

The British-Israel-World Federation Victorian Branch

AUSTRALIAN PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS ARCHIVE

TITLE: BIWF VIC HQ Monthly Notes 2011
ORIGIN: Victoria
LOCATION: Victorian Bookroom Archive

CONTENTS:

Jan-Feb 2011
Mar-Apr 2011
May-Jun 2011
*Jul-Aug 2011
*July-Dec 2011
(incorrect formatting)

DATE PREPARED AND SCANNED:
15.10.2024

Content within this document can be reproduced without permission
but must reference the original documentation and date published.

British-Israel World Federation (Victorian Headquarters) Inc. **MONTHLY NOTES**

No. 679



Jan-Feb. 2011

All Mail to:
P.O. BOX 596, CAMBERWELL, VIC. 3124
AUSTRALIA

Phone 03 9882 4256

[Note: The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily endorsed by the **BRITISH-ISRAEL WORLD FEDERATION (VICTORIAN HEADQUARTERS) Inc.**]

DANIEL 11 (Continued)

We now come to consider Daniel 11 verses 36-39. These verses are placed between verses 33-35 describing Jerusalem subject to Rome and verses 40-45 describing Jerusalem subject to Moslem rule. As we shall see verses 36-39 describe Jerusalem subject to Byzantine emperors who rule from Constantinople—the Willful kings.

Daniel 11.36 And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

In **AD 284**, the Roman Empire under Diocletian underwent its **first division** into Eastern and a Western Sectors. Emperor Diocletian divided the Roman Empire into two sectors, Eastern and Western. Diocletian retained rule over the Eastern sector.

Co-emperor Maximian with Diocletian retaining overall control ruled the Western sector.

After Diocletian, the Roman Empire was re-united and divided several times. Constantine re-united it after Diocletian had divided it; then after Constantine's death the empire was divided among his three sons.

The final division was made in **AD 395** after the death of **Theodosius I** when it passed to his sons **Arcadius** and **Honorius**.

Daniel 11.36-39 prophesies about the **predominantly Greek-speaking Eastern Sector of the Roman Empire** after its **final division into Eastern and Western Sectors in AD 395**. This Eastern Sector was known as the **Byzantine Empire**. This Empire lasted a very long time for an empire, for what other empire lasted a thousand years?

Firstly, however, we must ask, why and when was the Roman Empire divided into Eastern and Western Sectors? It was divided for logistical reasons. When the Roman Republic grew in size, the central government became too far away from the outlying provinces for effective administration. Transport and communication were slower in those days, and the bringing of news of rebellion or invasion from the outlying provinces to the capital was becoming inefficient.

As we have already mentioned, the first division of the Empire took place in **AD 284** when the **Emperor Diocletian divided the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western Sectors**. Diocletian retained the rule over the **Eastern Sector** and **Maximian** ruled over the West.

In Daniel chapter 2 the two legs of the image, depicted in Nebuchadnezzar's dream represented the division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western Sectors.

In the next (5th) century, after the final division into East and West in AD 395, the Western Sector began to be attacked by the barbarians. This is dealt with in Revelation chapter 8, symbolized by the first four TRUMPETS. The trumpet is a prophetic symbol of WAR. The first attack was from the **Goths**, (Revelation 8.7); the second attack was from the **Vandals**, (Rev. 8.8-9); the third from **Attila the Hun** (Rev. 8.10-11). The fourth barbarian attack came from Odovacer and the Heruli (the 4th Angel's Trumpet). It was this last attack that put an end to the Western Roman Empire in **AD 476**. We hope to study this later, God willing.

The **Eastern Roman Empire**, (ruled from Constantinople) survived for almost a further thousand years until it fell to the Moslems in **1453**. It is this **Eastern Roman Empire** also called the **Byzantine Empire** with which we are now concerned.

In **AD 96** the long prophecy of Daniel **joins up with the prophecy of the Book of Revelation**. It is also from this starting point, —this high point of prosperity and greatness of the Roman Empire—that Edward Gibbon began his monumental historical work, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

It is interesting to read what Gibbon has to say about the century after **AD 96**, **which he says**, is the **high point** from which his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* commences. In chapter 3 paragraph 27 Gibbon states:

If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus.

This is, of course, the period from **AD 96 to 180**. Gibbon in 3 paragraphs previous to this statement has written of the 5 emperors of this period: **“Their united reigns are possibly the only period of history in which the happiness of a great people was the sole object of government.”**

The information in Gibbon’s writings has been an inestimable help to the interpreters of the Book of Revelation, a point made clear by E. B. Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* Vol. 1, pp. 116-117. The Book of Revelation was written in the year **AD 96** according to the most reliable interpreters. Revelation chapter 6 starts with the opening of the first of a series of **seven SEALS**.

The **first four SEALS** tell of four Horses and their Riders, sometimes called: “The Four Horses of the Apocalypse”:

Revelation 6.1 (AV) And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals, and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, “Come and see.”

2. And I saw, and behold, a white horse: and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.

The **“White Horse”** of v. 2 is symbolic of the **first five Roman Emperors** after John commenced writing his prophecy in **AD 96**.

Nerva, the first of these emperors came to the throne in that very year of AD 96. These first five emperors after AD 96 are called "**the five good emperors**" by several historians. (See that of M. Carey in his *History of Rome*, pp. 628-665.) We hope, God willing, to cover this period when we come to study the Book of Revelation.

The following history from **AD 313-395** is from the chronological dictionaries of James Trager and Rodney Castleden. This will take us to the final division of the Roman Empire into Eastern & Western Sectors in **AD 395**.

In **AD 313** by the **Edict of Milan** the Roman Emperor Constantine gave freedom of worship to Christians in the Roman Empire.

In **AD 330** the Emperor Constantine dedicated the new capital of the Roman Empire, and he named it Constantinople after himself. It had been built on the site of the old Greek city of Byzantium, founded [by king Byzas and likewise named after himself] in the 7th century BC.

In **AD 337** Constantine, now called "The Great" died and was succeeded by his three sons, (Constantine II; Constans; & Constantius II).

In **340** one of the co-emperors **Constantine II** was killed in battle. Then in **350** the Emperor **Constans** was murdered leaving Constantius II to rule alone.

In **361** the Emperor **Constantius II** died in Tarsus on his way to meet **his cousin Julian**. **Julian** then came to the throne as the new emperor. He tried to re-establish paganism but was killed in a battle against the Persians in **363**.

Jovian the captain of the Imperial Bodyguard succeeded Julian and he re-established Christianity in the empire.

In 364 **Jovian** signed a treaty with **Shapur**, Shah of Persia ceding Armenia to Persia. Following this he was found dead at Dadastana on his way back to Constantinople. Jovian was succeeded by the Pannonian general **Valentinian** and appointed his younger brother **Valens** as co-emperor in the East.

In 375 The Emperor Valentinian died on the Danube and was succeeded by his four-year-old son Valentinian II who was emperor in name only. **Gratian**, the boy's 17-year-old half brother, became *de facto* emperor.

The **Visigoth barbarians** were now beginning to settle in Roman territory in Moesia.

In the battle of **Adrianople** in AD 378 the **Visigoths** defeated the Roman army killing the emperor **Valens**. **Gratian** then called on his general **Theodosius** to replace **Valens** as emperor in the East.

Theodosius I [later 'The Great'] was the last of the great Roman Emperors in the West. In 379 he came to terms with the **Visigoths** and allowed them to settle in Roman territory as allies. In this year also Shar **Shapur II** of Persia died and as the *World History* of Rodney Castleden states, "Shar Shapur had humiliated the Romans, taken Armenia and rebuilt Susa and founded Nishapur".

The teachings of **Athanasius**, the 4th century bishop of Alexandria, came to be generally accepted in the religion of the Empire at this time, [AD 379].

This doctrine asserts that Christ is of the same substance as God the Father.

At the First Council of Nicaea Athanasius argued against Arius and Arius's doctrine that Christ is of a distinct substance from the Father. Arianism asserted the primacy of the Father.

In **383** the Roman Legions deserted the Emperor Gratian at Lutetia (Paris) and he fled to Lyon but was assassinated.

The Roman general Magnus Clemens Maximus had led the insurrection in Britain and Gaul. Gratian's younger brother Valentinian II and his co-emperor Theodosius recognized Magnus Maximus as Augustus and he began a 5-year reign as co-emperor.

In **388** co-emperor Magnus Maximus crossed into Italy, but the co-emperor **Theodosius** defeated him at Aquileia.

Magnus Maximus was subsequently murdered and Valentinian II the younger half-brother of Gratian, now 17 years old continued as co-emperor.

In **390** an insurrection in Macedonia angered the emperor Theodosius. He had 3000 rebels massacred at Thessalonica. Bishop Ambrose of Milan forced Theodosius to perform public penance on December 25th.

In **391** Alexandria's library, a **wonder of the ancient world** was destroyed by fire.

The emperor Theodosius had ordered that non-Christian works be destroyed.

In **392** the co-emperor Valentinian II was assassinated at Vienne in Gaul. The Frankish general Arbogast, who was behind this murder set up Eugenius as emperor.

Theodosius was shocked and angered at the murder of his 21-year-old co-emperor and marched against him.

In 394 Eugenius died in battle against the forces of Theodosius and Arbogast escaped into the mountains but killed himself two days later.

In 395 Emperor **Theodosius died at Milan aged 49 and the Empire split into two and was never again united.** Theodosius' son **Arcadius** ruled the Eastern Empire from Constantinople, while **Honorius** ruled from Milan. Honorius was only aged 10 years and the real power was in the hands of his master of troops, a Vandal called **Stilicho**. The split in the Empire was intended to be temporary, but proved to be permanent.

Let us now discuss the history of the **Western sector** of the Roman Empire in the next century, when the barbarians attacked Rome until it fell to them in 476.

This century, the 400s, known as the 5th century, begins to lock into the prophecy given in the 8th chapter of Revelation.

The 8th chapter of Revelation tells of **FOUR ANGELS** sounding 4 trumpets. In prophecy, **Trumpets, Hail and Thunder are symbolic of WAR.**

Revelation 8.6 And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound.

8.7 The first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth: and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.

Most Historicist studiers of prophecy interpret verse 7 as the attack of Alaric the Goth on the Western Roman Empire.

8.8 And the second angel sounded, and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea: and the third part of the sea became blood;

8.9. And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.

Most Historicists interpret verses 8 & 9 as the attack of Genseric the Vandal.

Rev. 8.10 And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of waters;

8.11 And the name of the star is called Wormwood: and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.

Most Historicists interpret verses 10 & 11 as the attack of Attila the Hun.

Rev. 8.12 And the fourth angel sounded, and the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise.

Most Historicists interpret verse 12 as the attack of **Odovacer** the barbarian who brought about the **final fall of the Western Roman Empire in AD 476.**

After the fall of the Western Roman Empire to the Barbarian Odovacer in **AD 476**, the dynasty of Emperors in the West came to an end. For more information on this period go to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* chapters 36, 37 and 38.

When the Western Roman Empire and its dynasty of emperors fell to the barbarians, "He that letteth" was "taken out of the way" and the "man of sin" was revealed:

II Thessalonians 2.3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;

2.4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

II Thessalonians 2.7 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way.

2.8 And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming.

2.9 *Even Him*, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,

2.10 And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

2.11 And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:

2.12 That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

It is of very great interest to note that even although contemporary Christians show little interest in Biblical prophecy, was not always the case. **E. B. Elliott** in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* volume 1 page 227 refers to the fact that the early Christians got great benefit from fulfilled prophecy. It strengthened their faith just as it could today.

E B Elliott *Horae Apocalypticæ* vol 1, p. 227:

It is assuredly very striking and instructive to observe with what earnestness of interest the fathers of the early Church, throughout the whole era of Pagan persecution, referred to fulfilled prophecy, such as *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* and *Hyppolytus*. They searched into the inspired predictions handed down to them. These were to them no unmeaning, no profitless writings. However they may have been in doubt with regard to many particulars of the future, there was a certain great outline that they found clear in divine prophecy: and both in this, and in the views that it opened to them throughout of God's care and kindness to His Church, they found an admirable stay to their faith, together with counsel, encouragement and comfort. . . . First they judged with one consent that Daniel's fourth wild Beast symbolized the Roman empire; as also that the little horn of this wild Beast, or its equivalent the last head of the Apocalyptic Beast symbolized one and the same antichristian power as St. Paul's Man of Sin, and St. John's Antichrist. Further they judged that the Roman empire, in its then existing state, was the *let* or *hindrance* meant by St. Paul, standing in the way of Antichrist's manifestation; and that its removal would take place on the empire's dissolution into a new form of ten kingdoms: among which, Antichrist, the Man of the Apostasy, would forthwith arise, and reign over the Roman world and empire in this its latest form; Rome itself, and its empire, (so the most learned thought,) having been revived to supremacy under him. Moreover, they were agreed that this Antichrist would persecute the Christian Church with a fierceness altogether unparalleled: and thus that there would be a second series of martyrs slain under Roman oppression; —persecutions that would only terminate in Christ's coming and taking vengeance, at the end of the world.

(The **second** much larger series of martyrs that took place under the Papacy is mentioned in **Rev. 6.11.**)

To return to our theme: —The Roman Empire in the East, (The Byzantine Empire), continued for almost a thousand years after the fall in **AD 476** of the Empire in the West.

The Empire in the West, which fell to the barbarians, became known symbolically as the “head of the Beast” and the Eastern Roman Empire, which was ruled from Constantinople, became known as the “body of the Beast” as we see in **Daniel 7.11.**

Daniel 7.11 I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld *even* till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.

The **Byzantine Empire** suffered two great setbacks in 1071. First its rule in Italy ended when Bari fell to **Robert Guiscard** and his Norman forces. Then the **Seljuk Turks**, who had crossed the Euphrates River, into Roman territory, attacked and defeated the Byzantine forces at the **battle of Manzikert** driving them out of **Asia Minor**.

By the **15th century** the territory of the Turks surrounded Constantinople and all that was left of the once mighty Eastern Roman Empire was little more than the city of Constantinople itself, which ultimately fell to the Moslem Turks after a siege in 1453.

The fall of Constantinople marked the end of the last remnant of the Roman Empire and with it was lost much Greek culture.

Some of the Greeks fleeing from the Moslems took with them Greek literature and their Greek Bibles, and this had a direct influence on the rise of the new learning and the Reformation in Europe. At this time Erasmus, intent on correcting the inaccuracies of the Latin Vulgate Bible in 1516 obtained the help of the printer John Froben and published the **first Greek-Latin parallel New Testament**.

Revelation 9.13-19 describe in symbolic language, the incursion into, and the near defeat of, Christendom by the Turks. What is more, we can read in Revelation 9.20-21 the amazing words of prophecy, which could only have come from the Divine Mind:

Revelation 9.20 And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk:

9.21 Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts.

The **“rest of the men who were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands”**, were those in what had been the Western sector of the old Roman Empire. These were they who in **1453** were now ruled by the Papacy. The people, especially their leaders, had seen the fall of the idolatrous and sinful Eastern Empire and learnt nothing from this awful judgment that should have made them repent.

Revelation 9.20 condemns the **idolatry**, which had become so prevalent by this time in both the Eastern and Western churches and which continues to the present. **Verse 21** condemns the **murders, sorceries, fornication** and **thefts** of this system.

E B Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* vol. 2, p. 29 writes:

In the war against the *Waldenses* of Piedmont, in the years 1477 and 1488, by Popes Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII, the same spirit presided.

Like the people of the House of Judah after the fall of the House of Israel to the Assyrians, these “rest of men” who were spared for a time (Judah) failed to repent. (Jer. 3.6-8)

When we dealt with **Daniel 7.8** we discussed the rise and rule of the God-defying power which was at first a little horn but which grew to be a great power. This horn represented the **Papacy**. Chapter 7 verse 25 tells that this power would “**speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High.**” Here in **Daniel 11.36** we are told of the similar God-defying power of the Byzantine emperors:

Daniel 11.36 And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

The word for "will" in the Greek is *ratson*. Strong's Concordance tells us that the AV translates *ratson* as "favour" 15 times, "will" 14 times, and as "desire" and "self-will". It is interesting to compare the **self-willed** behaviour of the **Papacy** with that of the **Byzantine kings**. John Fox in his *Acts and Monuments* R.T.S. Vol. IV, p.157 refers to the Pope's claim to universal jurisdiction in things both **spiritual** and **temporal**. (See Filmer's book *Daniel's Predictions* p. 76).

Daniel 7.25 describes the Papacy thus:

Daniel 7.25 And he shall speak *great* words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

The **Byzantine kings** considered themselves likewise to be **raised above the Church**. Remember king Saul after he spared Agag and the best of the sheep, oxen etc. as recorded in I Samuel chapter 15. Samuel, the last Judge over Israel and a prophet, came and took over the situation from king Saul and saw that God's commandments were obeyed. Where the state failed, the church took over. So it should be today.

Norman H Baynes in his book *The Byzantine Empire* p. 92 states:

For the Emperor of East Rome was not only defender of the faith: he was the head of the Church: the heir of Constantine the Great; he alone could summon a Church Council, the religious parliament of the Empire,

where procedure was modeled on that of the secular senate, where the gospel took the place of the pagan altar of victory: his lay commissioners presided at the sessions of the council, and its conclusions had no force until authority was given to them by the Emperor's approval. In time even these representative assemblies appeared dangerously democratic, and the autocrat of Constantinople defined the dogmas of the Church by imperial edict.

In contrast, Scripture advises a king thus:

Deuteronomy 17.14 When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shall possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that *are* about me;

17.15 Thou shalt in any wise set *him* king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: *one* from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which *is* not thy brother.

17.16 But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way.

17.17 Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.

17.18 And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of *that which is* before the priests the Levites.

17.19 And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them:

17.20 That his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, *to* the right hand, or *to* the left: to the end that he may prolong *his* days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of Israel.

The description of the king in Daniel 11.36 falls well short of the instructions given to kings in Deuteronomy 17. The kings described in Daniel 11.36 are not obedient but self-willed. They love themselves rather than God.

