Okay, let's begin with another word of prayer. Father in heaven, we thank You for a brief moment to relax our minds for a moment. We ask that You grant us Your Holy Spirit again that we can carry on with this consideration of Daniel 11. We ask a blessing upon our time, a blessing that is brought to us by Your Holy Spirit. We know that we are at the very end of time and we want to be part of the ensign that is soon to be lifted up. We ask that You make that happen for each of us in Jesus' name, Amen.

So now that we're at the beginning of the notes, you see Uriah Smith quoting from Daniel 11, and he's speaking of, well, let me tell you, and we'll get to it, I’ll tell you something that we'll get to in the notes, but before I start through this, Seleucus Nicator is the one that establishes the Seleucid kingdom that we're speaking about, that has so many kings that take the name Antiochus upon it.

And when Alexander the Great’s kingdom was divided up, Seleucus Nicatorr was given the job or whatever, the position of Satrap, which means governor, of Babylon, which is one of the things that locks in this line of Syrian kings to typifying the Roman power at the end of the world.

But he didn't have it secured strong enough. And there was another general of Alexander the Great that was seeking to take control of the world, and he drove him out of Babylon, and Seleucus fled to Egypt, and there he forms an alliance with Ptolemy, and Ptolemy is the King of the South. And Seleucus, once he establishes himself, is going to be the first King of the North in Daniel 11. They work together, and this is something that needs to be understood.

The first human, Seleucus Nicator, that would establish the Seleucid kingdom, he comes out of Egypt, because papal Rome comes out of pagan Rome on many witnesses in the book of Daniel, and that particular connection is established when you realize that they had joined together, Ptolemy and Seleucus, to push Antigonus out of the area, and he returns and gets established once again in the city of Babylon.

So the verse that is being discussed here by Uriah Smith speaks of an alliance that's formed in the year 281 BC when this first Seleucid king, Seleucus Nicator, had been assassinated by one of the southern kings. Their friendship comes to an end and he's assassinated.

And the [new King of the North] determined to form an alliance, and the alliance is based upon the king of Egypt, the King of the South, giving his daughter to the new King of the North, and he gives him his daughter to take as his bride, and this King of the North sets aside his wife that he has in order to take this Egyptian princess as his queen, his new queen, and over a period of time, he gets tired of this Egyptian queen, and he sets her aside and takes his first queen back as queen, and when she gets in position, the first queen, she kills them all. She kills the Egyptian princess that had come to cement the contract, the treaty between north and south, her entourage, her child, and even the king himself.

That history took place from 281 to 246, 35 years, and it begins with a treaty and it ends with a broken treaty, because when the first wife kills the Egyptian wife, it enrages her brother back in Egypt, and he determines that he's going to retaliate against the King of the North, which he does, and that's what this verse is speaking about… “And in the end of years, they shall join themselves together, for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the King of the North to make an agreement, (in 281), but she shall not retain the power of the arm…” (she's going to be set aside, neither shall he stand, he's going to die too), “...nor his arm, but she shall be given up, and they that brought her (her entourage), and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times.”

So they break the treaty, and Uriah Smith says this, “There were frequent wars between the king of Egypt and Syria.” (Syria's the Seleucid kingdom, especially when this is the case with Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second king of Egypt, and Antiochus Theus, the third king of Syria.) “They at length agreed to make peace upon condition that Antiochus Theus should put away his former wife Laodice, and her two sons, and should marry Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Ptolemy accordingly brought his daughter to Antiochus, bestowing with her an immense dowry.”

So this treaty is broken, and the reason that this needs to be noted is the treaty marks [parallels] 538, when the papacy is placed upon the throne of the earth, they're placed upon the throne of the earth by “Egypt”, because Egypt had helped Seleucus get placed upon the throne of the King of the North in that history, and shortly thereafter they formed this treaty.

And at the end of the 1260 years, in 1797 (I think it might have been a year or two before that), one of Napoleon Bonaparte's generals was in the city of Rome, General Duphot, and he was promoting Napoleon's emphasis on republican government, and there was some zealots of the papacy in the city of Rome who didn't want anything to do with republicanism. They wanted the monarchy of the papacy to stand, so they assassinated this General Duphot, and this was Napoleon's justification for sending in General Berthier, who is going to come into the Vatican, take the pope captive, and take him back to France, where he's going to die a year later.

And this was all illustrated in this story of the struggle between the King of the South and the King of the North. Uriah Smith says it this way, he's quoting verse 7, he says, “But out of a branch of her roots (her roots, “her” being this princess of Egypt that was given to the King of the North), “...but out of the branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate (her brother), which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the King of the North, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail.”

When her brother retaliates, he comes all the way into the castle of “Babylon”, and he takes the Seleucid king captive, and takes him back to Egypt, just as Napoleon had his General Berthier take the pope and take him back to France. Identical parallel.

The reason that the brother of this slain Egyptian princess did so was because of this broken peace treaty that was premised upon the King of the North marrying this Egyptian princess, and the premise for Napoleon coming into the Vatican and taking the pope captive was the broken treaty of Tolentino, which Napoleon had entered into with the Vatican, and I don't remember the year, but it was just a few years before 1798, and when the Vatican zealots assassinated this General Duphot, Napoleon said that the treaty that he had entered into with the papacy, called the Treaty of Tolentino was broken, and so because of the broken treaty, Berthier comes into the Vatican and takes the pope captive. They're identical parallels.

So going back to the verses that Uriah Smith's quoting, “And he shall carry captives into Egypt, their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold, and he shall continue more years than the King of the North, so the King of the South shall come into his kingdom and shall return unto his own land.” (This branch out of the same root with Berenice was her brother Ptolemy Euergetes.)

