Daniel 11:11-12

Daniel 11:11-The Prophecy of Ptolemy IV Philopator’s Victory Over Antiochus III the Great

Review of Daniel 11:2-10

Daniel 11:2 “Now, at this present time, I must reveal to you the truth. Behold, three future kings will ascend to power for Persia. Then, the fourth will cause greater riches to make him wealthier than each and every one of these in comparison. However, when he amasses power through his wealth, the entire nation will stir up the Greek kingdom.” (Author’s translation)

The unidentified elect angel begins to communicate to Daniel revelation of God’s prophetic program for the nation of Israel during the Times of the Gentiles. He begins by issuing a prophecy regarding the Persian Empire, which in 536 B.C. was a world-wide empire. Cyrus the Persian was the ruler of the Medo-Persian Empire at that time. Persian became more dominant than the kingdom of Media, thus the angel does not mention Media. This Persian dominance is predicted in the prophecies found in Daniel chapter seven and eight.

The angel informs Daniel that there will be three kings who will ascend to power immediately after the reign of Cyrus the Persian. These three will be followed immediately by a fourth who will distinguish himself from these three by accumulating more wealth than his predecessors. However, when this fourth king amasses power through his wealth, the entire Persian Empire will stir up hostilities with the Greeks.

This prophecy of these four Persian rulers was fulfilled in history, which records the first as being Cambyses, who was the son of Cyrus the Persian, who reigned from 530-522 B.C. He was followed by Pseudo-Smerdis, who only reigned for a short period of time in 522 B.C. Darius I Hystaspes who ruled from 522-486 B.C. followed Pseudo-Smerdis. The fourth ruler was Xerxes, he was known in the book of Esther as Ahasuerus and he reigned over Persia from 485-465 B.C. He was more powerful than his three predecessors and the most influential and wealthy of the four, thus fulfilling the prophecy found in Daniel 11:2. During the reign of Xerxes, he fought wars against Greece which also served to fulfill this prophecy here in Daniel 11:2.

Daniel 11:3 “Next, a powerful king will ascend to power so that he will rule with great authority with the result that he will do according to his desire.” (Author’s translation)

The unidentified angel continues to present to Daniel God’s prophetic program for the nation of Israel during the Times of the Gentiles and thus simultaneously
during the seventy weeks or four hundred ninety prophetic years. The angelic being informs Daniel that after the four Persian kings mentioned in verse 4 and in particular after the fourth Persian king amasses great power and his nation stirs up hostilities with the kingdom of Greece, a powerful king will ascend to power so that he will rule with great authority with the result that he will do according to his desire. History records that this mighty king was none other than Alexander the Great who reigned from 336-323 B.C. before dying unexpectedly at the age of 32 from complications of malaria and alcoholism. He conquered Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and the Medo-Persian Empire. Not only is Alexander the Great prophesied about in Daniel 11:3 but he is also prophesied about in Daniel 8:5-8.

Daniel 11:4 “However, after he ascends to power, his kingdom will be broken up. Then, it will be divided towards the heaven’s four winds but not for the benefit of his posterity and in addition, not according to his sovereign will which he sovereignly exercised. For his kingdom will be uprooted specifically, for the benefit of others, to the separation and exclusion of these.” (Author’s translation)

Since history reveals that this powerful king was Alexander the Great, the four-fold division of this powerful king’s empire refers to the four-fold division of Alexander’s empire after his death. The four heads of the leopard in Daniel 7:6 as well as the four horns of the shaggy goat in Daniel 8:5-8 also depict this four-fold division of Alexander’s empire. History records that Alexander’s four generals who divided his empire after he died. To Ptolemy was given Egypt and parts of Asia Minor. Casander was given the territory of Macedonia and Greece. Lysimachus was given Thrace and parts of Asia Minor (western Bithynia, Phrygia, Mycia and Lydia). Seleucus was given the remainder of Alexander’s empire which included Syria, Israel and Mesopotamia.

The angelic prophecy that this powerful king’s empire will not be for the benefit of his offspring or posterity was fulfilled in history since Alexander’s son, Alexander Jr. who was born to Roxana after his death did not succeed his father after his death. Herakles or Hercules who was an illegitimate son by Barsina and his half-brother Philip were also possibilities to succeed Alexander but none of them inherited the throne nor did any of his descendants.

Daniel 11:5 “Then, the king ruling the south as well as one of his subordinate commanders will be strong. In fact, he will become stronger than him because he will exercise authority over a dominion greater than his dominion.” (Author’s translation)

The angel informs Daniel that after the four-fold division of the kingdom of the powerful king, the king ruling the South as well as one of his subordinate commanders will be strong militarily and politically. History records that the king ruling the south is Ptolemy I Soter (323-285 B.C.) who was a general who served
under Alexander. As we noted he was given authority over Egypt in 323 B.C. and proclaimed king of Egypt in 304 B.C. His dynasty ended in 30 B.C. History also tells us that the subordinate commander of the king ruling the south is Seleucus I Nicator (312-281 B.C.), who was also a general of Alexander. He was given authority over Babylon in 321 B.C. His dynasty ended in 64 B.C. In 316 B.C. Babylon came under attack by Antigonus who was another general.

Seleucus turned to Ptolemy I Soter in Egypt for help and got it. The combined strength of Ptolemy and Seleucus defeated Antigonus at Gaza in 312 B.C. Seleucus was greatly strengthened as a result of this victory and returned to Babylon. He ruled over Babylonia, Media and Syria. He assumed the title of king in 305 B.C. Thus, Seleucus I Nicator ruled over far more territory than Ptolemy I Soter. In fact, by the end of his reign, Seleucus reigned over the territory from Punjab to the Hellenspont with great power. He gained control over the entire area from Asia Minor to India. Therefore, we can see that Daniel 11:5 was fulfilled with these two men, Ptolemy I Soter and Seleucus I Nicator.

Now, the emergence of Ptolemy I Soter as the king over Egypt and Seleucus I Nicator as king over Syria set the stage for the lines of these two rulers in their respective countries to become rivals or adversaries. “The king of the South” in this prophecy in Daniel 11 is thus a reference to those descendants of Ptolemy who would rule over Egypt. On the other hand, “the king of the north” in this prophecy is a reference to those descendants of Seleucus. This rivalry between these two kingdoms would adversely affect Israel because she would be caught in between their wars.

Daniel 11:5 begins a detailed prophecy of the conflicts that would take place between these two kingdoms. The wars between these two factions would cause quite a bit of suffering for Daniel’s people. In fact, Antiochus Epiphanes IV, the “small or little horn” and “bold-face king” of Daniel chapter 8, would be a descendant of Seleucus and would persecute the Jewish people in the second century B.C.