Plato writing on the death of Socrates in his *Phaedo* explains that in Greek philosophy the human soul, after it had been released from its earthly body at death, enters a more blissful existence in another world. This idea from Greek culture has been taken very largely into the teaching of the Christian Church, that when a person dies he or she goes straight to heaven.

Newman's *Beginner's Ancient History* p. 204 states that even before the fall of the Western Empire in 476, it had descended into a dark period of history.

“The Eastern Empire, however, lived on through all this, keeping off the Barbarians sometimes with bribes,

sometimes by fighting. The emperors at Constantinople still regarded themselves as Caesars, but in fact the separation between East and West was practically complete. . . The emperors were **absolute rulers.**" (Emphasis added).

The Papacy and the Byzantine kings generally favoured the worshipping of icons. However, this worship offended true Christians who respected God's Commandments. In addition we know from history that idolatry was also contrary to Moslem teaching about which we shall presently make mention.

Surely the Moslem attacks on Christendom were a judgment from God because of the almost universal practice of idolatry in both the East and the West of the Empire. This is of great importance since the Moslems were making inroads into the Byzantine Empire militarily at this time. The Moslems had whittled away the territory of that great Byzantine Empire until about all that was left of it in 1453 was the city of Constantinople.

It is interesting to note that Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* volume 2, page 32, draws attention to the vow made by Mahomet II, 16 years after he had led the conquest of Constantinople in 1453:

"It was on 2nd of August, AD 1469, that Mahomet II published in all the mosques of his empire the vow following,

'I Mahomet, son of Amurath . . . emperor of emperors and prince of princes, from the rising to the setting sun, promise to the only God, creator of all things, by my vow and by my oath, that I will not give sleep to my eyes, that I will eat no

delicates, that I will not seek out what is pleasant, that I will not touch what is beautiful, nor turn my face from the West to the East, till I overthrow, and trample under the feet of my horses, the *gods of the nations*, those *gods of wood, of brass, of silver, of gold, or of painting*, which the disciples of Christ *have made with their hands.*'''

Daniel 11.36 states: "**the king shall do according to his will.**" Elliott, the two Newtons (Bishop and Sir Isaac) and Mede prefer to call the king "**self-deifying**".

There are other examples of this phrase in Scripture where a great leader does "according to his will", as in **Daniel 8.4** where it is applied to Persia pushing westwards; also in **Daniel 11.3** where it is applied to Alexander the Great. So we see that the king of the Byzantine Empire (and we repeat, in the Book of Daniel, "king" refers to a dynasty of kings rather than an individual) did exalt and magnify himself above every god, and speak marvelous things against the god of gods, and he did prosper till the "indignation be accomplished". The indignation here refers to the fall of Constantinople in 1453 when the kingdom ceased. We repeat verse 36:

Daniel 11.36 And the king shall do according to his will; and **he shall exalt, and magnify himself above every GOD**, and shall speak marvelous things against the GOD of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

Compare this verse with **II Thessalonians 2.3** which refers to the Papacy:

II Thessalonians 2.3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;

2.4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

In 533 the Emperor Justinian decreed that the Bishop of Rome should have precedence over the other four bishops (in Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch and Constantinople). From this time the Latin and Greek churches began a process of separation culminating in **1054** with a complete separation known as the **Great Schism** based on their two main differences:

1. The Eastern Church rejected the authority of the Papacy.
2. The Eastern Church held that The Holy Spirit issues only from the Father, whereas the Papacy held to the Nicene Creed, which proclaimed that The Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. (Apparently the original Greek form of the Nicene Creed says that the Holy Spirit proceeds "from the Father". The Latin text speaks of the Holy Spirit proceeding "from the Father and the Son".)

Moving on to Daniel 11.37

Daniel 11.37 Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women,* nor regard any God: for he shall magnify himself above all.

*The desire of women, Elliott's *Horae apoc.* Vol. 4, p. 92-93, note. He rejects that this means marriage and interprets it as the desire of the women of Israel to *bear* the Messiah and so be blessed. Hence the desire of women = Christ. This also fits the context that the emperor does not regard God in any shape or form.

The previous verse (36) evidently clarifies the meaning that "he" in verses 37, 38 and 39 applies to "the king that shall do according to his will".

Moving on to verse 38:

11.38 But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces†: and a god whom his father knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.

†The Hebrew word here from which "forces" is translated is *maowz* (Strong's number 4581). It is translated in the RSV "the god of fortresses". The A.V. translates the same Hebrew word in verses 7 and 10 as "fortresses".

Filmer in his book *Daniel's Predictions* p. 138 draws our attention to the fact that **icons were regarded as possessing great defensive powers**. Filmer quotes from the Cambridge Medieval History volume IV p. 5:

Everybody was convinced that by a mystic virtue the all-powerful images brought healing to the soul as well as the body, that they stilled tempests, put evil spirits to flight, and warded off diseases, and that to pay them the honour due to them was a sure means of obtaining all the blessings in this life and eternal glory in the next.

Edward Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Bury Edition) vol. V p. 249 writes:

The worship of images had stolen into the church by insensible degrees, and each petty step was pleasing to the superstitious mind, as productive of comfort and innocent of sin. But in the beginning of the eighth century, in the

full magnitude of the abuse, the more timorous Greeks were awakened by an apprehension that, under the mask of Christianity, they had restored the religion of their fathers; they heard, with grief and impatience the name of idolaters: the incessant charge of the Jews and Mahometans, who derived from the Law and the Koran an immortal hatred of graven images and all relative worship. The servitude of the Jews might curb their zeal and depreciate their authority; but the triumphant Musulmans [Moslems], who reigned at Damascus, and threatened Constantinople, cast into the scale of reproach the accumulated weight of truth and victory.

The cities of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt had been fortified with the images of Christ, His mother, and His saints; and each city presumed on the hope or promise of miraculous defence.

In the 7th century the almost universal idolatry and the self-deifying emperors had almost driven out worship of God as we are told in verse 37, already quoted above but which we repeat:

Daniel 11.37 Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any God: for he shall magnify himself above all.

But innocence cannot be assumed from ignorance of God's commandments because some did identify the sin and **two emperors** did act against the idolatry!

In 736 Emperor Leo III called a council of bishops to suppress the worship of images.

Norman Baynes in his book *The Byzantine Empire* p. 89 laments the destruction of the writings of the Iconoclasts. He tells of those who "would even choose an icon to be god-parent to a child." Baynes also writes of those who thought thus: —"Were not perchance the conquests of the Arabs, the haters of images, a judgment of an outraged heaven?"

The images, however, were restored by Irene the widow of Leo IV.

Leo V suppressed them again in 815, but the images were finally restored in 845 by another woman —Theodora widow of the emperor Theophilus.

Verse 39 in the RSV:

Daniel 11.39 He shall deal with the strongest fortresses by the help of a foreign* god; those who acknowledge him he shall magnify with honour. He shall make them rulers over many and shall divide the land for a price.

*Foreign, from Heb. *nekar* occurs 35 times in AV. Translated 17 times "strange" 10 times "stranger".

We have quoted from Gibbon above (p. 22) how many cities were fortified in this way with images of Christ, His mother and His saints. Instead of praying to God for protection in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, prayers were offered to patron saints or images of Christ who they regarded as intercessors for cities, to protect them, and to whom the people paid homage. **I Tim. 2.5** For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* ch. XL Bury ed. vol. 5, p. 244 says:

The primitive Christians were possessed with an unconquerable repugnance to the use and abuse of images . . . The Mosaic law had severely proscribed all representations of the Deity . . . The first introduction of a symbolic worship was in the veneration of the cross and of relics. The saints and martyrs, whose intercession was implored, were seated on the right hand of God; but the gracious and often supernatural favours, which, in the popular belief, were showered round their tomb, conveyed an unquestionable sanction of the devout pilgrims, who visited, and touched, and kissed these lifeless remains, the memorials of their merits and sufferings.

Then from Gibbon p. 250, the JUDGMENT:

In a rapid conquest of ten years, the Arabs subdued those cities and these images; and, in their opinion, the Lord of Hosts pronounced a decisive judgment between the adoration and contempt of these mute and inanimate idols. For a while Edessa had braved the Persian assaults; but the chosen city, the spouse of Christ, was involved in the common ruin; and His divine resemblance became the slave and trophy of the infidels. After servitude of three hundred years, the Palladium* was yielded to the devotion of Constantinople, for a ransom of twelve thousand pounds of silver, the redemption of two hundred Musulmans Moslem, and a perpetual truce for the territory of Edessa

* Palladium = a safeguard or source of protection.

The message here is that when the iniquity of the Byzantine Empire reached its fullness, God's judgment came in the form of the Moslem onslaught.

The next six verses take us to the end of Daniel chapter 11. As we shall see, these verses refer to that great and prolonged power that would hold Jerusalem in subjection from 638 until its power was broken by the British forces under General Allenby in 1917, the year 1335 in the Moslem calendar.

To be continued God willing.

CHRISTIANITY AND MARXISM

Marxism has made great strides at the expense of Christianity since WW II in nations, which had previously been described as Christian but no longer are. One has to wonder if people realize how far they have strayed from the faith in Christian principles that were held by their grandparents.

One hears the statement from time to time "The Ideal is the enemy of the Real." Equality is the ideal (for some) but inequality is the real. Much confusion has come about from information we are subjected to. For instance, the American Declaration of Independence signed 4th July 1776, begins with the words:

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident,
that all Men are created equal, . . ."
[emphasis added]

This is a corruption of the Virginia Declaration of Rights written a short time before the Declaration of Independence and adopted unanimously on June 12, 1776 by the Virginia Convention of Delegates. The Virginia Declaration of Rights was drafted by George Mason and Section I of it states:

"All men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights
...

So the two statements have little in common!

The slogan of the French Revolution was "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." Here we have another deception from the enemies of the Christian institution of the monarchy. You have to coerce people to make them equal by forcing them (in this case down to the level of slavery).

From history, it seems that where the masses have some knowledge of Biblical principles, then a liberating force appears as in early America. When the principles of Marxism were implemented as in the Soviet Union such was not the case and the government is tyrannical. Scripture does not say that people were created equal as is often heard from the pulpit and other places where Marxism is preached.

In fact we see that Scripture goes out of its way in numerous passages to state the inequality of man. Here are a few of these passages:

Malachi 1.1-2 The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi.

1.2 "I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, 'Wherein hast Thou loved us?' *Was* not Esau Jacob's brother?" saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob,

1.3 **And I hated Esau**, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.

Acts 10.40 Him God raised up the third day, and showed Him openly;

10.41 Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even* to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead.

Romans 12.3-8 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.

12.4 For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office:

12.5 So we, *being* many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

12.6 Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, *let us prophesy* according to the proportion of faith;

12.7 Or ministry, *let us wait* on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching;

12.8 Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, *let him do it* with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

Matthew 13.11 He answered and said unto them, because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.

13.12 For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

Matthew 19.29 And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name's sake shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.

19.30 But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last *shall* be first.

Matthew 25.28 Take therefore the talent from him, and give *it* unto him which hath ten talents.

25.29 For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Acts 10.39 And we are witnesses of all things which He did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; Whom they slew and hanged on a tree:

10.40 Him God raised up the third day, and shewed Him openly;

10.41 Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even* to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead.

So God did not show the risen Lord, His son, to all the people, but only to those He had chosen previously. This brings to mind a similar passage in Scripture, in 1 Corinthians:

1 Corinthians 2.7 But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory:

2.8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

The very influential teaching of Pelagius (a British monk who lived c. AD 360- c. 420) is built on the assumption that we should expect God to dispense his blessing equally.

Pelagius argues in the following way (see Milner *History of the Church of Christ* vol 4, p. 97:

If grace be perfectly free, and all men be alike, why is grace given to this man and not to that?

The first clause in this sentence is true for we are told that grace is perfectly free, but the second phrase of Pelagius is false, as all men are not alike and we have just quoted verses showing the inequality of men.

Isaiah 46.9 Remember the former things of old: for I *am* God, and *there is* none else; I *am* God, and *there is* none like Me,

46.10 Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times *the things* that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure:

46.11 Calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth My counsel from a far country: yea, I have spoken *it*, I will also bring it to pass; I have proposed *it*, I will also do it.

British-Israel World Federation (Victorian Headquarters) Inc. **MONTHLY NOTES**

No. 680



Mar-Apr. 2011

All Mail to:
P.O. BOX 596, CAMBERWELL, VIC. 3124
AUSTRALIA
Phone 03 9882 4256

[Note: The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily endorsed by the **BRITISH-ISRAEL WORLD FEDERATION (VICTORIAN HEADQUARTERS)** Inc.]

DANIEL 11 continued.

The last 6 verses, 40 to 45, of Daniel 11, prophesy about the incursion of **Islam** into Christendom. The push of the **Arab** "king of the South" into Christendom takes up only the first part of verse 40. The remaining parts of verse 40 together with verses 41-45 refer to the incursion of the **Turkish** "king of the north".

The **9th chapter of the Book of Revelation** is devoted entirely to these two Moslem incursions into Christendom where they are called the **First and Second Woes**.

Returning to Dan 11 we read from the AV:

Daniel 11.40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

11.41 He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many *countries* shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, *even* Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

11.42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape.

11.43 But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians *shall be* at his steps.

11.44 But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.

11.45 And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

As we can see, this is a prophecy of the **IDOLATRY-HATING** Moslems attacking **IDOLATRY-RIDDEN** Christendom. We know from history that the Arab Saracens south of Jerusalem were the first Moslems to attack Christendom. This Arab Saracen part of the Moslem incursion into Christendom is mentioned only briefly here, but more fully in **Revelation 9.1-12** where it is called the **FIRST WOE**. This Moslem attack began in **AD 632** and its **aggressive period** was to last a **symbolic five months** and on the year/day interpretation is **30 x 5 = 150 literal years**.

As we stand in awe at how exact Daniel's prophecy is we should also remember that our Lord Himself quoted from the book of Daniel, (see Matthew 24.15 and Mark 13.14).

Daniel 11.40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

When is the “**time of the end**,” mentioned at the beginning of this verse? A clue is in Daniel 12 where Daniel does not understand the prophecy and asks for its meaning.

Daniel 12.8 And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, “O my Lord, what *shall be* the end of these *things*?”

12.9 And he said, “Go thy way, Daniel: for the words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end.”

We must now be living in the “time of the end”, for we now understand the prophecy, as most of it has become history. From verse 40 we may say that the “time of the end” began when the king of the south “pushed at him”, because that is what the verse says.

The “Him” that was “pushed” is evidently the “he” featured in the previous verse, i.e. the Wilful King, the Byzantine Emperor.

Filmer in his book *Daniel's Predictions* agrees with this as we can read on p. 139 of his book *Daniel's Predictions*.

The “king of the south” is the Arab (Saracen) king to the south of Jerusalem. It is true that the Arab Saracens **only “pushed”** at the Byzantine kingdom. The Saracens **did not conquer the Byzantine Empire**, it was, the “king of the north” who conquered the Byzantine Empire after many years of war of attrition in which the territory of the empire was whittled away. All that was left in 1453 was the city of Constantinople, which finally fell to the Turks in that year. This ended the last of what remained of the Roman Empire.

The Old Roman Empire in the West had fallen to the Barbarians in AD 476 but was reclaimed later by the military power of Justinian, the Roman emperor in the East. This recovery in the West was destined to become the seat, not of another emperor in the West, but of the Papacy, supported by various nations that the Papacy would dominate spiritually. The Papacy would in return be supported temporally by these various nations. These various nations are described as the “horns of the beast” in the book of Revelation.

When the **Iconoclastic rulers of the Byzantine Empire banished icons**, the Moslem “king of the ^{south}~~north~~” was taken out of the way and the FIRST WOE ended, never to return. The Moslems were a judgment from God **on Byzantine Idolatry**.

The Bishop of Christchurch is reported as saying that the recent earthquake there with great destruction of the city and its churches was not a judgment from God!

However, when the Byzantine Emperor turned the nation from idolatry, the judgment of the First Woe disappeared! These are historically verifiable facts.

The Byzantine emperor was in no doubt that his empire was suffering judgment!

E. B. ELLIOTT in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* Vol. 1, p. 467 writes:

There remains just one other point to which I would wish to call attention, ere concluding this present Chapter; I mean the fact of two remarkable coincidences between certain notable epochs in the history of the Saracen woe already noticed, and others equally notable in the ecclesiastical and religious history of Eastern Christendom.

Its apostasy, its open apostasy from Christ, has been mentioned as the predicted cause of the infliction; and further how Mahomet and the early Saracen Moslems, understanding their special commission to be against idolaters, avowed that it was as regarding its people in that character, that they carried the war into Roman Christendom. Now throughout the seventh century this charge was made against them by their conquerors and tormentors altogether ineffectually.

At length, some twenty years, or less, from the commencement of the eighth century, the celebrated Isaurian family was raised to the imperial throne of Constantinople.

[Leo III acceded in 718 according to Bryce in his book *The Holy Roman Empire.*]

THE 1st ICONOCLASTIC PERIOD 730-787:
(Continuing from Elliott, p. 467:

[The Isaurian] princes, otherwise doubtless illustrious, became chiefly so on this account, because for **sixty years almost uninterruptedly**, — supported by not a few really religious, as even Gibbon admits, but with opposition bitter and abiding from the great majority within the empire, and the Roman Popes without it, —they set themselves strenuously to wipe away the reproach of image-worship, at least from Eastern Christendom. And what followed?

It was in AD 717, very soon after the emperor Leo's [V] accession, who even then was secretly bent on this reform of the Church, that the great armament of the Saracens attacked Constantinople. It attacked it, but was completely defeated and repulsed.

Elliott continues vol. 1, p. 468:

Again in **AD 754**, Constantine Copronymus, the successor of Leo . . . convened a grand synod at Constantinople, —the **Seventh General Council**, as he most properly called it, though it was afterwards stigmatized and disowned, —for the express purpose of condemning image-worship. [This synod] passed that public sentence of condemnation on it; and behold THE VERY NEXT YEAR, as historians record, THE CALIPHATE WAS DIVIDED;

THE MAHOMMEDAN COLOSSUS [WAS] BROKEN; the scorpion-locusts carried away, as by a strong west wind to the Euphrates; the intensity of the Saracenic woe brought to an end.