“He had no sooner succeeded his father Ptolemy Philadelphus in the kingdom of Egypt than, burning to avenge the death of his sister Berenice, he raised an immense army and invaded the territory of the King of the North, that is of Seleucus Callinicus, who with his mother Leodes, reigned in Syria. He prevailed against them even to the conquering of Syria, Cilicia, and the upper parts beyond the Euphrates. He plundered the kingdom of the Seleucus, took 40,000 talents of silver and precious vessels, and 2,500 images of the gods. Among these were the images which Cambyses had formerly taken from Egypt and carried into Persia. The Egyptians, being wholly given to idolatry, bestowed upon Ptolemy the title of Euergetes, or ‘Benefactor’, as a compliment for his having thus, after many years, restored their captive gods.”

Even this historical fact was repeated in the history of Napoleon and the Pope, because when Berthier takes the Pope captive, he also plunders the Vatican treasures and he brings their artwork, their pictures, their statues, and their gold back to France and puts them in the museums there in Paris, just as the Egyptians did when they retaliated over the broken treaty. It's an identical parallel.

I'm dropping down, continuing on with Uriah Smith's commentary…. “This, according to Bishop Newton, is Jerome's account, extracted from ancient historians, but there are authors still extant, he says, who confirmed several of the same particulars. Appian informs us that Laodice, having killed Antiochus, and after him, both Berenice and her child. Ptolemy, the son of Philadelphus, to revenge those murders, invaded Syria, slew Laodice, and proceeded as far as Babylon.” Babylon is typified by the Vatican,... that Berthier proceeded as far as the Vatican.

“From Polybius, we learn that Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes, being greatly incensed at the cruel treatment of his sister, Berenice, marched with an army into Syria and took the city of Seleucia, which was kept for some years after by garrisons of the kings of Egypt. Thus did he enter into the fortress of the King of the North.”

I have that in bold face because “the fortress”, and the “entering into the fortress”, becomes one of the prophetic keys in this passage. Because in verse 10, when the King of the North thinks to gather up all this geography that they're losing, in this particular narrative that Uriah Smith is identifying now, and the King of the South comes and it takes all the territory of the King of the North, when they finally return and gobble up and take that territory back, they just come “up to” the fortress, whereas when the King of the South retaliated against the King of the North, he went all the way “into” the fortress, and “the fortress” becomes a key to understand how this history and these verses are typifying the history of Daniel 11, verse 40.

According to Uriah Smith, “Polyaenus affirms that Ptolemy made himself master of all the country from Mount Tarsus as far as to India without war or battle, but he ascribes it by mistake to the father instead of the son. Justin asserts that if Ptolemy had not been recalled into Egypt by a domestic sedition, he would have possessed the whole kingdom of the Seleucids, the King of the South that came into the dominion of the King of the North and returned to his own land, as the prophet foretold. And he also continued more years than the King of the North, for the Seleucid, Callinicus, died in exile of a fall from his horse, and Ptolemy Euergetes survived him for four or five years.”

I have this bold face, this expression that the Seleucid king died in exile. The King of the South comes into Babylon, into the royal palace of Babylon, takes Seleucus captive, just as Berthier took the Pope captive. He brings him back to Egypt, just as Berthier took the Pope back to France. And when he gets to Egypt, the historians, for whatever reason, they record that this Seleucus, he dies from falling from his horse. And what this is representing is that the retaliation of the King of the South against the King of the North takes place 35 years after the peace treaty of giving Berenice to the King of the North.

And 35 years, if you have the willingness to see, can be understood as 3.5 years. This history can be recognized as 3.5 years because 3.5 years is 3 and one-half years, and 3 and one-half prophetic years is 1260 years, or 1260 days, or 42 months. The history from the peace treaty, which is marking 538, until the Pope or this King of the North is taken captive, is 1260 years as typified by 35 years. And it's marking 1798.

And in 1798, Napoleon delivers the deadly wound of the papacy. And the deadly wound of the papacy identifies not only the capture of the Pope, but also the end of his ability to rule. And his ability to rule was accomplished by the kings that had done his dirty work for 1260 years.

And in Revelation 17, this woman that is Modern Babylon, she's riding upon a beast. And the beast that she rides upon is this civil power that does her dirty work.

And so when Seleucus Callinicus died in Egypt in exile from the fall off his horse, it's identifying not only when the leader, the Pope, receives his deadly wound, but his deadly wound is identified as him being taken off his horse. And in Revelation 17, the papacy has been riding this beast. And when you're riding a horse or riding the beast, it means that you are the one that has the reins, that you're controlling it.

So the details of this history up to verses 7, 8, 9 is a perfect typification of the history of 538 to 1798. And Sister White says, “Much of the history that's taken place in fulfillment of Daniel 11 is going to be repeated”... in the last six verses of Daniel 11. And the last six verses of Daniel 11 begin in 1798 when the papacy receives its deadly wound. And they're preceded by the history of the papacy that begins in verse 31. And from verse 31 to verse 40, you have the 1260 years represented in verses 32 through 36. And then you have a “repeat and enlarge” from verse 36 to verse 40.

What I'm saying is that the beginning of Daniel 11, the history there at the beginning, is repeated in the last six verses of Daniel 11. But if you are someone that hasn't settled in to the truth of the application that's been available since 1989 of verse 40, if you don't understand that verse 40 is identifying how three powers lead the world to Armageddon, then it may be difficult for you to understand this parable.

