in the *niphal* (passive) voice, meaning "shall be cut off." This verb is traditionally used for covenant sacrifices in the Old Testament and in ancient Near Eastern contexts. The New King James Version (NKJV) accurately translates this as "Messiah shall be cut off." This linguistic connection allows for the same angel in a subsequent revelation to refer to Christ as "the prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22b).

The mention of the prince of the covenant's death in Dan 11:22 precludes interpreting the phrase "a vile person"[61] in Dan 11:21 as a

---

60. Tim Hayden, "A Consistent View of the Southern King in Daniel 11:23–45," (paper presented at Daniel 11 Symposium, October 19–21, 2018), 8.

61. The Hebrew term literally means "someone who is despised," "not considered," "not taken into account." This is a perfect fit for Tiberius Cesar, who was not considered worthy by Augustus to take his place on the throne. For this he prepared one of his grandsons (Lucio), but he died. Then Augustus

reference to Christian Rome, as some commentaries suggest,[62] nor does it support applying Dan 11:13–25a to the period of the Catholic Counter-Reformation (circa 1600 to 1789), as proposed by Doukhan.[63] The death of the prince of the covenant is a prophetic declaration of Christ's crucifixion. The presence of the Messiah in this verse also challenges critical views that regard this text as describing the actions of Antiochus Epiphanes two centuries before Christ.

The language of this section (11:16–30) is practically exclusive within the complete revelation of 11:2b–12:3. Only here are the following words employed: the verbs 11:17 (שׁים), שׁחת (11:17, 18), שׁבתו (11:18), בזה (11:21),עלה (11:21), עצם (11:23), בזר (11:23), חשׁב (11:24), (11:24, 25), עזב (11:30), כאה (11:30); the nouns (אכל (11:26), פָּנֶה (11:16, 17, 18, 19, 22), תֹּקֶף (11:17), יָשָׁר (11:17), אִיִּם (11:18), קָצִין (11:18), בִּלְתִּי (11:18), הָדָר (11:20), אֶחָד (11:20, 27), מִלְחָמָה (11:20, 25), הוֹד (11:21), שַׁלְוָה (11:21, 24), שֶׁטֶף (11:22), נָגִיד (11:22), מִרְמָה (11:23), מִשְׁמָן (11:23), מְדִינָה (11:24), שָׁלָל (11:24), מַחֲשָׁבָה (11:24, 25), עָצוּם (11:25), מְאֹד (11:25), פַּתְבַּג (11:26), מֵרֵעַ (11:27), שֻׁלְחָן (11:27), כָּזָב (11:27), אַחֲרוֹן (11:29), צִיִּים (11:29), כִּתִּים (11:30), the phrases וְעָמַד עַל־כַּנּוֹ בְמֶעַט־"And in his place shall arise" (11:20, 21),[64] גּוֹי,"with a small number of people" (11:23), עַל־בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ "against the holy covenant" (11:28, 30). These expressions are used exclusively in this section of Dan 11:2b–12:3.

Preliminary Conclusion

In this first article, we endeavored to shed light on the literary structure of Dan 11:2b–12:3, aiming to assist in the interpretation

---

prepared a second and last grandson that was left (Gaio), but he also died. So, he considered his son-in-law as his successor (Marco Vipsanio), but he also died. Then his stepson (Drusus), the younger brother of Tiberius, but he also died. Tiberius was the last stepson that was left, and the elderly Augustus forced him to separate from his wife and marry the only daughter of Augustus, Julia, a widow, so he could be named his successor.

62. Thiele, 122–131; Maxwell, 291–295; Antolín Diestre Gil, *El sentido de la historia y la palabra profética*, vol. 2 (Terrassa, España: Editorial Clie, 1995), 325–327; Merling Alomía, *Daniel: El profeta mesiánico* (Lima: Ediciones Theologika, 2008), 423–434; Shea, *Daniel*, 251–257; Roy E. Gane, "Religious-Political"; Stefanovic, 407; Carlos Elías Mora, "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Daniel 10–12 Applications and Implications," (paper presented at Daniel 11 Conference, June 11–21, Rome, 2018), 9.

63. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 113. For this author, the crucifixion of Christ in 11:22 is an *a posteriori* allusion, 139–140.

64. This sentence only occurred these two times in the whole OT.

and identification of the kings and realms represented therein. Our initial step was to determine the number and identity of these kingdoms. We examined the perspectives of both preterist and futurist scholars, who, aside from the ultimate kingdom of Michael, recognize merely two kingdoms in this passage: Medo-Persia (Dan 11:2b) and Greco-Macedonia (Dan 11:3–45), with a predominant focus on the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Dan 11:21–45). Among these scholars, specific studies on the structure of this revelation are sparse, as the Maccabean hypothesis generally prevails.

Conversely, historicist interpreters envisage four kingdoms, in addition to the Messianic kingdom: Medo-Persia, Greco-Macedonia, Imperial Rome, and Christian Rome. However, there exists some divergence regarding the boundaries of these empires.

Prior to delving into the segmentation of these kingdoms, we positioned Dan 10 to 12 within the overarching framework of the entire book, suggesting a Messiah-centric perspective. Subsequently, we delineated these five kingdoms, proposing their division into Dan 11:2b; 11:3–15; 11:16–30; 11:31–45; 12:1–3, respectively, inclusive of Michael's kingdom. We recognized the necessity of adhering to a Christ-centered hermeneutic principle for prophetic interpretation, aligning with our structural proposal and proving vital for an accurate understanding of Dan 11.

The five segments (Dan 11:2b–12:3), along with the introduction (Dan 10:1–11:2a) and conclusion (Dan 12:4–13) of this revelation, allowed us to categorize the entire section (chs. 10–12) into seven distinct parts. These segments collectively form a chiasmus with Rome at its nucleus (Dan 11:16–30), where the pivotal proclamation of the death of "the prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22b) is central. In our final analysis, we juxtaposed the parallel sections of this chiasmus, uncovering substantial evidence corroborating our proposed structure.

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