

Thoughts on Dan 12:6-7

Copyright (c) 2009 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

One of them said to the man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, "How long [*ʿad-māṭay*] will it be before these astonishing things [*happʿlāʾôṭ*] are fulfilled?" ⁷ The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, lifted his right hand and his left hand toward heaven, and I heard him swear by him who lives forever, saying, "It will be for a time [*lʿmôʿēd*], times and half a time. When the power of the holy people has been finally [*ûkʿkallôṭ*] broken [*nappēš*], all these things will be completed." (Daniel 12:6-7, NIV)¹

One said to the man clothed in linen, who was above the water of the river, "How long [*ʿad-māṭay*] until the end of these awful things [*happʿlāʾôṭ*]?" ⁷ Then I heard the man dressed in linen, who was above the water of the river, swear by the Ever-Living One as he lifted his right hand and his left hand to heaven: "For a time [*lʿmôʿēd*], times, and half a time; and when the breaking [*nappēš*] of the power of the holy people comes to an end [*ûkʿkallôṭ*], then shall all these things be fulfilled." (Dan 12:6-7, TNK)²

Introduction

The Passage Under Review

There is a question whether Dan 12:6-7 contemplates events in the timeframe of 11:40-12:4 (especially 12:1-3) or of 11:29-39, and whether the terms *ʿad-māṭay* ("How long?"), *happʿlāʾôṭ* ("astonishing things"), *lʿmôʿēd* ("for a time"), *ûkʿkallôṭ* ("finally" [NIV], "comes to an end" [TNK]), and *nappēš* ("broken"), refer to good things that God does or to bad things done by the king of the North. In the present paper I consider these words in other books, in Daniel where possible, and finally in Dan 12:6-7. At issue is whether this latter passage has good things in view and looks to the future, or whether it has bad things in view and looks to the past. In this paper I argue for the latter position, i.e., that the 1260 days occur in the past.

Adventist Futurism

I should say a word about the term "futurist" as used in this paper. Futurism among Seventh-day Adventists is not the same as Evangelical or dispensationalist futurism, and those labeled in this way object to the use of the term. Correctly understood, however, it conveys a useful distinction.

¹ English Bible quotations not otherwise marked are from *The Holy Bible: New International Version*®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House.

² *The Jewish Bible: Torah, Nevi'im, Kethuvim*. Copyright © 1985 by The Jewish Publication Society. All rights reserved.

The idea has to do with moving major prophetic time periods from the middle ages, where earlier generations of Adventist interpreters consistently placed them, to some future time, normally associated with the imposition of the national Sunday law. All Adventist futurists place the 1290 days and 1335 days of Dan 12:11-12 in the future, but there is a difference of opinion about the "time, times and half a time," or 1260 days, of Dan 12:7. Some place the 1260 days in the future, while others leave that period in the past. Past fulfillments of prophetic time periods are calculated using a year for a day, while future ones are calculated using a day for a day.

For the most part the issues discussed by Adventist futurists are uniquely Seventh-day Adventist and could not be otherwise, since the concepts of year for a day time symbolism and the belief that the United States will eventually pass a national Sunday law are uniquely Adventist issues. No one else talks about them. So in view of the need to make the above distinctions conveniently, I use the term "futurist" to describe those Seventh-day Adventists who wish to place the 1290 and 1335 days in the future, whether or not they also place the 1260 days in the future.

Key Terms in the Passage

What Does ad-māṭay Mean?

The meaning of ad-māṭay is really quite straightforward. It means "How long?" or, more literally, "Until when?" There are a number of ways to convey such meaning in Hebrew. One way is ad-ānā ,³ another is kammā ,⁴ another is ad-mā ,⁵ and yet another is alrê mātay ʿōd .⁶ The one we are concerned with here is, as stated, ad-māṭay .⁷ What is missing in the Hebrew is any way to draw a contrast between "How long?" and "Until when?" As exegetes, therefore, we should not insist too strongly on maintaining such a contrast in translation. It is present in the text etymologically, but not contextually. Given this limitation, it would be wise to note the potential difference and go on.

All passages

When we finish saying that ad-māṭay means "How long?" we have not exhausted the topic. How is the expression used in the various passages where it occurs? In what types of contexts does it appear? Knowing these things will give us a useful starting point for interpreting ad-māṭay in Dan 12:6. In table 1 (below) I give the NIV gloss for each of twenty-five Old Testament examples. With two exceptions, this is a complete list.

³ See Exod 16:28; Num 14:11; Josh 18:3; Job 8:2 (ad-ān); Ps 4:2; 13:1, 2; 62:3; Jer 47:6; Hab 1:2.

⁴ See Ps 35:17; 119:84; Zech 2:2.

⁵ See Ps 74:9; 89:46.

⁶ See Jer 13:27.

⁷ See Exod 10:3, 7; Num 14:27; 1 Sam 1:14; 16:1; 2 Sam 2:26; 1 Kgs 18:21; Neh 2:6; Ps 6:4; 74:10; 80:5; 82:2; 90:13; 94:3; Prov 1:22; 6:9; Isa 6:11; Jer 4:14, 21; 12:4; 13:27; 23:26; 31:22; 47:5; Dan 8:13; 12:6; Hos 8:5; Hab 2:6; Zech 1:12.

After looking over the references listed, what can we say about the types of contexts in which *ʿad-mātay* normally occurs? In these twenty-five passages, is it used to inquire about good things or bad things? What are its contextual associations in actual usage? Consider the first example, where God asks Pharaoh, "How long will you refuse to humble yourself before me?" (Exod 10:3). By refusing to humble himself, Pharaoh was rebelling against God. In this passage the question "How long?" is not merely a request for information. It expresses a desire for whatever is happening to stop. The context for *ʿad-mātay* in Exod 10:3 is negative. It is also negative in each of the other twenty-four examples in table 1.

Table 1
Examples of *ʿad-mātay*

Reference	Question
Exodus 10:3	"How long will you refuse to humble yourself before me?"
Exod 10:7	"How long will this man be a snare to us?"
Num 14:27	"How long will this wicked community grumble against me?"
1 Sam 1:14	"How long will you keep on getting drunk?"
1 Sam 16:1	"How long will you mourn for Saul?"
2 Sam 2:26	"How long before you order your men to stop pursuing their brothers?"
1 Kgs 18:21	"How long will you waver between two opinions?"
Ps 6:3	"How long, O LORD, how long?"
Ps 74:10	"How long will the enemy mock you, O God?"
Ps 80:4	"[H]ow long will your anger smolder against the prayers of your people?"
Ps 82:2	"How long will you defend the unjust and show partiality to the wicked?"
Ps 90:13	How long will it be? Have compassion on your servants.
Ps 94:3	[H]ow long will the wicked be jubilant?
Prov 1:22	"How long will you simple ones love your simple ways?"
Prov 6:9	How long will you lie there, you sluggard?
Isa 6:11	"For how long, O Lord?" And he answered: "Until the cities lie ruined and without inhabitant, until the houses are left deserted and the fields ruined and ravaged, . . ."
Jer 4:14	How long will you harbor wicked thoughts?
Jer 4:21	How long must I see the battle standard and hear the sound of the trumpet?
Jer 23:26	How long will this continue in the hearts of these lying prophets, who prophesy the delusions of their own minds?
Jer 31:22	How long will you wander, O unfaithful daughter?
Jer 47:5	O remnant on the plain [Gaza, Ashkelon], how long will you cut yourselves?
Dan 8:13	"How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled-- the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?"
Hos 8:5	How long will they be incapable of purity?
Hab 2:6	"How long must this go on?"
Zech 1:12	"LORD Almighty, how long will you withhold mercy from Jerusalem and from the towns of Judah, which you have been angry with these seventy years?"

I mentioned that two passages are omitted from the table. One of these is Neh 2:6 ("Then the king, with the queen sitting beside him, asked me, 'How long will your journey take, and when will you get back?' It pleased the king to send me; so I set a time"). Here the context

is neither negative nor positive, but simply neutral. The king wanted to know how long Nehemiah would be gone. Assuming Nehemiah's request could be granted, Artaxerxes wanted to know how to plan. The other example, which we are not yet ready to categorize, is Dan 12:6.

Daniel

Of the examples in table 1, Dan 8:13 is of special interest. For completeness it will always be necessary to understand how Daniel's words are used by other writers, but the real issue is how Daniel's words are used by Daniel. These two things do not always correspond, but in this case they do. So one reason why Dan 8:13 is interesting for our purposes is that it occurs within the book of Daniel, but there are other reasons as well.

Without prejudging what we're trying to establish, it is fair to point out that in both Dan 8:13 and Dan 12:6 the prophet uses *ʿad-māṭay* and that the narrator has a definite period of time in view. In 8:13 it is the 2300 days, in 12:7 it is a "time, times and half a time." It is also the case that this same period of a "time, times and half a time" is mentioned in Dan 7:25. I now quote Dan 8:13 for the reader's convenience.

Then I heard a holy one speaking, and another holy one said to him, "How long [*ʿad-māṭay*] will it take for the vision [*heḥḥāzôn*] to be fulfilled- the vision concerning the daily sacrifice [*hattāmîd*], the rebellion that causes desolation [*w^ehappéša^c šômēm*], and the surrender of the sanctuary [*tēt w^eqôdeš*] and of the host [*w^ešābā[?]*] that will be trampled underfoot [*mirmās*]?" (Dan 8:13)

In many versions, NIV included, Dan 8:13 is rendered too freely. In Hebrew, after the expression *ʿad-māṭay*, the question has three main parts: (1) "the vision (*heḥḥāzôn*), (2) "the daily" (*hattāmîd*), (3) and "the rebellion that causes desolation" (*w^ehappéša^c šômēm*). As an add on to part 3 we have four additional words. Both NIV ("and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot") and NRSV ("and the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled") begin this add on with the word "and," which implies (incorrectly) that this is the beginning of a separate fourth clause rather than an extension of part 3. Hebrew loves the word "and," but it is not present here. The last four words make up a phrase that pertains only to the rebellion. It is the rebellion, and not the vision or the "daily," that would give the sanctuary and host over for trampling. The vision does not do this, nor does the "daily." The last four words should be understood as an extension of the rebellion clause.

Part 1: The vision. What does "the vision" include? It includes everything presented on this occasion starting with, what? We commonly say that Babylon is excluded from the vision of Dan 8, but why is Daniel at the citadel of Susa? I don't mean why is he there on this occasion (vs. 2); I mean why is he there at all? Did a foreign power bring him there? Which one was it? Having noted Daniel's presence at Susa, we proceed to the Persian ram (vss. 3-4) and the Greek (or Macedonian) goat which challenges the ram (vss. 5-8).

The Macedonian empire of Alexander the Great rises to power quickly and is then divided "toward the four winds of heaven" (vs. 8), i.e., toward the four points of the compass.⁸ Out of one of them, i.e., from one of the points of the compass – some direction – another horn

⁸ Only two of these directions (North, South) continue to be of interest in chap. 11.

goes forth (*yāṣāʾ*).⁹ We're not told where it comes from, but we know where it goes. "[It] grew in power to the south and to the east and toward the Beautiful Land" (vs. 9). From this we deduce that the horn comes from the north and from the west as seen from the perspective of the Beautiful Land. And where might that take us? North and west from Judea could take us to Greece, but this power rises when Greece falls, so it's unlikely that Greece would be the angel's focus. Greece does not follow Greece in history, instead Rome follows Greece.

Including Rome at this point makes a great deal of sense, not only because we know it has to, but because the prophecy incorporates within it the first century AD in which Jesus would live and finally die on the cross. If our interpretation has no room for Rome, it has no room for Christ, because Christ was not crucified by Greeks, but by Romans.

The vision starts roughly half a millennium before Christ (457 BC). All of this and the centuries which follow, through the middle ages and beyond, is included in what Daniel sees. Is the history it portrays good or bad? Jerusalem would be overrun successively by Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans – the last of whom begin by crucifying Christ and end by terrorizing the church, in one way or another, for many centuries. How good is that? I think we would have to say this is bad. The context for the first part of the question is clearly negative.

Part 2: The "daily." The "daily" is often discussed as though it were some self-contained entity, but it is not. The "daily" is part of something larger, both in the immediate context of Dan 8:9-14 and more generally. When the two main services of the sanctuary are combined, they make up an annual cycle consisting of the "daily" (vss. 9-12) and the yearly (vss. 13-14). Not only are these functions closely related, but the sequence is as the passage before us portrays it. The "daily" comes first, occupying a long period of definite prophetic time, and the yearly follows, occupying a shorter period of unknown duration. The "daily" begins when Christ returns to heaven after the crucifixion.

Is this good? Yes! Although framed between two other things that are bad (as we shall see), the "daily" itself is good. But here the "daily" is presented in terms of the bad things that happen to it. It is taken away, misused, misunderstood, obscured. How good is that? But the "daily," unlike the material that surrounds it, is good and positive.

Part 3: The rebellion that causes desolation. The rebellion clause need not detain us long. Rebellion is not good and neither is anything that brings desolation. This part begins roughly half a millennium after Christ (AD 538). In this context *ʿad-māṭay* is an expression of longing. The idea is, When will this ever stop? The last four words emphasize the reason why it makes sense to say this. The rebellion gives both the sanctuary and the host (i.e., the host of worshipers at the sanctuary, the membership of God's church) over to be trampled.

Discussion. The question has three clauses and these are of different kinds. Like Christ on the middle cross, flanked by two thieves who are getting only what they deserve, there is no easy way to say whether the men being crucified that day are good. There are distinctions to make (see Luke 23:41). As regards *ʿad-māṭay* in Dan 8:13, however, we would have to say that the question contemplates a very bad situation. The "daily" is framed between two things that bring harm. In the case of the rebellion, what makes it so harmful is precisely that it detracts

⁹ If the prophet's intent were to say that the horn comes up, that would require a different Hebrew word (*ʿālâ*). The word Daniel uses (*yāṣāʾ*) specifically refers to horizontal movement.

from the "daily." This is what makes it so very wrong and defines the present context as being substantially negative.

What Does *happ^{lā}ʾôt* Mean?

Background

The term *happ^{lā}ʾôt* (Dan 12:6) has been translated variously, as shown in table 2 (below). This table covers a range of meanings, so the question is which one(s), if any, best capture the meaning of the term. Does the verse around it refer to positive things, or negative things?

In table 2, fourteen translations use the word "end" (or "cease"), which would be consistent with saying that the angel wants something to stop (CSB, ESV, GNB, GNV, JPS, KJV, ML, NAB, NASB, NEB ["cease"], REB, RSV, TNK, YLT). In this case what he has in view is bad. If it's bad, you don't want more of it. On the other hand, five translations frame the question in such a way that one could say the angel wants something to start (JV, NJB ["take place"], Mof ["happen"], NET ["occur"], NKJV ["fulfillment"]). In this case what he has in view is good. On the one hand, the time period mentioned in Dan 12:7 is a period of unimaginable hardship; on the other, one of blessing and spectacular deliverance. I am not yet ready to put NIV in either group. NIV gives the appearance of trying to split the difference so as to make either interpretation possible.