But when the Pope of Rome comes to his end with none to help in verse 45 of Daniel 11, he comes to his end between the seas, in the plural, and the glorious holy mountain. And if you take a map of the Middle East and you put it in the context of ancient Israel, and you have the Mediterranean Sea here, and you have the Dead Sea here, and you have the glorious holy mountain, which is Jerusalem here, and this pope that comes to his end between the seas and the glorious holy mountain, if you're going to take a point and place it in between those three entities, where it ends up getting placed is the Valley of Megiddo.

And the Valley of Megiddo is represented by John in the Book of Revelation. And the Book of Revelation takes up the same line of prophecy that's found in the Book of Daniel, according to Sister White. And the Book of Revelation brings to perfection. It “complements” the Book of Daniel, according to Sister White.

So when the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet in the sixth Plague lead the world to Armageddon, they're leading the world to Megiddo, because Har-mageddon is the word for Megiddo, and “Har” means “mountain”. And in the Megiddo Valley, which is between the seas and the glorious holy mountain in Israel, there is no mountain.

So the fact that John the Revelator calls “Har”-mageddon the “mountain” of Megiddo, he's making sure that we are to understand that this isn't a literal war (as Uriah Smith ends up teaching from his misunderstanding of verse 36 of Daniel 11), but that it's representing a spiritual application. The literal history illustrates a spiritual application. And when the King of the North comes to his end “between the seas in the glorious holy mountain”, he's coming to his end in Armageddon.

And the story that begins in verse 40 is the story of the King of the South, the King of the North, and the proxy army of the United States, which is represented by the chariots, ships, and horsemen. And that United-States-proxy-army in Revelation 16 is the false prophet. And the King of the North in verse 40, in chapter 16, in the sixth Plague, is the beast. It's the papal power. And the King of the South in verse 40 is the dragon.

In verse 40, the King of the South is the dragon, the King of the North is the beast, and the chariots, and ships, and horsemen are the false prophet. And these three powers in verse 40 are the events connected that lead to the close of probation. And the close of probation takes you to Armageddon. And you get to Armageddon in the terminology of John and Revelation 16, because the beast, the dragon, and the false prophet led you there. And those are the three powers in verse 40. They're parallel to one another. They bring each other to perfection.

This history of up to verse 10 is identifying a history that begins in 538 and ends with the deadly wound of Seleucus Callinicus as he's carried into Egypt and dies when he falls off the horse at 1798. When the King of the South takes Seleucus captive, he not only takes him captive, he gathers up all the geographical territory that the King of the North has had.

And when we get to verse 10, the sons of the King of the North are going to determine that they want to retaliate against Egypt, and they want to get their geography back.

Verse 10, in my mind, is where the complexity of the wheels within the wheels of Bible prophecy is really illustrated. And verse 10 marks the beginning… it shouldn't be called “the battle”, because the historians, if you're going to look for it in the historical records, you're going to find it listed under the Fourth Syrian War. When these brothers decide that they're going to come in and regather the territory that was lost to the king of Egypt, it begins the Fourth Syrian War, and it's typified in 1989.

Here's what Uriah Smith says, Verse 10, “But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of forces. And one shall certainly come and overflow and pass through. Then shall he return and be stirred up even to his fortress.”

Now, you've got to understand verse 10 in context of the previous verses. In the previous verses, the King of the South has captured the King of the North and taken him into Egypt, where he died. And the King of the South has also taken control of the geography that previously was owned by the King of the North.

So “the sons” are the sons of the King of the North that are going to retaliate against the King of the South, and they're going to “overflow and pass through”. This “overflow and pass through” is found in Daniel 11, verse 40, when the King of the North retaliates against the King of the South, and he “overflows and passes over” as he sweeps away the Soviet Union.

But let's read Uriah Smith. “The first part of this verse speaks of sons in the plural. The last part of one in the singular. The sons of Seleucus Callinicus were Seleucus Ceraunus and Antiochus Magnus.” (And Antiochus Magnus is going to be the subject now, all the way through verse 15.)

“These both entered with zeal upon the work of vindicating and avenging the cause of their father and their country. The elder of these, Seleucus, first took the throne. He assembled a great multitude to recover his father's dominion. But being a weak and pusillanimous prince, both in body and estate, destitute of money, and unable to keep his army in obedience, he was poisoned by two of his generals after an inglorious reign of two or three years. His more capable brother, Antiochus Magnus, was thereupon proclaimed king, who, taking charge of the army, retook Seleucia and recovered Syria, making himself master of some places by treaty and other places by force of arms. A truce followed, wherein both sides entreated for peace yet prepared for war, after which Antiochus returned and overcame in battle Nicholas, the Egyptian general, and had thoughts of invading Egypt itself. Here's the one who should certainly overflow and pass through.”

So these two sons of the King of the North, they're going to try to get back the geography they lost to the King of the South. The one son was taken off the scene of history. And what remains is Antiochus Magnus. And historians tell us that this is the beginning of the Fourth Syrian war. And Antiochus prevails initially, but once he's on the borderland of Egypt, he puts himself on hold for two years, as both he and the Egyptians began to prepare for the battle of Raphia.

But you shouldn't pass over to the next thought until you settle into some of these important prophetic indicators in this verse. This expression, “overflow and pass through” in verse 10 is found in Daniel 11, verse 40. And it represents when the King of the North and the proxy army of the King of the North, the United States, sweeps away the Soviet Union. It overflows and passes through.

