William H. Shea, former associate director of the Biblical Research Institute, was born in California on December 31, 1932. He attended La Sierra College from 1950 to 1954, where he met not only Drs. Edward Heppenstall and Tom Blincoe, two renowned Adventist theologians, but also Karen Olson, the love of his life. They were married in 1956, and after both graduated with medical degrees from Loma Linda University, they spent the next three years as medical missionaries at a small twenty-five-bed hospital in Nicaragua.

In an interview in 2015, he said, "I felt that I might be able to do more good in areas where medical care was not so readily available." From Nicaragua the Sheas moved to a hospital on the island of Trinidad. For the next two years, he worked at the hospital as well as Caribbean Union College. Because the college was short of teachers in the religion department, he volunteered to teach Old Testament subjects. His particular interest was history during the period of the Hebrew Bible and the light that archaeology can shine upon it.

During this two-year teaching stint at Caribbean Union College, he decided that if he was to do more of this, he would need to become better qualified in that field. So he spent the next three years at Harvard Divinity School, where G. Ernest Wright, a leading Old Testament scholar and biblical archaeologist, was his main teacher. Dr. Shea studied not only the Hebrew Bible, ancient languages, and other related subjects, but he also participated in the excavation of Tel Gezer for two seasons.

Following their time at Harvard, the Sheas returned to Trinidad for another two years, before moving to Michigan in 1972, where Dr. Karen Shea worked at a local hospital and Dr. Bill Shea began teaching in the Old Testament department of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. At the same time, he worked on a PhD in Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, completing it in 1976. Teaching Old Testament subjects at the seminary and working on his dissertation, titled "Famines in the Early History of Egypt and Syro-Palestine," allowed him to focus on his special interests: biblical history; the history of the ancient Near East, especially Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, and Canaan; and the intersection of these two main disciplines. He taught fourteen years at the seminary (1972–1986), before joining the Biblical Research Institute at the General Conference. At the Institute he travelled the world; taught classes in many of our...
Dr. Bill Shea was a consummate scholar and a gentleman. He was also an excellent teacher, who encouraged the scholars in his classroom to dig deep into God’s word. As a creative thinker and writer, he was not afraid of changing his mind if his studies led him to different conclusions from those he held at the outset. He published many scholarly and popular articles and book chapters for Adventist and non-Adventist publications. His article on the exodus for the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* became a benchmark for the defense of the fifteenth-century-BC date for the exodus from Egypt.

During the Davenport-Rea-Ford crisis in the early 1980s, Dr. Shea wrote a response to Dr. Desmond Ford’s attack on the investigative judgment in preparation for the consultation on the sanctuary doctrine held in August 1980, at Glacier View, Colorado. He began the 445-page manuscript in April of that year and completed it in July while teaching at an extension school at Newbold College in England. In less than four months, he presented a strong, comprehensive defense of the biblical pre-advent judgment, focusing on the year-day principle, and the date and nature of the pre-advent judgment. Unfortunately, his response to Dr. Ford was, for the most part, unpublished—except the first 166 pages on the year-day principle, which were published in 1992 as the book *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, volume 1 of the Daniel and Revelation Committee Series.

Bill Shea had a special interest in the apocalyptic books of Daniel and Revelation. Many journal articles on a variety of issues in these books appeared from his pen in *Andrews University Seminary Studies* and *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. He also wrote several chapters in the seven volumes of the Daniel and Revelation Committee Series. His commentary on Daniel was published in 1996, comprising two volumes in the *The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier* series. Seventh-day Adventists have a special interest in the book of Daniel, and Dr. Shea contributed to a better understanding of the book through this commentary and his many articles on Daniel.

For example, he was the first Seventh-day Adventist scholar who provided a convincing reason why Stephen’s death in AD 34 had been considered the conclusion of the 70-week prophecy. Looking at Stephen’s speech through the eyes of Old Testament prophets, it becomes another instance where a prophet of God brings a covenant lawsuit against His people. Therefore, his death was not just one more martyr’s death. He was the last Old Testament prophet to address the Jewish people as the elect people of God, appealing to them not to resist the Holy Spirit, as their fathers had done *(Acts 7:51)*. The prophets who followed Stephen were *prophets to the Christian church*, not to the nation of Israel.³

Shea was also the first to identify the prince in “the people of the prince who is to come” *(Dan 9:26)* as Jesus Christ. Generally, the prince in this verse is thought to refer to Titus and the Romans in AD 70. Bill Shea, however, taught that the verse pattern indicates that this prince also refers to Jesus.