Daniel 11:6 “Next, at the end of an unspecified number of years, they will form an alliance as the daughter of the king ruling the south will enter into marriage with the king ruling the north in order to secure a peaceful arrangement. However, she will by no means retain her powerful position likewise he will by no means endure, namely his power. For she will be delivered over as well as he who caused her to enter into marriage, as well as her child and in addition, her benefactor during those times.” (Author’s translation)

History records that all the events prophesied by the angel here in Daniel 11:6 have all taken place. As we noted in our study of Daniel 11:5, the king ruling the south was Ptolemy I Soter and his subordinate commander was Seleucus I Nicator...
who became more powerful than the former. Now, here in Daniel 11:6 the king ruling the south is the son of Ptolemy I Soter, who was named Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.). The king ruling the north is Antiochus II Theos (262-246 B.C.) who was the son of Seleucus I Nicator. History records that these two rulers were bitter rivals. However, in fulfillment of this prophecy they formed an alliance, which was secured by the marriage of the daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Antiochus II Theos. History records this daughter was Bernice. It also records that this marriage did not last. When Antiochus II Theos married Bernice, he divorced his wife Laodice. However, when Bernice’s father, Ptolemy II Philadelphus died in 246 B.C., Antiochus II Theos took back his first wife Laodice who exacted revenge on Bernice by killing her and the child she bore to Antiochus II Theos who was also killed by Laodice by poisoning him. She ruled in his place for a brief time. However, the son of Laodice and Antiochus succeeded Laodice who established him on the throne of his father. His name was Seleucus II Callinicus (246-227). Therefore, we can see that the death of Ptolemy II Philadelphus precipitated the murders of his daughter Bernice, her son and her husband Antiochus II Theos.

There was peace between these two kingdoms during the reigns of Ptolemy I Soter and Seleucus I Nicator. The former abdicated in favor of his son Ptolemy II Philadelphus whose half brother Magas had married a daughter of Antiochus I Soter who had succeeded Seleucus I Nicator as king over Syria. This marriage resulted in a war between these two dynasties since Magas persuaded his father-in-law Antiochus I Soter to declare war against Egypt. Antiochus I Soter was succeeded by Antiochus II Theos who continued the war. However, as prophesied by the angel here in Daniel 11:6, Ptolemy II Philadelphus offered his daughter, Bernice to Antiochus II Theos, as bribe for peace. There was a condition attached to this marriage, namely Antiochus II Theos would have to divorce Laodice and would have to declare her two sons as not legitimate heirs to the throne. However, as also predicted by the angel, when Ptolemy II Philadelphus died, Bernice could no longer retain her position of power as queen since Laodice from her place of exile formed a successful conspiracy. She engineered a successful coup by having Bernice and the child she bore to Antiochus II Theos killed. Not long after the death of these two, she poisoned Antiochus II Theos.

Daniel 11:7 “But one of the branches from her roots will ascend to power in his place. Then, he will wage an attack against their army so that he will enter the fortress of the king ruling the north. Indeed, he will take action against them so that he will be victorious.” (Author’s translation)

This verse was also completely fulfilled in history. “Her” is a reference to Bernice and “one of the branches from her roots” is a reference to her brother Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 B.C.). The name “Euergetes” means “Benefactor.”
After the death of their father, Bernice’s brother ascended to power. He then launched an attack against Seleucus II Callinicus who was the king ruling the north at this time who came to power through his mother, Laodice. Ptolemy III Euergetes attacked Seleucus II Callinicus at Antioch, Syria and killed Laodice. He also conquered much of that region around this city. He remained the foremost military power in the Middle East during the rest of his reign. He returned to Egypt not only avenging the death of his sister Bernice and her infant child and husband but also he came back with many spoils. In exchange for peace, Ptolemy III Euergetes was awarded new territories on the northern coast of Syria including the port of Antioch. Thus the Ptolemaic kingdom was at the height of its power.

Daniel 11:8 “Consequently, he will also cause their gods to be transported into captivity to Egypt along with their cast images, as well as their valuable silver and gold articles. Furthermore, for some years he will withdraw from the king ruling the north.” (Author’s translation)

Daniel 11:8 continues the prophecy regarding Ptolemy III Euergetes avenging his sister Bernice’s death by defeating in war Seleucus II Callinicus. The angel informs Daniel that as a result of his victory over the king ruling the north, the king ruling the south will cause the gods of the king ruling the north to be transported into captivity to Egypt along with their cast images, as well as their valuable silver and gold articles. Also, for some years he will withdraw from the king ruling the north. As was the case with Daniel 11:2-7, this verse also was fulfilled in history since as a result of his victory over Seleucus II Callinicus (“the king ruling the north”), Ptolemy III Euergetes transported the gods of Seleucus II Callinicus to Egypt. He also captured their cast images and valuable silver and gold articles from their temple treasuries. Ptolemy III Euergetes also signed a treaty with Seleucus II Callinicus in 240 B.C. which fulfilled the prophecy of the king ruling the south withdrawing from the king ruling the north for some years.

Daniel 11:9 “Then, he will wage an attack against the king ruling the south but will return to his land.” (Author’s translation)

The angel predicts that the king ruling the north will wage an attack against the king ruling the south but will return to his homeland implying that this attack will be a failed invasion. Although there is no ancient source who mentions this failed invasion, we know that this prophecy was fulfilled in history because the angel’s previous predictions in Daniel 11:2-8 have all been fulfilled in history and can be verified by ancient historians. In 240 B.C. Seleucus II Callinicus in retaliation for his great loss waged a failed invasion against Ptolemy III Euergetes. In 225 B.C., Seleucus II Callinicus died as a result of falling off his horse. Therefore, during this period, Egypt was in control of the Middle East and thus the land of Israel. Under Ptolemy III Euergetes, the Jews prospered. Thus the reason for the angel spending some time discussing the highlights of his reign.
Daniel 11:10 “Following this, his sons will initiate hostile military action. Specifically, they will muster a multitude of great military forces. Then, he will as a certainty wage a massive attack so that he will overflow, yes, pass through like a flood with the result that he will turn him back. Indeed, he will engage in hostile military action up to his fortress.” (Author’s translation)

This prophecy has also been fulfilled in history. First of all, the king of the north refers to Seleucus II Callinicus and the king of the south is Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.). The two sons of the king of the north were Seleucus III Ceranunus (also called Soter) who reigned for only three years (227-223 B.C.) and Antiochus III the Great who reigned for thirty seven years (223-187 B.C.). When Seleucus III Ceranunus was killed, the army placed his eighteen year old brother, Antiochus III on the throne.

These two sons of the sons of Seleucus II Callinicus were seeking to restore the lost prestige of their father’s Syrian kingdom. The older son, Seleucus III Ceranunus invaded Asia Minor and the younger son, Antiochus III attacked Egypt. Egypt had controlled all the territory north to the borders of Syria which included the land of Israel. Antiochus III was successful in driving back the Egyptians back to the southern borders of Israel during his campaign in 219-217 B.C. In the process, he gained control of Israel. Antiochus III was called “the Great” because of his great conquests since his efforts strengthened the Seleucid Empire. His forces had reclaimed the territories lost to the Ptolemy III Euergetes who was succeeded by Ptolemy IV Philopator.