But this expression is also found in Isaiah 8:8. And in Isaiah 8:8, if you have your Bible in front of you, you can look at it, but I'll read it for you in either case. The third reference in the scriptures of this expression, “overflow and pass through”, Verse 8 of Isaiah 8 says, “And he shall pass through Judah. He shall overflow and go over”, and that's the same expression as overflow and pass through, the same expression as verse 40, although they are each of the three times that Hebrew expression is used in these three verses.

The translators translate it a little bit different, but it's still the identical expression. “So he shall pass through Judah”, “he shall overflow and go over”, “he shall reach even to the neck”, and “the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel.”

So for me to claim that these three verses are three witnesses to the same truth requires at least a testimony of two or three. The first testimony is that the expression “overflow and pass through” is the same Hebrew expression in Daniel 11, verse 40, Isaiah 8:8, and Daniel 11, verse 10. And in Daniel 11, verse 40, that expression is the same, but it says it a little bit different. It says that “he shall overflow and pass over”. Verse 10 of Daniel 11 says “pass through”, and verse 8 of Isaiah 8 says “overflow and go over”. That's one witness that these three verses are to be aligned with each other.

A second witness is that in each of the instances, a King of the North is attacking a King of the South. In Isaiah 8:8, Sennacherib, an Assyrian king, which is the King of the North in that prophetic history, is attacking Judah, Jerusalem, the capital of Judah, the city of Jerusalem. And Judah is the King of the South. It's the southern kingdom of Israel. So we see a King of the North attacking the King of the South.

In verse 10 of Daniel 11, you see the King of the North, Antiochus Magnus, attacking Egypt, the King of the South. And in verse 40 of Daniel 11, the King of the North is attacking the King of the South. That's your second witness that establishes that these three verses are to be applied Line-upon-Line. And two of the verses identify something that is important to note.

When Antiochus Magnus in verse 10 comes against Egypt, he goes up even to his fortress. And the fortress is the capital. And when Sennacherib comes against Jerusalem in Isaiah 8, he comes “up to the head”. And in the prophecy of Isaiah 8 (the prophecy of Isaiah 8 begins in chapter 7.) In chapter 7, you have to find what “the head” is in prophecy. And in chapter 7 (which is the same prophetic passage as chapter 8 of Isaiah), it says, “For the head of Syria is Damascus.” The “head” of the kingdom of Syria is the capital city, Damascus. And the head of Damascus, the “head” of the capital city of Syria, is its king, Rezin.

And then it repeats, it gives a second witness to this truth in verse 9. And it says the head of Ephraim, that's the northern kingdom of Israel, is Samaria, its capital city. And the head of Samaria, the capital city of the northern kingdom of Israel, is Ramaliah's son. It's the king. So, in chapter 8 of Isaiah, when Sennacherib, the King of the North, comes up to the neck, he came up to Jerusalem, and he went no farther, because Jerusalem is the capital of Judea. It's the head. It's the king. And the story, you know, that he came up, and then in one night, his army was wiped out. He was ruined. He never took Jerusalem. He never invaded it. He just went up to the neck.

So, in Isaiah 8, you have a witness on this one line that he just comes up to the capital city. And in verse 10 of Daniel 11, this other line that's represented as the King of the North overflowing and passing through, he comes up to his fortress, and his fortress is the capital. It's the head. It's Egypt. And therefore, even though it isn't specifically identified in verse 40 of Daniel 11, when the papal power, the King of the North, forms an alliance, Pope John Paul II, with Ronald Reagan as represented by the chariots, ships, and horsemen of verse 40, and they sweep away the Soviet Union, what they leave is “the fortress”. They go up to the neck. They go up to the head. And the head of the Soviet Union was Russia. And they left Russia standing.

So, commenting on verse 10, this here is probably difficult to wrap our minds around the first few times we go through it. But I contend that this is the beginning of Daniel's final vision, illustrating the end of Daniel's final vision. And the end of Daniel's final vision is unsealed in 1989 at the time of the end. And Jesus always illustrates the end from the beginning. And what began in 1989 was the movement of the Third Angel. The movement of the Millerites was the movement of the first and second angels' message that began in 1798. The movement of the Third Angel arrived in 1989, and it ends at least at one level when the Lord has brought about the ensign of the 144,000. It ends at the Sunday Law, even though there's still a work that the Third Angel does as it calls God's other children out of Babylon.

But the point I want you to see here is that Jesus always illustrates the end from the beginning. And in 1989, He unsealed the last six verses of Daniel 11. And as you get to the approach of the soon-coming Sunday Law, as He's sealing the 144,000, He once again is going to unseal the truth of the last six verses of Daniel 11, because He always illustrates the end from the beginning. And the message that began this period, this prophetic period, is the message that comes again at the end. And the message that comes at the end is the message of the end of Daniel chapter 11 as represented in the last six verses. And that message is brought to light by the beginning of Daniel 11, in the first 15 verses. Jesus illustrates the end of Daniel 11 with the beginning of Daniel 11. And the unsealing in the beginning in 1989 is addressing the unsealing at the end of the movement of the Third Angel.

So in our history, there is going to be an unsealing of Daniel 11:40 to 45. And I contend that that unsealing is represented in verses 10 through 15 of Daniel 11, for that is, as Carl Bernstein said, the “hidden history” of our time. And it's the history of Pope John Paul II, “His Holiness”, who typifies all the Antichrists of the Catholic Church, who were typified by all the Antiochuses of the Seleucid Empire. And the Seleucid Empire's history is a clear parallel to the history of the papal power.