Elliott continues vol.1, pp. 468-9:

Alas! The efforts of these emperors and of the more enlightened of their subjects, always resisted by the majority, proved abortive. —In the year 781 Irene succeeded to the imperial throne.

And, having murdered her iconoclastic husband, who stood in the way of her object, she gathered in 787 another synod, the famous seventh General Council; in which the decrees of the former Council were reprobated and disavowed, and the worship of images, by a solemn act of the Catholic Church, declared lawful.

It was just about this time [from 781] that the Saracenic woe, though already broken, seemed as if it had received a temporary revivification.

Guided by Haroun Al Raschid, the Arab forces from Bagdad swept across the Lesser Asia, on provocation from the Greek Emperor, not once only, but eight times bearing down all opposition before them. Was there not a memento of warning from heaven in it? —But the Eastern Church persisted. UNQUOTE.

A Wikipedia article on the Internet tells that Harun al Rashid is “widely considered the greatest of the Abbasid caliphs, presiding over the Arab Empire at its political and cultural peak. He died in 809 aged 46 on an expedition to put down an uprising in Khurasan.”

Also it is of interest to note that when Charlemagne was crowned head of the Western Roman Empire on Christmas Day 800, he was not recognized as Emperor by Irene, Empress of the Eastern Roman Empire. Several historians have written that Charlemagne was not sympathetic to the iconodule [worship of Icons] view, as we can see from various articles on the Internet!

Elliott does not mention much about the **second Iconoclastic period of 814-842**. Here is a quote from a Wikipedia Internet article on the second iconoclastic period.

THE 2nd ICONOCLASTIC PERIOD 814-842:

Emperor Leo V the Armenian instituted a second period of Iconoclasm in 815, again possibly motivated by **military failures seen as Divine displeasure**. The Byzantines had suffered a series of humiliating defeats at the hands of the **Bulgarian Khan Krum**, in the course of which Nikephoros I had been killed in battle and emperor Michael Rangabe had been forced to abdicate.

Soon after his accession, **Leo V began to discuss the possibility of reviving iconoclasm with a variety of people, including priests, monks, and members of the senate.**

He was reported to have remarked to a group of advisors that:

All the emperors, who took up images and venerated them, met with death either in revolt or war; but those who did not venerate images all died a natural death, remained in power until they died, and were then laid to rest with all honours in the imperial mausoleum in the Church of the Holy Apostles. (Ref. *Scriptor incertus* 349, 1-18 cited by Pratsch, *Theodoros*, 208.)

Leo next appointed a "commission" of monks "to look into the old books" and reach a decision on the veneration of images. **They soon discovered the acts of the Iconoclastic Synod of 754.** (See ref. Pratsch, *Theodoros*, 211-12.)

A first debate followed between Leo's supporters and the clerics who continued to advocate the veneration of icons, the latter group being led by the Patriarch Nikephoros, which led to no resolution. However, Leo had apparently become convinced by the correctness of the iconoclastic position, and had the icon of the Chalke gate once more replaced with a cross. (See ref. Pratsch, *Theodoros*, 216-17.) In 815 the revival of iconoclasm was **rendered official by a Synod held in Hagia Sophia.**

Leo was succeeded by Michael II, who in an 824 letter to the Carolingian emperor Louis the Pious lamented the appearance of image veneration in the church and such practices as making

icons baptismal godfathers of infants.
**He confirmed the decrees of the
Iconoclast Council of 754.**

Michael was succeeded by his son, Theophilus. Theophilus died leaving his wife Theodora regent for his minor heir, Michael III. **Like Irene 50 years before her, Theodora mobilized the iconodules and proclaimed the restoration of icons in 843,** on the condition that Theophilus not be condemned.

Since that time, the first Sunday of Great Lent 843 has been celebrated in the Orthodox Church as the “Triumph of Orthodoxy”. [I.e. the triumph of idolatry, Ed.] (Emphasis added.)

The article goes on to mention that most of the records available to us today are from “iconodule writings”. However, the article reminds us, that “many arguments derived from Scripture recur in Protestant writings on the same issue.” Because the surviving sources were from the writings of the iconodules it has been difficult to get a reasonably balanced account of the various aspects of the controversy.

The “Wikipedia free encyclopedia” states where it gets the information from in its article on “Byzantine Iconoclasm”. Their “major theological sources include the writings of John of Damascus, Theodore the Studite, and the Patriarch Nikephoros, all of these were iconodules.”

Returning to the last few words of chapter 5 of Elliott’s *Horae Apocalypticae* vol. 1, p. 469 we read:

Under the influence of the empress **Theodora the struggle ended finally, in the year 842,** in the undisputed ascendancy and establishment of image worship. —And what then

[was] the consequence? With characteristic forbearance, as we have seen, the Lord continued to this guilty people the interval of mitigation and of respite, through the ninth and much of the tenth century.

But would He endure the provocation much longer? How long would be the respite before another woe?"

UNQUOTE. (Emphasis added)

The 3 Woes are first introduced into Scripture in **Revelation 8.13**:

Revelation 8.13 And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, "Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!"

We shall find in the next article that because of the persistence of idolatry, God's patience expired. The First Woe we had seen was mercifully removed when the iconoclastic emperors outlawed idolatry.

Now the Second Woe struck! —

This was the Turkish (Moslem) incursion into Christendom commencing in the 11th century. This led to the utter defeat of the Byzantine Empire when the Turks conquered the great city of Constantinople in 1453.

To be continued God Willing.

EDOM IN THE BOOK OF ESTHER:

The Book of Esther tells about Esau's descendants, the Edomites, in conflict with the Jewish Israelites in Persia.

Haman is introduced in the Book of Esther in chapter 3 verse 1. In verse 10, Haman is called "**the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, the Jews' enemy.**"

Josephus in his book *Antiquities of the Jews*, (Book XI, chapter VI, paragraph 5) calls Haman an **Amalekite**, thereby acknowledging him as an Edomite because Amalek was Esau's grandson:

From **Josephus's** we read:

Now there was one Haman, the son of Amedatha, by birth an **Amalekite**, that used to go in to the king; and the foreigners and Persians worshipped him, as Artaxerxes had commanded that such honour should be paid to him; but Mordecai was so wise, and so observant of his own country's laws, that he would not worship the man.

(Emphasis added).

Genesis 36.12 informs us that **Amalek** is **Esau's grandson**.

Genesis 36.12 And Timna was concubine to Eliphaz Esau's son; and she bare to Eliphaz Amalek: these *were* the sons of Adah Esau's wife.

Strong's concordance records only one person in Scripture by the name Amalek.

The Book of Esther calls Haman an Agagite, which was the collective name for the rulers of the Amalekites, as pharaoh was for the rulers of the Egyptians.

Esther 3.1 After these things did king Ahasuerus promote Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, and advanced him, and set his seat above all the princes that *were* with him.

Haman is described four times in the book of Esther as the “Jews enemy” (3.10; 8.1; 9.10, 24) no doubt because of his being an Edomite. The Jews here were Israelites, not Edomite Jews as many of the rulers of the Jewish nation were at the time of our Lord.

John 8.44 Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.

John 10.24 Then came the Jews round about Him, and said unto Him, “How long dost Thou make us to doubt? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly”.

10.25 Jesus answered them, “I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in My Father’s name, they bear witness of Me.

10.26 But ye believe not, because ye are not of My sheep, as I said unto you.

10.27 My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me:

Our Lord recognized Nathanael as an “Israelite indeed” in John, but not these Jews.

John 1.47 Jesus saw Nathaneal coming to Him, and saith unto Him, “Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!”

So there are two types of Jews in the Holy Land at the time of our Lord. There were Israelites, and there were those whom our Lord recognized as “of their father the devil”.

THE ROYAL WEDDING.

Prince William and Kate Middleton said that they were “incredibly moved” by the affection shown to them since their engagement.

In their official wedding programme their message reads: “We are both so delighted that you are able to join us in celebrating what we hope will be one of the happiest days of our lives. The affection shown to us by so many people during our engagement has been incredibly moving, and has touched us both deeply. We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone most sincerely for their kindness”.

Paola Totaro wrote in “The Age” newspaper Melbourne on 30th April 2011:

“Prince William, now officially His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Earl of Strathearn and Baron Carrickfergus arrived at the Abbey with his brother and best-man, Prince Harry, 45 minutes before the bride. William wore the ceremonial scarlet tunic and dark trousers of the Irish Guards, with a badge featuring the guards’ motto, Quis Separabit—“who shall separate us”.

The brothers were greeted by huge cheering crowds as their ~~chauffer-~~^X driven Bentley, painted in royal claret livery proceeded along the Mall.

It is no secret that the Queen’s first grandson had hoped to marry before friends and family in the village church in Berkshire where his fiancée

grew up. But the wedding of William Arthur Philip Louis Mountbatten-Windsor and Catherine Elizabeth Middleton was always to be the most public of weddings, another step in the gilded cage of aristocratic destiny that will see this young Prince—barring tragedy or historic personal decision—become King William V.

The Abbey was full of guests 90 minutes before the wedding began. . . . The bride, on the arm of her father Michael Middleton, arrived at the Great West Door on schedule at 11 am. She wore a diamond-studded Cartier tiara lent to her by the Queen, and was sheathed in an ivory satin Sarah Burton full-length gown with a comparatively modest three-metre train.

As the solemnity of Johann Sebastian Bach's *Fantasia* enveloped the Abbey, it was almost impossible to watch Prince William without remembering him walking down the very same aisle as a 15-year-old behind his young mother's coffin.

But when his bride arrived at his side, their open, candid gaze at each other could not have been more different to the diffident, nervous meeting at the altar of Prince William's parents 30 years ago. A smiling William told his bride she looked beautiful as they met at the altar."

The bride had walked up the aisle accompanied by the anthem, "I was glad", the music of which was composed for the coronation of King Edward VII by Sir Charles Parry. The words were taken from Psalm 122.

Psalm 122.1 I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord.

2 Our feet shall stand within Thy gates, O Jerusalem.

3 Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together:

4 Whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord.

5 For there are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David.

6 Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love Thee.

7 Peace be within thy walls, *and* prosperity within thy palaces.

8 For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace *be* within thee.

9 Because of the house of the Lord our God will seek thy good.

Kate's brother James read The Lesson from Paul's Epistle to the Romans 12.1-2 & 9-:

Romans 12.1 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, *which is* your reasonable service.

2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

9 *Let* love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good.

10 *Be* kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another;

11 Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord;

12 Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer;

Continuing our quote above from the article in "The Age":

"The Archbishop of Canterbury, in ceremonial robes, asked William first: "Wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife?" to which he replied with a firm "I will".

For Ms Middleton however, no vow to "obey": "I, Catherine Elizabeth, take thee, William Arthur Philip Louis, to my wedded husband, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse, in sickness and health, to love and to cherish till death us do part, according to God's holy law and thereto I give thee my troth."

As Prince William put the gold wedding band onto the fourth finger of his bride's left hand—a ritual momentarily interrupted by the ring sticking at her knuckle—there was an audible sigh of affection and emotion from the pews around them. A few moist eyes, too, as the first hymn after their formal union resounded throughout the Abbey: *Guide Me, O Thou Great Redeemer* was the last hymn sung at Diana's funeral 14 years ago.

The crowd outside cheered every vow and answer, but stilled en masse as the hymns filled the streets and the sun finally peaked through the blanket of cloud.

The young couple was afforded just a few minutes out of the public eye to disappear with both sets of parents into the Shrine of St Edward the Confessor to sign the register.

As they returned, to lead the procession out of the Abbey, there came a gift to Prince William from his new wife—a 30 second “accolade”, or fanfare, composed specially for him by a colleague and titled *Valiant and Brave*, after the motto of the Prince’s RAF Search and Rescue squadron.

As the newlyweds walked towards the outside world, the Abbey seemed dreamlike, a long emerald grove studded with six-metre English field maples and horn-beam—traditionally symbols of resilience.

As they stepped out of the Abbey, the crowd erupted into cheers and the bells began to peal.

And then, it was to the carriages—a riot of red velvet and gold wood, of polished brass and coachmen, white steeds and their riders, of the military and the mediaeval, the royal and their subjects. The route from the Abbey was jam-packed with people all the way along Parliament Square, to Whitehall, past Horse Guards Parade,

the elegant Mall and into Buckingham Palace, where the party would soon begin.

But the greatest moment for the crowds came on schedule at 1.25pm, when the young couple walked on to the balcony of Buckingham Palace, soon to be joined by other members of the Royal Family. The new Duke and Duchess of Cambridge waved and exchanged a quick, self conscious kiss, leaving Britain's future King faintly blushing.

As if to acknowledge the brevity of the first kiss, the couple delighted the crowd by kissing a second time, before disappearing inside."

GOD WILL NOT MAKE A FULL END OF ISRAEL

Jeremiah 30.11 For I *am* with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations wither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished.

Jeremiah 36.28 Fear thou not, O Jacob My servant, saith the Lord: for *I* am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished.

THE THRONE OF DAVID IS EVERLASTING

I Kings 2.44 The king said moreover to Shimei, "Thou knowest all the wickedness which thine heart is privy to, that thou didst to David my father: therefore the Lord shall return thy wickedness upon thine own head;

2.45 And king Solomon *shall be* blessed, and the throne of David shall be established before the Lord for ever."

I Kings 8.25 Therefore now, Lord God of Israel, keep with Thy servant David my father that Thou promisedst him, saying, 'There shall not fail thee a man in My sight to sit on the throne of Israel; so that thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before Me as thou hast walked before Me.'

I Kings 9.4 And if thou wilt walk before Me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, *and* wilt keep My statutes and My judgments:

9.5 Then I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, 'There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel.'

II Chronicles 6.16 . . . 'There shall not fail thee a man in My sight to sit upon the throne of Israel; yet so that thy children take heed to their way to walk in My law, as thou hast walked before Me.'

II Chronicles 7.17 And as for thee, if thou wilt walk before Me, as David thy father walked, and do according to all that I have commanded thee, and shalt observe My statutes and My judgments;

7.18 Then will I stablish the throne of thy kingdom, according as I have covenanted with David thy father, saying, 'There shall not fail thee a man *to be* ruler in Israel.'

Jeremiah 33.17 For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.

33.18 Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before Me . . . to do sacrifice continually.

British-Israel World Federation (Victorian Headquarters) Inc.

No. 681



May-June 2011

MONTHLY NOTES

All Mail to:
P.O. BOX 596, CAMBERWELL, VIC. 3124.
AUSTRALIA.
Phone 03 9882 4256

[Note: The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily endorsed by the BRITISH-ISRAEL WORLD FEDERATION (VICTORIAN HEADQUARTERS) Inc.]

DANIEL 11

In the last issue of these Notes we discussed the first part of Daniel 11.40:

Daniel 11.40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him:

Before moving on to discuss the “king of the north” of Daniel 11.40-45 we should first consider when the “king of the south” ended his attack or “push”. To establish this we need to find when this “push” began and how long it lasted.

The Book of Daniel does not tell how long the “king of the south” “pushed” at him. However, we are told this in Revelation 9.5.

Revelation 9.5 And to them it was given that they should not kill* them, but that they should be tormented† five months; and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man. (Emphasis added)

*Kill here is from Greek *apokteino* which the Enhanced Strong's Lexicon tells us the AV translates as “kill” 55 times, “slay” 14 times and “put to death” 6 times.

†Torment here is from Greek *basanizo* which the AV translates as “torment” 8 times, “pain” once, “toss” once, “vex” once, and “toil” once.

In Daniel 11.40 we are told that "the king of the south" at the time of the end would "push at him".

Push here is from the Hebrew *nagach* translated as "push" 8 times, and "gore" 3 times.

We are told in Rev. 9.5 that the Arab Moslems were to torment but not destroy the nominally Christian Byzantine Empire. The destruction of the Byzantine Empire was reserved to be done later by the Turkish Moslems, called in Revelation 9 the SECOND WOE. This we are told in Revelation 9.15:

Revelation 9.15 And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men.

In the last issue of these Notes (no. 680) we established that on the **day/year prophetic time scale**, the "five (symbolic) months" of Revelation 9.5 is a literal period of **150 years**. To establish the terminal date of this 1st Moslem attack we must therefore work out when the attack commenced and then add on 150 years.

E B Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* vol. 1, p. 457 gives four possible starting points for the Arab Moslem attack on the Byzantine Empire:

FIRST, when the **idea** established itself in Mahomet's mind of preaching his new and false religion.

SECOND, Next in **AD 609** when Mahomet began *privately* to **preach** his divine mission, and so, before his family, there rose up the smoke of the abyss; and:

THIRD, that of **AD 612** when he first *publicly* caused the smoke of the pit of darkness to rise up before the eyes of men.*

FOURTH, there was the epoch of the year **629**, when the locust-armies first issued out of the smoke, to make their attack on Syrian Christendom.

*Gibbon quotes Elmacin (*Hist. Sarac.*, p. 3).

E B Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* continues by writing in Vol. 1, p. 458:

Now out of these four epochs I agree with Daubuz* in selecting the *third*. I prefer it to the first two, first because in regard to the term of duration of any public woe, we ought, I think, to have some noted public act, and not anything merely *private*, to mark both its beginning and its end. And I am led to it in preference to the *last*, because the commencing epoch of AD 612 has, as we shall see, a suitable epoch of termination corresponding with it, whereas that of 629 has none. (See Elliott's footnote 2, vol. 1, p. 458).

*Daubuz *Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 1712.

But supposing the epoch of the *commencement* of the woe thus fixed, when may we consider that its five months' period of intensity *ended*? Not evidently **during the progress of the aggressive religious wars and victories of the Saracen Moslems.**

The earliest date for the end of the chief intensity of the Saracenic woe, that can for a moment be thought probable, is that of the **Battle of Poitiers**, already spoken of in which **Charles Martel defeated them in October 732**, the beginning of the *fifth* prophetic month. But though defeated, or at least repulsed, on that memorable occasion, **their power and spirit to aggress and to torment, with all the bitterness of fanaticism, was not terminated.**

"The vanquished spoilers," says Mosheim,† "soon recovered their strength and ferocity; and returned with new violence to their devastations."

†Mosheim *An Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 1, p. 171 Blackie edition.