The King of the South Will Be Enraged and Fight the King of the North

Daniel 11:11 “The king of the South will be enraged and go forth and fight with the king of the North. Then the latter will raise a great multitude, but that multitude will be given into the hand of the former.” (NASB95)

“This king of the South will be enraged and go forth and fight with the king of the North” is composed of the conjunction wa (ו) (waw), which is not translated and followed by the third person masculine singular hithpael middle imperfect form of the verb mā·rār (מָרָר) (maw-rar´), “will be enraged” and then we have the masculine singular construct form of the noun mē·lēk (מלך) (meh-lek), “a king” which is modified by the articular feminine singular noun nē·gēb ( negerb) (neh´-gheb), “South” and then we have the conjunction wa (ו) (waw), “and” which is followed by the third masculine singular qal active perfect form of the verb yā·šā (שָׁא) (yaw-tsaw´), “go forth” and then we have the conjunction wa (ו) (waw), “and” which is followed by the third person masculine singular niphal active perfect construct form of the verb lā·ḥām (כָּאָה) (law-kham´), “fight” and then we have the preposition ’im (אִמ) (eem), which is not translated and its object is the third person
masculine singular pronominal suffix hû(’) (חָ同城) (who), which is not translated and followed by the preposition ‘im (ה) (eem), “with” but this time its object is the masculine construct form of the noun mě·lěk (מלך) (meh-lek), “the king of” which is modified by the articular masculine singular noun sā·pôn (סָפון) (tsaw-fone’), “the North.”

wa

The conjunction wa means “then, next” since it is functioning as a marker of a sequence of closely related events. This means that it is introducing a statement that marks the next event that took place after the events recorded in Daniel 11:10. In this verse, the angel tells Daniel that after the failed attacked against the king of the south by their father, the sons of the king of the north will initiate hostile military action. The angel then specifies for Daniel by telling that these two sons will muster a multitude of great military forces. Then one of the sons will as a certainty wage a massive attack so that his army will overflow, yes, pass through the territory of the king of the south like a flood. The result of this will be that this son of the king of the north will turn the king of the south back. The angel then advances upon this previous statement by informing Daniel that this son of the king of the north will engage in hostile military action up to the fortress of the king of the south. Now, here in Daniel 11:11, the conjunction wa introduces a statement which says that the king of the south will be enraged so that he will go forth and fight the king of the north who is the son mentioned in Daniel 11:10. Therefore, the conjunction wa is marking this event as taking place some time after one of the sons of the king of the north was victorious over the king of the south.

mě·lěk hâ nē·rḗghēb

The noun mě·lěk means “king” and is used with reference to the governmental head of the Egyptian kingdom which was ruled by descendants of Ptolemy. The construct form of this noun means that it is governing the word which follows it, which is the noun nē·rḗghēb. The construct state expresses a genitive relation between these two words.

The noun nē·rḗghēb means “south” referring to the compass point directly opposite the north. This word’s primary meaning is a geographic region. Because this region lay to the south of the rest of Israel, the word became synonymous with dā·rôm, “south.” The meaning “south” is easily understood as “toward the Negeb.” Here in Daniel 11:11, the noun nē·rḗghēb means “south” and refers to the geographical location of the kingdom which was located to the south of Israel and was ruled by the descendants of Ptolemy who was one of Alexander’s generals.
who ruled Egypt after Alexander’s death. It refers to Egypt as made clear by the angel’s statements in verse 8.

The articular construction of this noun nē-ḥēb marks the word as unique in its class and distinctive. Here it indicates that the distinctiveness of this kingdom which lay to the south of Israel geographically in that it will was ruled by one of those who divided up Alexander’s kingdom after his death.

The genitive relation between mē-lēk and nē-ḥēb is subordination indicating that the region which lie to the south of Israel geographically was subordinate to this king. So the idea is the “king ruling the south.”

mā·rār

The verb mā·rār means “to enrage oneself with, to make oneself furious with someone or something” expressing intensity of emotion of anger and bitterness. Thus, the word indicates that the king of the south will cause himself to be enraged with the king of the north who had defeated him in battle.

The hithpael stem is a reflexive-factitive hithpael indicating the subject of the verb is causing itself to enter a state. Thus, this stem denotes that the king of the south as the subject of this verb caused will cause himself to enter the state of being enraged against the king of the north. This would indicate that the former will become enraged as a result of thinking about his great defeat at the hands of the latter.

The imperfect conjugation of the verb describes this event as taking place in the future from the perspective of Daniel in the sixth century B.C. after the king of the south is defeated in battle by the king of the north.

wa

This time the conjunction wa is a marker of result meaning that it is introducing a statement which presents the result of the previous statement that the king ruling the south will cause himself to be enraged.

yā-šā(‘)

The verb yā-šā(‘) means “to march out” since it pertains to linear movement away from a particular area by an army. Here refers to the king ruling the south “marching out” of his territory which he governed, which was Egypt. It refers to this king embarking on a military expedition to the territory of the king of the north.
The qal stem is fientive expressing the action of this king marching out of his territory. The perfect conjugation of this verb is a future perfect expressing a future state resulting from actions that will have been completed by that time. Here it is expressing the future state of the king of the south going forth from his land to fight the king of the north as a result of his actions to do so (his orders to his troops) that will be completed by that time.

wa

This time the conjunction wa functions as a marker of purpose meaning it is introducing a statement which presents the purpose for which the king ruling the south went forth from his territory.

lā-ḥām

The verb lā-ḥām means “to engage in battle or combat, to fight against, to wage war.” Here it is referring to the king ruling the south engaging the king ruling the north in battle or war.

The niphal conjugation of this verb is a reciprocal niphal expressing an action where multiple subjects act upon each other. Therefore, this stem denotes that these two kings will act upon each other in war.

The perfect conjugation of this verb is a future perfect expressing a future state resulting from actions that will have been completed by that time. Here it is expressing the future state of the king of the south fighting against the king of the north as a result of his actions to do so (his orders to his troops) that will be completed by that time.

hû(‘)

The third person masculine singular pronominal suffix hû(‘) means “him” referring to the king of the north and is the object of the preposition ’im which means “against” since it functions as a marker of opposition indicating that the king of the south will make war “against” the king ruling the north.

mē’lēk hā šāʾpōn

The noun mē’lēk, means “king” and is used with reference to the governmental head of the Seleucid dynasty which is the king ruling the north. The noun šāʾpōn means “north” referring to the compass point directly opposite the south. Here the noun refers to the geographical location of the kingdom which was located to the
north of Israel and was ruled by the descendants of Seleucus I Nicator who was one of Alexander’s generals who ruled Syria, Israel and Mesopotamia after Alexander’s death.

The articular construction of this noun sāpōn marks the word as unique in its class and distinctive. Here it indicates that the distinctiveness of this kingdom which lay to the north of Israel geographically in that it will was ruled by the son of Seleucus I Nicator.

The construct state of the noun mē-lēk, means that it is governing the word which follows it, which is sāpōn. These two words have a genitive relation, which is subordination indicating that the region which lie to the north of Israel geographically was subordinate to this king. So the idea is the “king ruling the north.” The noun mē-lēk is also the object of the preposition ‘im which means “against” since it functions as a marker of opposition indicating that the king of the south will make war “against” the king ruling the north.