So when you get to verses 10 through 15 of Daniel 11, you are in one of the most profound prophetic testimonies of God's Word, because this is where all the wheels within the wheels are going to seem at first look as if they're in confusion. But if you're willing to see and willing to hear and willing to do your due diligence as a student of prophecy, these are the verses that unseal that “hidden history” of verse 40. And it allows you to pass that final test. And that final test, the test of the 144,000, when the messenger of the covenant suddenly comes to his temple, was illustrated in the very first book of Daniel, in Daniel's final test, when he's brought in before the King of the North, Nebuchadnezzar, and he's tested, and he's found to be 10 times above all the wise men of Babylon.

That testing process that we're in now is a prophetic test that demands that we correctly understand the last five verses there, verses 10 through 15 of Daniel 11, because they are the “hidden history” of verse 40. If you can see the connections here, then even if you can't remember them all first time through, you can see how they're woven together. That should inspire you to make this history your own, so that you can begin to see the implications of what's being unsealed.

Before the first disappointment on July 18th, 2020, this movement in 2014 was infiltrated by ambassadors of Satan with their homosexual agenda. And they worked their way into this movement because they identified the Battle of Ipsus. And the Battle of Ipsus was a battle that took place in this history that's represented in Daniel 11:5 through 15. But this Battle of Ipsus is never mentioned in God's Word. They selected a history that was in that history, but they built their prophetic model upon a history that they chose, not a history that the Holy Spirit had identified.

They did so not because they were misguided, but because they were the ambassadors of Satan. And they did so because Satan was doing everything he could to undermine our ability to clearly understand these verses that are the verses that represent the final period of the sealing of the 144,000. They brought in histories to confuse the testimony of Scripture. And, of course, it led to a state that allowed this false proclamation of Nashville to go forth, the first disappointment.

And then in July 2023, the Lord began to awaken His people and bring them into this final sifting process. And in so doing, as He did in 1989, He is now unsealing verse 40 of Daniel 11 one more time. But in the midst of that unsealing, He's brought in a controversy that began in Millerite history, the controversy being, is the symbol that establishes the vision the United States, or is it Rome? The pioneers understood it was Rome, and they included it on the sacred chart of 1843. And inspiration says that those are the foundational truths that are to be guarded.

Yet there are those that have taken a pluralistic approach to truth and determined that, well, I can apply it this way, should I so choose? And there's a confusion that once again is being brought into this very same passage of Daniel 11 that was brought in by the ambassadors from Down Under and Wales that brought this “woke” agenda into the movement.

The fact that these verses have been the special point of attack here at the end should tell anyone that is serious about being among the 144,000 that they must understand this history correctly. And they can't simply allow themselves to be intellectually satisfied, letting their itchy ears be soothed by those that have a little bit of a grasp of these verses telling them some about it. It has to become your own. We have to individually come to understand these truths.

Now, I don't know where I left off in Uriah Smith's quote here from page 253, but I'm going to start in the middle…. “His more capable brother, Antiochus Magnus, was thereupon proclaimed king, taking charge of the army, retook Seleucia, recovered Syria, making himself master of some places by treaty and others by force of arms.”

He takes back all the territory that the previous king lost to the King of the South. A truce followed. He stopped, where on both sides entreated for peace, yet prepared for war, after which Antiochus returned and overcame in battle Nicholas, the Egyptian general, and had thoughts of invading Egypt itself. Here is the “one who should certainly come and overflow and pass through.” This is the beginning of the Fourth Syrian war. Verse 11 and 12 is a battle within the Fourth Syrian war.

Verse 11 says, “And the King of the South shall be moved with choler and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the King of the North, and he shall set forth a great multitude, but the multitude shall be given into his hand. Ptolemy Philopator succeeded his father Euergetes in the kingdom of Egypt, being advanced to the crown not long after Antiochus Magnus had succeeded his brother in the government of Syria. He was a most luxurious and vicious prince, but was at length aroused at the prospect of an invasion of Egypt by Antiochus. He was indeed ‘moved with choler’ for the losses he had sustained and the danger which threatened him, and he came forth out of Egypt with a numerous army to check the progress of the Syrian king.

“The King of the North was also to set forth a great multitude. The army of Antiochus, according to Polybius, amounted on this occasion to 62,000 foot, 6,000 horse, and 102 elephants. In the battle, Antiochus was defeated and his army, according to prophecy, was given into the hands of the King of the South. 10,000 foot and 3,000 horse were slain and over 4,000 men were taken prisoners, while of Ptolemy's army, there was only 700 horse and about twice the number of infantry.”

I applied this to 2014 in the beginning of the Ukrainian war, and I'm saying that when in 1989, the papacy, the King of the North, with its proxy army, the United States, represented by “chariots, ships, and horsemen”, swept away the Soviet Union and only went “up to” the head, to Russia. That Russia is the power now that's going to seek to regain its geographical geographical area that it lost, and that work is represented in the War of the Borderlands. Both “Raphia” and “Ukraine” mean “borderland”, and in 2014, that war, that battle began. It's still going on as we speak.

The Battle of Panium, 200 BC (and Panium is also Caesarea Philippi), is the next battle. And it's verses 13 through 15. And Uriah Smith says this, Verse 13, “‘For the King of the North shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and much riches.’ Antiochus Magnus now is going to retaliate against his defeat at the hands of the king of Egypt. The event predicted in this verse were to occur ‘after certain years’. The peace concluded between Ptolemy, Philopator, and Antiochus lasted 14 years. Meanwhile, Ptolemy died from intemperance and debauchery and was succeeded by his son, Ptolemy Eponys, a child then four or five years old. Antiochus, during the same time, having suppressed rebellion in his kingdom and reduced and settled the eastern parts in their obedience, was at leisure for any enterprise when the young Eponys came to the throne of Egypt.”