1. v. 25 Messiah *(mashiach)* Prince *(nagid)* A + B
2. v. 26a Messiah *(mashiach)* -- A --
3. v. 26b -- Prince *(nagid)* -- B

According to Shea this pattern suggests that all three references are to the same Messiah Prince, designated by the first occurrence of this word pair in Daniel 9:25. Thus “the people of the prince who is to come” refers to the people of the Messiah”—that is, the Jews. This unique interpretation raises some questions about the Jews and their involvement in the destruction of the sanctuary in AD 70. Therefore, other interpreters favored the interpretation that this is a reference to the Romans under Titus who destroyed the temple.³

Bill Shea was a brilliant Old Testament scholar and historian, well known even among non-Adventist biblical scholars, but he was first of all a loyal Seventh-day Adventist and defender of the faith. Because of his excellent contributions in the area of biblical apocalyptic, we now understand the books of Daniel and Revelation today better than we did before.

During the interview in 2015, he was asked what recommendations he could give to church members on how to read the Scriptures. He answered,

There are two main ways to read the Bible. One is an intensive scholarly way. For that approach, I use what has been called the historical-grammatical method. This means that the reader must pay close attention to the analysis of the words present in the original language. The historical setting and the literary structure of the text must also be taken into account. Of course, many scholarly tools can be used for such a purpose. These include concordances, dictionaries, commentaries, and encyclopedias.

The average reader may not wish to go into such depth. In that case, one can read simply for personal devotional or spiritual benefit. One way in which to read the Bible for this purpose is to read the passage or book that one is delving into several times. Each time it is read, more will appear of meaning to the reader. Also, as one reads, one should look for keywords. These are the words that are used more frequently in the passage. The Bible writer has used these words over and over again because he wishes to emphasize them. One can take each of these occurrences and see just how the term is used in each case. That
will give the reader an idea of the range of meaning in these words. All of these different avenues lead up to the idea that this is God’s Word, and through it, He is speaking to us.⁴

On a personal note, Bill was my major professor and a member of my doctoral committee at Andrews University. I spent many hours in his classroom and enjoyed every minute of it. I learned a lot from him and had the privilege of being his successor at the Biblical Research Institute when he retired in 1999. Even after he retired, I had the pleasure of traveling with him to various countries holding Bible conferences and ministers’ meetings. He was truly Christ’s ambassador, preaching and teaching the word of God that he loved.

Gerhard Pfandl, Ph.D.
Associate Director (retired)
Biblical Research Institute

3 Ibid., 75–76.

Lessons from Matthew 10
By Clinton Wahlen

As we saw earlier, Matthew 9 concludes with Jesus preaching to large crowds and instructing the disciples to pray earnestly for more laborers to be sent out to gather in the harvest (Matt 9:35–38). Now Jesus takes action by instructing the disciples for their mission and sending them out to proclaim the good news of the kingdom. This second of five discourses focuses on kingdom and discipleship. It is divided neatly into three parts, each of which culminates with a reference to the end time introduced by the words “Truly, I say to you . . . ” (Matt 10:15, 23, 42). The first section of Jesus’ discourse, introduced by the third mention of the twelve in five verses, is more localized (Matt 10:5–15), while the second (Matt 10:16–23) and third sections (Matt 10:24–42) of the discourse (which contain no mention of the Twelve, but only generic “disciple” references in verses 24–25 and 42) have a more universal scope.

Interpretation of the Chapter

1. Verses 1–4 (The Twelve Apostles)
   - Matthew introduces the discourse with Jesus summoning “the twelve disciples.” Then he identifies them as “the twelve apostles” and lists their names in groups of two (Matt 10:1–4). “Apostle” refers to one sent with a message, and is related to the Greek word for “sent” in verse 5 (apostellō).
   - Significantly, the apostles were not sent forth alone on this mission, but rather “two by two” (Mark 6:7; cf. Luke 10:1; Eccl 4:9–10).
   - As is evident already in Matthew, the Twelve were selected from a much larger group of disciples. In fact, the Twelve are mentioned here for the first time, while “disciples” and “multitudes” of followers have been mentioned repeatedly.
   - There are three other lists of the twelve apostles in the New Testament (Mark 3:16–19; Luke 6:13–16; Acts 1:13), all of which list the same three disciples as the heads of the “two by two” subgroups (Simon Peter, Philip, and James the son of Alphaeus).¹
   - Jesus gave the apostles power to heal “all kinds of sickness and all kinds of disease” and to cast out “unclean spirits” or demons. As with Jesus Himself, this healing ministry constituted a prominent part of the apostles’ evangelistic work in order to prepare the soil for planting the seeds of truth and reaping an abundant harvest.