Table 2
Renderings of *happ^{lā}ʾôṭ* in Twenty English Versions

Abbr	Version	Rendering
CSB	Christian Standard Bible	"How long until the end of these extraordinary things?"
ESV	English Standard Version	"How long shall it be till the end of these wonders?"
GNB	Good News Bible	"How long will it be until these amazing events come to an end?"
GNV	Geneva Bible	When shall be the end of these wonders?
JB	Jerusalem Bible	"How long until these wonders take place?"
JPS	Jewish Publication Society	'How long shall it be to the end of the wonders?'
KJV	King James Version	How long <i>shall it be</i> to the end of these wonders?
ML	Modern Language (Berkeley)	"How long until these marvels shall end?"
Mof	Moffatt	"How long shall it be until these wonders happen?"
NAB	New American Bible	"How long shall it be to the end of these appalling things?"
NASB	New American Standard Bible	"How long <i>will it be</i> until the end of <i>these</i> wonders?"
NEB	New English Bible	"How long will it be before these portents cease?"
NET	New English Translation	"When will the end of these wondrous events occur?"
NIV	New International Version	"How long will it be before these astonishing things are fulfilled?"
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible	'How long until these wonders take place?'
NKJV	New King James Version	"How long shall the fulfillment of these wonders <i>be</i> ?"
REB	Revised English Bible	"How long will it be until the end of these portents?"
RSV	Revised Standard Version	"How long shall it be till the end of these wonders?"
TNK	Tanakh	"How long until the end of these awful things?"
YLT	Young's Literal Translation	'Till when <i>is</i> the end of these wonders?'

In table 2 the reader will notice that the word "wonders" appears eleven times, and the related term "wondrous" once. We should not be too quick to place heavy emphasis on finding "wonders" (or "wonder") in an English translation, because the word can be used in more than one way. It does not always have positive connotations, unlike "wonderful" or "wondrous," which I grant are always positive. In KJV the word "wonder" describes people's response to the activity of the sea beast in Rev 13:3, and to that of the earth beast in Rev 13:13. In Rev 12:1 it describes John's response to the pure woman clothed with the sun, and in 12:3 his response to the dragon which pursues the woman. In Rev 17:6 the word "wonder" describes John's response to the impure woman on the beast and in 17:8 his response to the beast itself. So we should not assume too much about the translator's intent when this word appears, even though the examples in table 2 represent a variety of translations with a variety of publication dates.

To work our way through the attractive minefield of tempting assumptions and associations in Dan 12:6-7 we will need a clear context to work from. Unfortunately, we don't

have one, because the nature of the context has also been questioned and is at issue. So we can't work from context to word meaning here, and working insensitively from word meaning to context either here or elsewhere would be backwards. This puts us in a difficult situation. There appears to be no way – using only materials from the passage itself – to determine with certainty whether *happ^elā^oḏt* in Dan 12:6 describes the horrible depredations of the king of the North in Dan 11:29-39 or God's wonderful acts of delivering people from them in Dan 12:1-3.

Given this situation, we must go outside the passage in order to establish the needed points of reference – a process already begun in the preceding section. To understand the term *happ^elā^oḏt*, it will be necessary to consider both the origin of the word and its use in books by other writers (bearing in mind this exact form occurs only in Dan 12:6).¹⁰ For that matter, within Daniel the exact form *niplā^oḏt* appears only once (11:36). In 8:24 it is *w^eniplā^oḏt*. Of course adding *w^e* ("and") to *niplā^oḏt* does not make *w^eniplā^oḏt* a different form, but if someone insists, it is true that the forms are not exactly the same. Are *niplā^oḏt* and *happ^elā^oḏt* the same? They are not exactly the same. Just how different are they? That is a question to which we return below.

The two examples in Daniel of *niplā^oḏt* (8:24; 11:36) are important to us for the same reason Dan 8:13 was important earlier, i.e., they represent Daniel's own usage. And they are cognate with *happ^elā^oḏt*.

The sample

BibleWorks 7 gives a list of 84 hits in 81 verses when asked to search by lemma on a word representing Hebrew **pl^o*. But this hit list does not include Judg 13:18 (although Judg 13:19 is there) or Ps 139:6 (although Ps 139:14 is there), where the forms are adjectival and the consonants could be represented as *ply^o*. Another passage that our preliminary list of 84 items does not include is Job 37:16, where the form is *mip^ol^oḏt*. This is probably a variant spelling of *niplā^oḏt* but is treated as a separate lemma. By contrast, the list does include five Hiphil verbal forms where the surface consonants are *ply^o*. When the three additional forms from Judg 13:18; Ps 139:6; and Job 37:16 are included, we have 87 hits to start with, of which we will need to discard five.¹¹

A handful of other forms need not be considered beyond briefly mentioning them here. Four times **pl^o* (= **pl^o I?* = **pl^o II?*) occurs as part of a family and/or tribal name (Num 26:5, 5; Neh 8:7; 10:11). Three times the letters *pl^o* occur hidden within the name Tiglath-Pileser¹² (2 Kgs

¹⁰ This is the only example in the Old Testament or at Qumran where a form built on **pl^o* takes the definite article.

¹¹ There are different ways to do the search. If we select the Hebrew (WTT) as our search version and feed **פּלָ** (asterisks on both ends) into the search window we get 87 hits, but the two lists of 87 are not identical. This time all the legitimate examples mentioned above are included, but two extraneous examples are as well, and five legitimate examples are left out. The five left out are Hiphil verbal forms where the sequence of consonants is not *pl^o*, but *ply^o*. (When you search on *ply^o* using Hebrew letters (**פּלָ**) an extraneous example from Ezra 4:9 comes up and must be discarded.

¹² There's no hidden meaning here. Well, there is, but it has nothing to do with Hebrew *tiglath-pilēser*. I said the kings who bore this name are Assyrian, so their language is not Hebrew. In Akkadian the name – a throne name, not a given name – is *Tukultī-apil-Ešarra* ("my trust is in

15:29; 16:7, 10).¹³ Tiglath-Pileser, you will recall, was the name of three great Assyrian kings (1114-1076 BC, 967-935 BC, 745-727 BC) and also of Ellen White's watchdog at Sunnyside (c. 1897).¹⁴ These seven extra examples are not counted above and do not figure elsewhere in the study.

The five forms I said would need to be discarded from our enlarged list of 87 items represent what some lexicographers would call **plʿ* II "fulfill," i.e., a root homonymous with, but semantically distinct from, **plʿ* I "be marvelous." This second root **plʿ* II, if it really is a second root, occurs in Lev 22:21; 27:2; Num 6:2; 15:3, 8. In each case it has to do with commitments and vows. This meaning is almost certainly unrelated to **plʿ* I "be marvelous." We now set these five examples aside and prepare to work with our core list of 82 relevant examples. The list now contains two adjectival forms, 13 nominal forms, 18 verbal forms, and 49 participial forms.

So far we have isolated 82 examples, of what? If there were nothing that all 82 had in common, we would have no reason to treat them as a group. But in fact all 82 examples do have one thing in common, i.e., they all derive from a common root **plʿ* (or we could say **plʿ* I). In the debate so far there has been a certain fear of roots. Before discussing this particular root, we should mention what D. A. Carson calls a "root fallacy," to see what it is and is not, and hopefully demystify the process of dealing with roots. This is something we might as well learn to do, because it is very much a part of linguistic due diligence to understand what gives a given group of words its identity.

D. A. Carson's "root fallacy"

In his book, *Exegetical Fallacies*,¹⁵ D. A. Carson speaks of a "root fallacy." This fallacy occurs when a word is required to have a certain meaning regardless of context, based on its etymology. After giving some examples,¹⁶ Carson says,

I hasten to add three caveats to this discussion. First, I am not saying that any word can mean anything. Normally we observe that any individual word has a certain limited semantic range, and the

the son of Esharra"). Note that *lpl* and *lll* are in one word, while *lʿl* is in another. (The aleph is not written although its presence is inferred before the *lE* of Ešarra.) So there's nothing wonderful about Tilath-Pileser, or at least his name does not assert that there is. The occurrence of the string *lplʿl* in his name is pure coincidence.

¹³ See also 2 Kgs 15:19; 1 Chr 5:26; and Isa 66:19 where the same name (Tilath-Pileser) in Hebrew is shortened to Pul.

¹⁴ See Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: Volume 4, The Australian Years, 1891-1900* (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 1983), p. 213; idem, *Volume 5, The Elmshaven Years, 1900-1905*, p. 19.

¹⁵ 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1966), pp. 28-33.

¹⁶ Not every example Carson offers is convincing. Hebrew *lēhem* ("bread") and *milḥāmâ* ("war") are given as an example of two words related etymologically but having little or no synchronic meaning in common (p. 30). But if bread is devoured in a meal and people are devoured in a war, there really is an interesting and significant synchronic connection between *lēhem* and *milḥāmâ* that we can benefit from knowing about. It is not my purpose to refute the point Carson is making, only to cast light on this one example. His remarks on Greek *agapaō* are very much to the point, e.g., that the same word which normally signifies a high and holy, even spiritual, love can also be used – in context – to describe base lust (see 2 Sam 13:15, LXX).

context may therefore modify or shape the meaning of a word only within certain boundaries. . . . I am simply saying that the meaning of a word cannot be reliably determined by etymology, or that a root, once discovered always projects a certain semantic load onto any word that incorporates that root.¹⁷

I have been accused of committing the above fallacy. The way I did this was by pointing out that, with whatever implications might follow, *happ^llā^ot* in Dan 12:6 is related etymologically to *niplā^ot* in Dan 11:36. They share the same root **pl^o*, which appears also in Dan 8:24. But establishing this sort of connection is not what Carson was talking about. There is one reason in particular why this should be.

Since all related forms share a common etymological origin, etymology would tend to force one meaning on all examples. But the meaning I advocate in Dan 12:6 is one that does not occur frequently when the work of all writers is compared. Many of the 82 examples in the sample describe the wonderful works of God. Not all do, but many. There are also some astounding disasters (some of which are caused by God), but again, not many. So how does my advocating of a minority meaning illustrate the fallacy Carson describes?

Etymology unites, context divides. By this I mean that etymology can only show what all members of a word group have in common. It binds them together and defines them as a single class of forms. Context, on the other hand, splits off different shades of meaning – one here, another slightly different one there. So urging a minority meaning sounds more like an argument from context, although a different one than some might prefer. The context I have in mind is informed by Daniel's own usage rather than that of other writers, and it comes from the same narrative as the target term. In what way does this show a lack of sensitivity to context? What I suggest mentions roots but is not an argument from etymology in the sense of Carson's discussion and it has nothing whatever to do with his root fallacy.

Semantic facts

Meaning of the root. There is a debate in the literature whether **pl^o* describes an action (sometimes a state of affairs) which exerts an influence, or a response to such things. The *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* takes the latter position, i.e., that **pl^o* is primarily used to describe a response rather than a stimulus.

If *pele^o* and *niplā^ot* refer primarily to Yahweh's acts of deliverance, the virtual absence of the terms from the numerous accounts of deliverance and wonders in the OT (Gen 18:14, already considered; 2 Chron 26:15) demands explanation: The referent of *pele^o* is not God's act as such (contra Quell, op. cit. 290f.), the immediate experience of deliverance, but one's astonished reaction to God's unexpected intervention in one's hopeless situation of distress. Because the joyous, exuberant reaction of the delivered is a component of *pele^o*, Yahweh's wonders are discussed and sung predominantly in psalms of praise.¹⁸

¹⁷ Carson, *Fallacies*, p. 32.

¹⁸ Ernst Jenni and Clause Westermann, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (trans. Mark E Biddle) (TLOT) (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1997), pp. 984-85.

The editors make their point with reference to the many cases where God acts on behalf of His people, but this is not the only approach they could have taken. In table 3 (below) we consider some examples that fall outside the realm of God's initiative or activity, but that join in illustrating the point made in the quotation above.

Numerically the following examples are not significant, but they reveal a type of meaning that would remain obscure if all we had were praise passages. He does many praiseworthy things. It is not my purpose to deny it, but we need to understand that His activity is not the only source of the amazement described by *pl².

Table 3
Examples of *pl² Where the Grammatical
Subject is Not God

Reference	Topic	Proposed Application
Deut 17:8	A local judge	A case goes beyond the understanding of a local judge.
2 Sam 1:26	Love in the sense of loyalty ¹⁹	The deep bond that David and Jonathan feel for each other is something David has never encountered elsewhere. It goes beyond common experience.
2 Sam 13:2	Love in the sense of lust	Amnon doesn't see how he can possibly accomplish the seduction of Tamar. It seems impossible to him.
Lam 1:9	The fall of Jerusalem ²⁰	The destruction is beyond belief. People can't imagine how things could ever be so bad.

In Deut 17:8 there is nothing supernatural, good or bad. A legal dispute goes beyond the understanding [*yippālē²*] of a local judge, so he takes it to a higher authority. In 2 Sam 1:26 the reference is to the marvelous [*nipl²ātā*] bond that David and Jonathan feel for each other. Their loyalty to each other is on a high and holy level. We could say that 2 Sam 13:2 also deals with love, but this time in the sense of base lust. Amnon has no idea how to bring about the seduction of his half-sister Tamar. He considers the matter impossible [*wayyippālē²*].

An important example. Lamentations 1:9 has been much discussed in connection with the meaning of *pl², but without consensus. Let's look at the passage again. There is more to say about it. The writer is describing Jerusalem's fall at the hands of the Babylonians and says,

Her filthiness clung to her skirts; she did not consider her future. Her fall was astounding [*p²lā²īm*]; there was none to comfort her. "Look, O LORD, on my affliction, for the enemy has triumphed." (Lam 1:9)

One could approach this verse in one of two ways: (1) God causes the destruction of Jerusalem and that's why the word *p²lā²īm* (not *niplā²ôt*) is appropriate here. (2) God does not cause the destruction of Jerusalem; the Babylonians do. God permitted them to violate His will, as He permits us to violate His will. On the one hand, we could appeal for support to vs. 5 and other similar passages (Lam 1:5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22; 2:1).

¹⁹ See also Ps 31:21.

²⁰ See also Deut 28:59.

Her foes have become her masters; her enemies are at ease. The LORD has brought her grief because of her many sins. Her children have gone into exile, captive before the foe. (Lam 1:5)

On the other hand, in a number of passages God promises to punish the Babylonians for what they have done to Jerusalem. Why? How fair would it be for God to send the Babylonians against Jerusalem and then punish them for obeying Him? If they are carrying out His will, they deserve praise. If they deserve praise but get punishment, that is not fair by any standard of which I am aware. So what was happening in the destruction of Jerusalem? The surrounding nations certainly didn't understand these things.

But now many nations are gathered against you. They say, "Let her be defiled, let our eyes gloat over Zion!"¹² But they do not know the thoughts of the LORD; they do not understand his plan, he who gathers them like sheaves to the threshing floor. (Micah 4:11-12)

Obviously God did not protect His people on this occasion. That is a given. But why not? He couldn't because of their sins. Many passages speak of God bringing disaster on His people, but they must all be read in the context of Matt 23:37.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing." (Matt 23:37)

With hindsight we can see that in 605, 597, and 586 BC, when Babylon came against Jerusalem, it was not just Babylon attacking Jerusalem. Instead it was Satan attacking God. The same is true today when God's people are mistreated. The only way Satan can hurt Christ is by hurting us, so he continually tries to do this. In 586 BC, of course God allowed the events to occur. Certainly He used the Babylonians to punish His people for turning from Him. But if we think that God was simply bringing the Babylonians over to harm His people for a while, then we don't understand His plan any better than the people in Micah's day. The fact that God punishes Babylon rather than rewarding them speaks volumes about Babylon's place in all of this, and it does so in a variety of passages.²¹ Emphasis is added in each quotation that follows.