The King of the North Will Repulse the King of the South

Daniel 11:11 “The king of the South will be enraged and go forth and fight with the king of the North. Then the latter will raise a great multitude, but that multitude will be given into the hand of the former.” (NASB95)

“Then the latter will raise a great multitude, but that multitude will be given into the hand of the former” is composed of the conjunction wa ( gating), “then” which is followed by the third person masculine singular hiphil active perfect form of the verb ‘ā-mād (aw-mad), “will raise” which is followed by the masculine singular form of the noun hā-mōn (haw-mone´), “a multitude of” which is modified by the masculine singular form of the adjective rāḥ (rab), “great” and then we have the conjunction wa ( gating), “but” which is followed by the third person masculine singular niphal passive perfect form of the verb nā-tān (naw than), “will be given” and then we have the articular masculine singular form of the noun hā-mōn (haw-mone´), “multitude” which is followed by the preposition bē ( beh), “into” and its object is the feminine singular construct form of the noun yāḏ (yawd), “power” which is modified by the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix –hû (who), “his.”

wa

This time the conjunction wa means “consequently” since it is functioning as a marker of result meaning that it is introducing a statement which presents the result of the previous statement that the king ruling the south will march out in order to
wage war against the king ruling the north. The conjunction introduces a statement which records the angelic being predicting to Daniel that the king ruling the north will raise a great army. Therefore, the mustering of this great army by the king of the north will be the direct result of the king of the south marching out to wage war against him.

\[\text{‘ā·māḏ}\]

The verb \[\text{‘ā·māḏ}\] means “to raise, to muster, to cause to be assembled” since it pertains to the act of assembling an army or causing an army to be gathered together. Here it of course refers to the king of the north “raising” or “mustering” a large army.

The hiphil stem of this verb is factitive meaning that the subject of the verb causes itself direct object to enter the state described the verb in the qal. The subject of course is the king of the north and the direct object is a great multitude. Therefore, this stem denotes that the king of the north as the subject will cause a great multitude to be mustered or brought together in order to fight the king of the south.

The perfect conjugation of this verb is a future perfect expressing a future state resulting from actions that will have been completed by that time. Here it is expressing the future state of a great multitude being mustered as a result of the actions of the king of the north that will be completed by that time.

\[\text{rāḇ' hā·mōn'}\]

The noun \[\text{hā·mōn}\] means “a multitude” referring to troops to be used in a military conflict. It is modified by the plural adjective \[\text{rāḇ},\] which means “great” in the sense of being large in numbers indicating that in response to the king of the south marching out to attack him, the king of the north will muster a large number of troops to thwart the king of the south.

\[\text{wa}\]

This time the conjunction \[\text{wa}\] means “however, but, despite this” since it is introducing a statement which presents a contrast with the previous angelic statement that the king of the north will cause a great multitude to be assembled. It is introducing a statement which says that the king of the north will be defeated in battle by the king of the south. Therefore, the conjunction denotes that the king of the north will cause a great multitude to be assembled “however” or “despite this” the king of the north will be defeated in battle by the king of the south.
hā-môn

Once again, the noun hā-môn means “a multitude” referring to troops to be used in a military conflict. Here it refers to the multitude of troops assembled by the king of the north to fight the approaching invasion of the king of the south. The articular construction of the word is anaphoric meaning that this word appears in the previous result clause and retains the same referent and meaning here in this adversative clause.

nā·țān

The verb nā·țān means “to deliver” in the sense of being defeated in battle. It speaks of being given over to the power of another. Here it refers to the multitude assembled by the king of the north being “delivered over” to the power of the king of the south or in other words, being destroyed in battle.

The niphal passive stem of the verb expresses an action where the subject is acted upon by an expressed or unexpressed agency. Therefore, the niphal passive form of nā·țān indicates that the multitude of troops assembled by the king of the north will be delivered over to the power of the king of the south by God.

The perfect conjugation of this verb is a future perfect expressing a future state resulting from actions that will have been completed by that time. Here it is expressing the future state of a great multitude being delivered over to the power of the king of the south as a result of God’s sovereign decision that will be accomplished by that time.

yāḏ

The noun yāḏ means “power” which is modified by the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix –ḥû, which means “his” referring of course to the power of the king of the south. The noun yāḏ is the object of the preposition bē, which is a marker of a state or condition indicating that the great army assembled by the king of the north will be delivered “into” the power of the king of the south. This prepositional phrase denotes that this great army entered the state or condition of being delivered into the power of the king of the south.

Translation of Daniel 11:11

Daniel 11:11 “Then, the king ruling the south will cause himself to be enraged so that he will march out in order to wage war against him, against
the king ruling the north. Consequently, he will cause a great multitude to be assembled. However, this multitude will be delivered into his power.”

Exposition of Daniel 11:11

The angel continues to communicate to Daniel God’s prophetic program for the nation of Israel during the Times of the Gentiles by informing him that in response to his great defeat at the hands of the king of the north, the king of the south will cause himself to be enraged over this great loss. Consequently, he will take his army and march out in order to wage war against the king of the north. In response to this, the angel tells Daniel that the king of the north will cause a great multitude of troops to be assembled but despite this, this multitude will be delivered over into the power of the king of the south meaning these troops will be defeated in combat by the army led by the king of the south. This has all been fulfilled in human history.

The king ruling the south in Daniel 11:11 is a reference to Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.). The king ruling the north is a reference to Antiochus III the Great (223-187 B.C.). In 217 B.C., Ptolemy IV Philopator attacked the great army assembled by Antiochus III the Great at Raphia. The account of this great battle appears in Polybius’ work “Histories” (pages 430–436). In this battle, Ptolemy IV Philopator was accompanied by his sister-wife, Arsinoe. He led an army of 70,000 as well as 5,000 cavalry and 73 elephants. Antiochus II the Great led an army of 62,000 as well as 6,000 cavalry and 102 elephants. Antiochus lost 14,000 men according to Polybius. Ptolemy IV Philopator regained the land of Israel. According to Jerome, Antiochus was almost captured but escaped to the desert. Unlike his father, Ptolemy IV Philopator lacked his father’s military instinct and did not press his advantage. Instead, he was content with the victory and did not pursue Antiochus. This came back to haunt him later.

Excursus: Ptolemy IV Philopator

Ptolemy IV Philopator (“father-loving”) (222–204 B.C.). Born after 240 B.C., oldest son of Ptolemy III and Berenice II. On his accession he was challenged by Antiochus the Great, (Fourth Syrian War, 221–217 B.C.) who by the winter of 218/217 B.C. had taken control of the Ptolemaic possessions in Asia and had reached Ptolemais in Phoenicia. Assisted by 20,000 native Egyptian troops, Ptolemy defeated him decisively at Raphia in Gaza on 22 June 217 B.C. (Polyb. 5.51–87, and alluded to in Dan 11:11–12) and so regained control of Coele-Syria.

A highly colored story in 3 Maccabees 1–2 tells how after the battle Ptolemy was thrown to the ground in a fit when he attempted to enter the high temple in
Jerusalem; another (3 Maccabees 3–7, even more lurid in its details) recounts how on his return he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria, only to be thwarted again by divine intervention. Although this appears to be the etiology for a local Jewish festival, it may be that some of the Jews’ rights and privileges were curtailed under this king.