2. Verses 5–15 (Mission to Israel)
   - The mission of the apostles is confined to Israel (Matt 10:5–6) because the whole nation was to be a light for the world, teaching people about God and His law (cf. Matt 5:14; Isa 2:1–3).
   - They were to go over the same ground already covered by Jesus,² and to share the same message proclaimed by Him (Matt 4:17; cf. 5:3, 10) and by John the Baptist (Matt 3:2)—a message of repentance and readiness for the arrival of God’s heavenly kingdom. The miracles wrought by Jesus and the disciples signaled that the time of prophetic fulfillment had arrived (Mark 1:15) and distinguished their work from that of John, who did no miracu-
lous signs (John 10:41).

- The power to proclaim this message, to heal the sick, to cast out demons, and even to raise the dead they had freely received; therefore, they were to minister freely, without charge, and to depend on those who accepted the message for their support (Matt 10:8–10). Thus the apostles embarked on their mission by faith, trusting that all their needs would be supplied (cf. Phil 4:19).

- Jesus promises to bless with peace the household that receives the messengers (Matt 10:11–13). To receive them would be to receive Christ Himself (Matt 10:40) and the attendant blessings that the gospel brings, whereas to reject them would be to invite God’s judgment on their household, symbolized by shaking off the dust from their feet as they leave (cf. Acts 13:49–51; 18:5–6).

- The wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah was proverbial, and Jesus refers to it several times in connection with the eternal consequences that would attend rejection of the gospel (Matt 10:15; 11:23–24; Luke 10:12; cf. 2 Pet 2:6; Jude 7).

### Application of the Chapter

This chapter contains many practical lessons, including:

1. Ministers of the gospel are to be supported through the preaching of the message, because “the laborer is worthy of his hire” (Luke 10:7, KJV; cf. 10:10). While self-evident, its application here is also based on the biblical principle of returning the tenth or “tithe” to support the priests of the temple (Mal 3:10). Interestingly, Paul quotes Jesus’ instructions to the apostles here as the basis for his teaching on the support of Christian ministers (1 Cor 9:11–14; 1 Tim 5:17–18).
Jacques Doukhan has brought back for analysis and discussion Daniel 11, one of the most difficult passages in biblical apocalyptic literature, raising new questions and offering some new readings through the use of a new approach to the text. Doukhan’s academic training in literature and text analysis as well as his personal experiences and his interest in apocalyptic hope have qualified him well for the task at hand. The result of his study will raise new questions and will not go unchallenged.

After a short introduction discussing the coded nature of Daniel 11, Doukhan proceeds in the first chapter to deal with the important topic of methodology. He discusses the three major schools of interpretation (preterist, futurist, historicist) and a minor one—the Islamist interpretation. Doukhan argues that with respect to the interpretation of Daniel 11, all schools have been influenced by the preterist Maccabean thesis by finding in the chapter events related to the struggles between the Seleucids and Ptolemes and the role of Antiochus IV. He provides a penetrating critique of the Maccabean thesis not only in this chapter but throughout the rest of the book.

In the second chapter, Doukhan looks at the literary structures connecting Daniel 11 within its immediate context, understood by him to be Daniel 10 and 12, and with chapter 8 as its larger context. In order to help decode Daniel 11, Doukhan explores the literary connections between Daniel 9 and 10, identifying a chiasitic literary structure (understanding prophecy—10:1/9:1-2; praying and fasting—10:2-3/9:3-19; and fulfilling prophecy—10:4-21//9:20-27). The parallels are useful in several ways, but particularly in that they show that Rome is always implied in the prophetic sequence, including Daniel 11. He also finds a chiasitic literary structure in Daniel 11 and 12. This is, according to him, useful in that it demonstrates that the king of the North in Daniel 11:40–45 is identified with the little horn in Daniel 12:5–11. Doukhan also finds a significant number of linguistic and thematic parallels between Daniel 8 and 11.