This is what the LORD says- your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: "For your sake I will send to Babylon and bring down as fugitives all the Babylonians, in the ships in which they took pride." (Isa 43:14)

"I set a trap for you, O Babylon, and you were caught before you knew it; you were found and captured because you opposed the LORD." (Jer 50:24)

Listen to the fugitives and refugees from Babylon declaring in Zion how the LORD our God has taken vengeance, vengeance for his temple. (Jer 50:28)

²¹ See also Isa 14:22; 48:14; Jer 25:12; 50:9, 13, 14, 18, 23, 34, 35, 42, 43, 45, 46; 51:1, 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 29, 33, 44, 47-49, 53-55, 58. These passages have to do with Babylon. The following verses have to do with Chaldea. The places and peoples are the same; only the word is different. Jer 50:10, (24), 25, 35, 45, (54). Verses in parentheses mention both Babylon and Chaldea.

"Summon archers against Babylon, all those who draw the bow. Encamp all around her; let no one escape. Repay her for her deeds; do to her as she has done. For she has defied the LORD, the Holy One of Israel." (Jer 50:29)

"Before your eyes I will repay Babylon and all who live in Babylonia for all the wrong they have done in Zion," declares the LORD. (Jer 51:24)

Thus in Lam 1:9 the Babylonians are indeed responsible for what they do to Jerusalem. How can we know this? Because God holds them responsible. God's longing wish was to protect His people, and He would have done it, but they were too stubborn to let Him. If this understanding is correct, as Matt 23:37 would imply, then the context of Lam 1:9 is truly and fairly negative.

Before moving on, notice that *p^olā^oim* in Lam 1:9 is the same word as *happ^olā^oôt* in Dan 12:6, but without the definite article and with a masculine rather than feminine plural ending. Such things are not differences. At Qumran, as in the Old Testament, there is latitude regarding which plural to use on noun forms derived from **pl^o*. Thus we find the following five examples with masculine plural and three examples with feminine plural. It is of interest that most of the forms shown below came from the same cave, so the differences among them is not the result of some process of linguistic development over time or of geographical considerations. At Qumran the two plurals are in free variation with each other. See table 4 (below).

Table 4
Examples of **pl^o* From Qumran²²

Masculine Plural	Reference	Feminine Plural	Reference
<i>pl^oym</i> (=p ^o lā ^o im)	4Q286 1ii6	<i>pl^owt</i> (=p ^o lā ^o ôt)	1QH ^a XII,29
<i>pl^o[y]m</i> (=p ^o lā ^o [i]m)	4Q286 1ii8	<i>[p]l^owt</i> (=p ^o lā ^o ôt)	4Q427 7ii12
<i>pl^o[y]m</i> (=p ^o lā ^o [i]m)	4Q392 1,7	<i>pl^o[wt]kh</i> (=pil ^o ôtê ^o kâ)	4Q491 8-10i12
<i>pl^oym</i> (=p ^o lā ^o im)	4Q405 17,2		
<i>pl^o[y]m</i> (=p ^o lā ^o [i]m)	4Q504 6,6		

Discussion. We won't understand the root **pl^o* well until we understand the examples in table 3. If all we look at are praise passages, we could come to the conclusion that **pl^o* is limited to what God does, that only God can do such things, and that therefore **pl^o* has to do almost, if not exclusively, with God. But taking only this much is one sided. When God's mighty acts are involved, **pl^o* has to do with people's reaction to them. When God's mighty acts are not involved, it has to do with their reaction to something else. The root **pl^o* describes a state of amazement; it does not tell us what caused it.

²² Martin G. Abegg, Jr., et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, vol. 1, The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran [Part Two]* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 611-12, passim.

Structural facts

Adjectival forms. In our data sample there are two adjectival forms built on *pl². We have *péliy* once in Judg 13:8 (פְּלִיָּי) and *pil²iygâ* פְּלִיאָה (but read *p²lîâ* פְּלִיאָה) in Ps 139:6. The one form (*péliy* Judg 13:8) is the name by which the Angel of the LORD introduces Himself to Samson's future parents to announce the child's birth. The other comes in a context we will see again ("Such knowledge is too wonderful for me, too lofty for me to attain" [Ps 139:6]).

Nominal forms. There are 13 examples of nominal forms in the sample. Among these, three have a possessive pronominal suffix (second person singular in each case) (see table 5) and five occur with a verb of doing (see table 6). The remaining five have no distinguishing feature that would set them apart either morphologically or syntactically.²³ Throughout the section I illustrate only forms of special interest. Other references appear in footnotes.

Table 5
Nominal Examples of *pl² With
Possessive Pronoun

Reference	Text
Psalm 77:11	I will remember the deeds of the LORD; yes, I will remember your miracles [<i>pil²ékā</i>] of long ago.
Psalm 88:12	Are your wonders [<i>pil²ékā</i>] known in the place of darkness, or your righteous deeds in the land of oblivion?
Psalm 89:5	The heavens praise your wonders [<i>pil²ékā</i>], O LORD, your faithfulness too, in the assembly of the holy ones.

Table 6
Nominal Examples of *pl² With
Verb of Doing

Reference	Text
Exodus 15:11	"Who among the gods is like you, O LORD? Who is like you-- majestic in holiness, awesome in glory, working wonders [<i>ōśēh péle²</i>]?"
Psalm 77:14	You are the God who performs miracles [<i>ōśēh péle²</i>]; you display your power among the peoples.
Psalm 78:12	He did miracles [<i>āśâ péle²</i>] in the sight of their fathers in the land of Egypt, in the region of Zoan.
Psalm 88:10	Do you show your wonders [<i>ta²ōśeh-péle²</i>] to the dead? Do those who are dead rise up and praise you? Selah
Isaiah 25:1	O LORD, you are my God; I will exalt you and praise your name, for in perfect faithfulness you have done marvelous things [<i>āśîtā péle²</i>], things planned long ago.

²³ Ps 119:129; Isa 9:6; 29:14; Lam 1:9; Dan 12:6.

Finite verbs. There are 13 examples of finite verbs built on *p^l. Three conjugations are represented: Hiphil (x4), Niphal (x8), and Hithpael (x1). All eight Niphal examples and the one Hithpael example occur with a prepositional phrase (see table 7). There is also one example (*nīplēytî*, Ps 139:14), a Niphal finite verb, where the final letter /^l/ does not appear, but which is clearly an example of *p^l.

Table 7
Verbal Examples of *p^l With Prepositional
Phrase (Niphal, Hithpael)

Reference	Text
Niphal	
Preposition <i>min</i> "From, Than"	
Genesis 18:14	"Is anything too hard for the LORD [<i>h^ayippālē^ʔ miYHWH</i>]? I will return to you at the appointed time next year and Sarah will have a son."
Deuteronomy 17:8	If cases come before your courts that are too difficult for you [<i>yippālē^ʔ mim^mkā</i>] to judge-- whether bloodshed, lawsuits or assaults-- take them to the place the LORD your God will choose.
Proverbs 30:18	"There are three things that are too amazing for me [<i>nīpl^ʔū mim^mēnnî</i>], four that I do not understand:"
Jeremiah 32:17	"Ah, Sovereign LORD, you have made the heavens and the earth by your great power and outstretched arm. Nothing is too hard for you [<i>yippālē^ʔ mim^mkā</i>].
Jeremiah 32:27	"I am the LORD, the God of all mankind. Is anything too hard for me [<i>h^amimmēnnî yippālē^ʔ</i>]?"
Preposition <i>b^e</i> "In"	
2 Samuel 13:2	Amnon became frustrated to the point of illness on account of his sister Tamar, for she was a virgin, and it seemed impossible for him [<i>wayyippālē^ʔ b^eēnē ʾammôn</i>] to do anything to her.
Zechariah 8:6 a,b	This is what the LORD Almighty says: "It may seem marvelous to the remnant of this people [<i>yippālē^ʔ b^eēnē š^ʕērîṯ hāʿām</i>] at that time, but will it seem marvelous to me [<i>gam-b^eēnay yippālē^ʔ</i>]?" declares the LORD Almighty.
Hithpael	
Preposition <i>b^e</i> "In"	
Job 10:16	If I hold my head high, you stalk me like a lion and again display your awesome power against me [<i>titpallā^ʔ-bî</i>].

Infinitives. In addition to the finite verbs listed above, there are four Hiphil infinitives (absolute x2, construct x2). See table 8.

Table 8
 Infinitive Examples of *pl³ (Hiphil)

Reference	Text
Absolute	
2 Chronicles 2:9	to provide me with plenty of lumber, because the temple I build must be large and magnificent [<i>w^haplē³</i>].
Isaiah 29:14b	Therefore once more I will astound these people with wonder [<i>haplē³</i>] upon wonder; the wisdom of the wise will perish, the intelligence of the intelligent will vanish."
Construct	
Isaiah 29:14a	Therefore once more I will astound [<i>l^haplî³</i>] these people with wonder upon wonder; the wisdom of the wise will perish, the intelligence of the intelligent will vanish."
Joel 2:26	You will have plenty to eat, until you are full, and you will praise the name of the LORD your God, who has worked wonders [<i>l^haplî³</i>] for you; never again will my people be shamed.

Participial forms. There are 50 examples of participial forms built on *pl³. Among these, three occur with a verb of doing, 22 have a possessive pronominal suffix, four occur with either *min* ("from, than") or *b^e-* ("in") forming a preposition phrase (table 10), and four occur with a verb of doing (table 11). In five cases we find both a verb of doing and a possessive pronoun (table 12). Fifteen examples have no distinguishing morphological or syntactic characteristic.²⁴ Virtually all participial forms are Niphal, feminine, and plural. These facts are summarized in table 13 (below).

²⁴ Exod 34:10; Josh 3:5; 2 Sam 1:26; Job 5:9; 9:10; 37:5; 37:14; 37:16; Ps 106:22; 119:18; 136:4; 139:14; Dan 8:24; 11:36; Mic 7:15.

Table 9
Participial Examples of **pl*^ʔ With
Possessive Pronoun

Reference	Text
Judg 6:13	"Where are all his wonders [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] that our fathers told us about when they said, 'Did not the LORD bring us up out of Egypt?'"
1 Chr 16:9	Sing to him, sing praise to him; tell of all his wonderful acts [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>].
1 Chr 16:12	Remember the wonders he has done, his miracles [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>], and the judgments he pronounced,
1 Chr 16:24	Declare his glory among the nations, his marvelous deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] among all peoples.
Ps 9:1	I will praise you, O LORD, with all my heart; I will tell of all your wonders [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 26:7	proclaiming aloud your praise and telling of all your wonderful deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 40:5	Many, O LORD my God, are the wonders you have done [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 71:17	Since my youth, O God, you have taught me, and to this day I declare your marvelous deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 75:1	We give thanks to you, O God, we give thanks, for your Name is near; men tell of your wonderful deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 78:11	They forgot what he had done, the wonders he had shown them [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 78:32	In spite of all this, they kept on sinning; in spite of his wonders [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>], they did not believe.
Ps 96:3	Declare his glory among the nations, his marvelous deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] among all peoples.
Ps 105:2	Sing to him, sing praise to him; tell of all his wonderful acts [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>].
Ps 106:7	When our fathers were in Egypt, they gave no thought to your miracles [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>]; they did not remember your many kindnesses, and they rebelled by the sea, the Red Sea.
Ps 107:8	Let them give thanks to the LORD for his unfailing love and his wonderful deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] for men,
Ps 107:15	Let them give thanks to the LORD for his unfailing love and his wonderful deeds for men [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>],
Ps 107:21	Let them give thanks to the LORD for his unfailing love and his wonderful deeds for men [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>].
Ps 107:24	They saw the works of the LORD, his wonderful deeds [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] in the deep.
Ps 107:31	Let them give thanks to the LORD for his unfailing love and his wonderful deeds for men [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>].
Ps 111:4	He has caused his wonders [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtāyṯw</i>] to be remembered; the LORD is gracious and compassionate.
Ps 119:27	Let me understand the teaching of your precepts; then I will meditate on your wonders [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].
Ps 145:5	They will speak of the glorious splendor of your majesty, and I will meditate on your wonderful works [<i>nīpl</i> ^ʔ <i>ōtēykā</i>].

Table 10
Participial Examples of *pl^ʔ With Prepositional
Phrase (Niphal)

Reference	Text
Deuteronomy 30:11	Now what I am commanding you today is not too difficult for you [<i>nīplēʔt</i>] or beyond your reach.
Job 42:3	<i>You asked, 'Who is this that obscures my counsel without knowledge?' Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me [<i>nīplāʔôṭ</i>] to know.</i>
Psalms 118:23	the LORD has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes [<i>nīplāʔt</i>].
Psalms 131:1	A song of ascents. Of David. My heart is not proud, O LORD, my eyes are not haughty; I do not concern myself with great matters or things too wonderful for me [<i>ûb^enīplāʔôṭ</i>].

Table 11
Participial Examples of *pl^ʔ With Verb
of Doing (Niphal, Hiphil)

Reference	Text
Niphal	
Psalms 72:18	Praise be to the LORD God, the God of Israel, who alone does marvelous deeds [<i>nīplāʔôṭ</i>].
Psalms 86:10	For you are great and do marvelous deeds [<i>nīplāʔôṭ</i>]; you alone are God.
Psalms 98:1	A psalm. Sing to the LORD a new song, for he has done marvelous things [<i>nīplāʔôṭ</i>]; his right hand and his holy arm have worked salvation for him.
Hiphil	
Judges 13:19	Then Manoah took a young goat, together with the grain offering, and sacrificed it on a rock to the LORD. And the LORD did an amazing thing [<i>ûmapl^ʔ la^aʕôṭ</i>] while Manoah and his wife watched:

Table 12
Participial Examples of *pl^ʔ With Both Possessive
Pronoun and Verb of Doing (Niphal)

Reference	Text
Exodus 3:20	So I will stretch out my hand and strike the Egyptians with all the wonders that I will perform [<i>nīpl^ʔôṭay</i>] among them. After that, he will let you go.
Nehemiah 9:17	They refused to listen and failed to remember the miracles you performed [<i>nīpl^ʔôṭéykā</i>] among them.
Psalms 78:4	We will not hide them from their children; we will tell the next generation the praiseworthy deeds of the LORD, his power, and the wonders he has done [<i>nīpl^ʔôṭāyw</i>].
Psalms 105:5	Remember the wonders he has done [<i>nīpl^ʔôṭāyw</i>], his miracles, and the judgments he pronounced,
Jeremiah 21:2	"Inquire now of the LORD for us because Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon is attacking us. Perhaps the LORD will perform wonders [<i>nīpl^ʔôṭāyw</i>] for us as in times past so that he will withdraw from us."

We now summarize the above numbers. In regard to participial forms notice that five forms have characteristics from two columns. To keep the total correct I have broken out these five forms, which do not sum horizontally, from the rest of the participial examples, which do. See table 13.

Table 13
Summary

Formal Category		Possessive Pronoun	Prepositional Phrase	Verb of Doing	Other	Total
Adjectives					2	2
Nouns		3		5	5	13
Finite verbs			9		4	13
Infinitives					4	4
Participles	One	22	4	4	15	45
	Both	5		5		5

Discussion. Adjectival forms hold no special interest here. Nominal forms appear with possessive pronouns and verbs of doing, but not with prepositional phrases. Verbal forms appear with prepositional phrases. Participial forms exhibit all three behaviors.