While Ptolemy failed to capitalize upon his victory at Raphia, the role which the Egyptians had played in the battle did much to reawaken their sense of national identity. A period of serious internal unrest followed, with Upper Egypt seceding and being ruled by Nubian kings from 207 B.C. to 187 B.C. There is no doubt that the situation was aggravated by Philopator’s weak and self-indulgent nature, and his reign is rightly identified as marking the beginning of the dynasty’s decline. Yet his character is perhaps blackened to excess by Polybius (5.34) and Plutarch (Cleom. 33).¹

Excursus: Polybius’ Account of the Battle of Raphia

Forces Available to Antiochus and Ptolemy

At the beginning of the following spring, having all² preparations for war completed, Antiochus and Ptolemy determined to bring their claims to Coele-Syria to the decision of a battle. Ptolemy accordingly set out from Alexandria with seventy thousand infantry, five thousand cavalry, and seventy-three elephants. Being informed of his approach, Antiochus drew his forces together. These consisted of Daae, Carmani, and Cilicians, equipped as light-armed troops to the number of about five thousand, under the charge and command of Byttacus the Macedonian.³ Under Theodotus, the Aetolian, who had deserted from Ptolemy, were ten thousand picked men from the whole kingdom, armed in the Macedonian fashion, most of whom had silver shields. The number of the phalanx was twenty thousand, and they were led by Nicarchus and Theodotus Hemiolius. In addition to these there were Agrianes and Persians, who were either bowmen or slingers, to the number of two thousand. With them were a thousand Thracians, under the command of Menedemus of Alabanda. There was also a mixed force of Medes, Cissians, Cadusians, and Carmanians, amounting to five thousand men, who were assigned to the chief command of Aspasianus the Mede. Certain Arabians also and men of neighbouring tribes, to the number of ten thousand, were commanded by Zabdibelus. The mercenaries from Greece amounting to five thousand were led by Hippolochus of Thessaly. Antiochus had also fifteen hundred Cretans who came

---

² B. C. 217. Antiochus and Ptolemy recommence hostilities in the spring. Ptolemy’s army: 70,000 infantry, 5000 cavalry, 73 elephants.
³ The army of Antiochus: 62,000 infantry, 6000 cavalry, 102 elephants.
with Eurylochus, and a thousand Neo-Cretans commanded by Zelys of Gortyna; with whom were five hundred javelin-men of Lydia, and a thousand Cardaces who came with Lysimachus the Gaul. The entire number of his horse was six thousand; four thousand were commanded by the king’s nephew Antipater, the rest by Themison: so that the whole number of Antiochus’s force was sixty-two thousand infantry, six thousand cavalry, and one hundred and two elephants.

Antiochus Advances To Raphia

Having marched to Pelusium Ptolemy made his first halt in that town: and having been there joined by the stragglers, and having given out their rations of corn to his men, he got the army in motion, and led them by a line of march which goes through the waterless region skirting Mount Casius and the Marshes. On the fifth day’s march he reached his destination, and pitched his camp a distance of fifty stades from Rhaphia, which is the first city of Coele-Syria towards Egypt.

While Ptolemy was effecting this movement Antiochus arrived with his army at Gaza, where he was joined by some reinforcements, and once more commenced his advance, proceeding at a leisurely pace. He passed Rhaphia and encamped about ten stades from the enemy. For a while the two armies preserved this distance, and remained encamped opposite each other. But after some few days, wishing to remove to more advantageous ground and to inspire confidence in his troops, Antiochus pushed forward his camp so much nearer Ptolemy, that the palisades of the two camps were not more than five stades from each other; and while in this position, there were frequent struggles at the watering-places and on forays, as well as infantry and cavalry skirmishes in the space between the camps.

Theodotus Attempts to Assassinate Ptolemy

In the course of these proceedings Theodotus conceived and put into execution an enterprise, very characteristic of an Aetolian, but undoubtedly requiring great personal courage. Having formerly lived at Ptolemy’s court he knew the king’s tastes and habits. Accordingly, accompanied by two others, he entered the enemy’s camp just before daybreak; where, owing to the dim light, he could not be recognised by his face, while his dress and other accoutrements did not render him noticeable, owing to the variety of costume prevailing among themselves. He had marked the position of the king’s tent during the preceding days, for the skirmishes took place quite close; and he now walked boldly up to it, and passed through all
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4 Ptolemy enters Palestine.
5 Called Barathra. See Strabo, 17.1.21.
6 Antiochus goes to meet him.
7 During attempt of Theodotus to assassinate Ptolemy.
the outer ring of attendants without being observed: but when he came to the tent in which the king was accustomed to transact business and dine, though he searched it in every conceivable way, he failed to find the king; for Ptolemy slept in another tent, separate from the public and official tent. He however wounded two men who were sleeping there, and killed Andreas, the king’s physician; and then returned safely to his own camp, without meeting with any molestation, except just as he was passing over the vallum of the enemy’s camp. As far as daring went, he had fulfilled his purpose: but he had failed in prudence by not taking the precaution to ascertain where Ptolemy was accustomed to sleep.

Dispositions For the Battle of Raphia

After being encamped opposite each other for five days, the two kings resolved to bring matters to the decision of battle. And upon Ptolemy beginning to move his army outside its camp, Antiochus hastened to do the same. Both formed their front of their phalanx and men armed in the Macedonian manner. But Ptolemy’s two wings were formed as follows:—Polycrates, with the cavalry under his command, occupied the left, and between him and the phalanx were Cretans standing close by the horsemen; next them came the royal guard; then the peltasts under Socrates, adjoining the Libyans armed in Macedonian fashion. On the right wing was Echecrates of Thessaly, with his division of cavalry; on his left were stationed Gauls and Thracians; next them Phoxidas and the Greek mercenaries, extending to the Egyptian phalanx. Of the elephants forty were on the left wing, where Ptolemy was to be in person during the battle; the other thirty-three had been stationed in front of the right wing opposite the mercenary cavalry.

Antiochus also placed sixty of his elephants commanded by his foster-brother Philip in front of his right wing, on which he was to be present personally, to fight opposite Ptolemy. Behind these he stationed the two thousand cavalry commanded by Antipater, and two thousand more at right angles to them. In line with the cavalry he placed the Cretans, and next them the Greek mercenaries; with the latter he mixed two thousand of these armed in the Macedonian fashion under the command of the Macedonian Byttacus. At the extreme point of the left wing he placed two thousand cavalry under the command of Themison; by their side Cardacian and Lydian javelin-men; next them the light-armed division of three thousand, commanded by Menedemus; then the Cissians, Medes, and Carmanians; and by their side the Arabians and neighbouring peoples who continued the line up to the phalanx. The remainder of the elephants he placed in front of his left wing under the command of Myiscus, one of the boys about the court.

8 Disposition of the two armies for the battle of Rhaphia.
9 Agema. See note on 5, 25.
Each King Exhorts His Army

The two armies having been drawn up in the order I¹⁰ have described; the kings went along their respective lines, and addressed words of encouragement and exhortation to their officers and friends. But as they both rested their strongest hopes on their phalanx, they showed their greatest earnestness and addressed their strongest exhortations to them; which were re-echoed in Ptolemy’s case by Andromachus and Sosibius and the king’s sister Arsinoe; in the case of Antiochus by Theodotus and Nicarchus; these officers being the commanders of the phalanx in the two armies respectively. The substance of what was said on both sides was the same: for neither monarch had any glorious or famous achievement of his own to quote to those whom he was addressing, seeing that they had but recently succeeded to their crowns; but they endeavoured to inspire the men of the phalanx with spirit and boldness, by reminding them of the glory of their ancestors, and the great deeds performed by them. But they chiefly dwelt upon the hopes of advancement which the men might expect at their hands in the future; and they called upon and exhorted the leaders and the whole body of men, who were about to be engaged, to maintain the fight with a manly and courageous spirit. So with these or similar words, delivered by their own lips or by interpreters, they rode along their lines.

