

Brazil School of the Prophets: January-February 2019

43. History (21-02-19)

In vs 40 we chose to look at the KN and KS. But our attention has been so fixed to the KN. We pretty much got that correct, even from the very beginning, not about Trump but we would come to the last president, events before the SL, and resurrection of this king. What we did do is miss the KS. The way we approach the verse cause us misunderstandings. What caused us the problems? We said the KS ends in 1898. We didn't read the words properly. Maybe we're like the disciples in Mt 24. What was their assumption? They mingled the destruction of Jerusalem and of the world by saying it's the same. What they didn't anticipate is that there was something in between them: the days. Jesus' answer doesn't destroy their understanding because they didn't know how long the days were!

So, when we read the words of Dn 11:40 it ends in 1989. It ends with the death of the KS. When does he die? 1989 (1991 but we ignored it, we said we want to focus on 1989). We combined the two dates (1989 and 1991; 1798 and 1799). We said 1798 is the death. We said 1989 because we saw the death of the KS with our own eyes. Then we said: in the early days, because time is short, the next event is the SL. Perhaps we have longer time than we think till the SL.

So we had vs 40 to 1989, and vs 41 at the SL. And with that modeling we get Pyrrhus' history as an extra-Biblical history. So then we took it all the way to the SL. But we have many events before the SL, and where do we get all of them? [me: there's no Bible nor SOP quote]. Is 2014 in the Bible? Or is extra Biblical? It's not, if you can construct 2014 with structures, it's just as valid a waymark as 1989. So to create a waymark you can have words or structure. It's very easy to make errors with words, but not so much with structures. So Pyrrhus is not extra Biblical, but you have to go to wikipedia.

EGW says that Dn 11 has almost reached its complete fulfillment. She is already in Dn 11 a. And her proof is what? In this passage she says that if you look at the rise of the papacy over 1000 years, it's already beginning. Because the history is almost fulfilled. She takes us from 30 to 36. She says these verses which are the rise of the KN will show us the rise of the KN. Vs 36 says 'the king' and it has to be the same as in vs 30-35. Josiah Litch says no, that 'the king' is another new king. And France is the king. We say it's wrong because EGW says it is. (and other reasons).

Dan 11:35 And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed.

Dan 11:36 And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify

himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

So vs 36 is where? After the ToE? Because if you go from 36 to 39, vs 40 says ToE. So you have a problem. The way most people understand that is repeat and enlarge.

If you go to France, who is France? Close to 1798 France is the KS. Was France always the KS? No. What was it before? KN.

Today we say that the US is the KN. And if you think that is an anomaly, like America being a puppet of the papacy.