Another approach

There is another way to approach the data. Instead of asking what morphological or syntactic properties each form has, we could ask who performs the action and what results follow from it.

In many cases terms such as or "marvelous," or "wonderful deeds," or "wonders," or whatever, are used in a broadly general way, without any indication of what the writer has in mind, e.g., "proclaiming aloud your praise and telling of all your wonderful deeds [*nīpl^oôtêkā*]" (Ps 26:7). Which wonderful deeds? The writer does not tell us. In such cases I grant the benefit of any doubt and assume that the intent is inherently positive, rather than being good for Israel only in the sense that it is bad for some other nation. In such cases God is the source of the action (or state of affairs) 59 times²⁵ – almost three quarters of the sample.

In five cases an attribute of God, or something He has ordained, causes amazement or goes beyond human understanding. See table 14 (below).

²⁵ See Exod 3:2; 15:11; 34:1; Deut 28:59; Josh 3:5; Judg 6:13; 13:19; 1 Chr 16:9, 12, 24; 2 Chr 2:9; 26:15; Neh 9:17; Job 1:16; 5:9; 9:1; 15:2, 5; 16:7, 22; 17:8, 15, 21, 24, 31; 37:5, 14, 16; Ps 4:5; 9:1; 26:7; 71:17; 72:18; 75:1; 77:11, 14; 78:4, 11, 12, 32; 86:1; 88:1, 12; 89:5; 96:3; 98:1; 111:4; 119:18, 27; 136:4; 145:5; Isa 9:6; Isa 25:1; 29:14a, 14b, 14c; Jer 21:2; Joel 2:26; Mic 7:15.

Table 14
Examples of an Attribute of God
Causing Amazement

Reference	Subject	Text
Judg 13:18	Name	He replied, "Why do you ask my name? It is beyond understanding [<i>pēlîʾy</i>]."
Ps 31:21	Love	Praise be to the LORD, for he showed his wonderful [<i>hiplîʾ</i>] love to me when I was in a besieged city.
Ps 119:129	Statutes	Your statutes are wonderful [<i>pēlîʾāʾōt</i>]; therefore I obey them.
Ps 139:6	Knowledge	Such knowledge is too wonderful for me [<i>pilʾīyyâ</i>], too lofty for me to attain.
Isa 28:29	Counsel	All this also comes from the LORD Almighty, wonderful [<i>hiplîʾ</i>] in counsel and magnificent in wisdom.

In 15 cases a "thing" of some sort (not God, not an attribute of God, not human activity) causes amazement. I list these in table 15 (below). In this table, please note that the examples are categorized by object, not subject. The subject in each case is the "thing" that influences the object, of whatever sort.

Table 15
Examples of Something Inanimate
Causing Amazement

Reference	Text
God as Grammatical Object	
Gen 18:14	Is anything too hard for the LORD [<i>h^ayippālē</i>]? I will return to you at the appointed time next year and Sarah will have a son."
Jer 32:17	"Ah, Sovereign LORD, you have made the heavens and the earth by your great power and outstretched arm. Nothing is too hard for you [<i>yippālē</i>]."
Jer 32:27	"I am the LORD, the God of all mankind. Is anything too hard for me [<i>yippālē</i>]?"
Zech 8:6b	This is what the LORD Almighty says: "It may seem marvelous to the remnant of this people at that time, but will it seem marvelous to me [<i>yippālē</i>]?" declares the LORD Almighty.
Human Beings as Grammatical Object	
Deut 17:8	If cases come before your courts that are too difficult for you [<i>yippālē</i>] to judge-- whether bloodshed, lawsuits or assaults-- take them to the place the LORD your God will choose.
Deut 30:11	Now what I am commanding you today is not too difficult for you [<i>nīplēt</i>] or beyond your reach.
2 Sam 13:2	Amnon became frustrated to the point of illness on account of his sister Tamar, for she was a virgin, and it seemed impossible for him [<i>wayyippālē</i>] to do anything to her.
Job 42:3	<i>You asked, 'Who is this that obscures my counsel without knowledge?' Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful [<i>nīplāḏt</i>] for me to know.</i>
Ps 131:1	My heart is not proud, O LORD, my eyes are not haughty; I do not concern myself with great matters or things too wonderful [<i>ûb^cnīplāḏt</i>] for me.
Prov 30:18	"There are three things that are too amazing [<i>nīpl^oû</i>] for me, four that I do not understand:"
Zech 8:6a	This is what the LORD Almighty says: "It may seem marvelous to the remnant of this people [<i>yippālē</i>] at that time, but will it seem marvelous to me?" declares the LORD Almighty.
Other Object	
2 Sam 1:26	I grieve for you, Jonathan my brother; you were very dear to me. Your love for me was wonderful, more wonderful than [<i>nīpl^oâtâ</i>] that of women.
2 Chr 2:9	to provide me with plenty of lumber, because the temple I build must be large and magnificent [<i>w^haplē</i>].
Ps 118:23	the LORD has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes [<i>nīplāt</i>].
Ps 139:14	I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; your works are wonderful [<i>nīplāḏm</i>], I know that full well.

Above I mention 59 examples where God is active and say that in each case, even if the exact nature of His activity is unspecified, I grant the benefit of any doubt and assume that the context is positive.

There are two other groups of examples to notice. In the remaining twelve examples something destructive causes amazement. God is responsible for the destruction nine times and human beings are responsible three times. See tables 16 and 17 (below).

Table 16
Examples Where God Is Active and the
Effect Is Destructive

Reference	Text
Exodus 3:20	So I will stretch out my hand and strike the Egyptians with all the wonders [nīpl ^o ōtay] that I will perform among them. After that, he will let you go.
Exodus 34:10	Then the LORD said: "I am making a covenant with you. Before all your people I will do wonders [nīplā ^o ōt] never before done in any nation in all the world. The people you live among will see how awesome is the work that I, the LORD, will do for you.
Deut 28:59	the LORD will send fearful [w ^o hiplā ^o] plagues on you and your descendants, harsh and prolonged disasters, and severe and lingering illnesses.
Judges 6:13	"But sir," Gideon replied, "if the LORD is with us, why has all this happened to us? Where are all his wonders [nīpl ^o ōtāyw] that our fathers told us about when they said, 'Did not the LORD bring us up out of Egypt?' But now the LORD has abandoned us and put us into the hand of Midian."
Job 10:16	If I hold my head high, you stalk me like a lion and again display your awesome [titpallā ^o] power against me.
Psalms 78:12	He did miracles [pēle ^o] in the sight of their fathers in the land of Egypt, in the region of Zoan.
Psalms 106:22	miracles in the land of Ham and awesome deeds [nīplā ^o ōt] by the Red Sea.
Jeremiah 21:2	"Inquire now of the LORD for us because Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon is attacking us. Perhaps the LORD will perform wonders [nīpl ^o ōtāyw] for us as in times past so that he will withdraw from us."
Micah 7:15	"As in the days when you came out of Egypt, I will show them my wonders [nīplā ^o ōt]."

Table 17
Examples Where Human Beings Are Active and the
Effect Is Destructive

Reference	Text
Lam 1:9	Her filthiness clung to her skirts; she did not consider her future. Her fall was astounding [p ^o lā ^o īm]; there was none to comfort her. "Look, O LORD, on my affliction, for the enemy has triumphed."
Dan 8:24	He will become very strong, but not by his own power. He will cause astounding [w ^o nīplā ^o ōt] devastation and will succeed in whatever he does. He will destroy the mighty men and the holy people.
Dan 11:36	"The king will do as he pleases. He will exalt and magnify himself above every god and will say unheard-of things [nīplā ^o ōt] against the God of gods. He will be successful until the time of wrath is completed, for what has been determined must take place."

Of the 59 examples where God is active, 50 (84.7%) are positive and 9 (15.3%) negative. Of the three examples where human beings are active, all are negative. This is about the same as the ratio we get when comparing all 82 examples in the sample against the 12 that must be assigned negative meaning (85.4% as compared to 14.6%). Thus, about one example in every seven is destructive, harmful, blasphemous, negative. This fact puts Daniel's negative usage in 8:24 and 11:36 in perspective.

The argument from Greek translation equivalents

One could argue that *nīplāʾôt* in Dan 11:36 has to be different from *happēlāʾôt* in Dan 12:6 because Theodosian translates the two terms with different Greek equivalents (*huperogka* and *thaumastiōn* respectively). This is a strong argument, but why should we leave Dan 8:24 out of the comparison? Dan 8:24 and 11:36 use the same Hebrew word ($[w^e]nīplāʾôt$), so it should be of interest to see how both of them compare with *happēlāʾôt* in Dan 12:6, rather than just one of them. See table 18.

Table 18
Hebrew and Greek Correspondences
in Three Passages

	Dan 8:24	Dan 11:36	Dan 12:6
Hebrew	w ^e nīplāʾôt	nīplāʾôt	happēlāʾôt
Greek (Th)	thaumasta	huperogka	thaumastiōn

Notice that whereas Dan 8:24 and 11:36 have equivalent Hebrew terms, Dan 8:24 and 12:6 have equivalent Greek terms. If the Hebrew terms used in columns 1 and 2 are equivalent and the Greek terms used in columns 1 and 3 are equivalent, we will want to keep these facts in mind when we return below to consider the relationship between columns 2 and 3.

What Does *l^emôʿēd* Mean?

Notice the question is not what does *l^e-* mean? One writer²⁶ points out that *l^e-* can mean "after," and yes, it can have that meaning. Not in any context that has a bearing on what we're talking about here, but yes, it can mean "after" in other, unrelated, contexts. For example, during creation week God made sea creatures "after their kind [*l^emînēhem*]" (Gen 1:21, KJV). It would be legitimate to pursue the meaning of *l^e-* by itself if in the text there were an example in the text of *l^e-* by itself. But there isn't. So examining *l^e-* in isolation from any meaningful context relating to Dan 12:7 takes us nowhere. What we do find in the passage is *l^emôʿēd*, where the two elements *l^e-* and *môʿēd* occur together, so the real question is, What does *l^emôʿēd* mean? There are 18 examples in the Old Testament. See table 19.

²⁶ Samuel Núñez, *Las profecías apocalípticas de Daniel* [The Apocalyptic Prophecies of Daniel] (Mexico, DF: Samuel Núñez, 2005), pp. 169-70.

Table 19
Typical Examples of Hebrew *l^emô^cēd* / *lammô^cēd*

Reference	Text
Genesis 17:21	But my covenant I will establish with Isaac, whom Sarah will bear to you by this time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] next year."
Genesis 18:14	Is anything too hard for the LORD? I will return to you at the appointed time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] next year and Sarah will have a son."
Genesis 21:2	Sarah became pregnant and bore a son to Abraham in his old age, at the very time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] God had promised him.
Exodus 23:15	" Do this at the appointed time [<i>l^emô^cēd</i>] in the month of Abib, for in that month you came out of Egypt. No one is to appear before me empty-handed.
Exodus 34:18	" Do this at the appointed time [<i>l^emô^cēd</i>] in the month of Abib, for in that month you came out of Egypt.""
1 Samuel 9:24	So the cook took up the leg with what was on it and set it in front of Saul. Samuel said, "Here is what has been kept for you. Eat, because it was set aside for you for this occasion [<i>lammô^cēd</i>], from the time I said, 'I have invited guests.'" And Saul dined with Samuel that day.
1 Samuel 13:8	He waited seven days, the time set [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] by Samuel; but Samuel did not come to Gilgal, and Saul's men began to scatter.
1 Samuel 13:11	"What have you done?" asked Samuel. Saul replied, "When I saw that the men were scattering, and that you did not come at the set time [<i>l^emô^cēd</i>], and that the Philistines were assembling at Micmash,
2 Kings 4:16	" About this time next year [<i>lammô^cēd</i>]," Elisha said, "you will hold a son in your arms."
2 Kings 4:17	But the woman became pregnant, and the next year about that same time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] she gave birth to a son, just as Elisha had told her.
Daniel 8:19	He said: "I am going to tell you what will happen later in the time of wrath, because the vision concerns the appointed time [<i>l^emô^cēd</i>] of the end.
Daniel 11:27	The two kings, with their hearts bent on evil, will sit at the same table and lie to each other, but to no avail, because an end will still come at the appointed time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>].
Daniel 11:29	" At the appointed time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] he will invade the South again, but this time the outcome will be different from what it was before.
Daniel 11:35	Some of the wise will stumble, so that they may be refined, purified and made spotless until the time of the end, for it will still come at the appointed time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>].
Habakkuk 2:3	For the revelation awaits an appointed time [<i>lammô^cēd</i>]; it speaks of the end and will not prove false. Though it linger, wait for it; it will certainly come and will not delay.

There are three passages not included in table 19. In Josh 8:14 *l^emô^cēd* refers to an appointed place, rather than an appointed time. In 1 Sam 20:35 it refers to a preplanned meeting between Jonathan and David – not a time, or a place, but the meeting itself. See table 20 (below). The third passage is Dan 12:7.

Table 20
Unusual Examples of Hebrew *l^emô^cēd* / *lammô^cēd*

Reference	Text
Joshua 8:14	When the king of Ai saw this, he and all the men of the city hurried out early in the morning to meet Israel in battle at a certain place [<i>lammô^cēd</i>] overlooking the Arabah. But he did not know that an ambush had been set against him behind the city.
1 Samuel 20:35	In the morning Jonathan went out to the field for his meeting [<i>l^emô^cēd</i>] with David. He had a small boy with him,

In most of the examples in table 19 (above) *l^emô^cēd* (or *lammô^cēd*) means "at the appointed time," or such, where *l^e-* (or *l^e + ha[C]-*) has the meaning "at" (or "at the"). The reason why this is appropriate is that the context deals with an event at a moment in time rather than a period of time. To the extent this is so, the contexts shown in table 19 (above) are not comparable to what we find in Dan 12:7. In Daniel, once again, the situation is almost unique.

In Gen 17:21; 18:14; 21:2; 2 Kgs 4:16, 17, for example, the reference is to the moment of birth. The time period of Dan 12:7 is not a momentary event because a "time, times and half a time" occupies much more than a moment. In Exod 23:15 and 34:18 it is to a recurring event. The time period of Dan 12:7 is not a recurring event. In 1 Sam 9:24 the reference is to a special event that would never be repeated, so here we're coming closer.

Consider 1 Sam 13:8. Here the focus is on the end of a period of time, so if there is an ending point there must be an expanse of time leading up to the ending point. One can't have the one without the other. The predicate here is "waited" (*wayyô^hhel*, read *wayyô^hhel*). Saul waited the first day, then waited the second day, . . . , then waited the seventh day, and Samuel did not come. The time appointed time, it is true, was not the days during which Saul waited, but the end of the period of waiting. So we could say that he waited "until" the seven days had run their course. Could we also say that he waited "after" the seven days had run their course? The waiting was before or up to, not after.

In Hab 2:3 also there is waiting, so this also is close to what we find in Dan 12:7, but there is no time period. When does the waiting occur? Is it up to (until, before) the appointed time, or after the appointed time? Is there a difference between these two ideas? I submit that "before" is not the same as "after." If I say more now I'll be accused of interpreting prematurely, but hold the thought. We'll come back to it.

What Does *ûk^ekallôt* Mean?