In France the strength and power of the Saracens was so far from being crushed, that we find its southern districts continued in subjection to them till the middle of this century.

Charles Martel besieged Narbonne, the chief town of the Saracens in vain after the battle. In 739 he had to invoke aid from Luitprand king of the Lombards against the Saracens, who had taken all the chief cities in Provence, and extended their ravages as high as Vienne, near Lyons. Nor were they finally driven out till some 15 to 20 years afterwards.

In Spain the tide of their success and supremacy, notwithstanding the ill success of their efforts at totally extinguishing Pelayo and the Gothic remnant, had not yet begun to ebb.

In Africa, some twenty years after the battle of Poitiers, the torment of the scorpion-sting so operated, as to induce nearly the whole Christian population of the province to apostatize, and become Mussulman.* From east to west, throughout the vast Mohammedan world, one Caliph still governed the locust hordes in the name of the Prophet. **Their power remained unbroken.**

Elliott continues, vol. 1, last line p. 460:

But just about the middle of the eighth century a change occurred, marked by two events of such a nature, and such importance, as to be regarded by historians, both the one and the other, as constituting epochs most memorable in the Saracenic history. The change was this:

The *Abbasides*, descendants of a different family of the earlier followers of Mahomet, in the year 750 supplanted the *Omniades* in the Caliphate. —

And then what followed?

First: the one and only survivor of the deposed and proscribed family [the *Omniades*] escaped to Spain: and behold, he was there received, acknowledged, and established as the lawful Caliph. This was in the year 755.

So at length was the Caliphate divided. There was thenceforth a Caliph in the West in opposition to the Caliph in the East.

"The Colossus" says Sismondi, "that had bestridden the whole South was now broken." And he adds, "This revolution did more for the deliverance of Europe from the Mussulman arms than even the battle of Poitiers."* — Such was the first notable result.

*Sismondi *Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 2 p. 92.

[Second:] Further, out of this change of dynasty, a second most important consequence followed in the East.

Elliott continues, p. 461

The new Abbassidean Caliph, dissatisfied with the Syrian capital in **Damascus**, where his rivals and enemies, the Ommiades, had so long lived and reigned, **determined on building another [capital] on the western bank of the Tigris**, where a canal with the waters from the Euphrates joined it, just a few miles **beyond** the old Roman Euphratean frontier. It was in the year **762** that **Almanzor** there laid its [the future Baghdad's] **foundations**; and thither the government and head of the locusts took flight, far eastward, away from **Christendom**. This was the era, as Daubuz well calls it, of the **settlement of the locusts**. They no more roved, he says, in a body as before, in quest of new conquests.

The Arab Saracen Moslem time of five months given to the king of the south in Revelation 9.5 to torment was now lapsed and they became bound in the great river Euphrates.

See C. Daubuz p. 415.—It is to Daubuz that we are indebted for this explanation of the 150 years.)

So from Mahomet's public opening of his mission in AD 612 to the removal of the Caliphate from Damascus to Baghdad in 762 there is a period of 150 years thus fulfilling the prophecy of Revelation 9.5

E B Elliott continues in vol. 1, p. 469:

Under the influence of the empress Theodora, the struggle [with the iconoclasts] ended finally in the year **842** in the undisputed ascendancy and **establishment of image worship.**

—And what then [was] the consequence?— With characteristic forbearance, as we have seen, the Lord continued to this guilty people the interval of mitigation and of respite, **through the ninth and much of the tenth century.**

But would He endure the provocation much longer? How long would be the respite before another WOE?

Harun al Rashid, probably the greatest of the Abbasid leaders, died in 809, just before the 2nd Iconoclastic period of 814-842.

In 842 the last of the iconoclastic Byzantine emperors, Theophilus, died and was succeeded by his three-year-old son Michael III. His mother Theodora served as regent and as we have mentioned above, the **struggle against idolatry finally ended.**

In Revelation 9, the first half of the chapter describes in symbolic language the first Arab Moslem “Holy war” on Byzantine Christendom. Here this attack is called the **FIRST WOE**. The second half of Revelation 9 describes the Turkish Moslem attack on Byzantine Christendom, here called the **SECOND WOE**. We only mention this in passing and hope to discuss it in detail later when we come to deal with the Book of Revelation, God willing.

Revelation 9.12 One woe is passed! Behold there come two more woes hereafter.

THE SECOND MOSLEM ATTACK on the Byzantine Empire came from the Turkish “king of the north” in two stages. The first came from the **Seljuks Turks** and the second from the **Ottoman Turks.**

Edward Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* chapter LVII (57) gives a good picture of how the Turkish Seljuks arose to prominence. In the fourth paragraph of chapter 57 (Bury Ed. p. 229) we read:

The first emigration of the eastern Turkmans [Turks], the most ancient of their race, may be ascribed to the tenth century of the Christian era. In the decline of the [Arab] Caliphs, and the weakness of their lieutenants, the barrier of the Jaxartes* was often violated: in each invasion, after the victory or retreat of their countrymen, some wandering tribe, embracing the Mahometan faith, obtained a free encampment in the spacious plains and pleasant climate of Transoxiana and Carizme.

*Jaxartes is the Greek name of a large river in central Asia now known as Syr Darya.

Gibbon's footnote on p. 229 states: "The first emigrations of the Turkmans, and doubtful origin of the Seljukians, may be traced in the laborious history of the Huns by M. de Guignes."

From Wikipedia encyc. on the "Seljuq Dynasty" we read:

The Seljuqs [or Seljuks] were a Turco-Persian **Sunni Muslim** dynasty that ruled parts of Central Asia and the Middle East from the 11th to the 14th centuries. They established an empire, the Great Seljuk Empire, which at its height stretched from Anatolia through Persia and which was the target of the First Crusade.

Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* vol. 1, p. 498 f. 4 writes:

In 1066 appeared *the great comet*; great as never seen before. "The appalled multitude," it has been said, "gazed night after night at the messenger of evil; the long-haired star darting its awful splendour from the horizon to the zenith."—a portent that "with fear of change perplexed monarchs." Quart. Rev. Oct. 1844, p. 301.

This comet was later known as Halley's comet.

Nineplanets.org/Halley.html writes:

In 1705 Edmond Haley predicted, using Newton's newly formulated laws of motion, that the comet seen in 1531, 1607, and 1682 would return in 1758 (which was, alas, after his [Halley's] death). The comet did indeed return as predicted and was later named in his honour.

Gibbon *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* vol. VI, (Bury ed.) p. 237 writes:

The name of Alp Arslan, the valiant lion, is expressive of the popular idea of the perfection of man; and the successor of Togrul displayed the fierceness and generosity of the royal animal. He passed the Euphrates at the head of the Turkish cavalry, and entered Caesarea, the metropolis of Cappadocia, to which he had been attracted by the fame and wealth of the temple at St. Basil

The Turks had penetrated into the heart of Phrygia; but the sultan himself had resigned to his emirs the prosecution of the war; and their numerous detachments were scattered over Asia in the security of conquest. Laden with spoil and careless of discipline they were separately surprised and defeated by the Greeks;

. . . In three laborious campaigns, the Turks were driven beyond the Euphrates; in the fourth and last, [the Byzantine emperor] Romanus undertook the deliverance of Armenia. The desolation of the land obliged him to transport a supply of two months' provisions; and he marched forwards to the siege of Malazkerd" [Manzekert].

Gibbon continues, p.239:

"On the report of this bold invasion, which threatened his hereditary dominions, Alp Arslan flew to the scene of action at the head of forty thousand horse."

In August 1071 the [Byzantine] emperor Romanus Diogenes was captured by Alp Arslan, following a decisive defeat at Manzikert (called Malazkerd by Gibbon) in eastern Anatolia.

“In this fatal day,” [August 1071] wrote Gibbon, “the Asiatic provinces of Rome were irretrievably sacrificed”, for in the following year the Seljuk Turks overran most of Asia Minor. (Gibbon VI, page 240 Bury Edition).

Gibbon records the conversation between the Turkish leader **Alp Arslan** and the **Byzantine emperor Romanus IV Diogenes** after the Battle. Also recorded are the peace terms and the civility with which the Emperor was treated by the Turks. (Gibbon *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* Bury edition, vol. 6, p. 241-2.)

The Seljuk Turks ruled in central Asia from 1060-1307. They are regarded as the ancestors of the modern Turks. They are regarded as having provided a barrier between Europe and the raiding Mongols of Genghis Khan. Although Genghis Khan died in 1227, his successors in 1243 in the **Battle of Kose Dagh** routed the **Seljuk army**.

Wikipedia encyclopaedia writes on Battle of Kose Dagh of 1243:

The primary sources do not record the size of the opposing armies but suggest that the Mongols faced a numerically superior force . .

..
The Mongols routed the Seljuks and their allies. . . The defeat resulted in a period of turmoil in Anatolia and led directly to the decline and disintegration of the Seljuk state. After a long period of fragmentation, Anatolia was unified by the Ottoman dynasty.

Another Wikipedia article on the Mongol Empire states:

The Mongol Empire emerged from the unification of Mongol and Turkic tribes in the region of modern-day Mongolia under the leadership of **Genghis Khan, who was proclaimed ruler of all Mongols in 1206.** The Empire grew rapidly under his leadership and then that of his descendants, who sent invasions in every direction. The vast transcontinental empire, which connected the east with the west would eventually function as a cultural “clearing house” for the Old World.

Under the Mongols, new technologies, various commodities and ideologies were disseminated and exchanged across Eurasia; the exchanges ranged from cartography to printing, from agriculture to astronomy.

The Empire began to split as a result of wars of succession, as the grandchildren of Genghis Khan disputed over whether the royal line should follow from Genghis's son and initial heir Ogedei, or one of his other sons such as Tolui, Chagatai, or Jochi. The Toluids prevailed after a bloody purge . . . but disputes continued even among the descendants of Tolui.

Kublai [Genghis's grandson, and whose guest around 1271-1275 was Marco Polo] successfully took power . . . but it was not until 1304, when all Mongol khans submitted to Kublai's successor, the Khagan Temur Oljeitu, that the Mongol world again acknowledged a single paramount sovereign for the first time since 1259

With the death of Khan Abu Said Bahatur in 1335, the Mongol rule in Persia fell into political anarchy. The **Black Death** began in the densely inhabited Mongol dominions from 1313 to 1331. . . . By the end of the 14th century, it may have taken 70-100 million lives in Africa, Asia and Europe.

As the power of the Mongols declined, chaos erupted everywhere. The Golden Horde* lost all of its western dominions.

*The name "Golden Horde" is traditionally said to derive from the golden tent of Batu, a grandson of Genghis Khan, who expanded the domain of the Golden Horde in a series of brilliant campaigns that included the sacking and burning of Kiev in 1240. At its peak, its territory included most of European Russia. The outbreak of the Black Death in 1346 marked the beginning of its disintegration; in the 15th century it broke into several smaller khanates.

We now turn our attention back to the Turks, as “the king of the north”.

Ertughrul Bey the leader of the Kayi tribe that had just arrived to settle in Anatolia gave assistance to the Seljuks and was given land at Bursa near the border of the Byzantine Empire. Ertughrul Bey's son **Osman Bey [1258-1324] set up a dynasty, which was to lead the Ottoman Empire.**

It was the Turks, first the Seljuks whose power was doused only to flare up again as the mighty Ottomans, who are referred to as “the king of the north” in Daniel 11.40-45. It is important to realise that although the **Arab** “king of the south” only “pushed” at “him” (the wilful king of the Byzantines), the **Turkish** “king of the north” **made a full end to the Byzantine Empire in 1453** when Constantinople fell. This important distinction is also made in Revelation 9 where in verse 5 where we read:

Revelation 9.5 And to them it was given that they **should not kill them**, but that they should be tormented five months: . . .

But when we come to consider the actions of the next Moslem attack or SECOND WOE we read:

Revelation 9.14 Saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, “Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates.”

9.15 And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to **slay** the third part of men. **(Emphasis added)**

The Book of Revelation (written in AD 96) correctly foretells that whereas **the Arab Saracens did not make a full end to the Byzantine Empire, the Turkish Ottoman Turks did!**

Also the Book of Daniel is in full agreement with the Book of Revelation in making this distinction. We are told in Daniel 11.40

Daniel 11.40 (AV) And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push* at him; and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow† and pass over.

***push** is from Hebrew *nagach* which occurs 11 times in Scripture. The AV translates it 8 times as “push” and 3 times as “gore”.

†**Overflow** comes from Hebrew *shataph* which occurs 31 times in Scripture. The AV translates this word as “overflow” 20 times, “rinsed” 3 times, “wash away” twice, “drown” once, and “flowing” once.

It may be worthwhile to quote these contrasting phrases from the different translations of this verse Daniel 11.40.

Revised Version. 11.40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south **contend with him**; and the king of the north shall **come against him like a whirlwind**, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass through.

Daniel RSV. 11.40 At the time of the end the king of the south **shall attack him**; but the king of the north **shall rush upon him** like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall come into many countries and shall overflow and pass through.

Ferrar Fenton: Daniel 11.40 But at the end of the period the King of the South **will contend with him**, and the North **will rush against him** with chariots and cavalry, and many ships, and advance to his territories, and flood and overflow

Moffatt: Daniel 11.40 When the end arrives, the king of the South shall **butt at him**, but the king of the North shall **storm at him** like a whirlwind, with chariots and cavalry and a large fleet, invading his lands and flooding into them.

(Emphasis added)

These translations suggest that the “king of the south” merely discomfited the nominally Christian Byzantine Empire. But, the “king of the north” conquered the Byzantine Empire and **made a full end of it**. This difference is in keeping with the different outcome of attack stated in **Revelation 9.5** as compared with the outcome described in **Revelation 9.15**.

Continuing in **Daniel 11** we read:

Daniel 11.40 and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

11.41 He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many *countries* shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, *even* Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

W E Filmer in his book *Daniel's Predictions* p. 142 writes of these two verses:

This was fulfilled in 1516-17 when Selim I marched south through Palestine "the glorious land" Palestine to conquer Egypt, leaving untouched those Arab lands east of Jordan known in biblical times as Edom, Moab, and Ammon.

Filmer is quoting from the *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 1, p. 95.

Joseph Mede (1586-1638) in his *Works*, p. 674, confirms that the inhabitants of Arabia Petrea: "were never yet provincials of the Turkish Empire."

Daniel 11.42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape.

11.43 But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians *shall be* at his steps.

E. S. Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks*, Vol. 1 p. 243 writes:

In September 1517, Sultan Selim led back his victorious army from Egypt to Syria. A thousand camels laden with gold and silver, carried part of the rich spoils of war; and a more valuable portion had been sent by Selim on board the Ottoman fleet to Constantinople. This consisted of the most skilful artisans of Cairo, whom Selim selected. . . . and removed to the capital of his empire.

He returned to Constantinople in August, 1518. He had been absent but little more than two years, and in that time had conquered three nations, the Syrian, the Egyptian, and the Arabian.

Another important dignity, which the Sultan Selim and his successors obtained from the conquest of Egypt, was the succession of the Caliphate, and to the spiritual power and pre-eminence of the immediate vicars of Mahomet himself. After the deaths of the four first Caliphs, who had been personal companions of the Prophet, the spiritual sovereignty of Islam passed successively to the Omniade Caliphs and to the Abbassides, whose temporal power was overthrown by Houlogou Khan, a grandson of Zingis Khan, in 1258.

E S Creasy tells how the Caliphate came to the Mamelukes on p. 241.

After the deaths of the four first Caliphs, who had been personal companions of the Prophet, the spiritual sovereignty of Islam passed successively to the Omniade Caliphs and to the Abbassides, whose temporal power was overthrown by Houlogou Khan, a grandson of Zinghis Khan [Genghis Khan], in 1258. But though the substantial authority of the Caliphs as independent princes was then shattered, the name was perpetuated three centuries longer in eighteen descendants of the House of Abbas, who dwelt in Egypt with titular pomp, but no real power, in the capital of the Mameluke rulers, like the descendants of the Great Mogul in British India. They gave their names to edicts of the Mameluke Sultans when required; and we have seen in the case of the Ottoman Bajazet I, that Mahomedan princes in other countries still regarded the Egyptian Caliph as the fountain of honour, and sought from him the stamp and sanction of sovereignty.

When Selim conquered Egypt, he found there Mohammed, the twelfth caliph of the family of Abbas, and he induced him solemnly to transfer the Caliphate to the Ottoman Sultan and his successors. At the same time Salim took possession of the visible insignia of that high office, which the Abbassids had retained, —the sacred standard, the sword, and the mantle of the Prophet. e
e

The Turks continued to expand their territories in Europe especially under Selim's son Suleiman the Magnificent, (1494-1566). Compared with his father's short but expansive reign of 8 years, Suleiman reigned for 46 years, the longest-reigning Sultan of the Ottoman Empire (1520 to his death in 1566). In that time Suleiman personally led Ottoman armies to conquer Christian strongholds of Belgrade, Rhodes, and most of Hungary.

It is interesting to read from E S Creasy's *History of the Ottoman Turks* Volume 1, p. 264:

In 1526, the Sultan [Suleiman] invaded Hungary with an army more than 100,000 strong, and 300 pieces of artillery; like his predecessors Selim and Mahomet II, he paid extreme attention to this important arm of war; and, throughout his reign, the artillery of the Ottomans was far superior in number, in weight of metal, in equipment, and in the skill of the gunners, to that possessed by any other nation. . . The Battle was fought at Mohacz, on the 28th August 1526, and is still known by the terribly expressive name of "the Destruction of Mohacz."

After this decisive victory, Solyman [Suleiman] marched along the Danube to the twin cities of Buda (or Ofen) and Pesth, on the opposite banks of that river, and the capital of Hungary at once submitted to him. At last, at the end of September, Solyman began his homeward march. His soldiers were laden with the richest plunder; and they drove before them a miserable herd of 100,000

Christians, men, women, and little children, destined for sale in the Turkish slave-markets.

The Turks continued to expand their territories in the latter half of the seventeenth century, until they came into conflict with the rising power of Russia. The prophecy continues:

Daniel 11.44 Tidings from the east and north shall alarm him, and he shall go forth with great fury to exterminate and utterly destroy many.