The Elephants in the Battle

Ptolemy, accompanied by his sister, having arrived at the left wing of his army, and Antiochus with the royal guard at the right: they gave the signal for the battle, and opened the fight by a charge of elephants.¹¹ Only some few of Ptolemy’s elephants came to close quarters with the foe: seated on these the soldiers in the howdahs maintained a brilliant fight, lunging at and striking each other with crossed pikes.¹² But the elephants themselves fought still more brilliantly, using all their strength in the encounter, and pushing against each other, forehead to forehead.

The way in which elephants fight is this: they get their tusks entangled and jammed, and then push against one another with all their might, trying to make each other yield ground until one of them proving superior in strength has pushed aside the other’s trunk; and when once he can get a side blow at his enemy, he

¹⁰ Addresses to the two armies before the battle of Rhaphia.
¹¹ The battle of Rhaphia.
¹² Sarissae, the long Macedonian spears.
¹³ Fighting elephants.
pierces him with his tusks as a bull would with his horns. Now, most of Ptolemy’s animals, as is the way with Libyan elephants, were afraid to face the fight: for they cannot stand the smell or the trumpeting of the Indian elephants, but are frightened at their size and strength, I suppose, and run away from them at once without waiting to come near them. This is exactly what happened on this occasion: and upon their being thrown into confusion and being driven back upon their own lines, Ptolemy’s guard gave way before the rush of the animals; while Antiochus, wheeling his men so as to avoid the elephants, charged the division of cavalry under Polycrates. At the same time the Greek mercenaries stationed near the phalanx, and behind the elephants, charged Ptolemy’s peltasts and made them give ground, the elephants having already thrown their ranks also into confusion. Thus Ptolemy’s whole left wing began to give way before the enemy.

**Victory of Ptolemy**

Echecrates the commander of the right wing waited at first to see the result of the struggle between the other wings of the two armies: but when he saw the dust coming his way, and that the elephants opposite his division were afraid even to approach the hostile elephants at all, he ordered Phoixidas to charge the part of the enemy opposite him with his Greek mercenaries; while he made a flank movement with the cavalry and the division behind the elephants; and so getting out of the line of the hostile elephants’ attack, charged the enemy’s cavalry on the rear or the flank and quickly drove them from their ground. Phoixidas and his men were similarly successful: for they charged the Arabians and Medes and forced them into precipitate flight. Thus Antiochus’s right wing gained a victory, while his left was defeated. The phalanxes, left without the support of either wing, remained intact in the centre of the plain, in a state of alternate hope and fear for the result. Meanwhile Antiochus was assisting in gaining the victory on his right wing; while Ptolemy, who had retired behind his phalanx, now came forward in the centre, and showing himself in the view of both armies struck terror in the hearts of the enemy, but inspired great spirit and enthusiasm in his own men; and Andromachus and Sosibius at once ordered them to lower their sarissae and charge. The picked Syrian troops stood their ground only for a short time, and the division of Nicarchus quickly broke and fled. Antiochus presuming, in his youthful inexperience, from the success of his own division, that he would be equally victorious all along the line, was pressing on the pursuit; but upon one of the older officers at length giving him warning, and pointing out that the cloud of dust raised
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14 Antiochus’s right wing successful.
15 Ptolemy’s right wing also successful.
16 The centre coming into action, Ptolemy is victorious.
by the phalanx was moving towards their own camp, he understood too late what was happening; and endeavoured to gallop back with the squadron of royal cavalry on to the field. But finding his whole line in full retreat he was forced to retire to Rhaphia: comforting himself with the belief that, as far as he was personally concerned, he had won a victory, but had been defeated in the whole battle by the want of spirit and courage shown by the rest.

*The Losses on Each Side*

Having secured the final victory by his phalanx, and killed large numbers of the enemy in the pursuit by means of his cavalry and mercenaries on his right wing, Ptolemy retired to his own camp and there spent the night. But next day, after picking up and burying his own dead, and stripping the bodies of the enemy, he advanced towards Rhaphia. Antiochus had wished, immediately after the retreat of his army, to make a camp outside the city; and there rally such of his men as had fled in compact bodies: but finding that the greater number had retreated into the town, he was compelled to enter it himself also. Next morning, however, before daybreak, he led out the relics of his army and made the best of his way to Gaza. There he pitched a camp: and having sent an embassy to obtain leave to pick up his dead, he obtained a truce for performing their obsequies. His loss amounted to nearly ten thousand infantry and three hundred cavalry killed, and four thousand taken prisoners. Three elephants were killed on the field, and two died afterwards of their wounds. On Ptolemy’s side the losses were fifteen hundred infantry killed and seven hundred cavalry: sixteen of his elephants were killed, and most of the others captured.

Such was the result of the battle of Rhaphia between kings Ptolemy and Antiochus for the possession of Coele-Syria. After picking up his dead Antiochus retired with his army to his own country: while Ptolemy took over Rhaphia and the other towns without difficulty, all the states vying with each other as to which should be first to renew their allegiance and come over to him. And perhaps it is the way of the world everywhere to accommodate one’s self to circumstances at such times; but it is eminently true of the race inhabiting that country, that they have a natural turn and inclination to worship success. Moreover it was all the more natural in this case, owing to the existing disposition of the people in favour of the Alexandrian kings; for the inhabitants of Coele-Syria are somehow always more loyally disposed to this family than to any other. Accordingly they now
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17 Final retreat of Antiochus.
18 The losses on either side.
19 The effect of the battle of Rhaphia.
stopped short of no extravagance of adulation, honouring Ptolemy with crowns, sacrifices, and every possible compliment of the kind.\textsuperscript{20}

Daniel 11:12-The Prophecy of the Failure of Ptolemy IV Philopator to Pursue His Advantage Because of His Pride

The Pride of the King of the South

Daniel 11:12 “When the multitude is carried away, his heart will be lifted up, and he will cause tens of thousands to fall; yet he will not prevail.” (NASB95)

“When the multitude is carried away, his heart will be lifted up” is composed of the conjunction wa (ʼ) (waw), “when” which is followed by the third person masculine singular nippal passive perfect form of the verb nā·śā(ʼ) (ןַפַּבּ) (naw-saw), “is carried away” and then we have the articular masculine singular form of the noun hā·môn (הָמוֹן) (haw-mone´), “the multitude” which is modified by the third person masculine singular qal active imperfect form of the verb rûm (רֹום) (room), “will be lifted up” and then we have the masculine singular construct form of the noun lē·bâh (לבַּה) (lay-bawb´), “heart” which is modified by the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix –hû (הוּ) (who), “his.”

wa

This time the conjunction wa means “when” since it is used as a temporal marker relating points of time which occur simultaneously. The first point of time is the multitude which was mustered by the king ruling the north but defeated by the king ruling the south. The second is the king ruling the south becoming arrogant. This indicates that “when” this multitude led by the king ruling the north was defeated in battle by the army of the king ruling the south, the latter became arrogant.

hā·môn

The noun hā·môn means “a multitude” referring to the multitude of troops assembled by the king ruling the north which were defeated by the army led by the king ruling the south. The articular construction of the word is anaphoric meaning that this word appears in Daniel 11:11 and retains the same referent and meaning here in Daniel 11:11.

nā·śā(ʼ)

The verb nā·śā(ʼ) means “to be defeated” and its subject is the multitude of troops led by the king ruling the north and its object is the army led by the king
ruling the south. This would indicate that when the multitude of troops led by the
king ruling the north “were defeated” by the army led by the king ruling the south,
the king ruling the south became arrogant.