The word *kallôt* occurs some 40 times in the Old Testament, but it will be more interesting to focus on those examples with prefixed *k^e-*, because that is what we have in the text before us. The word *k^ekallôt* occurs four times in the Old Testament with prefixed *û-* ("and") and eight times without *û-*. Again, the presence or absence of "and" is not a difference. Structurally the word in question is a Piel infinitive construct. Examples of (*û*)*k^ekallôt* are of two kinds.

Table 21
Temporal Clause Governed by an Infinitive Construct
Used as a Verb

Reference	Text
Deut 31:24	After Moses finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] writing in a book the words of this law from beginning to end,
Josh 8:24	When Israel had finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] killing all the men of Ai in the fields and in the desert where they had chased them, and when every one of them had been put to the sword, all the Israelites returned to Ai and killed those who were in it.
Josh 10:20	So Joshua and the Israelites destroyed them completely [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] -- almost to a man-- but the few who were left reached their fortified cities. (NIV) And it happened that when Joshua and the Israelites finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] striking them , . . .
1 Sam 24:16	When David finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] saying this, Saul asked, "Is that your voice, David my son?" And he wept aloud.
1 Kgs 8:54	When Solomon had finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] all these prayers and supplications to the LORD, he rose from before the altar of the LORD, where he had been kneeling with his hands spread out toward heaven. (NIV) And it happened that when Solomon finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] praying to the LORD (literal gloss)
1 Kgs 9:1	When Solomon had finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] building the temple of the LORD and the royal palace, and had achieved all he had desired to do,
2 Chr 7:1	When Solomon finished [<i>ûk^ekallôôt</i>] praying , fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices, and the glory of the LORD filled the temple.
2 Chr 29:29	When the offerings were finished [<i>ûk^ekallôôt</i>], the king and everyone present with him knelt down and worshiped. (NIV) When [the king and everyone present] finished [<i>ûk^ekallôôt</i>] offering , the king and everyone present with him knelt down and worshiped. (literal gloss)
Jer 26:8	But as soon as Jeremiah finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] telling all the people everything the LORD had commanded him to say, the priests, the prophets and all the people seized him and said, "You must die!"
Jer 43:1	When Jeremiah finished [<i>k^ekallôôt</i>] telling the people all the words of the LORD their God-- everything the LORD had sent him to tell them--

Table 22
Temporal Clause Governed by a Noun

Reference	Text
2 Chr 31:1	When all this had ended [<i>ûk^ekallôôt</i>], the Israelites who were there went out to the towns of Judah, smashed the sacred stones and cut down the Asherah poles. . . .
Ezra 9:1	After these things had been done [<i>ûk^ekallôôt</i>], the leaders came to me and said,

In addition to the examples shown above, there are two others we must mention. One is Ps 71:9 ("Do not cast me away when I am old; do not forsake me when my strength is gone [*kiklôt*"]), where the infinitive construct is Qal rather than Piel, and the other is Dan 12:7. The reader will notice that the syntax of Dan 12:7 does not fit either of these patterns. Commentators confess that the Hebrew of the present clause (*ûk^ckallôt nappēš yad ʿam qôdeš*) is difficult.²⁷ It appears to be unique.

What Does *nappēš* Mean?

The core meaning of *nappēš* and other members of its word group is to break. But Hebrew has a rich inventory of words for breaking. Transitivity one can break something down (**dwsš, *hlm, *hrs, *nts, *rp, *rwsš, *šbr*), in pieces (**dk^c, *ktt, *pwsš, *r^c, *šbr*), off (**prq*), up (**nyr, *prš, *šbr*). Intransitively one can break forth (**bq^c, *gwh/*gyh, *psh, *prh, *prš, *pth*), in (**prš*), into (**bq^c*), out (**bq^c, *yš[?], *nts, *šlh*), through (**bq^c, *hrs, *prš*). Metaphorically one can break in the sense of violating an agreement or covenant (**prr*). And there are other shades of meaning, all clustering around the idea of breaking.²⁸ The root we are concerned with here is **npš*. So what idea does this root convey? The only way to know is to examine the various places where it is used. With two exceptions, tables 23 and 24 together offer a complete list.

²⁷ James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927), p. 475.

²⁸ Source*****

Table 23
Examples Where **npš* Refers to a Result

Reference	Question
Scattering (Spreading Things Out)	
Gen 9:19	[F]rom them came the people who were scattered [<i>nāpšâ</i>] over the earth.
1 Sam 13:11	Saul replied, "When I saw that the men were scattering [<i>nāpaš</i>], and that you did not come at the set time, . . ."
1 Kgs 5:9	There I will separate [<i>w^enippaštîm</i>] them [cedar logs] and you can take them away.
Isa 11:12	[H]e will assemble the scattered [<i>ûn^epûšôt</i>] people of Judah from the four quarters of the earth.
Isa 33:3	At the thunder of your voice, the peoples flee; when you rise up, the nations scatter [<i>nāpšû</i>].
Jer 22:28	Is this man Jehoiachin a despised, broken [<i>nāpûš</i>] pot, an object no one wants?
Shattering (Breaking Things Up)	
Judg 7:19	They blew their trumpets and broke [<i>w^enāpôš</i>] the jars that were in their hands.
Ps 2:9	"You will rule them with an iron scepter; you will dash them to pieces [<i>t^enapp^ešēm</i>] like pottery."
Ps 137:9	[H]e who seizes your infants and dashes [<i>w^enippēš</i>] them against the rocks.
Isa 27:9	When he makes all the altar stones to be like chalk stones crushed to pieces [<i>m^enūpaššôt</i>], no Asherah poles or incense altars will be left standing.
Jer 13:14	I will smash them [<i>w^enippaštîm</i>] one against the other, fathers and sons alike, declares the LORD.
Jer 48:12	But days are coming," declares the LORD, "when I will send men who pour from jars, and they will pour her out; they will empty her jars and smash [<i>y^enappēšû</i>] her jugs.

Table 24
Examples Where **npš* Refers to a Process

Reference	Question
Jer 51:20	"You are my war club, my weapon for battle-- with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] nations, with you I destroy kingdoms, . . ."
Jer 51:21	"with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] horse and rider, with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] chariot and driver, . . ."
Jer 51:22	with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] man and woman, with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] old man and youth, with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] young man and maiden
Jer 51:23	"with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] shepherd and flock, with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] farmer and oxen, with you I shatter [<i>w^enippāštî</i>] governors and officials."

In the examples from table 22 (above) the Jewish TNK translation renders **npš* as "clubbed," which with regard to living things makes more sense than NIV's "shattered." This choice of words shows a unique sensitivity to Hebrew usage, which is typical for TNK. It is an excellent translation.

In addition to the verses shown in tables 21 and 22, I mentioned that there are two others. One is Isa 30:30 ("with raging anger and consuming fire, with cloudburst, thunderstorm and hail"), where the noun *népeš* (from **npš*) refers to a cloudburst. This probably has more to do with scattering (raindrops) than with shattering (storm clouds). The other verse is Dan 12:7.²⁹

Other Key Terms

I argue above that (*w^cnīplāʔôt* (Dan 8:24; 11:36) and *happ^llāʔôt* (Dan 12:6) are closely related words with no linguistic basis for a sharp distinction between them. They do not mean fundamentally different things. If this point is correct, it brings Dan 8:24; 11:36; and 12:6 together for comparison, which makes sense because all three represent the same writer's usage and in one case the same narrative as the target term. I also point out that *āḏ-mātay* in Dan 8:13 and *āḏ-mātay* in 12:6 are identical and that the contexts in which they appear are similar. Both cases deal with a relatively long prophetic time period (2300 days, 1260 days). These facts bring Dan 8:13 and 12:6 together for comparison. Would it be possible to draw other verbal connections between the target passage and passages elsewhere in Daniel? And as we do this, do any broad patterns emerge that would contribute to our understanding of Dan 12:6-7?

If a handful of isolated terms in and outside of Dan 12:6-7 are not enough to be convincing, let us broaden our scope. Among those who wish to see Dan 12:6-7 as a positive statement about God's marvelous deliverances in the end time, there is a difference of opinion about how to group the verses. One writer suggests taking Dan 11:40-12:3 as a single bloc of text, to which we could add vs. 4 as an epilogue (thus Dan 11:40-12:4).³⁰ Another writer suggests beginning the section at Dan 11:36 (thus Dan 11:36-12:4).³¹ If Dan 11:40-12:4 are a textual unit, then Dan 11:29-39 and 12:5-13 are not part of it and may be considered separate

²⁹ At this point one can't help thinking of Desmond Ford's historic blunder of deriving *nappēš* in Dan 12:7 from the wrong word: "What has not been noticed is the fact that the root term here for 'breakers,' 'the men of violence,' or 'robbers' is found again in 12:7 where the 'shattering of the power of the holy people' is once more mentioned" (*Dny^l*, p. 256). But of course the terms **prš* ("break through," 11:14) and **npš* ("break apart," 12:7) are not in any way related. This, in turn, calls to mind Kenneth Cox's published interpretation: "When the power of the holy people has been completely shattered' (12:7), refers to the time of the latter rain. . . . The word shattered in Hebrew is the word 'Narphats' [sic] which means to disperse. In other words the power of the holy people as witnesses will be poured out like rain during the ' . . . Time of the End' (12:4)" (*Daniel: A Closer Look at the Book that Tells What will Happen in the End Times* [Coldwater, MI: Remnant Publications, 2005], p. 147). Ford gets the wrong root, Cox gets the wrong meaning.

³⁰ Carlos Capote, "Las maravillas de Daniel 12:6," unpublished manuscript.

³¹ "The course of this last world kingdom is presented in two specific eras of history: 'before the time of the end' (11:21-35) and during the 'time of the end' (11:36-45). In this last era the great Prince of the kingdom of God appears; i.e., Michael (12:1-3)" (Núñez, *Profecías apocalípticas*), p. 151. Thus, 11:36-12:3.

blocs of text in their own right. We return to the matter of the relationship between 11:29-35 and 11:36-39 below.

Is it possible to establish a larger context in which the smaller contexts of 11:36 and 12:6 are shown to be related? I think it is. How would we go about doing this? By mapping the connections between related words, where by related I mean cognate. Dan 11:31, 32, 33, 35 and 12:9, 10, 11 have a number of such word pairs in common, unlike Dan 11:40-12:4 and 12:5-13, which do not. Notice carefully, we have still not reached the point of interpretation. It is not a matter of interpretation that nine pairs of words link Dan 11:29-35 to 12:5-13. That is simply a fact about the text. We are still assembling materials for later use.

Hebrew *ûmaškilê ʿam* and Three Other Terms

The word *maškilîm* occurs in Dan 11:33 and also 35. It and the three terms that accompany it in 11:31-33 are repeated in Dan 12:10-11. These terms are *hattāmîd*, *haššiqqûš mʿšômēm*, and *ûmaršîʿê bʿrît*. See table 25 below.

Table 25
Four Hebrew Terms

Dan 11:31-33		Dan 12:10-11	
11:31	w ^e hēsîrû hattāmîd	ûmē ^c et hûsar hattāmîd	12:11
11:31	w ^e natt ^e nû haššiqqûš mʿšômēm	w ^e lâtēt šiqqûš šômēm	12:11
11:32	ûmaršîʿê bʿrît yaḥ ^a nîp baḥ ^a laqqôt	w ^e lô ^a yābînû kol-r ^e šāʿîm	12:10
11:33	ûmaškilê ʿam yābînû lārabbîm	w ^e hammaškilîm yābînû	12:10

The *tāmîd* and the *šiqqûš* (11:31; 12:11) are opposite counterparts of each other. For the one to rise, the other must fall. The one-sided competition between them is mentioned in Dan 8:9-12, where the hostile power is called the "little horn" rather than the "king of the North." In any event, in Daniel's final prophecy the "wicked" (*ûmaršîʿê bʿrît*, *kol-r^ešāʿîm*) are associated with the "abomination" (*haššiqqûš mʿšômēm*, *šiqqûš šômēm*), while the "wise" (*ûmaškilê ʿam*, *w^ehammaškilîm*) are associated with the "covenant" (*bʿrît*), and therefore the *tāmîd*. These thematic relationships are summarized in table 26 below.

Table 26
Some Relationships

Evil		Good	
11:31	hattāmîd haššiqqûš m ^e šômēm	hattāmîd šiqqûš šômēm	12:11
11:32 11:33	ûmaršî'ê b ^e rît ûmaškîlê 'ām	kol-r ^e šā'im w ^e hammaškîlîm	12:10

There is one more term that we could mention along with the others, i.e., "understand" (*yābînû*). This term appears in both sets of passages, but in only one complete word pair. See table 27 below.

Table 27
Understanding

Don't Understand		Do Understand	
11:32 12:10	... w ^e lō' yābînû kol-r ^e šā'im	ûmaškîlê 'ām yābînû lārabbîm w ^e hammaškîlîm yābînû	11:33 12:10

Notice that *hattāmîd* in 12:11 is identical to *hattāmîd* in 11:31; *šiqqûš šômēm* is the same as *haššiqqûš m^ešômēm*; and *kol-r^ešā'im* in 12:10 is the same as *ûmaršî'ê b^erît* in 11:32. Actually *yābînû* in 12:10 is not identical to *yābînû* in 11:33, since the one is Hiphil and the other Qal, but having identical form the two are surely comparable. Textual relationships such as these cry out to be, not only noticed, but embraced. Their implications must be allowed to shape and nourish our exegesis.

Hebrew *w^ehammaškîlîm* and Four Other Terms

I point out above that *w^ehammaškîlîm* in Dan 12:10 refers back to *ûmaškîlê 'ām* in Dan 11:33. The same term occurs again in Dan 11:35. Five terms from Dan 11:35 are repeated in Dan 12:9-10, one of which is *maškîlîm*. The other four are *lišrôp*, *ûl^ebārêr*, *w^elalbên*, and *'ad 'et qêš*. See table 28.

Table 28
Five Parallel Terms

Dan 11:35			Dan 12:9-10		
vs. 35	ûmin hammaškîlîm	A			
			E	ʿad ʿet qēš	vs. 9
vs. 35	lišrôp bâhem	B			
vs. 35	ûl ^e bārēr	C	C	yitbār ^a rû	vs. 10
vs. 35	w ^e lalbēn	D	D	yitlabb ^e nû	vs. 10
			B	w ^e yişšār ^e pû	vs. 10
vs. 35	ʿad ʿet qēš	E			
			A	w ^e hammaškîlîm	vs. 10

Notice that, when repeated in chap. 12, the sequence is almost perfectly reversed. Only one word prevents this from being an ABCDE:EDCBA chiasm, which would have to set some sort of record for sophistication in the use of this literary device. The one word is *yitlabb^enû* (or *yitbār^arû* if you like). These words are reversed in Dan 12:10 from chiasmic sequence to match, rather than mirror, the sequence of terms in Dan 11:35. So the end result is ABCDE:ECDBA. Even the reversal of D and C (to C and D) in vs. 10, however, is done in such a way as to strengthen the connection with the earlier passage (both exhibit the order C D). So there is ample evidence here to show that the five terms in 11:35 belong together with all five of the corresponding terms in 12:9-10. This really is what the angel intended to point back to. There is no mistake here, no point of private interpretation.