In the third chapter, Doukhan explores the significance of Daniel 8 for the interpretation of chapter 11. This is a fundamental hermeneutical section for him. First he argues that Daniel 8 omits the kingdoms of Babylon and Rome found in Daniel 2 and 7 (a point that most historicist interpreters would take issue with). This allows him to omit these kingdoms in the interpretation of Daniel 11, though he recognizes that Rome is implicitly present in both chapters. Second, he argues that the composite animals representing the kingdoms in Daniel 7 are symbols of the kingdoms, while the clean animals in Daniel 8 are portrayed as real animals (a ram and a goat). This, he adds, signals a reference to the Day of Atonement. Third, the parallels between Daniel 7 and 8 show that in both cases the little horn stands for the same power: papal Rome. In Daniel 8 the movement is from Persia and Greece to papal Rome, from literal kingdoms to spiritual entities. This finding is used to decode Daniel 11. The conflicts between the kings of the North and the South are spiritual conflicts and assume that they take place after Christ. Doukhan’s methodology includes the hermeneutics of the covenant according to which the prophecies before the coming of Christ are to be interpreted literally (e.g., literal Jerusalem and Babylon) and those after, when the new covenant was universalized, are interpreted spiritually (e.g., the heavenly Jerusalem and the mystical Babylon). He maintains that pagan Rome is implied in the text and that there are flashbacks to it in the prophecy (e.g., Dan 11:16), interpreted by him in a typological fashion—the oppressive power of pagan Rome was a type of the papal oppressive power, represented in both cases by their respective “abomination of desolation.”

Chapter 4 is dedicated to a useful discussion of the North-South symbolism, a key element in the structure of Daniel 11. It stands as a symbol of totality, religious power, human self-reliance, and conflict. All of these symbolic meanings are present in Daniel 11, represent-
ing the spiritual power of papal Rome in its struggles with different ones from the South. As a religious entity, the king of the North is a spiritual power claiming divine prerogatives (spiritual Babylon) and the king of the South functions as a self-reliant oppressive power (spiritual Egypt).

In chapter 5, Doukhan provides a very detailed and complex literary structure of Daniel 11 based on the interaction of the kings of the North and the South. According to him, the literary structure of the chapter could be read as reflecting a historical-chronological perspective depicting a conflict from the time of Daniel to the time of the end, thus emphasizing the theme of the cosmic conflict. The events, he adds, are not necessarily in chronological order. He finds a significant amount of linguistic and thematic parallels to support his view. Doukhan also suggests that Daniel 11 could be structured as a chiastic-covenant structure whose center is 11:22, emphasizing the historical and theological progression of the oppression of God’s covenant people by the king of the North. It is an exploration of the theological significance of the linear-chronological structure found within the text itself.

Chapter 5 is a detailed commentary of Daniel 11 based on the literary structure previously discussed and using Doukhan's hermeneutical principles. It is indeed a close reading of the biblical text. For the commentary Doukhan uses the linear-chronological structure of the chapter, delimited by the inclusio of the use of the phrase “Michael the Prince” in Daniel 10:21 and 12:1. This is followed by the prologue (Dan 11:1-4), a description of the East-West-East conflict related to the kingdoms of Medo-Persia and Greece. The rest of Daniel 11 deals with the work of the papacy. The following is a summary of Doukhan's interpretation of the sections:

- **Daniel 11:5–8** is about the rise of Christianity and the papacy and the beginning of its corruption; it includes the invasion of some of the barbarian tribes (AD 284–455). This is about the North (papacy) and the South (Rome).
- **Daniel 11:9–13a** refers to the rise of the supremacy of the pope and includes matters related to the Ostrogoths, the union of state and church under Clovis and Charlemagne, and the Crusades and Inquisitions (AD 476–1400). Doukhan identifies the king of the South with Clovis (the Frankish Kingdom, Dan 11:9).
- **Daniel 11:11–12** describes the Avignon captivity (AD 1309–1377) and the rise of the Renaissance and rationalism (AD 1400–1600). The king of the South refers to secular royal powers of Europe.
- **Daniel 11:13–25a** deals with the Counter-Reformation, particularly with the Council of Trent (AD 1545–1563), and includes the missionary expansion of the church as well as the persecutions (AD 1600–1789), particularly the Saint Bartholomew’s Day massacre (1572). The king of the South refers to political powers supporting the king of the North. Daniel 11:22 contains a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus and His work as High Priest. The passage alludes to the prophecy of the 70 weeks (Dan 9:25–27). Since for Doukhan the prophecy of Daniel 11 is mainly about the papacy, the mention of the “prince of the covenant,” although alluding to Christ, is thematically about the suffering of God’s people and not those of Christ. The flashback to the experience of the Messiah is used to associate God’s people with the experience of Jesus. The breaking of God’s people is identified with the breaking of the Messiah, thus showing the close connection between the two. Doukhan does not clearly identify of the king of the South mentioned in Daniel 11:25a.

**Daniel 11:25–27** is taken to refer to the French Revolution (1789–1798) and the mortal wound inflicted on the king of the North.