The niphal stem of the verb is a passive niphal meaning that the subject is acted
upon by an expressed or unexpressed agency. Here the subject is of course
multitude of troops led by the king ruling the north and the unexpressed but
implied agency is the army led by the king ruling the south. Therefore, this stem
denotes that the multitude of troops led by the king ruling the north received the
action of being defeated in battle by the army led by the king ruling the south.

The imperfect conjugation of this verb nā·šā(’) refers to a completed action as
part of a temporal sequence. It is expressing this event of the army led by the king
ruling the north being defeated in battle by the army led by the king ruling the
south as taking place in the future from the perspective of Daniel in the sixth
century B.C. when he received this revelation from the angel.

lē·bāh

The noun lē·bāh means “heart” and refers to the place where the king ruling the
south did his thinking and made his decisions. It is the dominant lobe of the soul,
the right lobe and is the mental activity or function of the soul. The lē·bāh is that
aspect of the soul, which circulates thought or mental activity and is where one’s
frame of reference and memory center resides. It is also the place where one’s
vocabulary and the classification of thoughts reside as well as the conscience
where the norms and standards reside. A person’s entire mental attitude circulates
in the lē·bāh as well as the sub conscience where various categories of things that
shock or impress from adversity, sin, failure or disappointment are located.

The emotions of a person are expressed from the lē·bāh, such as joy (Deut.
28:47), or pain (Jer. 4:19) of tranquility (Pr. 14:30) or excitement (Deut. 19:6). The
heart in the Old Testament was used as the seat of the understanding and of
knowledge, of rational thought and was the place of intellectual activity.

Evil thoughts took place in the heart (Hebrews 3:17) and the heart can reject
Bible teaching (Prov. 5:12, 13), and is the source of discord and troublemaking
(Prov. 6:14, 18). Hatred emanates from the heart (2 Sam. 6:16) and the heart
suffers disappointment from promises not kept (Prov. 13:12).

The heart promotes mental attitude sins: (1) Bitterness (Prov. 14:10). (2)
Sorrow and disappointment (Prov. 14:13). (3) Pride (Prov. 21:4; Obad. 3). (4)
Worry (Eccl. 2:23). The frantic search for happiness is related to the heart (Eccl.
1:13) and apostasy is described in terms of the heart (Jer. 17:5, 9; Zech. 7:12).
Revolution and insubordination are described as being in the heart (2 Sm. 15:6; Jer.
5:23; Ezek. 6:9) as well as hypocrisy is related to the heart (Job. 36:13; Ps. 55:21).
The heart is related to psychosis (Is. 13:7, 8) and mental attitude sins relate the old sin nature to the heart (Ps. 66:18; 101:5; Prov. 6:18; Mt. 12:35; 15:18, 19; Lu. 6:45; 24:25).

The noun *lēḇāh* is the center of the person, that which determines one’s life and from which one must determine one’s life. It is a part of the essence of the soul. The perceptive apparatus in the unregenerate is different from the regenerate. A regenerate person possesses a body, soul and human spirit thus making them trichotomous whereas the unregenerate person possesses only a body and a soul making them dichotomous (See 1 Corinthians 15:45).

Essence of the soul: (1) Self-consciousness (2) Conscience (3) Mentality (4) Emotion (5) Volition. The Essence of the Heart: (1) Frame of reference (Proverbs 4:4) (2) Memory center (Philippians 1:13) (3) Vocabulary storage (4) Categorical storage, i.e. classification of thoughts (5) Conscience, i.e. norms and standards (Rm. 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; 1 Co. 8:7; 2 Co. 4:2; 5:11; Tit. 1:15; Heb. 9:14; 1 Pet. 2:19). (6) Mentality (7) Subconscious.

Therefore, in Daniel 11:12, the noun *lēḇ* refers to the “heart” of the king ruling the south. It denotes that aspect of his soul, which circulated his thought or mental activity and was where his frame of reference and memory center resided. It is also the place where his vocabulary and the classification of his thoughts resided as well as his conscience where his norms and standards resided. This king’s entire mental attitude circulated in the *lēḇāh* as well as his subconscious where various categories of things that shock or impress from adversity, sin, failure or disappointment are located. Also, it contained his volition, which he used to decide not to pursue his advantage against the king ruling the north.

This noun *lēḇāh* is modified by the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix –*hû*, which means “his” referring of course to the king ruling the north who was defeated in battle by the king ruling the south.

*rūm*

The verb *rūm* literally means “to lift up” referring to the king ruling the south’s heart “being arrogant” as a result of his great military victory over the king ruling the north. This verb denotes that because of this great military victory over the king ruling the north, the king ruling the south possessed in his heart an exaggerated view of himself and importance in an overbearing manner.

The qal stem of the verb is stative expressing a state or condition. Here it denotes the king ruling the south’s heart existing in the state of being arrogant because of his great military victory over the king ruling the north.

The imperfect conjugation of this verb *rūm* refers to a completed action as part of a temporal sequence. It is expressing this event of the king ruling the south
becoming arrogant as a result of his great military conquest over the king ruling the north as taking place in the future from the perspective of Daniel in the sixth century B.C. when he received this revelation from the angel.

The King of the South Will Cause Death of Thousand and Will Fail

Daniel 11:12 “When the multitude is carried away, his heart will be lifted up, and he will cause tens of thousands to fall; yet he will not prevail.” (NASB95)

“And he will cause tens of thousands to fall; yet he will not prevail” is composed of the conjunction wa ( withholding, “and” which is followed by the third person masculine singular hiphil active perfect form of the verb nā·pāl (חָלָה) (naw-fal’), “he will cause to fall” and then we have the feminine plural form of the noun rib·bō (רִבּוֹ) (rib-bo’), “tens of thousands” which is followed by the conjunction wa ( withholding) (waw), “but” which is followed by the negative particle lō (withstanding, “not” which is negating the meaning of the third person masculine singular qal active imperfect form of the verb ā·zāz (חָזָה) (aw-zaz’), “he will prevail.”

wa

This time the conjunction wa means “in spite of this, despite this, even though, although” since the word has a concessive force to it meaning that “despite the fact” or “even though” the king ruling the south will cause the deaths of thousands, he will in fact not remain strong militarily and politically.

nā·pāl

The verb nā·pāl means “to fall” referring to a soldier falling in combat in the sense of being killed in combat by the enemy. Here it refers to the deaths of thousands in the army led by the king ruling the north. Here it refers to the king ruling the south causing the death of thousands in the army led by the king ruling the north.

The hiphil stem of the verb nā·pāl is factitive meaning that the subject of this verb causes its direct object to enter the state described by the same verb in the qal. Therefore, this stem indicates that the king ruling the south will cause the thousands in the army of the king of the north to enter the state of having fallen or in other words to enter the state of being dead.