I'm not going to read all this. It goes on to identify that Antiochus forms a confederacy with Philip of Macedon. And they determined that they're going to take on the King of the South, Egypt, this infant king. And they're going to divide up his territory between themselves. But in that same history, same year as the Battle of Panium, “the robbers of thy people” are going to insert themselves in the history.

And Uriah Smith quotes verse 14. He says, “And in those times…” (in this struggle between the alliance of Antiochus and Philip of Macedon against Ptolemy, the infant king of Egypt) “‘...in those times, there shall many stand up against the King of the South. Also, the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall.’ Antiochus was not the only one that rose up against the infant Ptolemy. Agathocles, his prime minister, having possession of the king's person and conducting the affairs of the kingdom in his stead, was so dissolute and proud in the exercise of his power that the provinces which before were subject to Egypt rebelled. Egypt itself was disturbed by sedition. And the Alexandrians, rising up against Agathocles, caused him, his sister, his mother, and their associates to be put to death. At the same time, Philip, king of Macedon, entered into a league with Antiochus to divide the dominions of Ptolemy between them, each proposing to take parts which lay nearest and most convenient to them. Here was a rising up against the King of the South sufficient to fulfill the prophecy and the very event, beyond doubt, which the prophecy intended.’”

He's going to go into the new power that's introduced in verse 14, but what I'm saying is that Antiochus Magnus of verse 14 is typifying the work of the papacy in the United States in sweeping away the Soviet Union in 1989. That's verse 10. And verse 11 and 12 is the Ukrainian war, and the fact that Russia is going to prevail in that war over the proxy army of the papacy, which is the Ukrainians, which are associated with Nazism and financed by the other proxy power of the papacy, the United States.

So this verse 13 through 15, this Battle of Panium, is being carried out by the same Antiochus Magnus that's in verse 11 and 12, and in verse 10. And Antiochus Magnus in verses 10 through 15, in the beginning of the Fourth Syrian War, and the Battle of Raphia, and the Battle of Panium, is the proxy power of the papacy. It's the United States.

Antiochus, the symbol of Antiochus, being a symbol of the Antichrist, is representing the papal power at one level. But the papal power has never led out in military battles. He's always had a king to do his dirty work. And the proxy-king, in the history of Daniel 11, verse 40 and onward, the proxy power that does the work of the papacy is the United States. So verses 10, 11, and 12, and 13 through 15 is the United States.

But the United States, in the line of prophecy that is represented in verses 13 through 15, has been typified by Antiochus. And one of the Antiochus’ was Antiochus Epiphanes. And in Millerite history, the controversy of their history, was that the Protestants were identifying Antiochus as the one who establishes the vision. And therefore, when we bring that controversy to the end of the world, the Protestants were identifying the United States as the power that established the vision. And the Millerites were saying, not so, because it's a new power. And Antiochus Magnus has been the subject of these verses from verses 10 all the way through verse 15.

So when the verse says, “also the robbers of thy people”, it must be a different power than the Antiochus’ or the Antiochus Epiphanes that the Protestants pointed forward to. But this Antiochus in verses 10 through 15, is the proxy army that is the United States. To identify the United States as the robbers of thy people is to accomplish the same identification that the Protestants were making in opposition to the foundational truth that's on the 1843 chart.

This is why Uriah Smith carries on, “A new power is now introduced, the robbers of thy people. Literally, says Bishop Newton, the breakers of thy people.” Uriah Smith is quoting from a historian called Bishop Newton. And why is it that Bishop Newton is taking the phrase out of verse 14, the “robbers” of thy people, and calling it the “breakers” of thy people? It's because if you take the word “robbers” in the Hebrew and take it down to its foundational meaning, it's “a breaker”. And the “breakers” of thy people in scripture was pagan Rome. And it's throughout the scriptures that pagan Rome is the breakers of thy people.

Look at Daniel chapter 7. And this was the reason that Bishop Newton interpreted “robbers” of thy people as “breakers” of thy people. And it was so sound. That is why Uriah Smith quotes Newton, because it was understood that there was a power in Bible prophecy that was to “break” the people of God. And the word “break” is the root word for “robber”. And in verse 7 of Daniel 7, it says this, “I saw in the night vision, and behold, a fourth beast….” (And the fourth beast in the book of Daniel is pagan Rome.) “...Dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, and it had great iron teeth. It devoured, and it break in pieces.”

Speaking of the same power in verse 19 of Daniel 7, “...Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass, which devoured, and break in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet.” (And in verse 23, thus he said, Gabriel said), …”the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.”

The pioneers understood that “the robbers of thy people” was pagan Rome. And they also understood that the word “robbers”, the root word is “breakers”, and the breakers of God's people in the scriptures was pagan Rome. And therefore, they argued that the new power that was introduced in the same year of the battle of Panium, which was 200 BC, and which the historians confirmed that in 200 BC, pagan Rome intruded itself into the history that was unfolding, that pagan Rome is “the breakers of thy people”.

And whoever the breakers of thy people are, they're the robbers of thy people that exalt themselves, that fall, and establish the vision. Uriah Smith said, “A new power is now introduced. The robbers of thy people literally, said Bishop Newton, the breakers of thy people. Far away on the banks of the Tiber, a kingdom had been nourishing itself with ambitious projects and dark designs. Small and weak at first, it grew with marvelous rapidity in strength and vigor, reaching out cautiously here and there to try its prowess and test the vigor of its warlike arm. Till, conscious of its power, it boldly reared its head among the nations of the earth and seized with invincible hands the helm of their affairs. Henceforth, the name of Rome stands upon the historic page, destined for long ages to control the affairs of this world and exert a mighty influence among the nations, even to the end of time.”