**Daniel 11:28–39** looks back to the work of the king of the North and reveals the implications of his work from a more theological perspective. In that sense the passage goes over the previous historical emphases of the chapter with a message of judgment (the Day of Atonement). Doukhan comments that this new focus does not totally exclude historical references. **Daniel 11:40–45** goes back to the attacks against the church (Dan 11:25b–27), the wound and the recovery, and the final defeat of the king of the South that allows the king of the North to unify the church and secular powers in a final attempt to exterminate the camp of God (Armageddon).

After a careful and long commentary on Daniel 11, Doukhan discusses in chapter 7 the theology that flows from his analysis of the chapter. It is theologically rich and concentrates on the theology of history, the cosmic conflict, the denunciation of evil, and the Messiah’s saving work. A useful excursus is included, dealing with Daniel 11 and Islam.

Doukhan challenges all of us to take a closer look at the biblical text of Daniel 11 and be ready to evaluate any interpretation of it. His linguistic discussions are certainly valuable and should be taken seriously since they can shed light on the meaning of a difficult text. His proposed literary structure of the chapter and its connections with chapters 8–10 and 12 provide us with an excellent starting point for analysis and interpretation.

Perhaps one of Doukhan's most important contributions is found in his willingness to question and reject finding in the chapter any reference to the struggles between the Ptolemais and the Seleucids—a reading of the text some of us have considered to be almost irrelevant within the chapter. The value of Doukhan's interpretation would need to be carefully assessed. This leads us to what may well be one of the points of significant debate in his hermeneutics.

In principle, Doukhan's reading of chapter 11 is determined by his reading of Daniel 8, which provides for him a point of departure, a perspective. The omission of Rome in chapter 8 has two significant contributions to his discussion. The first is that in Daniel 8, the prophet moves from Greece to papal Rome—to the Christian era. Second, using the hermeneutics of covenant, he concludes that we are now dealing with
spiritual interpretations, not literal kingdoms. He takes these two elements to his reading of Daniel 11 because this chapter is directly related to and builds on Daniel 8. Therefore, after the brief discussion of Persia and Greece, Daniel 11 is about papal Rome, a spiritual power. If it could be demonstrated that Rome is not only implicit in Daniel 8 but actually present as a political power, Doukhan's interpretation of Daniel 11 would have to be modified.

The question of whether pagan Rome is only implied or actually present in Daniel 8 is debatable, and one we cannot develop here. Doukhan is sensitive to the need to keep pagan Rome present in the discussion—albeit implicitly—because it is present in a historicist reading of the 70 weeks in Daniel 9, and this prophetic period is directly related to the 2300 days in chapter 8. Besides, a horn usually grows out of the head of a beast, although the horns depicted in Zechariah 1:18–21 are not related to any beasts. This would give the impression that through the horns the whole beast is present—the part stands for the whole—not implicitly but in reality, because the horn is inseparable from it.

Doukhan also needs Rome implicitly present in the chapter because Daniel 11:22 mentions the death of the Messiah that took place under pagan Rome. He takes this to be a flashback to the death of the Messiah, but that is prophetically referring in Daniel 11:22 to the suffering and death of believers, thus providing a theological interpretation to their experience. The verse, according to him, is not a prediction of the death of the Messiah, but it assumes that He died under pagan Rome. This particular reading of the text needs to be strengthened before it can gain widespread support. It would appear that in Daniel 11:22 we have an explicit reference to the death of the Messiah in the flow of the historical line of the chapter. Besides, one would have to ask how useful a flashback is if what it is pointing to is not explicitly mentioned in chapters 8 or 11.

The discussion of the interpretation of Daniel 11 must continue, and it would be good to explore Doukhan's suggestion of ending the discussion of Greece in verse 4, but allowing for some discussion of the Roman Empire not only in verse 5 but also in some of the subsequent verses. This should be done after a careful reading of the text and could be grounded on the fact that the first mention of the king of the South (Dan 11:5)—which, according to Doukhan, implies the presence of the king of the North—does not seem to be about an open conflict between the two of them.

I highly recommend this book to anyone interested in apocalyptic prophecy, and specifically in Daniel 11. Although Doukhan's exegesis is based on the Hebrew text, he transliterates and translates every Hebrew term and his expositions are very clear.

Ángel Manuel Rodríguez
Director (retired)
Biblical Research Institute

The Lord can do but little for the children of men, because they are so full of pride and vain glory. They exalt self, magnifying their own strength, learning, and wisdom. It is necessary for God to disappoint their hopes and frustrate their plans, that they may learn to trust in Him alone.
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