The perfect conjugation of this verb is a future perfect expressing a future state resulting from actions that will have been completed by that time. Here it is
expressing the future state of thousands in the army of the king ruling the north falling in combat as a result of the military leadership of the king ruling the south that will be accomplished by that time.

\textit{rib-bô(‘)}

The noun \textit{rib-bô(‘)} means “ten thousand” since it pertains to a number one hundred times greater than one hundred. Here it refers to the soldiers under the command of the king ruling the north. It refers to the soldiers who died in combat with the army under the command of the king of the south.

\textit{wa}

This time the conjunction \textit{wa} is emphatic meaning it is introducing two words which emphasize that the king ruling the south will remain not strong politically and militarily despite the fact that he killed ten thousand of the troops under the command of the king of the north.

\textit{ā·zāz}

The verb \textit{ā·zāz} means “to continue to prevail” since it pertains to maintaining military strength and superiority over an enemy. It refers to continuing to overpower or triumph over an enemy. Here the verb’s meaning is emphatically negated by the negative particle \textit{lō(‘)}, which is functioning as a marker of emphatic negation. Therefore, these two words denote that the king ruling the south “will by no means continue to prevail” over the king of the north.

The qal stem of this verb is stative expressing a state or condition. Here it refers to the state or condition of the king of the south continuing to prevail militarily and politically over the king of the north.

The imperfect conjugation of this verb \textit{ā·zāz} refers to a completed action as part of a temporal sequence. It is expressing the state of the king ruling the south continuing to prevail militarily over the king of the north as taking place in the future from the perspective of Daniel in the sixth century B.C. when he received this revelation from the angel.

\textit{Translation of Daniel 11:12}

Daniel 11:12 “When this multitude will be defeated, his heart will become arrogant. Even though, he will cause ten thousand to fall in combat, he will in fact by no means continue to prevail.”
Exposition of Daniel 11:12

The angel continues to communicate to Daniel God’s prophetic program for the nation of Israel during the Times of the Gentiles. Specifically, he continues to describe for Daniel the events that will take place during the reigns of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.) and Antiochus III the Great (223-187 B.C.). The latter is the king of the north in Daniel 11:11-12 and the former is the king of the south.

As we noted in our study of Daniel 11:11, the elect angel informs Daniel that in response to his great defeat at the hands of the king of the north, the king of the south will cause himself to be enraged over this great loss. Consequently, he will take his army and march out in order to wage war against the king of the north. In response to this, the angel tells Daniel that the king of the north will cause a great multitude of troops to be assembled but despite this, this multitude will be delivered over into the power of the king of the south meaning these troops will be defeated in combat by the army led by the king of the south. This has all been fulfilled in human history.

The king ruling the south in Daniel 11:11 is a reference to Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.). The king ruling the north is a reference to Antiochus III the Great (223-187 B.C.). In 217 B.C., Ptolemy IV Philopator attacked the great army assembled by Antiochus III the Great at Raphia. The account of this great battle appears in Polybius’ work “Histories” (pages 430–436). In this battle, Ptolemy IV Philopator was accompanied by his sister-wife, Arsinoe. He led an army of 70,000 as well as 5,000 cavalry and 73 elephants. Antiochus II the Great led an army of 62,000 as well as 6,000 cavalry and 102 elephants. Antiochus lost 14,000 men according to Polybius. Ptolemy IV Philopator regained the land of Israel. According to Jerome, Antiochus was almost captured but escaped to the desert.

Now, here in Daniel 11:12, the angelic being tells Daniel that when this multitude of troops under the command of the king ruling the north is defeated in battle, the heart of the king ruling the south will become arrogant. The angel then surprisingly adds that despite causing the death of ten thousand in battle, this king ruling the south will by no means continue to prevail militarily and politically over the king of the north.

This too was fulfilled in history since history records that Ptolemy IV Philopator did indeed become proud and arrogant because of his great military victory at Raphia over Antiochus III the Great. Unlike his father, Ptolemy IV Philopator lacked his father’s military instinct and did not press his advantage. Instead, he was content with the victory and did not pursue Antiochus. In fact, he established a peace treaty with Antiochus. This came back to haunt his kingdom
after his death. Therefore, the ascendancy of Ptolemy IV Philopator did not continue after his great victory over Antiochus at Raphia. He did not continue to maintain his military superiority after this great victory. Instead Antiochus III continue to wage war biding his time until he could once again attack Egypt.

Polybius writes “Meanwhile Antiochus, on arriving at the city which bears his own name, immediately despatched an embassy to Ptolemy, consisting of Antipater, his nephew, and Theodotus Hemiolius, to treat of a peace, in great alarm lest the enemy should advance upon him.” For his defeat had inspired him with distrust of his own forces, and he was afraid that Achaeus would seize the opportunity to attack him. It did not occur to Ptolemy to take any of these circumstances into account: but being thoroughly satisfied with his unexpected success, and generally at his unlooked for acquisition of Coele-Syria, he was by no means indisposed to peace; but even more inclined to it than he ought to have been: influenced in that direction by the habitual effeminacy and corruption of his manner of life. Accordingly, when Antipater and his colleague arrived, after some little bluster and vituperation of Antiochus for what had taken place, he agreed to a truce for a year. He sent Sosibius back with the ambassadors to ratify the treaty: while he himself, after remaining three months in Syria and Phoenicia, and settling the towns, left Andromachus of Aspendus as governor of this district, and started with his sister and friends for Alexandria: having brought the war to a conclusion in a way that surprised his subjects, when they contrasted it with the principles on which he spent he rest of his life. Antiochus after exchanging ratifications of the treaty with Sosibius, employed himself in making preparations for attacking Achaeus, as he had originally begun doing. Such was the political situation in Asia.

During these years of peace between the two kingdoms, Antiochus III no longer possessed Phoenicia and Palestine since he was forced to give them over to Ptolemy IV. However, from 212 to 204, Antiochus III subdued many rebellious provinces in the Middle East. From the Caspian Sea in the north to the Indus River in the east, he achieved great military success. Then, in 203, he saw a great opportunity to exact revenge against the Ptolemaic dynasty since Ptolemy IV had just died and had been succeeded by Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) who was only a small child of four years old when he ascended to the throne.

The pride and arrogance of Ptolemy IV Philopator was manifested by the fact that he killed his father, mother and brother, married his sister Arsinoe. He also loved a flute-player named Agathoclea.

In the Scriptures, pride is a great evil because it involves pretending to a greatness and glory that belongs rightly to God alone. It is condemned as evil (1

---

21 Peace between Ptolemy and Antiochus for a year, B. C. 217.
Samuel 15:23; Proverbs 21:4; James 4:16; cf. Mark 7:22-23; Romans 1:29-30; 2 Corinthians 12:20; 2 Timothy 3:1-2; 1 John 2:16). It is a characteristic of Satan (Ezekiel 28:2; 1 Timothy 3:6; cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:4, the antichrist)

There are warnings about pride in the book of Proverbs (Proverbs 16:5, 18; cf. Proverbs 3:7, 34; 6:16-17; 11:2; 25:6-7, 27; 26:12; 27:1; 29:23) as well as elsewhere in Scripture (Psalm 119:21; cf. Leviticus 26:19). God is said to be opposed to the proud (1 Peter 5:5; James 4:6; Proverbs 3:34).