H Grattan Guinness in his book *Light for the Last Days*, chapter 6, p. 111 writes:

From the date of the fall of Constantinople before the advance of the Mohammedan hordes, A D 1453, up to the great naval battle of Lepanto, A D 1571, the Turkish Power had been continually *advancing* in Europe. The Euphratean flood rose higher and higher, till it reached its highest point under Solomon [Suleiman] the Magnificent, in the middle of the sixteenth century. It remained stationary at high-water mark for half a century, and even as late as 1669 Candia was added to the dominions of the Porte. But the **last quarter of the seventeenth century was a time of fierce struggle**, and of alternate victory and defeat. Wars with Russia and Austria severely shook the Ottoman power, and the war, which was closed by the **Peace of Carlowitz, signed in 1699, broke for ever the aggressive power of the Turkish Empire**. It closed a twenty years' struggle, in which the Porte had been engaged with Russia and Austria. The conflict had been attended with varying fortunes; but, exhausted at last by the sanguinary defeats inflicted on her by Prince Eugene, the Porte was compelled, in 1699, to lay down her arms, and make peace on most disastrous terms. For a time Turkey remained, however, a mighty and formidable empire, holding under its cruel and debasing sway numbers of Christian nations.

A long peace with Christendom followed; but when next the shock of war brought the Mussulman forces into the field against Russia and Austria, *victory was again and more decidedly with the Christians*. Crushing defeats were inflicted on the Turkish armies in 1774. The Russians surrounded the vizier and his troops near Shumla, in Bulgaria, and were able to dictate the terms of the humiliating *Peace of Kainardje*, by which Russia obtained the free navigation of the Black Sea, besides large cessions of territory. Thus commenced that dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, which has been going on ever since.

Never since that date has the Porte been able to take the aggressive against the nations of Europe, or even to stand successfully on the defensive. Its history, as is well known, has consisted of one monotonous series of disastrous wars, humiliating treaties, military and provincial revolutions, insurrections, massacres, cessions of territory, failures of revenue, diminution of population, plagues, bankruptcies, armies destroyed and fleets annihilated, ever-contracting dominions, and ever-increasing debts, and gradual loss of independence; till at the present moment [1886] protracted decay verges on total extinction. Europe is driven to recognise that nothing can much longer avert the long predicted and richly deserved doom of Mohammedan rule in Europe—political death.

Ever since 1821 the progress of Turkish decay has been so rapid and alarming as to keep Europe in perpetual anxiety. In that year began the insurrection in Greece, the finest province in the Turkish Empire, an insurrection which quickly spread to the Aegean Isles and to Wallachia and Moldavia.

In 1826 Turkey was obliged to surrender to Russia all its fortresses in Asia, and frightful civil commotions distracted Constantinople, ending in the slaughter of the Janissaries,

when 4000 veteran but mutinous and unmanageable soldiers were shot or burned to death by order of the Sultan himself in their own barracks in the city, and many thousands more all over the country. **Unquote.**

This was in fulfilment of the next verse as is much of the rest of our story:

Daniel 11.44 But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.

Continuing the story from Grattan Guinness's *Light for the Last Days* p. 113:

The [Turkish] empire had for centuries groaned under their [the Janissaries] tyranny, and Mahmoud II was resolved to organise a fresh army on the military system of western Europe, and saw no other way of delivering himself from the tyrannical Janissaries than this awful massacre, which, while it liberated Turkey from an intolerable incubus, at the same time materially weakened her strength.

Before a fresh army had been matured, Russia again attacked the Turkish Empire, and, backed up by England and France, secured the independence of Greece, after the great naval battle of Navarino, October 20th 1828, in which the Ottoman fleet was totally destroyed.

In 1828-29 Russia again invaded Turkey; her armies crossed the Balkans, and penetrated as far as Adrianople, where a treaty more disastrous to the Porte than any previous one was concluded.

In 1832 Turkey was brought to the verge of dissolution in consequence of the successful rebellion of the powerful pasha of Egypt, **Mehemet Ali**. He attacked and conquered Syria, and defeated the Turkish armies in three great battles, and he would have taken Constantinople had not the western nation intervened.

A second rebellion on the part of Egypt took place in 1840, when Ibrahim Pasha

defeated the Turks at Nezib. The Turkish fleet was betrayed into the power of Mehemet Ali, and taken to Alexandria; and Europe was obliged again to interfere to protect the Sultan from the rebellion of his vassal, who could at that time have easily overthrown the Turkish Empire. In the following year the British admiral took Sidon, Beyrout, and St. Jean d'Acre; and, in order to restore the Turkish rule, which had been completely lost, drove Mehemet Ali out of Syria. Egypt, however, long remained virtually independent; but owing to Turkey joined the Germanic Powers in war against Britain, Egypt was constituted a British Protectorate in December 1914.

In 1844 the Porte was compelled by the Christian nations of Europe to issue an edict of religious toleration, abolishing for ever its characteristic and sanguinary practice of execution for apostasy, that is, for the adoption of the Christian faith. As this was entirely against its will, because against the precepts of the Koran, and contrary to the practice of all the ages during which Mohammedanism had been in existence, it was a most patent proof that the *Ottoman independence was gone*, as a matter of fact, though often mentioned still as a plausible fiction of diplomacy, and that henceforth it had to shape its conduct in accordance with the views of its neighbours, the Christian nations of Europe. It was *a compulsory sheathing of the sword of persecution*, which had been relentlessly wielded for over twelve centuries, *a most marked era in the overthrow of Mohammedan Power*.

The next great stage in the fall of the Moslem power in Europe was the **Crimean War**, and the Treaty of Paris, which followed it in 1856.

This date is one of paramount importance in the process of the decadence of the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean War was ostensibly undertaken **in defence of Turkey**

against Russian aggression; and as it was a successful war on the part of the allies, England, France, and Italy, it would seem at first sight that it should be reckoned as a postponement of the fall of Turkey, rather than a stage of it.

Such, however, is not the case; it was in reality a very decided stage in its loss of independence. The Russian Czar was not alone in seeing that the decay of the Ottoman power had, even at that date, already gone so far that the question as to what should be done with its dominions on its final dissolution pressed for decision. As is well known, he was anxious to be recognised as heir apparent, at any rate to Constantinople; and he was anxious also to secure the position of protector of the Christian races in the Balkan Peninsula and Syria, in order that he might have the power to interfere with Turkish administration in its own dominions, and thus of hastening the long-desired catastrophe. Now the Crimean War was waged not so much to protect Turkey, as to maintain the principle that the political destiny of these regions should be a matter of *European Concert*, and not be settled according to [Christian] Russian views alone. As the Duke of Argyll says: "The one great question which was really at issue was, not whether Turkey was or was not a sick man, or even a dying man, but whether the Czar had the right to solve that problem by anticipation in his own favour, and to take steps constituting himself sole heir of the sick man's possessions and effects It was because Turkey, as a Power and as a Government, was decaying, and because sooner or later its place would have to be supplied by some other government, and by the rule of some other people, that it was necessary to take steps in time, to prevent this great change from being made prematurely, in the exclusive and selfish interests of a single Power."

Continuing the quote from Guinness p. 116:

In result, the Turkish empire was placed under the common care of Europe, and the claim of any single Power to settle the destinies of that empire without the concurrence of the rest has since been repeatedly negated.

In a "Collection of Treaties and other Public Acts, illustrating the European Concert in the Eastern Question," the editor says: "The assumption of the collective authority on the part of the European Powers to supervise the solution of the eastern question, in other words, to regulate the disintegration of Turkey, has been gradual. Such an authority has been exercised tentatively since 1826, *systematically since 1856*. It has been applied successfully to Greece, to Syria, to Egypt, to the Danubian Principalities and the Balkan Peninsula generally, to certain other of the European provinces of Turkey, to the Asiatic boundaries of Turkey and Russia, and to the treatment of the Armenians. The present work will contain the text in full of the treaties and other diplomatic acts which are the title deeds of the States which have thus been wholly or partially *freed by the European concert from the sovereignty of the Porte*."

Hence **1856** is a critical date in the fall of the Mohammedan power, marking the point of its *entire* loss of independence; the point when it practically passed into the hands of Europe, with a view to its safe and gradual dismemberment. The tottering structure was condemned to come down, and the scaffolding was erected by which it was to be safely demolished.

In 1860 took place the horrible Druze massacre of the Christians in the Lebanon and at Damascus, a massacre connived at, if not planned by, the Turkish Government. The remonstrations of the European consuls in the

country were treated with neglect and contempt. The Christians were disarmed by the authorities, and left like defenceless sheep, to be butchered by their bloodthirsty enemies. Thousands of innocent lives and millions of property were sacrificed, and the total apathy and incompetence of the Turkish Government to maintain order was such that the great Powers of Europe intervened. Syria was occupied by French troops, and an English fleet anchored at Beyrout. The result was the conclusion of the treaty by which northern Syria was placed under a Christian governor, and the welfare of its inhabitants secured by a restriction of the Turkish power, submitted to under European compulsion. The year, in short, witnessed a marked though partial *deliverance of the Holy Land from Mohammedan oppression*; it witnessed the turn of the tide. The condition of Palestine and Syria has ever since been improving, and the contrast of what they are today and what they were fifty years ago is remarkable.

Another great crisis in the decay of Turkey was the **Russo-Turkish War of 1877**. The horrible atrocities committed by the Turkish soldiery in suppressing an unimportant insurrection in Bulgaria were the immediate cause of this outbreak. Fifteen thousand men, women, and children had been slaughtered in cold blood, with every conceivable circumstance of cruelty and horror, people against whom no crime could be alleged. Their property was destroyed, their villages were burned, and large districts desolated. Christian Europe was horrified. The great Powers would have interfered in concert, but that England, whose supposed interests required the maintenance of the Ottoman tyranny over the subject Christian races, would not join in any effective common action. **Russia went to war alone** consequently to deliver her co-religionists, and she secured her object by a succession of

victories, which broke the Turkish power to pieces, and laid it helpless at her feet. England did interfere then, to prevent her seizing Constantinople, and at the Berlin Conference obliged the victorious Czar to modify the Treaty of San Stephano, and to agree to that of Berlin, by which a large portion of **Armenia** was ceded to **Russia**. The **Dobrudcha** was lost to Turkey, the complete **independence** of **Romania** was recognised, the **limits** of **Serbia** and **Montenegro** were extended, and **Bulgaria** was erected into an **autonomous Christian principality**. **Cyprus** was at the same time ceded to **England** by the Anglo-Turkish Convention, while this country undertook to defend the Turkish possessions in Asia, the Porte promising necessary reforms, subject to British approval.

In 1876 Turkey had become nationally bankrupt, her debt having been mostly contracted abroad, had reached the amount of one hundred and ninety five millions, on which sum she was unable even to pay interest. This is as serious a feature in the condition of the country as any of its military reverses or territorial losses.

In 1882 a fresh and very singular stage in the downfall of the Ottoman power and independence was reached. It arose in a military insurrection in Egypt, which was headed by Arabi Pasha; this man and the army obtained a monopoly of power, and the Khedive was forced to accept a national ministry in defiance of the protests of the European controllers of the debt, thus subverting the authority of England and France in connexion with the finances of Egypt. The Sultan encouraged Arabi to defy Christian intervention in the financial and other affairs of Egypt, and tried to seize the crisis as an occasion for enforcing his own authority as suzerain. It was understood throughout Europe that if the western Powers were defeated in this struggle, it would mean

a surrender of Egypt to absolute anarchy, and the total ruin of civilisation and European interests in the country. British and French squadrons anchored in the harbour of Alexandria in May. Panic began to prevail among Europeans in Egypt; the military party soon became totally unmanageable, and the Khedive was a mere tool in their hands. The Europeans in Cairo and Alexandria were obliged to flee the country, and all attempts at pacification, whether on the part of western Powers, or of the Sultan himself, failed. A Mussulman rising having taken place in Alexandria, in which a large number of Europeans were killed, and their houses pillaged, Arabi also continuing extensive preparations for resistance in defiance of the English admiral's expostulations, Sir Beauchamp Seymour finally bombarded Alexandria in the summer of 1882. The rebels were defeated, and under cover of a flag of truce evacuated Alexandria, not, however, without first setting fire to the European quarters, and letting loose upon it gangs of reckless plunderers. A plan had been laid for the murder of the Khedive, but it was unsuccessful. A brief but brilliant military campaign succeeded, in which the English troops defeated the rebels at Tel-el-Kebir, and victoriously entered Cairo. An army of occupation of 12,000 men was left to keep order in the country, which then became practically an English protectorate.

This campaign was remarkable as an illustration of the diminished fanaticism of Mussulman nations. The Mohammedans of India were in no way affected by the struggle between their rulers and the Egyptians.

An Indian contingent was sent to Egypt, with the full approval of the co-religionists of Arabi.

Grattan Guinness published the book *Light For the Last Days* from which we have just been quoting in 1886. This is interesting because of his calculations

using Scriptural prophecy. On pages 252-5 of this book he writes:

It was in the year BC 606 that Nebuchadnezzar first came against Judah and carried Daniel and the Hebrew children among others captive. At this time he was acting on behalf of his father, and it was not until two years later, BC 604, that he himself acceded to the throne. That year is consequently, properly speaking, the first of Nebuchadnezzar; and it was probably also the year in which he saw the vision of the Great Image, in connexion with which it was said to him, "Thou art this head of gold." This year has therefore some special claims to be considered as a very principal starting point of the "times of the gentiles." Measured from it the period runs out in AD 1917, and it is a very notable fact that a second most remarkable period does the same. The 1335 years of Daniel 12.12, the *ne plus ultra* of prophetic chronology, which is evidently eastern in character, and consequently lunar in scale, measured back from this year 1917, lead up to the great Hegira era of Mohammedanism, the starting-point of the Mohammedan calendar, the birthday of the Power which has for more than twelve centuries desolated Palestine and trodden down Jerusalem.

At this stage it is worth considering the Mohammedan calendar which contains 12 lunar months each of 29 or 30 days making a year of 354 days instead of 365. This causes the year to slip back 11 days every year or **three years every century.**

So in 1335 Moslem years there are 13.35 centuries. Therefore $13.35 \times 3 = 40$ years must be added to the Moslem calendar starting date (Hegira) year AD 622. So $622 + 1335 = 1957$ from which we must subtract the 40 years that the Moslem calendar has slipped back in 1335 years. $1957 - 40 = \underline{1917}$

Grattan Guinness continues on p. 253:

The year 1917 is consequently doubly indicated as a final crisis date, in which the

“Seven Times” run out, as measured from two opening events, both of which are clearly most critical in connexion with Israel, and whose dates are both absolutely certain and unquestionable

Thoughtful readers will weigh the facts and draw their own conclusions, asking themselves, in the light of all the chronological facts mentioned in this work, *if* the year BC 604 witnessed the rise of the typical Babylon, the supremacy over the typical Israel, what event in the corresponding year in this time of the end likely to witness? There can be no question that those who live to see this year 1917 will have reached one of the most important, perhaps *the* most momentous, of these terminal years of crisis.

UNQUOTE.

Guided by Scripture, Grattan Guinness was perfectly correct in pointing out this very important date in prophecy. How is it that we hear practically nothing preached about it now?

In fact there is more we could say about this prophecy. In 1917 Jerusalem fell to the British in fulfilment of the words of Isaiah 31.5. There is a booklet available entitled *As Birds Flying* by A. Adams and another by the same name by J M Stears which is an in-depth study of the history and events surrounding this amazing fulfilment of prophecy. See note on p. 30.

Daniel 11.45 And he shall pitch his palatial tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain, . . .

This could apply to the Turkish occupation of Jerusalem until they were driven out by General Allenby in December 1917. Five years later, in 1922, the Sultan abdicated, and the Moslem Caliphate was abolished; and as Daniel said,

11.45 “. . . He shall come to his end with none to help him”

Henry Grattan Guinness died 21 June 1910 and so he did not live to see this stupendous fulfilment of Scripture. And yet how soon are these proofs of the truth of the Bible forgotten? Jerusalem, the city upon which our Lord God has put His name, after "seven times" of bondage, under Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, and Islam, was set free for a time!

LIBERTY OR BONDAGE?

Galatians 5.1 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

5.2 Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.

5.3 For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

5.4 Christ is become of no affect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.

5.5 For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

5.6 For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

5.7 Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?

5.8 This persuasion *cometh* not of Him That calleth you.

5.9 A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

5.10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

5.24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

Ferrar Fenton interprets:

Galatians 5.24 And the men of Christ have crucified the body, together with its passions and lusts.

Galatians 6.11 Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand.

6.12 As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.

6.15 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

LEADERS OF ISLAM KNEW THEY WERE A JUDGMENT ON CHRISTENDOM

From E B Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticae* vol. 2, p. 31 we read of ISLAM'S OPPOSITION TO IDOLATRY.

THE VOW OF MAHOMET II 16 years after his capture of Constantinople.

It was on 2nd of August, AD 1469, that Mahomet II had published in all the mosques of his empire the vow following,

“I Mahomet, son of Amurath, . . . emperor of emperors and prince of princes, from the rising to the setting sun, promise to the only God, creator of all things, by my vow and by my oath, that I will not give sleep to my eyes, that I will eat no delicates, that I will not seek out what is pleasant, that I will not touch what is beautiful, nor turn my face from the West to the East, till I overthrow, and trample under the feet of my horses, the *gods of the nations*, those *gods of wood, of brass, of silver, of gold, or of painting*, which the disciples of Christ *have made with their hands*.

SOME INTERESTING WORDS

Deuteronomy 28.1 And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe *and* to do all His commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth:

28.2 And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God.

28.3 Blessed *shalt* thou *be* in the city, and blessed *shalt* thou *be* in the field.

28.12 The Lord shall open unto thee His good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow.

28.13 And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, which I command thee this day, to observe and to do *them*.

28.15 But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee:

28.16 Cursed *shalt* thou *be* in the city, and cursed *shalt* thou *be* the field.

28.43 And the stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low.

28.44 He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him: he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail.