Some of the wise [*ûmin hammaškîlîm*] will stumble, so that they may be refined [*lišrôp bâhem*], purified [*ûl^ebārēr*] and made spotless [*w^elalbēn*] until the time of the end [*ʿad ʿet qēš*], for it will still come at the appointed time. (Dan 11:35)

He replied, 'Go your way, Daniel, because the words are closed up and sealed until the time of the end [*ʿad ʿet qēš*]. Many will be purified [*yitbār^arû*], made spotless [*yitlabb^enû*] and refined [*w^eyişšār^epû*], but the wicked will continue to be wicked. None of the wicked will understand, but those who are wise [*w^ehammaškîlîm*] will understand. (Dan 12:9-10)

Daniel 12

Verse 6

Hebrew *ʿad-mātay*

Parallel passages. Outside of Daniel *ʿad-mātay* is normally more than just a request for information. Twenty-five times in the Old Testament it expresses a wish for something to stop. Only once is it neutral. It is never positive, i.e., it is never used to inquire when a time of blessing or benefit would end. Nor is it ever used to mean "after." What we have in the text is *ʿad-mātay*, not *ʿah^arê mātay ʿod*.

Daniel. The expression *‘ad-māṭay* appears in Dan 8:13 in a mixed context. Only the second part of the question, which refers to the "daily," can be considered good, but *‘ad-māṭay* does not apply only to the second part of the question. It applies to the whole thing, which comprises three main terms. Here, and in many passages outside Daniel, *‘ad-māṭay* implies a wish that bad things would stop. It is not merely a request for information. Thus, when we come to Dan 12:6, where the same expression is used, there is every expectation that the meaning is the same. It is certainly not an expression of approval asking how long the wonderful blessing of deliverance will last, as the futurist interpretation would require. For that type of interpretation there is no precedent anywhere in Scripture.

Hebrew *happ^lāṭot*

Parallel passages outside Daniel. We have seen that the exact form *happ^lāṭot* is unique in the Old Testament. One reason for this is that it is the only form in the sample with a prefixed definite article. The two examples that come closest to *happ^lāṭot* are *p^lāṭot* (feminine plural, no article, Ps 119:129) where the meaning is positive, and *p^lāṭim* (masculine plural, no article, Lam 1:9) where it is negative.

In regard to Lam 1:9, we must hold Babylon responsible for what it did to Jerusalem on this occasion, because in many passages God holds Babylon responsible. Some verses give the impression that God Himself caused the fall of Jerusalem (Lam 1:5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22; 2:1). This is a strong, but God is often represented as causing what He allows. By allowing Babylon to do what it did, there is a sense in which it is true that He is ultimately responsible. And yet there are two powers in the world. That is why we speak of a great controversy. Did Satan recuse himself from these events and take no active interest in the destruction the Babylonians were causing? That is unlikely.

The only way Satan can attack God is by attacking His followers. So despite any figures of speech to the contrary, I see the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC as an attempt on Satan's part to do as much harm to God's people as God would allow. He was working alone, but through people. Which ones? In this case it was the Babylonians. There is a sequel during the time of Persia when Haman tried to destroy the Jews. Under Greece we have an attempt to obliterate the Jewish religion during the time of Maccabees. Secular Rome mounted persecutions, starting with Nero and continuing in a desultory fashion down to the time of Diocletian. Religious Rome had inquisitions. There is a pattern here and the destruction of Jerusalem is only one part of it. God does not build up and tear down capriciously. His house is not divided against itself. If it were, it could not stand (see Matt 12:25; Mark 3:24-25; Luke 11:17). Instead we are forced to say, "An enemy did this" (Matt 13:28).

In 605, 597, and 586 BC God badly wanted to defend and protect His people, but could not because of their sins (see Matt 23:37; Luke 13:34). So Satan was allowed to use the Babylonians to accomplish his purposes, and they caused astounding devastation. This was one of Satan's more spectacular successes in his ongoing warfare against God. The passage itself says so: "Look, O LORD, on my affliction, for the enemy has triumphed."³²

³² "Enemy" could be understood to mean Babylon, but even in Jeremiah's day the meaning would have to be limited in this way.

So *p^lāʾim* in Lam 1:9 is not a debatable form. It clearly illustrates that human beings, aided by Satan, can cause devastation that is astounding in the sense of **pl^ʔ* and this fact places it in the same category as the deeds of the little horn in Dan 8:24 and the words of the king of the North in Dan 11:36. The passages which say God caused the destruction of Jerusalem will be easier to interpret metaphorically than those where He vows to punish the Babylonians for doing so.

Syntactic behavior. Earlier I pointed out that the various forms of **pl^ʔ* sometimes participate in morphological or syntactic relationships that set them apart. Nominal forms appear with possessive pronouns and verbs of doing, verbal forms appear in prepositional phrases, and participial forms exhibit all three behaviors. This is interesting in its own right, but there is more. Notice the proportions in which these behaviors occur. Below I repeat table 13 for the reader's convenience.

Table 13
Summary of Structural Facts (Repeated)

Formal Category		Possessive Pronoun	Prepositional Phrase	Verb of Doing	Other	Total
Adjectives					2	2
Nouns		3		5	5	13
Finite verbs			9		4	13
Infinitives					4	4
Participles	One	22	4	4	15	45
	Both	5		5		5

The information I'm trying to bring out will appear more readily if we now reorder the rows and columns of table 13. In table 29 (below) I bring the "Nouns" row down just above the "Participles" row and move the "Verb of Doing" column just left of the "Prepositional Phrase" column.

Table 29
Summary of Structural Facts (Rearranged)

Formal Category		Noun-Like		Verb-Like	Other	Total
		Possessive Pronoun	Verb of Doing	Prepositional Phrase		
Adjectives					2	2
Finite verbs				9	4	13
Infinitives					4	4
Nouns		3	5		5	13
Participles	One	4	22	4	15	45
	Both	5	5			5

Notice that the participial forms in our sample exhibit noun-like behavior ("Possessive Pronoun," "Verb of Doing") 26 times and verb-like behavior ("Prepositional Phrase") 4 times. There's a 6:1 split here. Participles exhibit noun-like syntactic behavior six times more often than verb-like behavior, as it relates to the material in the present sample. If I could say it this way,

they derive like verbs but act like nouns. The participles in the present sample are noun equivalents. So to rule out any parallel between *nīplāʾôt* (Dan 11:36) and *happ^llāʾôt* (Dan 12:6) because the one is verbal in origin (*pala'*) while the other is nominal in origin (*pele'*) can't be justified on linguistic grounds. Functionally, i.e., in terms of their syntactic behavior in a sentence, the two are for all intents and purposes the same.³³

The argument from Greek. The argument from Greek translation equivalents was supposed to demonstrate that *nīplāʾôt* (Dan 11:36) can't have the same meaning as *happ^llāʾôt* (Dan 12:6), because Theodosian translates them differently in Greek. The one term is rendered *huperogka* ("arrogant, haughty, pompous"), while the other is *thaumasiōn* ("wonderful, remarkable, admirable"). This is a good argument, and one that would carry more weight if Daniel had used **pl'* only twice instead of three times. But when the first of the three references (Dan 8:24) is brought into the comparison, the outcome changes dramatically. I now repeat table 18 for the reader's convenience.

Table 18
Hebrew and Greek Correspondences
in Three Passages (Repeated)

	Dan 8:24	Dan 11:36	Dan 12:6
Hebrew	w ^e nīplāʾôt	nīplāʾôt	happ ^l lāʾôt
Greek (Th)	thaumasta	huperogka	thaumasiōn

Notice that columns 1 and 2 use the same Hebrew word and that columns 1 and 3 use the same Greek words. What implications does this have for our understanding of the relationship between columns 2 and 3? If w^enīplāʾôt (Dan 8:24) and happ^llāʾôt (Dan 12:6) are rendered by closely similar Greek terms (*thaumasta*, *thaumasiōn*), the Hebrew words that they translate are in free variation with each other in Daniel's usage. There are different nuances here, especial readers of Greek, but no substantive contrast in meaning.

We still have not explained the reason for Theodosian's choice of words. Why would he translate two virtually identical Hebrew terms with different Greek words in Dan 8:24 and 11:36? More specifically, why would he select *huperogka* as a translation equivalent for *nīplāʾôt* in Dan 11:36? I suggest it was because Dan 11:36 emphasizes arrogant words rather than violent deeds. (If claiming to be God is not arrogant, what is arrogance?) Recall that *huperogka* means "arrogant, haughty, pompous," which makes this a perfect choice of words in such a context.

I pointed out earlier that in Hebrew the contrast between astounding words and astounding deeds is not an issue, because **pl'* focuses on a result (amazement), rather than what caused it (words or deeds). The two Greek words (*huperogka*, *thaumasiōn*) have to do precisely with the contrast between different causes, which for someone writing Hebrew would

³³ Keil speaks of them as synonyms: "*happ^llāʾôt* are, according to the context, the extraordinary things which the prophecy had declared, particularly the unheard-of oppressions described in ch. xi. 30 ff.; cf. with *p^llāʾôt* the synonym *nīplāʾôt*, ch. xi. 36 and vii. 24" (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, vol. 9, *Ezekiel, Daniel*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.], 9:487. Emphasis added.

be irrelevant. It would never enter the discussion. Thus, it really is true that in Hebrew Daniel is treating the words *nīplāʾôt* and *happēlāʾôt* synonymously, even though Theodosian, working in a different language, finds it convenient to make a distinction.

Verse 7

Clauses 1-4

Dan 12:7 consists of an introduction in which Daniel identifies the one who is about to speak (the man dressed in linen [clause 1], who was above the water of the river [clause 2]) and describes what he does (raises both hands to heaven [clause 3], swears to the One who lives forever [clause 4]). These introductory facts are presented in four clauses (1-4), which, may or may not be poetry, but they have comparable numbers of syllables.³⁴ The oath itself consists of three additional clauses (5-7) and these are what we're interested in here.

The first part of the oath has to do with time: "For a time, times and half a time" (*lʿmôʿēd mōʿdīm wāḥḥēšī* [clause 5]). The second part has to do with the breaking of the people's strength: "and when the breaking of the power of the holy people comes to an end" (*ūkʿallôt nappēš yad-ʿam-qōdeš* [clause 6]). The third is a concluding statement to the effect that when the preceding events have taken place, "then shall all these things be fulfilled" (*tiklênâ kol ʾēlleh* [clause 7]).

Clause 5: Time period

One writer insists on an unusual rendering of the expression *lʿmôʿēd* in Dan 12:7. This is an important part of his argument, by which I mean it is important in his model to pass over the time period itself and apply the rest of Dan 12 at a time later than 1798. Here is what he says:

Lamentably, the majority of Bible translations have translated the preposition *lʿ*, in Daniel 12:7, as "for," instead of "until" or "after" (cf. Deut. 16:4; 2 Sam. 13:23).

The significance of "for," in the response of Daniel 12:7, would emphasize the duration of the process or the period of the events instead of their termination. That significance, however, is not appropriate in Daniel 12:7 because the person who poses the first question inquired, When?, and not, For how much time? If the questioner asked, Until when?, (Dan. 12:6), then the Hebrew preposition *lʿ*, in the answer of Daniel 12:7, would have to be translated "until" or "after," but by no means "for." Based on this grammatical analysis, we conclude that the first clause of the answer of the man dressed in linen would have to be translated: "Certainly it will be *after* a time, times and half a time." That is to say, after the three and a half prophetic times of the prophecy of Daniel or after the year A.D. 1798.³⁵ (Emphasis in original.)

³⁴ The numbers of syllables per clause are: 1 = 10, 2 = 10, 3 = 14, 4 = 9, 5 = 10, 6 = 10, 7 = 6. These numbers take *maqṣep* into account.

³⁵ Núñez, *Profecías apocalípticas*, pp. 170.

Granting that either would be possible, which is preferred? The preposition *l^e* occurs in an answer. What is the corresponding question? We have talked about this previously. It is *ʿad-māṭay* ("until when"). Logically "until" (→|, "up to a point") has quite a different meaning from "after" (|→, "away from a point"). If the question is, Until when? I would expect the answer to be, Until then, where "then" specifies which period of time the questioner has in mind.

The JPS *Tanakh* translates the question as, "How long until the end of these awful things?" (Dan 12:6, TNK). To this the answer is, "For a time, times, and half a time; and when the breaking of the power of the holy people comes to an end, then shall all these things be fulfilled" (Dan 12:7, TNK). If we wanted to substitute "Until when" for the word "For" the result would be, "Until a time, times, and a half a time." This much makes perfect sense. But don't forget the next clause. "When the breaking of the power of the holy people comes to an end," in this context, is the moment of time when the time period would be over. The moment when the breaking of the power of God's people stops is the moment when the time period stops. At that point all these things that we've been talking about are over. They will have reached their end then. That's what *tiklênâ* means. It means, "It will be ended" (literal gloss). Hebrew **klh* does not mean "begin"; it means "end." So this is it. This is the end.

The closest parallel to Dan 12:7 is Dan 7:25, where the context is identical to the present one but the language is Aramaic.

And he shall speak *great* words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time [*ʿad ʿiddān w^eʿiddanîn ûp^elag ʿiddan*]. (Dan 7:25)

In this passage the angel is not telling Daniel that after a "time, times and half a time" then the little horn will start wearing out the saints of the most High, but rather that he will wear out the saints up until the completion of the period. Someone will immediately point out that the Aramaic which introduces the time period is not *l^e*- but *ʿad*. It is a different word, yes, but word meanings are established by context and the contexts of these two passages, with respect to time periods, are identical. We can say confidently that *l^e*- (Hebrew, Dan 12:7) is used to convey a meaning similar to *ʿad* (Aramaic, Dan 7:25).

Reinforcing what we have just said is the fact that *ʿad* (*ʿad-māṭay*) occurs in the Hebrew of the question in Dan 12:6. This draws the passages together, and also provides insight into how we must translate *l^emôʿēd* in Dan 12:7, if our choices must be limited to "until" and "after." I don't feel bound by that limitation, but if those are the choices, "after" is vastly less preferable than "until." All other things being equal, we would expect the meanings of *ʿad* (question, Dan 12:6) and *l^e*- (answer, Dan 12:7) to be similar. Otherwise the answer would not correspond to the question. If the question is, Until when? and the answer is, After this and this something else will occur, the question has not been directly answered. Until when? as a question, expects, Until then, as an answer. So there is an argument from symmetry.

Another interpretation that won't work is, When will the completion of the vision end?³⁶ I grant, the focus is on the end of the period, but if we take this wording seriously it makes no logical sense. The moment when the vision ends is, precisely, a moment. Momentary actions do not end. That's why they are momentary actions. Only periods of time end. So from the fact that

³⁶ Núñez, p. 167.

something ends, we can be sure that the reference is not exclusively on the ending point, but includes an expanse of time. How long do the above periods last before they end? Whatever our answer is, that is the focus of the word *ʿad* in *ʿad ʿiddān w^eʿiddanîn ûp^elag ʿiddan* (Dan 7:25) and of the preposition *l^e* in *l^emô^ed mō^edîm wāhēšî* (Dan 12:7).

Clause 6: Breaking

Hebrew *ûk^ekallôt* in relation to *nappēš*. The problem mentioned in an earlier section about *ûk^ekallôt* in relation to *nappēš* might not be as insuperable as it seems. I mentioned that examples of this term are of two kinds. The twelve examples shown in table 21 (above) require a surface subject and in such cases *k^ekallôt* functions as a verbal predicate. Thus, "When David finished saying this [*wayhî k^ekallôt dāwīd l^edabbēr ʿet-hadd^ebārîm hāʿēlleh*], Saul asked," (1 Sam 24:16). If we model the syntax of Dan 12:7 on this type of example, we would have to import a surface subject (similar to "David" in the present verse) from wherever (e.g., the king of the North), insert the preposition *l^e*-, and then the text would read, "When [the king of the North] finishes breaking the power of the holy people," (Dan 12:7, suggested gloss). The corresponding Hebrew would be, *ûk^ekallôt [mélek haššāpôn l^e]nappēš yad-ʿam-qōdeš . . .*³⁷ I can't say I'm drawn to explanations which involve rewriting passages.