Rome spoke in 200 BC. And the reason they spoke is Rome's growing dependence upon Egypt to supply it with grain to feed its citizens and its army. So Rome was forbidding Antiochus Magnus and Philip of Macedon from wiping out Egypt because they did not want their supply of wheat to be broken. So they interceded and became protectors of the Egyptian child king…. “Rome spoke, and Syria and Macedonia soon found the change coming over the aspect of their dreams. The Romans interfered on behalf of the young king of Egypt, determined that he should be protected from the ruin devised by Antiochus and Philip. This was 200 BC and was one of the first important interferences of Romans in the affairs of Syria and Egypt.”

Now, Uriah Smith quotes on in talking about the work of Antiochus and Philip. And ultimately, Antiochus and Philip are going to defeat Egypt, but it isn't going to establish them because Rome's about to take control of the world. Uriah Smith in the next paragraph continues his commentary on verse 14…

“‘...to establish the vision… ‘The Romans being more prominently than any other people the subject of Daniel's prophecy.” We should understand this. “The Romans being more prominently than any other people the subject of Daniel's prophecy.” The Romans.

“Their first interference in the affairs of these kingdoms is here referred to as being the establishment or demonstration of the truth of the vision which predicted the existence of such a power.

“‘But they shall fall’. Some refer to those mentioned in the first part of this verse, ‘who should stand up against the King of the South’, others to ‘the robbers of Daniel’s people’, the Romans. It is true in either case. If those who combine against Ptolemy are referred to, all that needs to be said is that they did speedily fall; and if it applies to the Romans, the prophecy simply looked forward to the period of their overthrow.“

OK, I'm going to drop down to verse 16. And Uriah Smith is what is on your screen now, the conclusion of page 258. He's talking about Antiochus Magnus prevailing in the battle of Panium. And then in verse 16, it says, “But he that cometh against him (against Antiochus Magnus, against the Seleucid kingdom, but Rome, that cometh against the Seleucid kingdom), “…shall do according to his own will. And none shall stand before him, and he shall stand in the Glorious Land, by which his hand shall be consumed.

“Although Egypt could not stand before Antiochus (the King of the North), Antiochus could not stand before the Romans, who now came against him. No kingdoms were longer able to resist this rising power. Syria was conquered and added to the Roman Empire when Pompey, in 65 BC, deprived Antiochus Asiaticus of his possessions and reduced Syria to a Roman province.

“The same power (pagan Rome), was also to stand in the holy land and consume it. Rome became connected with the people of God, the Jews by alliance, in 162 BC, from which date it holds a prominent place in the prophetic calendar. It did not, however, acquire jurisdiction over Judea by actual conquest until BC 63, and then in the following manner.”

 In verse 16, pagan Rome is conquering the Seleucid kingdom. It was started by Seleucid Nicator, who had 26 to 30 kings, and many of them took upon themselves the name “Antiochus”, which is typifying the title of Antichrist. And they took that name upon them, not to honor Seleucus, the first king of the Seleucid Empire, but to honor his father, who was closely connected with Alexander the Great, and whose name was Antiochus.

And in verse 16, pagan Rome has conquered the Seleucid kingdom in BC 65, and then it stands in the Glorious Land. And verse 16 and verse 41 of Daniel 11 is the only place that Daniel uses the expression “Glorious Land”. And in verse 41 of Daniel 11, the King of the North stretches his hand out, or conquers the Glorious Land, and “many shall be overthrown, and some shall escape his hand; even Edom, Moab and the chief of the children of Ammon.”

Verse 16, when pagan Rome conquers the Glorious Land, the literal Glorious Land, it is illustrating when spiritual Rome, at the end of the world, conquers the spiritual Glorious Land, which is the United States. The United States is overthrown at the Sunday Law. The United States falls one time. Rome, which is Babylon, falls three times. Babylon fell in the time of Nimrod. Babylon fell in the history of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. And the message “Babylon has fallen has fallen” is identifying the third and final fall of Babylon, which is illustrated in Revelation 17 and 18, when the ten kings burn modern Babylon and eat her flesh.

Whoever modern Rome is that comes to its end with none to help, it is the subject of Bible prophecy and it's the papal power. And it's fallen, it's fallen. The United States falls one time and when it's fallen, it falls at the Sunday Law and it's no longer the Glorious Land. There's no longer anything glorious about it. It's past tense.

All the prophetic characteristics that are associated with the robbers of thy people establishing the vision deny that it can be the proxy power represented by Antiochus Magnus in verses 10 through 15. It has to be another power, and the other power that it was in the history that first fulfilled those verses, was pagan Rome. That truth became a foundational understanding in the Millerite movement.

Let me just see if I've covered everything I want to cover before I bring this to a close. Well, there's a lot more to say, but I know I've said enough. I've passed over some other points. The other points were to show that the characteristics of the Seleucid Kingdom clearly illustrate the characteristics of the papal kingdom 538, 1798, 1989. At the same time there, I identified the role of the military power, which is the United States, with the papal power at the end of the world.