28.45 Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded thee:

28.46 And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever.

28.47 Because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all *things*;

But Deuteronomy 30 and other Scripture such as the *everlasting* and *unconditional* promises of God to Abraham and his seed, recorded in **Genesis 15, 17 and 18**; also **Jeremiah 30.11 and 36.28** show that God *will* eventually turn His people back to obedience and blessing. How true are the words of :

Romans 9.16: So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God That sheweth mercy.

We recommend the books *As Birds Flying*, one by J M Stears (\$6.00) and another by A Adams (\$20.00).

British-Israel World Federation (Victorian Headquarters) Inc. **MONTHLY NOTES**

No. 682



July-Aug. 2011

All Mail to:
P.O. BOX 596, CAMBERWELL, VIC. 3124
AUSTRALIA
Phone 03 9882 4256

[**Note:** The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily endorsed by the **BRITISH-ISRAEL WORLD FEDERATION (VICTORIAN HEADQUARTERS) Inc.**]

DANIEL 12

Daniel 12.1 (RSV) At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation till that time: but at that time your people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book.

12.2 Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

12.3 Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness like the stars for ever and ever.

The first three verses of Daniel 12 are a continuation of the prophecy of Daniel 11.

“At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people” evidently referring to the time after the King of the North comes to the end of his rule over Jerusalem, just mentioned in Dan. 11.45. The first part of verse 40 of chapter 11 is about the king of the south. The second part of verse 40 to the end of verse 45 is about the **king of the south**. So chapter 11 closes with the coming to an end of the **Turkish** king of the north with none to help him.” Then:

This all sets the scene for the next thing to happen as recorded in the **next verse** i.e. Daniel 12.1; that is, **help for God’s people!**

The **rule** of the Turkish “king of the north” over Jerusalem came to an end after the **surrender of the Turkish army in Jerusalem on 9th December 1917 to the British army under General Allenby.**

The National Message of January 1957, page 22, (forty years after the event) gives more information from Dr. A.U. Michelson:

It was remarkable how General Allenby captured Jerusalem. As he approached Jerusalem with his army he was abhorred by the thought of shedding blood in the city of the Lord, or of damaging its walls, for Allenby was a Christian. He then marched up to Jerusalem and cabled to King George for orders as to whether or not he should destroy the Holy City, if capture seemed impossible otherwise. In reply the King requested his general to pray about it and do as he felt led.

While the General was at prayer with his officers in his tent west of Jerusalem the Turkish delegation appeared and surrendered the City. Allenby notified the Commander-in-Chief of the Turks, warning him that any act of sabotage on the part of the Turkish soldiers would result in an aerial bombardment. To affirm his warning he ordered that several aeroplanes should fly over Jerusalem to preserve it. Allenby and his army entered in while the aeroplanes were flying over the city and captured Jerusalem without firing a single shot or shedding a single drop of blood. Of the twenty-seven captures of Jerusalem in the past, this was the only time it was "delivered and preserved".

The prophet Isaiah had foretold about seven centuries before Christ how Jerusalem would be taken:

"As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem, defending also He will deliver it and passing over it He will preserve it."

Also on December 8, as the Turks were evacuating the Holy City (the British entered on the 9th), **the appointed morning lesson in the *Book of Common Prayer* was Isaiah 31.** This included verse 5:

'As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem: defending also He will deliver *it*; *and* passing over He will preserve it.'

A wonderful account of this event is to be found in *How Jerusalem Was Won* (1919), by W.T. Massey, Official Press Correspondent (pp. 189, 190).

END QUOTE.

Realizing the utmost significance of the occasion, General Edmund Allenby entered the Holy City of Jerusalem on foot, on 11th December, ending centuries of Turkish rule.

What will it take for us to realize the full significance of this prophecy?

H. Grattan Guinness realized the enormity of this prophecy of Jerusalem's deliverance. He wrote in his book *Light for the Last Days* published in 1886, **well before the event:**

Thoughtful readers will weigh the facts and draw their own conclusions asking themselves in the light of all the chronological facts mentioned in this work, *if* the year B.C. 604 witnessed the rise of the typical Babylon, the supremacy over the typical Israel, what event is the corresponding year in this time of the end likely to witness? There can be no question that those who live to see this year **1917** will have reached one of the most important, perhaps *the* most momentous, of these terminal years of crisis. END QUOTE (Emphasis added)

On 3rd March 1924 Mustapha Kemal, Turkey's President, ended the Ottoman dynasty by abolishing the Caliphate and banishing all members of the Osman family.

Daniel 12.1 (RSV) At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation till that time: but at that time your people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book.

The Hebrew word for “trouble” here in this verse 1 is *tsarah* and according to Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon, occurs 73 times in Scripture. In the A.V. translates as “trouble” 44 times, distress 8 times, “affliction” 7 times, “adversity” 5 times, “anguish” 5 times, “tribulation” 3 times, and “adversary” once.

From the context evidently whatever was to happen here would be under the influence of God’s messenger, **“the great prince Michael, who has charge of your [Daniel’s] people.”**

It is after Michael arises that the time of trouble is mentioned. It is impossible to conceive of anything but a good outcome from Michael’s intervention and that is what we read.

It is interesting also to study Michael’s previous intervention in Daniel 10.13:

Now for a few words about the heavenly persons named in the Books of Daniel and Revelation:

Michael, Gabriel, and the certain man clothed in linen (garments of the Priest’s office, Lev. 16.32), with the appearance of the Lord in Revelation 1.13-16.

See Ez. 1.7; Dan. 10.6; Rev. 1.15, 2.18

Daniel 12.4: gives instructions to Daniel:

Daniel 12.4 (RSV) "But you, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, until the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall increase."

Daniel 11.40 told us it was the "time of the end" when "the king of the south" pushed at the Byzantine Emperor. Hence "the time of the end" is any time since the "First Woe" of Revelation 9. So from this, we are now well into the "time of the end" and we assume that the Book of Daniel is now unsealed.

12.5 Then I Daniel looked, and behold, two others stood, one on this bank of the stream and one on that bank of the stream.

12.6 And I said to the man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the stream, "How long shall it be till the end of these wonders?"

12.7 The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the stream, raised his right hand and his left hand toward heaven; and I heard him swear by Him Who lives for ever that it would be for a time, two times, and half a time; and that when the shattering of the holy people comes to an end all these things would be accomplished.

12.8 I heard, but I did not understand. Then I said, O my Lord, what shall be the issue of these things?"

12.9 He said, "Go your way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed until the time of the end.

12.10 Many shall purify themselves, and make themselves white, and be refined; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but those who are wise shall understand.

It is interesting that the comparison here is not between the wicked and the righteous, but between the wicked and the wise. None is righteous except those God makes righteous, and these He makes wise and they understand.

In verses 11 & 12 are two important epochs.

Daniel 12.11 And from the time that the continual burnt offering is taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate is set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

There are 4 instances of “**abominations that make desolate**”:

1. Ezekiel 33.29;
2. Daniel 9.27;
3. Daniel 11.31; and this one in
4. Daniel 12.11.

E B Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* volume IV p. 110 makes an interesting comment on this verse. He asserts that in the Hebrew text,

“the *definite article* is wanting before the word *abomination* in verse 11: so the correct rendering here would be:

“From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and an abomination that makes desolate set up, there shall be 1290 days.”

By this not only is the desolating abomination of Daniel 11.31 (that we interpreted as the **Roman armies that desolated Jerusalem under Vespasian**) not plainly and specifically referred to, but rather almost *excluded* from being the subject of reference. If this is correct, then it removes the difficulty, felt by almost every expositor of prophecy, of calculating these prophetic periods from the epoch of the Roman overthrow of Jerusalem: whence measured they conduct to no terminating chronological points, whether on the day-day or year-day scale, that can at all satisfy the conditions of the prophecy. —What *the abomination making desolate* meant is another question. The ancient fathers, partly no doubt from its stated period being that of Antichrist in Daniel 7, thought that it was Antichrist's desolating abomination that was specially intended; . . . And, calculating on the *year-day* principle, we cannot but in the first instance think of the setting up of the abomination of the Papacy by "the King" of verse 36.

On page, 112, Elliott continues:

Another abomination making desolate, (indeed the only other of past times I can think of) was that of Mahommedism by which Christendom and Jerusalem were desolated. UNQUOTE.

We have dealt with “a little horn” in **Daniel 7**, which evidently represents the **Papacy** and which came to rule the territory previously ruled by the ancient Western Roman Emperor. Also we dealt with “a little horn” in **Daniel 8**, which evidently represents the **Caliphate**, which came to rule over territory previously ruled by the ancient Eastern Roman Emperor. The rule of these “little horns” was partly **contemporaneous**.

Quoting from Filmer’s book *Daniel’s Predictions* page 85 we read:

Justinian is particularly famous for his codification of Roman law. The importance of this law for the church lay in its “dealing with the organization of the clergy, the regulation of their moral life, the foundation and administration of religious houses, the government of ecclesiastical property, and the control and jurisdiction to which clerics were liable. (See Cambridge Medieval History II, p. 43) The first edition of Justinian’s Code was promulgated in AD 529, but it was subsequently revised, the final edition being issued in 534. Adding 1260 years to these dates brings us to 1789 and 1794. In **1789** the French Revolution began when Roman law was rejected, the Catholic Church in France was nationalised and its property confiscated. The Revolution culminated with the Reign of Terror in 1794 when, from 10 June to 27 July 1376 victims fell to the guillotine.

(See New Cambridge Modern History IX, p. 284.)

Of particular significance was the decree of Justinian in 533, which made the bishop of Rome “head of all the Holy Churches”. [Filmer quotes L E Froom, *Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* I, p. 931, but this is confirmed in Blackwood’s Edinburgh magazine, Volume 31 that is available on the Internet.]

Adding 1260 years to 533 brings us to 1793 when the revolutionaries issued a series of “**de-christianisation**” decrees. In October 1793 France deliberately broke with her religious past, when the convention voted the most anti-Christian act of the Revolution, the replacement of the Gregorian calendar by a calendar based on a **ten-day week eliminating Sunday**. (See New Cambridge Modern History IX, p. 147.) On 9th November the Cathedral of Notre Dame was consecrated to the worship of Reason, and by the year-end all churches in Paris, and many in the provinces were closed. Not only papal authority, but also Christianity itself was cast off. At first this applied only to France, but in 1796 Napoleon invaded Italy, threatening the pope who was forced to pay heavily to secure a truce.

This lasted only until 1798, when the French army entered Rome, expelled the pope, and sent him into exile. (See NCMH IX, p. 256.) These events occurred just 1260 years after Belisarius invaded Italy and established the Papacy in Rome. This did not bring the Papacy to an end, neither did Daniel's prophecy say that it would: it says that the saints "shall be given into his hand" for the stated period. All that the revolutionaries achieved in 1793 was the end of papal authority, for as soon as the pope was removed from power, freedom of religious worship followed. The Napoleonic wars, 1796-1815 were disastrous for the Papacy. Twice during this period the pope was led away captive, and in 1806, the Holy Roman Empire collapsed. In 1808 Napoleon suppressed the last remaining Inquisition in Spain, and it was officially abolished in 1813. This, however, is not the point of Daniel's time prophecy. These same disasters brought release to God's people from papal oppression over a period of nineteen years falling exactly 1260 years after 536-555, when Justinian's generals, Belisarius and Narses, reconquered Italy, securing supremacy for the bishop of Rome as head of the whole Christian church. These events confirmed writings of earlier students of prophecy who had published them long before the French Revolution.

Thus, as far back as 1689, Dr. D. Cressener, in a book *The Judgments of God upon the Roman-Catholic Church*, reckoned 1260 years from Justinian's recovery of the western empire, and gave his opinion that these judgements "will not be much sooner or later than about 100 years hence. Others made different calculations, but it was widely believed that France* would be the principle agent for overthrowing the Papacy. (See Thomas Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies* II, p. 336.

*[Perhaps because of the assistance given by the Franks against the Lombards in 753]

As with the **Papacy**, so with the **Caliphate**, their religions persist. Although the Caliphate was abolished, the Papacy continues but with little temporal power.

In the first of Daniel's prophecies in chapter 2, we notice that in the end, the whole image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream remains to be cast down by the stone that strikes its feet. All the powers that make up the image will be destroyed and at last give place to the Kingdom of God in fulfilment of Daniel 2.35; 2.44-45; Revelation 11.15:

Revelation 11.15 And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become *the kingdoms* of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever."

Since Elliott wrote his book *Horae Apocalypticæ*, (6th edition 1862), the rule of the Turkish "King of the North" over Jerusalem came to an end in 1917. Then on November 1st, 1922, Mustapha Kemal, the Turkish Nationalist leader proclaimed the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate and the **establishment of the Turkish republic.** Sultan Mohammed VI fled Constantinople (Istanbul) on board a British warship.

Taking 1922 as the terminal date, and subtracting **1290 years**, we arrive at the date of AD 632, when Mohammed died and the Caliphate was established.

Daniel 12.12 Blessed is he who waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and thirty-five days.

The Moslem calendar is reckoned from the year A.D. 622 on the Christian calendar, which is zero year on the Moslem calendar. This was the year when the prophet Mohammed fled from Mecca to Medina, prompted by opposition from the merchants of Mecca. In Medina he set up the first Muslim community.

The **Moslem calendar** contains twelve lunar months of 29 or 30 days, making **354 days instead of 365 days in the year.** Hence it **slips back 11 days every year** or 1,100 days, or **three years every century.**

In 1335 Moslem years there are 13.35 centuries. If we multiply 13.35 by three we get around 40 years difference. So subtracting the 40-year slip back and adding on A.D. 622 years from the birth of our Lord to the Hegira, brings us to **1917.** So the Moslem year 1335 is **1917 on the Christian calendar.**

Egyptian coins for the year 1917 also bear the Arabic date 1335. This author has two such coins in his possession.

This is the year that Jerusalem was liberated from its **seven times captivity** at the hands of the Gentile succession of nations. It was delivered into the hands of Britain Israel, a blessed day indeed as promised in verse 12!

12.13 But go your way till the end; and you shall rest, and you shall stand in your allotted place at the end of the days.”

IS THE PRESENT DEBT MONEY SYSTEM SUSTAINABLE?

Most governments in the Western World end each financial year with a deficit. This means that they have not collected enough revenue to pay their debts. The main reason that most governments cannot collect enough money to pay their debts, is that they have to pay so much interest to the private banking system on money they have previously borrowed from the private banking system.

The obvious question is, why doesn't the government itself create the money it needs instead of giving the authority to the private banking system to create money out of nothing at interest?

The ridiculous system we now have has only been operating since the 17th century. According to Alexander Del Mar, the ancient civilizations knew the dangers of private banking.

Prior to the 17th century the nation states closely guarded their prerogative to issue money. There is adequate proof of this in England in the findings of the Privy Council case of 1604 known as the Case of Mixed Moneys. There is further proof in the provisions of the first charters given by the English Government to the American Colonial Assemblies. (Virginia 1606, Massachusetts 1628-9 the full texts of these are on the Internet))

Nowadays when governments are faced with a deficit, which is usually the case, the shortfall is funded by government borrowing from the private banking system, which creates the money out of nothing and lends it at interest to the government.

There is never a question of the banking system not having enough money to meet the endless requirements of all the governments of the world, for the simple reason that the banking system gets its money from the only possible endless source. The Governments give them the authority to create money out of nothing.

This creating money out of nothing started with the Goldsmiths of England and the full story of this is freely available on the Internet.

Now that gold is no longer the basis of money, no one talks of creating money out of nothing, it is not mentioned.

Banking is not fully taught in the education system because it might spell the end of the very lucrative practice. Also it is too embarrassing for national leaders that such an inequitable and iniquitous system should be allowed to operate.

However, as the debt has built up it has been increasingly difficult for such a gross system to continue. People can see there is something wrong but they cannot put their finger on what exactly it is.

There is an elephant in the room, everyone knows is there but nobody mentions it!

The money system has been high jacked by a small oligarchy for their personal profit.

If every dollar bears interest to the lenders, where can people get the interest to pay except by depleting the money already in circulation, thus reducing the total money in circulation? So, unless the moneylenders create more new money each year, there will be a contraction of the total money in circulation. But if the nation can increase its productivity new money can be created that will not cause damaging inflation of the money already in circulation.

This is why we are being continually told to lift productivity. But this is unsustainable in the long run. The story goes that when John Maynard Keynes (the father of Keynesian economics) was reminded that modern economics is unsustainable and was asked what will happen in the long-run, it is said that he replied: "In the long-run we will all be dead".

But we wait for the fall of this Mystery Babylon, and God's Jubilee.

evidently, whether in the world or in the Church) from after the time of St. John's seeing the vision in Patmos; and this continuously, as appeared from subsequent express statements in the Apocalyptic book, down even to the consummation. Moreover, as regards Mr. Greg's 4th condition, its fulfilment in the case before us is equally obvious; for what merely *human* sagacity could have seen into the events of that prolonged, and in part far distant futurity? The only question remaining is whether the predictions were *specific* and *definite* also.

(Rev. J.A. Wylie, another very eminent writer on this subject, although differing from Elliott on the interpretation of the 10th chapter of Revelation, states in his book *The Seventh Vial*, that he regards Elliott as "**holding the first rank among Apocalyptic interpreters.**" See page v of the introduction to Wylie's *Seventh Vial*.)

What can we say about the title of this Book of Revelation?

As Bullinger says in his Companion Bible, "**Man** calls it 'The Revelation of St John the Divine'. But its **God** given title is in the first verse: "**The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to shew unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass;**

A most important point to bear in mind in considering the "Book of Revelation", is the fact that one of the most prestigious and important historical writings in the English language, is "*The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*" by Edward Gibbon.

prophecy of the future in the Christian Scriptures. And what then [are] the criteria by which we are to decide it? I am perfectly willing to accept the criteria laid down by one who has argued out the plea for infidelity with as much ability, and as elaborately and temperately also, as any other of our modern sceptics; —I mean Mr. Greg, in his “Creed of Christendom.” At the beginning of his 4th chapter, on “The Prophecies,” he thus expresses himself.