There is another possibility, which does not involve rewriting anything. The second type of example mentioned earlier appears in table 22 (repeated below). Here there is no personal surface subject and no need to insert a preposition. Someone did the action, but the writer does not feel a need to mention who it was. Instead the subject is an impersonal noun phrase.

Table 22
Temporal Clause Governed by a Noun

Reference	Text
2 Chr 31:1	When all this had ended [<i>ûk^ekallôt</i>], the Israelites who were there went out to the towns of Judah, smashed the sacred stones and cut down the Asherah poles. . . .
Ezra 9:1	After these things had been done [<i>ûk^ekallôt</i>], the leaders came to me and said,

If we model the syntax of Dan 12:7 on this second type of example, *nappēš yad-ʿam-qōdeš* ("the breaking of the power of the holy people," literal gloss) will function as a noun phrase corresponding to "all this" (2 Chr 31:1) and "these things" (Ezra 9:1). It may or may not be that *nappēš* by itself (functioning as a verbal predicate) can't be the subject of *ûk^ekallôt*, but *nappēš yad-ʿam-qōdeš* (functioning as a noun phrase) can. In this case, the translation would be, "and when the breaking [*nappēš*] of the power of the holy people comes to an end [*ûk^ekallôt*]," (TNK), just as the translations have it already.

Before going on we should ask what sort of "breaking" we're talking about here. Is there any contextual information that could help us? We know that clause 5 contains a time period of known duration ("time, times and half a half" or 1260 days). We also know that clause 6

³⁷ Idem, p. 172.

represents a time period, because *ûk^ekallôt* speaks of it coming to an end. The differences between the two references to a time period are neatly symmetrical. See table 30.

Table 30
Two Time Periods

Clause	Duration	Activity
5	Known (3 1/2 times)	Unknown
6	Unknown	Known (breaking)

Discussion. The relationships summarized in table 30 are not obscure. When Daniel asks for an explanation of what he has heard (prominently including the time periods of vs. 7), the answer consists of a litany of references going back to Dan 11:31, 32, 33, and 35, i.e., to vss. 29-35. These were discussed above. I here repeat tables 25 and 26 (below) for the reader's convenience.

Table 25
Four Hebrew Terms

Dan 11:31-33		Dan 12:10-11	
11:31	w ^e hēsîrû hattāmîd	ûmē ^e ēt hûsar hattāmîd	12:11
11:31	w ^e natt ^e nû haššiqqûš m ^e šômēm	w ^e lâtēt šiqqûš šômēm	12:11
11:32	ûmaršî ^e b ^e rit yaḥ ^a nîp baḥ ^a laqqôt	w ^e lō ⁷ yābînû kol-r ^e šā ⁷ im	12:10
11:33	ûmaškilê ʿām yābînû lārabbîm	w ^e hammaškilîm yābînû	12:10

Table 28
Five Parallel Terms

Dan 11:35			Dan 12:9-10		
vs. 35	ûmin hammaškilîm	A			
			E	ʿad ʿet qeš	vs. 9
vs. 35	lišrôp bâhem	B			
vs. 35	ûl ^e bārēr	C	C	yitbār ^a rû	vs. 10
vs. 35	w ^e lalbēn	D	D	yitlabb ^e nû	vs. 10
			B	w ^e yīššār ^e pû	vs. 10
vs. 35	ʿad ʿet qeš	E			
			A	w ^e hammaškilîm	vs. 10

We should not consider it out of context for a summary section (chap. 12 is a summary section) to refer the reader or hearer back to the material being summarized. That's what summary sections are for. It's what they do. So here the angel directs Daniel's attention back to what he had said in 11:29-35 so the prophet would understand the time periods he has just asked about. From this we learn that the awful treatment God's people endure in Dan 11:29-35 is something Daniel is going to have to reflect on in order to grasp the significance of Dan 12:6-7. But actually it would be impossible for him to have a clear understanding of these things, because the events the words refer to had not yet occurred. Conversely, that is precisely why

we *can* understand them. The instruction is for us rather than Daniel. So we are the ones who must reflect on Dan 11:29-35 in order to understand Dan 12:6-7.

The two time periods of clauses 5 ("time, times and half a time") and 6 ("breaking of the power of God's people") fit together like hand and glove. The information that lies on the surface in clause 5 (how long a period we're talking about) answers the question that was puzzling in clause 6, and the information that lies on the surface in clause 6 (what happens during a certain period of time) answers the question that was puzzling in clause 5. The "time, times and half a time" would be a time when the strength of God's people is systematically broken.

The type of breaking we're talking about is not a scattering, and therefore a multiplying, of Adventist influence as our witness goes all around the world in the end time.³⁸ Instead it is the kind of breaking described in Dan 11:29-35, where the "daily" is set aside, the abomination that causes desolation is put in place of the "daily," those who defile the covenant draw others in by smooth talk, and those who are wise struggle against impossible odds to help others understand (see table 25). It would be the kind of breaking that takes place when those who are wise, through a process of horrible affliction, are made pure and clean, and all this would last until the time of the end (see table 28). These are the facts the angel wanted Daniel (or rather us) to know about the "time, times and half a time" and the breaking of the strength of God's people. At least this is what he put in his explanation.

Clause 7: Completion

There is a question what is included in the phrase "all these things" (clause 7). What Uriah Smith says is as follows:

The question, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" undoubtedly has reference to all that has previously been mentioned, including the standing up of Michael, the time of trouble, the deliverance of God's people, and the special resurrection of verse 2.³⁹

But this explanation does not work. The immediate context of Dan 12:7 is not vss. 1-3. It is vs. 6. An angel poses a question involving a time period. That's vs. 6. Then an answer is given. That's vs. 7. The expression "all these things" is part of the answer. If the answer has to do with the question, it follows that "all these things" have to do with the time period. The verse does not tell us when all things will be completed; it tells us when "all these things will be completed." If the focus of the question is on when the time period ends in vs. 6, let us not misplace that fact when we come to the final phrase of the answer in vs. 7. The end of "all these things" is the end of the time period we are talking about.

The only way to attach "all these things" to Dan 12:1-3 is to remove them from their own immediate context in 12:6-7. Time periods don't fit with the events of vss. 1-3, at least not if we take the word "all" seriously. What vs. 3 says is that, "they that turn many to righteousness [will shine] as the stars for ever and ever." And in vs. 7 again what it says is "all these things will be completed." How long will it take for "forever" to be completed? It makes no sense to ask. There is a way to avoid such contradictions. Separate Dan 12:6-7 from 12:1-3. On the other hand asking, How long will it take for the period of breaking to be completed? is entirely reasonable.

³⁸ See Cox, *Daniel*, p. 147.

³⁹ Uriah Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Southern, 1944), p. 320.

All the more because the answer is given in the previous verse. It will take a "time, times and half a time."

Five Excurses

Dan 11:36-39

When Uriah Smith came to Dan 11:36-39, he made a crucial error by not appreciating the significance of one letter – the definite article on the word for "king" in vs. 36, thus *hammélek* (*hmlk*) "the king" rather than *mélek* (*mlk*) "a king." What this letter implies is that the king referred to here had been referred to before. He was not a new player on the stage of history when mentioned in Dan 11:36. Smith thought vs. 36 represented a major break in the chapter, and many commentators agree.⁴⁰ But this is too much of a break. Consider vss. 35 and 40 one above the other.

Some of the wise will stumble, so that they may be refined, purified and made spotless **until the time of the end**, for it will still come at the appointed time. (Dan 11:35)

"At the time of the end the king of the South will engage him in battle, . . ." (Dan 11:40)

If vs. 35 brings us up to the time of the end and vs. 40 starts at the time of the end, then vss. 35 and 40 immediately adjoin one another and where does that leave vss. 36-39? The letter Smith neglected provides the key to all of this. Verse 36 represents a continuation of the king's career. Thus, vss. 35 and 40 really do meet with no break between and vss. 36-39 could be seen as recapping the period covered in vss. 29-35.⁴¹ There is no actual repetition of events here because the two sections (vss. 29-35, 36-39) do different things. In vss. 29-35 the focus is on what happens; in vss. 36-39 it is on the king's attitudes that lead him to do what he does. The sections represent two ways of seeing one bloc of history.

There is a precedent for this sort of dual or reinforcing style of presentation. Dan 11:23-38 go back over the same ground as vss. 16-22. Although it was not my intent in the thesis to do this, this type of analysis accounts for Uriah Smith's unusual interpretation of vss. 23-28, which loops back to the time when Rome enters the prophecy. Many have not understood this and assumed he was being arbitrary. By his own lights maybe he was, but in the end he was right – here, not in vss. 36-45. Yet another example of dual presentation concerns Dan 11:44-45 and 12:1-3. Probation closes in 12:1, but the death decree goes out in 11:44, which can only occur after probation closes. Is this a contradiction? No. The sections overlap.

Why all this doubling in Dan 11? For the same reason that Dan 2 speaks of iron and also iron mixed with clay; for the same reason that Dan 7 speaks of a terrible beast and also a little horn; for the same reason that the time prophecies of Dan 8-9 are given in two chapters – one

⁴⁰ See Frank Hardy, *An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11* (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1984), pp. 36-64. Evangelical futurists, and for that matter preterists, make this the single most important section break in the chapter.

⁴¹ See <http://www.historicism.org/Documents/Jrnl/Dan1136-39.pdf>, pp. 1-51

focusing on Rome as a religious power, the other focusing on Rome as a secular power. Everything that concerns Rome in the book of Daniel is done twice.

But in this event, why would vss. 40-43 not participate in such a schema? Why should that brief period be dealt with only once if everything that concerns Rome in the book of Daniel is done twice? The reason is that it describes the period of the king's deadly wound, when he is temporarily rendered unbeastlike. The king of the North's recovery is slow, as we who have lived through much of it can verify, and this is symbolized by his gradual progress as he moves his forces into position to do battle with the king of the South once more. When the wound is fully healed and the king is in a position to become angry again, what happens is again shown twice – both from an earthly (Dan 11:44-45) and from a heavenly (Dan 12:1-3) point of view. In this context Dan 11:36-39 can't be dissociated from Dan 11:29-35, but instead the two sections must be together in the period leading up to the time of the end.

The 1260 days are a time during which the power of God's people is broken. That's what all the references to "be[ing] purified, made spotless and refined" (Dan 12:10), or "be[ing] refined, purified and made spotless" (Dan 11:35), are about. But let me quote a bit more of the context. What that last reference – the one from chap. 11 – says is, "Some of the wise will stumble, so that they may be refined, purified and made spotless *until the time of the end*, for it will still come at the appointed time" (Dan 11:35, emphasis added). "Until the time of the end" (*ʿad-ʿet qeš*) would have to mean that the purification through affliction described in this verse, and therefore also in the verse which refers back to it (Dan 12:10), takes place not during the time of the end, but before. It extends "until the time of the end." Then it stops.

In Matt 24:22 and Mark 13:20 Jesus says the time would be shortened. The fulfillment of this prediction was the Protestant Reformation. The Reformation did not change the total number of years from 1260 to some other number, but made them more bearable. Supporting this point, in Dan 12 after repeating the time period of Dan 7:25 in the context of the prophecy of Dan 11, the angel adds that what comes next must follow the completion of the entire 1260 day period (*ʿad-kālā zāʿam*). The time period, though eased by the Reformation, must run its course.

Will there be persecution in the future? Yes. The deadly wound will be healed (Rev 13:3, 12). The king of the North will once more become angry (Dan 11:44-45). How long will his power remain once it is restored? God has not chosen to share that information with us. No one knows. We do know, however, that this period of renewed wrath will in fact not run its full course. If it did, no one would survive. In the middle ages people had to wait. "When the power of the holy people has been finally broken, all these things will be completed" (Dan 12:7). By contrast, "at that time your people-- everyone whose name is found written in the book-- will be delivered" (Dan 12:1). When Michael stands up there is intense trouble while He makes His way to the earth, but when He arrives, it's no longer a matter of waiting.

Dan 12:1-3

Verse 1

What does it mean for Michael to stand up? Would it not mean that His work in the sanctuary is over? What other point of transition should we be looking for? Daniel says,

"As I looked, "thrones were set in place, and the Ancient of Days took his seat. His clothing was as white as snow; the hair of his head was white like wool. His throne was flaming with fire, and its wheels were all ablaze. ¹⁰ A river of fire was flowing, coming out from before him. Thousands upon thousands attended him; ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. The court was seated, and the books were opened. (Dan 7:9-14)

This is the great investigative, or pre-advent, judgment. When it is over Christ leaves the sanctuary in heaven and comes to the earth. When He leaves the sanctuary, that's the close of probation. When He arrives here, that's the second coming. All of the confusion and distress described in Dan 11:44-45, the plagues, the time of Jacob's trouble, and anything else that must occur, all of this fits between the time when Christ leaves heaven and when He arrives here at the second coming. During this brief time, which occupies "a number of days,"⁴² we have all the events of Dan 11:44-45, when the king is enraged and seeks "to destroy and annihilate many." During this time heaven is depopulated (see Rev 8:1) and the earth is in a state of total anarchy and confusion.

The "time of distress such as has not happened from the beginning of nations until then" (vs. 1a) sounds a lot like the time of Jacob's trouble (see Jer 30:7). "But at that time your people-- everyone whose name is found written in the book-- will be delivered" (vs. 1b). During the middle ages God's people had to endure to the bitter end. They were not delivered. That is because the king of the North had to succeed until the end of the time of wrath (*w^ohišlî^h ad-kâlâ zâ'am*, "He will be successful until the time of wrath is completed," Dan 11:36). After the wound is healed, however, any remaining time is cut short and the saints are delivered by supernatural intervention (*ûbâ'êt hahhî^o yimmâlêt amm^okā*, "But at that time your people . . . will be delivered, Dan 12:1). There's a contrast here. What happens that delivers God's people? The second coming. We know this because the very next thing mentioned is a resurrection.

Verse 2

In vs. 2 we have a resurrection. We say this is a special resurrection, and it is, because some of the wicked are included, but this whole matter requires more thought. To suggest that the entire prophecy of Daniel ends by emphasizing a special resurrection that includes those at Christ's trial, some soldiers, and those who have died since 1844,⁴³ but ignores the righteous dead of all ages involves a certain loss of perspective. This is *the* resurrection, with a few others thrown in for good measure. The only thing that sets this resurrection apart as special, or different from the main one, is the words, "others to shame and everlasting contempt." Most of the wicked dead are not raised until after the thousand years (see Rev 20:5a). However, from Christ's trial before Caiaphas we have the following:

⁴² "And I saw a flaming cloud come where Jesus stood. Then Jesus . . . took His place on the cloud which carried Him to the East, where it first appeared to the saints on earth--a small black cloud which was the sign of the Son of man. While the cloud was passing from the Holiest to the East, which took a number of days, the synagogue of Satan worshipped at the saints' feet." Ellen White, *Mar* 287.7. Notice what she says here is "the synagogue of Satan," not the king of the North.