The history that fulfilled those verses initially is the history of Syria and pagan Rome. If much of the history that's taking place, the fulfillment of Daniel 11 is repeated. It's repeated in the final fulfillment of Daniel 11. The final fulfillment of Daniel 11 is that portion of the book of Daniel that relates to the last days, and that portion of the book of Daniel that relates to the last days in 1989 was the last six verses of Daniel 11, and those six verses were opened up by the history of verse 40 when it was seen that the Soviet Union was swept away by this alliance between the papal power and its proxy representative, the United States.

The beginning of that movement in 1989, when it reaches the end in the sealing of the 144,000, will have an unsealing of Daniel 11, and what's unsealed in Daniel 11 at the end is not simply verse 40 and onward to verse 45. It's the “hidden history” of verse 40, and the “hidden history” of verse 40 began in 1989 with the collapse of the Soviet Union, and it goes to the Sunday Law. And in Daniel chapter 11, verse 10 through verse 16, you have typified 1989 to the Sunday Law.

Therefore, verses 10 through 15 of Daniel 11 represent the hidden history of verse 40, and in that hidden history, you have it being typified by the Fourth Syrian War that was begun by Antiochus Magnus, followed by the Battle of Raphia, followed by the Battle of Panium. And the Battle of Panium is the Battle of Caesarea Philippi, because when Jesus took His disciples to Caesarea Philippi, He was taking them to Panium, because Caesarea Philippi is simply the name of that town in the time of Christ.

And there's much that can be said about Caesarea Philippi and the message that Christ was unfolding to His disciples at that time, and one of the things that He said to the disciples is, don't worry about telling anyone that I'm the Messiah. We're on our way now to the cross. The people had the opportunity to understand that I was the Messiah, but that's not the issue any longer. During [the visit to] Caesarea Philippi, He told them, tell no man that I'm the Messiah, and then He began to open up to them that He was going to suffer persecution and death at the cross.

Caesarea Philippi is Panium, and the Holy Spirit has now brought His people prophetically to Panium, to an understanding of verses 13 to 15 of Daniel 11, which is the hidden history of verse 40 from 1989 until the Sunday Law. And He's saying that anyone now that hasn't come to grips with the reality that September 11, 2001 was marking the arrival of the Third Woe, and that the mighty angel of Revelation 18 descended at that time and lightened the earth with his glory, don't worry about convincing them, because the subject now is no longer that. The subject is what's just ahead, and what's just ahead is the cross, and the cross is typifying the Sunday Law.

Once Jesus brings His disciples to Caesarea Philippi, once He brings his 144,000 to Panium, He's brought them to the place where He is now going to open up the events of the Sunday Law.

But Satan is introducing the final controversy, because the beginning controversy was over verse 14, the verse in the middle of verses 13 to 15. And that controversy was, “Is the robbers of thy people the United States, or is it Rome?” In the beginning of Millerite history, [the question] was, was the robbers of thy people Antiochus, or was it Rome? It's the identical argument, and Jesus illustrates the end from the beginning.

And as students of prophecy in the last days, first and foremost, you need to stand upon the foundation. First and foremost, you need to stand upon the authority of the Spirit of Prophecy that identifies that the 1843 Chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and should not be altered.

Now, I shouldn't be saying “first and foremost”, because I'm putting a priority into the emphasis that I don't want. What you need to understand is that we are approaching the Sunday Law in verse 16, [and] the Sunday Law in verse 41.

We're in the final sifting of the 144,000, and the test at this time for the people of God is, are you a pluralist, or do you believe in absolute truth? Do you believe that there's only one true identification for the robbers of thy people? Do you believe in the foundations of Adventism as represented on Habakkuk's table in 1843? Or are you a pluralist and are willing to accept other ideas of what that symbol represents?

Because while you're holding to that confused position, the gold and silver of the Levites is going to be separated from the dross in the final sifting, and just as the Protestants were passed by in the Millerite history, those among us that are unwilling to stand upon absolute truth are about to be spewed out of the mouth of the Lord.

And I know that those people that I am directing that warning towards, their response is, for someone to speak in such a fashion, it is manifesting an un-Christian attitude. I've read it in the recent days, and I'm telling you here, that a Christian is someone that's Christ-like, and Christ is the Word of God, and the Word of God says, “Surely the Lord thy God will do nothing except He reveal it through His servants, the prophets”, and He's not simply revealing the sequence of events that are represented in verses 13 through 15, and that portray the hidden history of verse 40, He's also representing that we are now in the final sifting of the 144,000, and we are being tested, as was Daniel being tested by Nebuchadnezzar, and it's our privilege to be found ten times wiser than all the soothsayers and magicians in Babylon, if we will but stand upon absolute truth, and stand upon the foundations of Adventism, and stand upon the endorsement of those foundations as represented in the spirit of prophecy, and as identified and set forth in the Bible.

Shall we pray?

Heavenly Father, we thank You for this Sabbath, but we're in serious times, and serious issues are being brought forth, that are being allowed to be brought forth, You've allowed them. You said You will allow heresy to come in among us to force Your people to study. This has happened. You're trying to warn us that the probationary time, the sand in the hourglass, is about over, if we're willing to see.

We can see this in the political world, the religious world, the military world, the economic world, we can see that probation is about over, and if we're willing to see, we can see that in agreement with Your promise that You won't do anything except You reveal it through Your prophetic Word, we can see that You're trying to warn us of of these old controversies that are being reintroduced.

But we can also see that it's part of the purification process that You've ordained, and I ask that as we break at this time, and go back and consider this presentation, and compare with Your Word, that You would give us Your Holy Spirit and divine discernment to see that we are much closer to the close of probation, and that we are actually wrapped up in a disagreement that has life or death consequences. We ask for Your grace and wisdom as we work through these things, in Jesus' name,

Amen.