“In order to establish the claim of any anticipatory statement, promise, or denunciation, to the rank and title of a *prophecy*, four points must be ascertained with precision: —viz. 1st, **what the event was to which the alleged prediction was intended to refer**; 2ly, **that the prediction was uttered, in specific not vague language, before the event**; 3ly, **that the event took place specifically, not loosely, as predicted**; 4ly, **that it could not have been foreseen by human sagacity.**”

Now, as regards the two conditions first laid down, viz. as to the *subject predicted*, as unquestionably preceding it, — their fulfilment in the case before us is obvious. For the things figured in the Apocalyptic prophecy were declared to be the things that were to happen (the grand and most characteristic events

Here is what Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* had to say about this in volume 1 of his Fifth Edition page 130.

I turn to Gibbon, whose history, by a singular coincidence, in respect of commencing date, as well as of subject, agrees with the Apocalyptic prefigurations: and find him just as in this first seal's symbolic sketch, deferring for a while to enter on his great subject of the *decline* of the Roman empire; in order, in the first place, to describe its *glory* and its *happiness* in this precise aera, as being that which immediately preceded its declining. In fact, he makes it the bright ground, if I may so say, of his historic picture: whereon to trace out afterwards more effectively in dark colouring, the successive traits of the empire's corruption and decline.

He represents it (and his representations are well confirmed by the original histories remaining with us) as a "golden age" of prosperity, union, civil liberty, and good government; (volume 1 p 131.) a period "*unstained by civil blood*," (like the *white* of the first Apocalyptic horse, in contrast with the *red* of the second,) and "undisturbed by revolution;" a period remarkable, both at its commencement and at its close, for very wonderful and almost uniform triumphs in war, whereby the glory of the empire was illustrated, and its limits extended; and of which

early youth to regard them. Even yet more does the importance of the work strike me at the present time, when *infidelity* has become notoriously prevalent among our educated men; and even from ordained ministers in our own Church a voice has been raised somewhat pretentiously, with questionings of the truth of Christianity as a religion supernaturally revealed from heaven, and denial of all supernatural inspiration of the Christian Scriptures. For, supposing the evidence in proof of the fulfillment of the Apocalyptic prophecy in the history of Christendom since St. John's time to be satisfactory and irrefragable, we have herein a proof similarly irrefragable not only of the possibility, but of the fact, of the divine supernatural inspiration of one book at least of Holy Scripture; —a fact annihilative of the sceptic's doctrine as to the impossibility in the nature of things of such inspiration; and rendering more than probable, *a priori*, the idea of divine supernatural inspiration in other of its prophetic books also.

I said, *supposing the evidence in proof of the historical fulfillment of the prophecy to be satisfactory and irrefragable*. And here of course arises the grand question for solution between myself and the sceptics who deny the fact of any really predictive

British-Israel World Federation
(Victorian Headquarters) Inc.
MONTHLY NOTES

No. 682



July-Dec. 2011

All Mail to:
P.O. BOX 596, CAMBERWELL, VIC. 3124
AUSTRALIA
Phone 03 9882 4256

[Note: The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily endorsed by the BRITISH-ISRAEL WORLD FEDERATION (VICTORIAN HEADQUARTERS) Inc.]

DANIEL 9.25, 26 & 27

Before proceeding with a study of the Book of Revelation, it is worth mentioning a few **additional points** about the magnificent prophecy in Daniel 9 verses 25, 26 & 27.

Daniel 9.25 (AV) Know therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

9.26 And after (the)* threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof *shall be* with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

* The definite article here marks this period as the one just mentioned in v. 24. I.e. after the 483 years.

Daniel 9.27 And He shall confirm the covenant with many for a week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make *it* desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.'

"He shall confirm the covenant". It is Christ who confirmed the covenant made with Abraham as we read in Galatians:

Galatians 3.16 Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

3.17 And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

Rev. E.P. Cachemaille in his booklet *The Seventy Weeks and the Messiah* p. 7 writes:

The chief purpose of this vision is to give the **exact dates** for the coming and work of the promised Messiah. Neither in the Vision of the Image nor in that of the Four Great Beasts is the first Advent of Christ described or referred to, the reason being that it is much too important an event to appear as a mere incident in the history of the Fourth or Roman Empire.

But here it has an entire prophecy dedicated to itself and to its consequences. The great subject of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks is the appearance of the Christ in the fullness of time; the accomplishment of His great work of redemption; and the sentence of judgment which was to fall upon the Jewish nation in consequence of their rejection of Him. It is the only prophecy in the Old Testament, which definitely predicts the time of the first Advent and of the death of the Messiah.

Daniel was a student of prophecy. He did not rely upon his own Visions only, nor think that everything had been revealed to him alone.

Daniel 9.1 In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans;

9.2 In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that He would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

9.3 And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes:

See Jeremiah 25.11-12; and 29.10 for this remarkable prophecy used by Daniel!

The time appointed by God for Judah's captivity in Babylon was seventy years.

But what was the starting point?

This is a common difficulty in dealing with the prophetic periods; their length may be plain enough, but whence are they to be measured? In this case there had been several stages in the beginning of the Captivity, from each of which the seventy years might be reckoned, thus leading to several corresponding stages of fulfilment.

The whole time was to be Seventy Weeks of years, that is 490 years, or a Jubilee measure of 49 years on a tenfold scale. Within these Seventy Weeks all the great matters mentioned in verse 24 were to be accomplished, in reference to Daniel's people and Daniel's Holy City.

Daniel 9.24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

This period of Seventy Years is subdivided in the next verses into three portions thus:

Verse 25	7 weeks
Verse 25	62 weeks
Verse 27	1 week
Making a total of	70 weeks

9.25 Know therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

For verses 25-26, compare the translations of the Authorized Version with that of the Revised Standard Version:

VERSE 25:

9.25 (AV) Know therefore and understand,

9.25 (RSV) Know therefore and understand

(AV) *that* from the going forth of the commandment

(RSV) that from the going forth of the word

(AV) to restore and to build

(RSV) to restore and build

(AV) Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince

(RSV) Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince,

(AV) *shall be* seven weeks,

(RSV) there shall be seven weeks.

(AV) and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again,

(RSV) Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again

(AV) and the wall, even in troublous times.

(RSV) with squares and moat, but in a troubled time.

VERSE 26:

(AV) And after [the] threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof *shall be* with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

(RSV) And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off, and shall have nothing; and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed.

Quoting from Filmer's book *Daniel's Predictions* p. 108-9:

The main differences between the AV and modern translations such as the RSV are:

1. **Messiah's name has been changed to "an anointed one"** [without even capitalising the initial letter of this title].

2. **A full stop has been inserted between the seven weeks and the sixty-two weeks, so making it appear that an anointed one came after the seven weeks** instead of after the seven plus the sixty-two weeks. Filmer in his book *Daniel's Predictions* reminds us that Ancient Hebrew has no punctuation. Which prompted Paul to emphasise the necessity to "rightly divide the word of truth" (2 Timothy 2.15).

The AV follows the old Latin and Greek translations made from the Hebrew by the early fathers of the Christian church, who, in their day,

were able to consult the unpunctuated text. Guided, no doubt, by the Holy Spirit, as well as by well-known Jewish tradition, they all coupled the seven with the sixty-two making a total of sixty-nine weeks to the coming of the Messiah.

It was not until the **tenth century** that the Massoretic Jews, who rejected Jesus as the Messiah, and disliked the Christian application of this prophecy, inserted the full stop in the middle of the sentence thus throwing it into total confusion. No fulfilment or application of the prophecy according to the Massoretic text has ever been successfully demonstrated, although some attempts have been made.

VERSE 27:

9.27 (AV) And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make *it* desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.'

9.27 (RSV) And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator."

Filmer in his book *Daniel's Predictions* on p. 111 writes:

The RSV and other modern translations say here:

9.27 (RSV) And he shall make a strong covenant with many . . .

This is another faulty translation arising from the anti-messianic bias from which all these versions suffer.

The covenant to be confirmed is the New Covenant, for concerning Jesus Christ we read in Hebrews 9.15:

Hebrews 9.15 (AV) He is the Mediator of the new testament [covenant], that by means of death, for the redemption of transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they, which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Hebrews 10.16 "This *is the* covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;

10.17 And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."

Who other than Christ the Messiah could fit this prophecy of Daniel 9.26 & 27?

THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

Who was the writer of this book?

The writer more than once names himself as "John". E. B. Elliott in his book *Horae Apocalypticae* page 1 writes:

The authority which the several contexts imply to have attached to this John, —in one place from the asserted fact of his being Christ's chosen medium for receiving the revelation, and communicating it to the angels or presiding bishops of the seven Asiatic Churches, —in another from that of his pronouncing a blessing on those several presiding bishops, —in another from the prophets being spoken pointedly of as his brethren, — is such as could scarcely belong to any one named John of less than *apostolic* dignity: insomuch that the very *genuineness* of the Book seems almost involved in the fact of its writer being John *the apostle*.

END OF QUOTE

It is also interesting to note that many of the early Christians studied the Book of Revelation with, as Elliott says, "**earnestness and interest.**" Quoting from Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticae*, volume 1 page 227, we read:

QUOTE:

It is assuredly very striking and instructing to observe with what **earnestness** and **interest** the fathers of the early Church, throughout the whole era of the Pagan persecution referred to, □□as *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian* and *Hippolytus* —searched into the inspired predictions handed down to them. These were to them no meaningless, no profitless writings. However they may have been in doubt with regard to many particulars of the future, there was a certain great outline that they found clear in divine prophecy: and both in this, and in the views that it opened to them throughout of God's care and kindness to His Church, they found an *admirable stay to their faith together with counsel, encouragement, and comfort.*

So that there was fulfilled to them, even thus early, what was written, "**Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this prophecy.**" —It was specially the prefigurative visions in Daniel and the Apocalypse of the *quadripartite symbolic Image* and *four symbolic wild Beasts*, and the predictions in St. Paul and St. John respecting the *Man of Sin* and the *Antichrist*, that fixed their attention.

And what [were] their inferences as to the things then present, and the things future? First they judged with one consent that Daniel's fourth wild Beast symbolized the Roman Empire; as also that the little horn of this wild Beast symbolized one and the same antichristian power as St. Paul's Man of Sin, and St John's Antichrist.

Further they judged that the Roman empire, in its then existing state, was the *let* or *hindrance* meant by St. Paul, standing in the way of Antichrist's manifestation; and that its removal would take place on the empire's dissolution into a new form of ten kingdoms: among which, or contemporarily with which, Antichrist, the Man of Apostasy, would forthwith arise, and reign over the Roman world and empire in this its latest form; Rome itself, and its empire, (so the most learned thought,) having been revived to supremacy under him.

Moreover they were agreed that this Antichrist would persecute the Christian Church with a fierceness altogether unparalleled: and thus that there would be a second series of *Roman* persecutions, and a second series of martyrs slain under Roman oppression; —persecutions that would only terminate in Christ's coming and taking vengeance, at the end of the world. **UNQUOTE.**

Elliott quotes his sources in Vol. I of his *Horae* p. 229.

When was this book written?

Drawing from E B Elliott's exhaustive study of this subject, we quote from his book *Horae Apocalypticae* p. 47:

The varied historical evidence that has been inquired into all concurs to confirm the date originally and expressly assigned by *Irenaeus* to the Apocalypse, as seen and written *at the close of the reign of* [the Roman Emperor] *Domitian*; that is near the end of the year 95 or beginning of 96. [Domitian was assassinated in September A.D. 96.] **End of quote.**

The rewards of the serious study of this book by the proper interpretation of its symbols have increased as time has gone by. When it was first written around AD 96, all of what was written applied to the future. Now, however, after nearly 2000 years, a large part of it consists of fulfilled prophecy. Surely only God could have set out so much detailed history written before the events. Other prophecies in Scripture such as those in the Book of Daniel and the other prophets and the words of our Lord, also stand as evidence of the truth of Scripture. The prophet Isaiah draws our attention to this fact in the words:

Isaiah 46.9 Remember the former things of old: for I *am* God, and *there is* none else; I *am* God, and *there is* none like Me,

46.10 Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times *the things* that are not *yet* done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure:

Telling the future is a prerogative of God alone. He used His Prophets and Apostles to convey these words to His People. Daniel tells in his book Daniel 12.8-9 that he did not always know the full meaning of what he were told to write at the time, but we know that God made clear to them what to write. This we are told in the O.T and also in the NT.

Our Lord in Matthew 13.17 told His disciples regarding the gospel of the kingdom:

Matthew 13.17 For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous *men* have desired to see *those things* which ye see, and have not seen *them*; and to hear *those things* which ye hear, and have not heard *them*.

When I was first interested in gaining an understanding of the book of Revelation, I first went to some of the elders of the different churches. Perhaps I went to the wrong ministers or elders, but there I didn't find anything to help me.

There were certainly none who were pleased to tell me that there was a fulfilment of Isaiah 46.10: where God says:

Isaiah 46.9 Remember the former things of old: for I *am* God, and *there is none like Me*,

46.10 Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times *the things* that are not *yet* done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure:

To fail to teach fulfilled prophecy is to lose a wonderful opportunity to show the Divine origin of Scripture! This lost opportunity is similar to how Moses lost the opportunity to show forth the power of God to the Children of Israel when he struck the rock (Numbers 20.11) when he was told by God (Numbers 20.8) to speak to it to bring forth water. It was for this disobedience that Moses was not allowed to go into the Promised Land with the Children of Israel. On an earlier occasion Moses was instructed of God to strike the rock with his rod to obtain drinking water for the children of Israel, (Exodus 17.6).

To see how the churches have got to where they are, it is worth studying the history of how the earlier historicist teaching of the Book of Revelation was rejected by J. N. Darby and other influential teachers who substituted the **new** Futurist teaching.

We quote from the book by a Brethren writer, *A History of the Brethren Movement* by F. Roy Coad, page 128, paragraph 4:

“Many able students of their generation, (including some of the early Tractarians*) had moved away from the traditional interpretation of the Book of Revelation, which considered that book to give a symbolic outline of the history of the Church. These men had been repelled by the sensational and wild results of those traditional teachings, exemplified in much that we have already noted at Albury. †

See note at end of this quote for * & † references.

For the traditional view of the Revelation, another was substituted. This [new] view had first been suggested by the **Jesuit Francesco Ribera in the sixteenth century**, and had been popularized in the early years of the nineteenth century by the translation into English of the work of another Jesuit, Manuel Lacunza, who (under the pen-name of Ben Ezra) had written a long treatise, *"The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty"*.

* "Tractarians" was the name given to the Oxford Movement, which, together with the Brethren, very successfully promoted the futurist teaching into the Protestant Churches.

† A series of meetings were held annually at the **Albury**, Surrey, home of the banker Henry Drummond, from 1826-1830. These meetings became the centre of wild speculation, and from them developed the **pentecostalist movement of Irving's Catholic and Apostolic Church**

Continuing the quote from Coad p. 128:

This was the futurist view, according to which the Book of Revelation, except for the first few chapters, predicts the events of a closing few years of Divine judgment on the earth.

Many of them believed this era to be imminent. This era would be inaugurated by the appearance of Antichrist, a violent persecutor of the Church, and would be closed by the Second Advent of Christ, when He would appear in glory to destroy the oppressor and to establish the millennial reign of peace and righteousness.

Into this system both Derby and Irving had injected a further refinement based upon a detailed attempt to reconcile the different parts of the New Testament, which they considered to be relevant. In their view, the Second Advent would take place in two stages: first, there would be a quiet appearance—the “presence”—of Christ, when all true Christians, the true Church, would be removed from the earth. This was the “rapture of the saints.” Only then, when the restraining presence of the Holy Spirit in His own people had been removed from the world scene, would Antichrist arise. His rule would be brought to an end by the second stage of the Advent—the public “appearing” of Christ in glory.

There is plainly a problem in this interpretation, and it was around this problem that the differences between Derby and Newton crystallized.

If the Church were to be removed before the persecution of Antichrist started, who then would be the faithful ones who would suffer at his hands? Newton’s objection was a forcible one: if they were not of the Church, it was necessary to postulate *another people of God apart from the Church*. Since, by definition, the Church included all who were redeemed by Christ, this remnant must therefore be the fruits of a redemptive

act of God other than the redemption through Christ. Thus, in Newton's view, the idea struck at the very heart at the orthodox doctrine of salvation, and was perilously near to postulating another Gospel and incurring the condemnation pronounced in Paul's letter to the Galatians.

This step Darby (in Newton's view) seemed willing to take. He distinguished sharply between the Old Testament economy and the New. In his view the faithful of the Old Testament were not comprised in the Church, and the two dispensations were utterly distinct. Following out this distinction, he [Darby] taught that the faithful remnant of the tribulation under Antichrist would be, in effect, a restoration of the Old Testament economy: they would be a remnant of Jews remaining faithful to God in the fires of persecution.

In the millennial reign of Christ, all the Old Testament promises to the Jewish people would have a literal fulfillment, while the Church, □□ the "saints" of the dispensation of grace, □□ would have no part in that earthly reign. *

In contrast to these earthly hopes of the Jewish remnant, the promises to the Church were essentially "heavenly" in character.

UNQUOTE.

It was to write against this new FUTURIST interpretation of the Book of Revelation that E. B. Elliott gives as his reason for writing his magnificent *Horae Apocalypticae*.

Elliott in the Preface to the 5th Edition of his *Horae Apocalypticae*, published 1862, [the most careful, erudite and respected work written on the Apocalypse,] wrote on p. 1:

When first I began to give attention to the subject, some twenty years ago, [The 1st Edition was published in 1844], it was the increasing prevalence among Christian men in our country of the *futurist system of Apocalyptic interpretation*, □□a system which involved the abandonment of the opinion held by all the chief fathers and doctors of our Church respecting the Roman Popes and Popedom as the great intended anti-Christian power of Scripture prophecy, □□that suggested to me the desirableness, and indeed necessity, of a more thoroughly careful investigation of the whole subject than had been made previously. For thereby I trusted that we might see God's mind on the question; all engaged in that controversy being alike agreed as to the fact of its being expressed in this prophecy, rightly understood; and whether indeed in His view Popery was that monstrous evil, and the Reformation a deliverance to our Church and nation as mighty and blessed, as we had been taught from

early youth to regard them. Even yet more does the importance of the work strike me at the present time, when *infidelity* has become notoriously prevalent among our educated men; and even from ordained ministers in our own Church a voice has been raised somewhat pretentiously, with questionings of the truth of Christianity as a religion supernaturally revealed from heaven, and denial of all supernatural inspiration of the Christian Scriptures. For, supposing the evidence in proof of the fulfillment of the Apocalyptic prophecy in the history of Christendom since St. John's time to be satisfactory and irrefragable, we have herein a proof similarly irrefragable not only of the possibility, but of the fact, of the divine supernatural inspiration of one book at least of Holy Scripture; —a fact annihilative of the sceptic's doctrine as to the impossibility in the nature of things of such inspiration; and rendering more than probable, *a priori*, the idea of divine supernatural inspiration in other of its prophetic books also.