⁴³ See Ellen White, *Great Controversy*, p. 637.

"Yes, it is as you say," Jesus replied. "But I say to all of you: In the future you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven." (Matt 26:64; also Mark 16:62)

In addition, the soldiers who mistreated Jesus and pierced His body on the cross will be raised to see Him come (see Rev 1:7), which would imply that they are raised a short time before. Also, Ellen White mentions those also who have "died in the faith of the third angel's message" will see Jesus come, vindicating their faith.

Graves are opened, and "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth . . . awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Daniel 12:2). All who have died in the faith of the third angel's message come forth from the tomb glorified to hear God's covenant of peace with those who have [272] kept His law. "They also which pierced Him" (Revelation 1:7), those that mocked and derided Christ's dying agonies, and the most violent opposers of His truth and His people, are raised to behold Him in His glory, and to see the honor placed upon the loyal and obedient.-GC 636, 637 (1911). {LDE 271.2}

We need not focus on a handful of special cases and lose sight of the innumerable multitude of righteous dead that are raised on the same occasion, but not necessarily at the same moment. If what the angel has in mind are only those people whose presence in the first resurrection can be considered unusual, when do the rest of the righteous dead come to life? Verse 3 uses the words "forever and ever." At what later point, following vs. 3, do they rise?

Verse 3

In vs. 3 the saints are glorified. From other passages, when does this occur? The time when Paul says this will happen is "at the last trumpet."

Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed-⁵² in a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. (1 Cor 15:51)

The next question is, How long does it take? Again Paul says, "For the Lord himself will come down from heaven, with a loud command, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet call of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first" (1 Thess 4:16). They will rise "first" means they will rise before the living saints are caught up to be with the Lord in the air. It doesn't mean they will rise before Caiaphas and company. Caiaphas and the other members of the council who condemned Christ, the Roman soldiers who mistreated Him, and some who believed in His coming when no one else did will see it all. How much beforehand would they have to rise in order to do this? Minutes, perhaps hours. All of this takes place at substantially the same time in connection with the second coming. I ask again, How long will this take? Not 1335 days.

Dan 12:8-10

Let us consider very briefly what's happening in Dan 12:8-10. To do this we need a concept of how the surrounding material is structured. The narrative of Dan 10-12 does not end at 11:45. It carries over to 12:4, which serves as a counterpart to 11:2a. The narrative proper is framed between these two verses. If we try, as some have, to bring all of chap. 12 into one structure, it's going to be a mixture of this and that – part narrative, part conclusion. So if vss. 5-13 are a unit, and vss. 1-13 are not, here is what we have. See table 29.

Table 29
Chiastic Structure of Dan 12:5-13

Dan 12	Subject Matter	Verses
5	Introduction	1
6-7	Time period ("time, times and half a time")	2
8-10	Question and answer	3
11-12	Time periods (1290 days, 1335 days)	2
13	Conclusion	1

For present purposes vss. 5 and 13 can be set aside. The working portion of the conclusion consists of vss. 6-12. In this concluding section the angel's purpose is to convey information about time periods. He begins in vss. 6-7 by taking and then answering a question as to how long the unbelievable things he has just told Daniel about would last. Daniel doesn't understand and interjects a question of his own (vs. 8), which the angel courteously answers in vss. 9-10. He then continues in vss. 11-12 talking about time periods.

Please notice that Daniel's question is not part of what the angel was trying to say. From one point of view it is extraneous – not textually but from a narrative point of view. Before Daniel speaks the angel is talking about time (vss. 6-7). Daniel does not understand what the angel has just said and interrupts (vs. 8). After dealing with the interruption (vss. 9-10) the angel continues talking about time (vss. 11-12). Thus, the 1290 and 1335 days (vss. 11-12) have a closer relationship to the earlier "time, times and half a time" (vss. 6-7) than might first appear. I submit that it is a mistake to separate the three time periods of Dan 12 from each other. They should be both considered, and interpreted, together.

The Definite Article on *happ^llā^ʔôt*

The definite article on *happ^llā^ʔôt* strongly implies that the word has an antecedent. This letter carries no less significance than the article on the word "king" (*hammélek*, "the king") in Dan 11:36. Ignoring it will not cause us to repeat the same errors Smith made involving France and Turkey in Dan 11:36-45, but it has the potential for causing errors that are just as harmful.

In the futurist model, *happ^llā^ʔôt* refers generally to the remarkable events described in Dan 12:1-3. I admit that, in the absence of anything more specific, something along these lines would be possible. But when a cognate term occurs earlier in a related context within the same

prophecy, we need not settle for generalities. A term comparable to *happ^ēlā^ʾōt* has evidently been used before. Where?

It would strengthen the futurist position if its proponents could drive a wedge between *happ^ēlā^ʾōt* (12:6) and *nīplā^ʾōt* (11:36) showing that the two terms are not closely related, but they are. One writer insists that *nīplā^ʾōt* comes from *pala'* (*pālā^ʾ*), while *happ^ēlā^ʾōt* comes from *pele'* (*pēle^ʾ*). I'm not sure what *pala'* could mean in this context, but let us say for argument that *nīplā^ʾōt* (11:36) and *happ^ēlā^ʾōt* (12:6) come from *pala'* and *pele'* respectively. What do *pala'* and *pele'* come from? And of course both come from **pl^ʾ*, so what does the above argument accomplish?

The best explanation for the definite article on *happ^ēlā^ʾōt* (12:6) is that it points back to the earlier occurrence of the cognate form *nīplā^ʾōt* (11:36). This position is strengthened by the extended series of verbal links that point from Dan 12:9, 10, 11 back to Dan 11:31, 32, 33, 35, some of the terms forming an exquisite five part chiasm. There can be no question as to the angel's intentions. Daniel is confused by the time period of vss. 6-7. In explaining this further the angel goes to great lengths to ensure that as Daniel contemplates the time period, he will do so in the context of Dan 11:29-35. This is something we also must do if we want the insights the angel was trying to convey to Daniel.

Spirit of Prophecy

For those who are willing to listen to the Spirit of Prophecy, there are counsels that speak to the current debate. No one can accuse me of basing the more than forty pages of argument in the paper so far on the Spirit of Prophecy, but I believe the counsels are inspired and that's where I stand. If you are not willing to learn from the counsels, say so openly. Don't say you support the Spirit of Prophecy and then ignore what she says. What she says about time setting is often in the context of setting a time for the second coming. This obviously is not the case in regard to Adventist futurism in Dan 12. On one occasion someone thought he could set a date for the close of probation, which is not the same as the second coming, but she opposed what he was doing, even without a connection to the second coming.

I plainly stated at the Jackson camp meeting to these fanatical parties that they were doing the work of the adversary of souls; they were in darkness. They claimed to have great light **that probation would close in October, 1884**. I there stated in public that the Lord had been pleased to show me **that there would be no [36] definite time in the message given of God since 1844**.-2SM 73 (1885). {LDE 35.3}

The principle is more inclusive than just setting a date for this event, or that event. What she was saying is, **Don't set a date for any event. Don't dabble in time periods.**

Our position has been one of waiting and watching, with no time-proclamation to intervene between the close of the prophetic periods in 1844 and the time of our Lord's coming.-10MR 270 (1888). {LDE 36.1}

The people will not have another message upon definite time. After this period of time [Revelation 10:4-6], reaching from 1842 to 1844, there can be no definite tracing of the prophetic time. The longest reckoning reaches to the autumn of 1844.-7BC 971 (1900). {LDE 36.2}

One statement – that was given in the context of the second coming, but to which the broader principle of no time periods at firmly applies – is as follows.

The preaching of a definite time for the judgment, in the giving of the first message, was ordered by God. The computation of the prophetic periods on which that message was based, placing the close of the 2300 days in the autumn of 1844, stands without impeachment. The repeated efforts to find new dates for the beginning and close of the prophetic periods, and the unsound reasoning necessary to sustain these positions, not only lead minds away from the present truth, but throw contempt upon all efforts to explain the prophecies. The more frequently a **definite time is set for the second advent**, and the more widely it is taught, the better it suits the purposes of Satan. After the time has passed, he excites ridicule and contempt of its advocates, and thus casts reproach upon the great advent movement of 1843 and 1844. **Those who persist in this error will at last fix upon a date too far in the future for the coming of Christ. Thus they will be led to rest in a false security, and many will not be undeceived until it is too late.** {GC 457.1}

If you don't set a date for the second advent, but you do establish a framework of time period based calculations in which the second coming can't occur until whenever, the details are different but the effect is the same. This is a serious matter that could affect the destiny of souls.

It is a temptation for Seventh-day Adventist teachers is to say that, yes, she opposed someone else's time setting, but she didn't opposed my time setting. My time setting is different from their time setting because they are setting a date for this, whereas I'm setting a date for that. Another approach would be to deny that the time periods we move into the future involve time setting at all. And since they don't, none of the counsels or warnings about time setting and time periods with which the Spirit of Prophecy abounds apply to me. They do apply to others, however, and since I fully support the Spirit of Prophecy I agree with deep conviction that she was telling the truth when she said this and this to other people.

Let us grant for argument that everything Ellen White says about time setting and time periods real was written for someone else. What use of time periods does she support? We have talked about what she condemns and how slippery it is to identify what that is. She condemns everything other than what you are doing, but when and where does she support what you're doing – with time periods. Never mind generalities about how there will be affliction in the last days. What does she say specifically mentioning time periods that supports your own use time periods – or any use of time periods – after 1844? In the absence of such support, the only honest thing to do is (a) stop referring to the Spirit of Prophecy and acknowledge that you are in opposition to it, or (b) start applying it wherever possible to your own case.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ "When Jeremiah finished telling the people all the words of the LORD their God- everything the LORD had sent him to tell them- ² Azariah son of Hoshaiah and Johanan son of Kareah and all the arrogant men said to Jeremiah, "You are lying! The LORD our God has not sent you to say, 'You must not go to Egypt to settle there.'" (Jer 43:1-2; see also chap. 42)

Summary

The nature of the context in Dan 12:6-7 is what we're trying to establish here. It can't be considered positive because of parallels with *l'mô'ed* in various Old Testament passages, since there really aren't any direct parallels. This is the only case where *l'mô'ed* (or *mô'ed* without the preposition) refers to a period of time, as opposed to a moment of time. It can't be considered positive because of parallels with *ûk'kallôt*, since correctly understood, this term rather than protecting the time period from the breaking clause due to unusual syntax, opens the way for the two clauses to be interpreted together, as two descriptions of one set of events.

It can't be considered positive because of Daniel's use of *nīplā'ôt* in 8:24 and 11:36, because both of those contexts are negative. And why should we prefer comparisons with other writers while ignoring the writer's own usage, in one case occurring within the same narrative as what we're trying to explain? It can't be considered positive because of the parallel with *ʔad mātay* in 8:13, because, although the question is composed of three parts, on balance the context is clearly negative. It can't be considered positive because of parallels involving *nappēš* since in every case outside Dan 12:7 this term refers to some form of destructive activity.

It can't be considered positive because of the way Theodosian translates *happ'elā'ôt* (Dan 12:6) and *nīplā'ôt* (Dan 11:36) into Greek, when Dan 8:24 is taken into account. It can't be considered positive because of the nine word pairs linking 12:9, 10, 11 with 11:31, 32, 33, 35, since these direct our attention back to some very unpleasant past events in the main body of the narrative. So why should we think of the context as being positive?

Conclusion

If it is true that the context for Dan 12:6-7 is largely negative and looks to the past, as explained by the angel in vss. 9, 10, and 11, this frees us to see the connection between what happens in Dan 12:1-3 and events surrounding the second coming. It also frees us to see the connection between the "times" of vs. 7 and the "days" of vss. 11-12. The "time, times and half a time" of Dan 12:7 is spelled in three different ways. Etymologically these are not related to each other, but the meaning – what the terms refer to – is related, and closely. Three and a half "times" (or years; Dan 7:25; 12:7) is equivalent to 42 months (Rev 11:2; 13:5) and these in turn are equivalent to 1260 days (Rev 11:3; 12:6). If we can see the connection between a "time, times and half a time," 42 months, and 1260 days, why should we pretend there is no connection between the "time, times and half a time" = 42 months = 1260 days and the 1290 days? Or the 1335 days?

If the Holy Spirit is using comparable terms in hopes that we will compare them, why not do it? Consider the "evening-mornings" (*'ereb-bôqer*) of Dan 8:14 and "weeks" (*šābū'im*) of Dan 9:24-26. Any connection between those two sets of terms and the prophecies they represent? The words are different. Different, but clearly related. Evenings and morning make up days; weeks have days as their constituent parts. The Holy Spirit does not force us to see the connection, but it is there and seeing it has made Seventh-day Adventism what it is.

A positive point to grasp

When Michael stands up (vs. 1), that's the close of probation. The judgment is over at that point and mercy stops pleading with people on earth. The trouble mentioned in Dan 12:1 is described in 11:44-45. When the king "set[s] out in a great rage to destroy and annihilate many" (11:44), that's the death decree. When he "come[s] to his end, and no one will help him" (11:45), that's another way of saying, "But at that time your people-- everyone whose name is found written in the book-- will be delivered" (12:1).

When God's people are delivered, what they are delivered from is the wrath of the last king of the North as he "set[s] out in a great rage to destroy and annihilate many" (11:44). Jesus comes again for the specific and very timely purpose of rescuing them from this wrath. On this occasion He raises the righteous dead of all ages, but raises certain others shortly before the rest. Thus, "Multitudes who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake: some to everlasting life, others to shame and everlasting contempt" (12:2).

Once they are raised to life again, "Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever" (Dan 12:3). This is the glorification of the saints. This final act in the last drama will not take 1290, or 1335 days, to accomplish. Paul says it will happen,

In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed (1 Cor 15:52, KJV).

A negative point to avoid

If by the time we get to these events time is gone, but we teach people to expect that time is not gone, that they still have more than three and a half years, what then? When the national Sunday law comes, as we know it will, let us say Jesus waits four more years to come. It could happen. In that case the futurists among us would have performed a useful service in getting the church to wake up and study, even if they're wrong in a few details. But what if Jesus were to wait only four months? That could happen too. If people are led to believe that they have over three and a half years and Jesus comes in less time than that, is there the possibility that someone would be caught off guard? Is there a possibility that this disparity between what people think will happen and what actually does could cause someone to miss out on eternal life? Telling people what Jesus can and can't do makes strange theology, and it could have results that will stay with us through eternity.

This is the root of the problem with Adventist futurism. It is not a matter of words and syllables. It's a matter of setting ourselves up to say in our hearts, Jesus can't come until It's one thing to have such theories and keep them to ourselves. Hopefully such theories won't do too much harm. But when we start teaching these things publically and urging them on people with great urgency, inviting them to believe what could turn out to be disastrously wrong, that is another matter. Telling people that, once we come to a certain point in history, Jesus can't come until . . . could cause souls to be lost. Creating an advent-free zone of time for the remnant right at the end of time could undo much of the work that the church has labored long years to accomplish.

Therefore

I appeal to my readers to teach what Seventh-day Adventists have taught about the time periods from the beginning until 1978, when Desmond Ford published his commentary on Daniel,⁴⁵ i.e., that they apply in the past and need no repeating, that the Father will bring things about when He determines it is best to do so, that Jesus is not bound by time.

⁴⁵ *Dnyl* (Nashville: Southern).