I said, *supposing the evidence in proof of the historical fulfillment of the prophecy to be satisfactory and irrefragable*. And here of course arises the grand question for solution between myself and the sceptics who deny the fact of any really predictive

prophecy of the future in the Christian Scriptures. And what then [are] the criteria by which we are to decide it? I am perfectly willing to accept the criteria laid down by one who has argued out the plea for infidelity with as much ability, and as elaborately and temperately also, as any other of our modern sceptics; —I mean Mr. Greg, in his “Creed of Christendom.” At the beginning of his 4th chapter, on “The Prophecies,” he thus expresses himself.

“In order to establish the claim of any anticipatory statement, promise, or denunciation, to the rank and title of a *prophecy*, four points must be ascertained with precision: —viz. 1st, **what the event was to which the alleged prediction was intended to refer**; 2^{ly}, **that the prediction was uttered, in specific not vague language, before the event**; 3^{ly}, **that the event took place specifically, not loosely, as predicted**; 4^{ly}, **that it could not have been foreseen by human sagacity.**”

Now, as regards the two conditions first laid down, viz. as to the *subject predicted*, as unquestionably preceding it, — their fulfilment in the case before us is obvious. For the things figured in the Apocalyptic prophecy were declared to be the things that were to happen (the grand and most characteristic events

evidently, whether in the world or in the Church) from after the time of St. John's seeing the vision in Patmos; and this continuously, as appeared from subsequent express statements in the Apocalyptic book, down even to the consummation. Moreover, as regards Mr. Greg's 4th condition, its fulfilment in the case before us is equally obvious; for what merely *human* sagacity could have seen into the events of that prolonged, and in part far distant futurity? The only question remaining is whether the predictions were *specific* and *definite* also.

(Rev. J.A. Wylie, another very eminent writer on this subject, although differing from Elliott on the interpretation of the 10th chapter of Revelation, states in his book *The Seventh Vial*, that he regards Elliott as "holding the first rank among Apocalyptic interpreters." See page v of the introduction to Wylie's *Seventh Vial*.)

What can we say about the title of this Book of Revelation?

As Bullinger says in his Companion Bible, "**Man** calls it 'The Revelation of St John the Divine'. But its **God** given title is in the first verse: "**The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to shew unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass;**

A most important point to bear in mind in considering the "Book of Revelation", is the fact that one of the most prestigious and important historical writings in the English language, is "*The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*" by Edward Gibbon.

Here is what Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticae* had to say about this in volume 1 of his Fifth Edition page 130.

I turn to Gibbon, whose history, by a singular coincidence, in respect of commencing date, as well as of subject, agrees with the Apocalyptic prefigurations: and find him just as in this first seal's symbolic sketch, deferring for a while to enter on his great subject of the *decline* of the Roman empire; in order, in the first place, to describe its *glory* and its *happiness* in this precise aera, as being that which immediately preceded its declining. In fact, he makes it the bright ground, if I may so say, of his historic picture: whereon to trace out afterwards more effectively in dark colouring, the successive traits of the empire's corruption and decline.

He represents it (and his representations are well confirmed by the original histories remaining with us) as a "golden age" of prosperity, union, civil liberty, and good government; (volume 1 p 131.) a period "*unstained by civil blood,*" (like the *white* of the first Apocalyptic horse, in contrast with the *red* of the second,) and "undisturbed by revolution;" a period remarkable, both at its commencement and at its close, for very wonderful and almost uniform triumphs in war, whereby the glory of the empire was illustrated, and its limits extended; and of which

the middle interval, though not without occasional wars (always successful) on the frontiers, was generally a time of profound and happy peace.

HERE IS THE QUOTE from Gibbon volume 1 page 78:

“If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus.” (Bury Edition of Gibbon, “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” Volume 1, page 78.)

Elliott in his *Horae Apocalypticæ* mentions in a footnote in his vol. 1 page 131, (footnote 6)

In Dugald Stewart’s Life of Dr. Robertson (Works i. 38, Ed. 1817 a Letter from Mr. Walpole to Dr. R. is inserted; in which he intimates the idea which he had entertained of writing the history of this era of Nerva, Trajan, and the Antonines as “the most remarkable period of the world,” i.e. for *good* government. This was AD 1759 **before** Gibbon’s writing of his history.

Elliott in a further footnote states:

But I must at once introduce that greatest of Roman historians, *Tacitus*: who, having lived and held office in “the iron age” preceding, lived also to enjoy, and to record the golden age that followed.

Elliott goes on to mention that it is supposed that *Tacitus* died during the reign of Hadrian. In the same footnote, Elliott also mentions to the same effect, another contemporary historian, *Suetonius*. See this footnote for further information. So there were many witnesses to this remarkable era, which lasted for a century from AD 96.

Having established (I hope), the paramount importance of The Book of Revelation, let us turn to a study of it in the next issue, God willing.

JACOB AND ESAU

The study of the history of Jacob and Esau and their descendants the children of Israel and the Edomites, is essential to a proper understanding of the Bible. The book of Genesis devotes a lot of writing to these two characters, and not without good reason. Some writers describe the conflict between the descendants of Jacob and Esau as “the conflict of the ages”, or the “longest hatred”. We first hear of this conflict in Genesis 25 when Rebekah the wife of Isaac is expecting her firstborn.

Genesis 25.22 And the children struggled together within her; and she said, “If *it be* so, why *am* I thus? And she went to inquire of the Lord.

Genesis 25.23 And the Lord said unto her, "Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger.

25.24 And when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, *there were* twins in her womb.

25.25 And the first came out red, all over like an hairy garment; and they called his name Esau.

25.26 And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob: and Isaac *was* threescore years old when she bare them.

25.27 And the boys grew: and Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field; and Jacob *was* a plain man, dwelling in tents.

25.28 And Isaac loved Esau, because he did eat of *his* venison: but Rebekah loved Jacob.

25.29 And Jacob *sod* pottage: and Esau came from the field, and he *was* faint:

25.30 And Esau said to Jacob, "Feed me I pray thee, with that same red *pottage*; for I *am* faint: therefore was his name called Edom.

25.31 And Jacob said, "Sell me this day thy birthright".

25.32 And Esau said, "Behold I *am* at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me?

Genesis 25.33 And Jacob said, "Sware to me this day"; and he sware unto him: and he sold his birthright unto Jacob.

25.34 Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentiles; and he did eat and drink, and rose up and went his way: thus Esau despised *his* birthright.
(End of Genesis 25)

The next chapter, Genesis 26 verse 34 tells how Esau then **grieved his parents** by marrying out of his race to two Hittite women. (Is this an example of Genesis 6.2 where "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they *were* fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose?)"

26.34 And Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite:

26.35 Which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah. (End chapter 26)

The next chapter, Genesis 27, is taken up with the father Isaac **blessing not the elder Esau, but Jacob**. This brought about great resentment in Esau:

Genesis 27.38 And Esau said unto his father, "Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, even me also, O my father." And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept.

27.39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above;

NB The AV is incorrect to translate that Esau's dwelling "shall be the fatness of the earth". The RSV has corrected the error from which we give the whole verse 39:

Genesis 27.39 (RSV) His father Isaac answered him, "Your dwelling will be away from the earth's richness, away from the dew of heaven above.

27.40 (AV) And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

27.41 And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.

We now have the beginning of a hatred of Esau for his younger twin brother Jacob that will continue through the Bible but little taught.

Furthermore, we see also a hatred of God for Esau and a love of God for Israel.

Malachi 1.1 The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi.

1.2 I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, 'Wherein hast Thou loved us?' *Was* not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet **I loved Jacob,**

1.3 And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.

1.4 Whereas Edom saith, 'We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places;'

thus saith the Lord of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever.

Now let us consider some of the instances of the continuing animosity of Esau's descendants known as Edomites, inflicted on the descendants of Jacob, the children of Israel.

We must remember that Amalek was Esau's grandson. Most Christians know the Amalekites are consistent enemies of Israel, but do they know they are Edomites?

The enmity between these twins **Jacob and Esau** and their offspring *right from the beginning* commenced before they were born. The story begins in Genesis 25.22-23.

Genesis 25.21 And Isaac entreated the Lord for his wife, because she *was* barren: and the Lord was entreated of him, and Rebekah his wife conceived.

25.22 And the children **struggled together within her**; and she said, if *it be* so, why *am* I thus? And she went to inquire of the Lord.

25.23 And the Lord said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of peoples shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the **elder shall serve the younger**.

Note that Esau will serve the younger Jacob. This is in accord with their father's important statement to Esau in Genesis 27.40. But when Isaac was giving a blessing to Esau we are given the additional important information that Esau will "**break his** (Jacob's) **yoke from off his** (Esau's) **neck.**"

Genesis 27.40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

The first example of open warfare between the descendants of Jacob and Esau is mentioned in Exodus 17 where the very first enemy confronting the children of Israel after their exodus from Egypt were the Amalekites. Amalek, as we have mentioned, was the grandson of Esau, which makes the Amalekites Edomites. We know this from Genesis 36.12:

Genesis 36.12 And Timna was concubine to Eliphaz Esau's son; and she bare to Eliphaz Amalek: these *were* the sons of Adah Esau's wife.

Much of the Gospel writings and the words of our Lord become more understandable if we have knowledge of the history of the Edomite descendants of Esau (called Idumea in the Greek of the NT). It is remarkable to observe that not only did Esau harbour resentment against his twin brother Jacob, but also Esau's descendants the Edomites. (Later called in the Greek: Idumeans), **made themselves the consistent enemy of Jacob's descendants** (Israel) **down through the ages,** Genesis 27.41, and Exodus 17.16.

For those who can believe it, this is the present state of things.

Exodus 17.16 For he said, "Because the Lord hath sworn *that* the Lord *will have* war with Amalek from generation to generation.

Earlier in this chapter 17 we have seen that the Amalekites have attacked the children of Israel soon after they had come out of Egypt.

Exodus 17.8 Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim

We must realise that the Edomites were not the only enemies of the Israelites. The very first children of Israel fought among themselves and expelled their own youngest brother, Joseph, leaving him in a pit to be rescued and sold into slavery in Egypt. Also it appears that after 130 BC, the **in fighting among the Asamonean Jews**, made it easier for their enemies the Edomites to gain dominating power in Judea.

From the time of the war with the Amalekites soon after the Exodus, until Herod, the Edomites were a continuing enemy of the Israelites. Here are some of the encounters Israel had with the Edomites.

Numbers 14.43 For the Amalekites and the Canaanites *are* there before you, and ye shall fall by the sword: because ye are turned away from the Lord, therefore the Lord will not be with you.

Numbers 14.45 Then the Amalekites came down, and the Canaanites which dwelt in that hill, and smote them, and discomfited them, *even* unto Hormah.

Deuteronomy 25.17 comments on the events of Ex. 17.8

Judges 6.2-3. And the hand of Midian prevailed against Israel: *and* because of the Midianites the children of Israel made them the dens which *are* in the mountains, and caves, and strong holds.

6.3 And *so* it was, when Israel had sown, that the Midianites came up, and the Amalekites,* and the children of the east, even they came up against them; *Amalek, grandson of Esau.

I Samuel 14.47-48 So Saul took the kingdom over Israel, and fought against all his enemies on every side, against Moab, and against the children of Ammon, and against Edom, and against the kings of Zobah, and against the Philistines: and whithersoever he turned himself, he vexed *them*.

I Samuel 14.48 And he gathered an host, and smote the Amalekites, and delivered Israel out of the hands of them that spoiled them.

I Samuel 21 & 22 Tells the story of Doeg the Edomite who murdered the priests of the Lord. Doeg also discomfited David, and reference to this we can read about in Psalm 52.

So the subverting Edomites must also have been among the Israelites at this time.

II Chronicles 20 tells about Jehoshaphat. **Psalm 137** writes strong words against Edom.

Psalm 137

1 By the rivers of Babylon,
There we sat down,
Yea, we wept,
When we remembered Zion.
2 We hanged our harps
Upon the willows in the midst thereof.
3 For there they that carried us away
captive required of us a song;
And they that wasted us *required of us*
mirth, *saying*,
“Sing us *one* of the songs of Zion.”
4 How shall we sing the Lord’s song
In a strange land?
5 If we forget thee, O Jerusalem,
Let my right hand forget *her cunning*.
6 If I do not remember thee,
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of
my mouth;
If I prefer not Jerusalem
Above my chief joy.
7 Remember, O Lord, the children of
Edom
In the day of Jerusalem,
Who said, “Rase *it*, rase *it*,
Even to the foundations thereof.”
8 O daughter of Babylon, who art to
be destroyed,
Happy *shall he be*, that rewardeth thee
As thou hast served us.
9 Happy *shall he be*, that taketh and
dasheth thy little ones
Against the stones.

What strong words against Edom!

KING DAVID: We read that David fought against the **Amalekites** in I Samuel 27. 8.

I Samuel 27.8 And David and his men went up and invaded the Gushurites, and the Gesrites, and the Amalekites: for those *nations were* of old the inhabitants of the land,* as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt.

*It is important to remember that Esau married the inhabitants of the land.

Then again in I Samuel 30 we read where the **Amalekites** had taken two of David's wives, whom we are told he rescued in verse 18.

I Samuel 30.18 And David recovered all that the Amalekites had carried away: And David rescued his two wives.

Also in the very first verse of II Samuel we read of David returning from the slaughter of the **Amalekites**:

II Samuel 1.1 Now it came to pass after the death of Saul, when David was returning from the slaughter of the **Amalekites**, and David had abode two days in Ziklag;

We now read from the next verse, of an Edomite man who came out of the camp of Saul and had come to David to tell how he had apparently mortally wounded Saul and possibly expected a reward. This Edomite apparently did not understand the significance of killing the Lord's anointed as the story suggests! It appears he is a typical Edomite and a liar, the people Saul had spared. Read the truth in the previous chapter I Sam. 31.4-5.

II Samuel 1.2 It came even to pass on the third day, that, behold, a man came out of the camp from Saul with his clothes rent, and earth upon his head: and so it was, when he came to David, that he fell to the earth, and did obeisance.

1.3 And David said unto him, "From whence comest thou?" And he said unto him, "Out of the camp of Israel am I escaped."

1.4 And David said unto him, "How went the matter? I pray thee tell me." And he answered, "That the People are fled from the battle, and many of the People also are fallen and dead; and Saul and Jonathan his son are dead also."

1.5 And David said unto the young man that told him, "How knowest thou that Saul and Jonathan his son be dead?"

1.6 And the young man that told him said, "As I happened by chance upon mount Gilboa, behold, Saul leaned upon his spear; and, lo, the chariots and horsemen followed hard after him.

1.7 And when he looked behind him, he saw me, and called unto me. And I answered, 'Here *am* I.'

1.8 And he said unto me, 'Who art thou?' And I answered him, 'I *am* an Amalekite.'

1.9 He said unto me again, 'Stand, I pray thee, upon me, and slay me: for anguish is come upon me, because my life *is* yet whole in me.'

1.10 So I stood upon him, and slew him, because I was sure that he could not live after that he was fallen: and I took the crown that *was* upon his head, and the bracelet that *was* on his arm, and have brought them hither unto my lord.”

David asked him how he knew this, and the man told the whole story of how he slew Saul when asked to do so by Saul himself. (Verse 10)

II Samuel 1.13 And David said unto the young man that told him, Whence *art* thou? And he answered, I *am* the son of a stranger, an Amalekite.

1.14 And David said unto him, how wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord’s anointed?

1.15 And David called one of the young men, and said, Go near *and* fall upon him. And he smote him that he died.

1.16 And David said unto him, Thy blood *be* upon thy head; for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord’s anointed.

II CHRONICLES:

KING JEHOSEPHAT: In the days of Jehoshaphat, we read in II Chronicles 20 that when Moab and Ammon confronted Israel, Edom joined in.

We are also reminded in this same verse 10, (which is Jehoshaphat's prayer for God's help), that God would not let Israel destroy these three nations when they could have, on coming out of Egypt.

II Chronicles 20.10 And now, behold, the children of Ammon and Moab and **mount Seir**, whom thou wouldest not let Israel invade, when they came out of the land of Egypt, but they turned from them, and destroyed them not; **[Mount Seir = the land of Edom]**

20.11 Behold, *I say how* they reward us, to come to cast us out of Thy possession, which Thou hast given us to inherit.

20.12 O our God, wilt Thou not judge them? for we have no might against this great company that cometh against us; neither know we what to do: but our eyes *are* upon Thee.

20.13 And all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their wives, and their children.

20.14 Then upon Jahaziel the son of Zechariah, the son of Benaiah, the son of Jeiel, the son of Mattaniah, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, came the Spirit of the Lord in the midst of the congregation;

20.15 And he said, "Hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou king Jehoshaphat, Thus saith the Lord unto you, 'Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle *is* not yours, but God's.

20.16 To morrow go ye down against them: behold, they come up by the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel.

20.17 Ye shall not *need* to fight in the *battle*: set yourselves, stand ye *still*, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; to morrow go out against them: for the Lord *will be* with you.”

20.20 And they rose early in the morning, and went forth into the wilderness of Tekoa: and as they went forth, Jehoshaphat stood and said, “Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe His prophets, so shall ye prosper.”

20.21 And when he had consulted with the people, he appointed singers unto the Lord, and that should praise the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army, and to say, “Praise the Lord; for His mercy *endureth* for ever.”

20.22 And when they began to sing and to praise, the Lord set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, which were come against Judah; and they were smitten.

Mount Seir is Edom, from the area they inhabited.

We shall continue with these conflicts in the next issue God willing. It becomes very interesting of course!