Notes

Note: All Scripture quotations from published sources in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society. When literal glosses of the Hebrew are used I either overtly identify them or put them in only one set of quotation marks.

[1]It is as A. Wayne Wymore says in his preface to *A Mathematical Theory of Systems Engineering--The Elements* (New York: Wiley, 1967): "Every author has several motivations for writing, and authors of technical books always have, as one motivation, the personal need to understand; that is, they write because they want to learn, or to understand a phenomenon, or to think through a set of ideas" (ibid., p. v).

[2]Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:16-22," *Historicism* No. 14/Apr 88, pp. 3-4.

[3]See Hardy, "Daniel 8:9-12," *Historicism* Supplement/Jul 85, p. 9.

[4]See Hardy, "The Four-Part World Empire Motif in Daniel and the Corresponding Seven-Part Motif in Revelation," *Historicism* No. 9/Jan 87, pp. 16-23.

[5]Hardy, "Daniel 8:9-12," pp. 9-11.

[6]The hypothesis that the Hebrew of Daniel 8-12 is not original but was itself translated from Aramaic provides the best avenue of approach for anyone wishing to circumvent the Hebrew at this point, since there is little difference in later Aramaic between *mélek* "a king" and *malkāʾ* "the king." Frank Zimmermann has presided over this discussion for a number of years (see idem, "The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8-12," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 [1938]: 255-72; on the definite article [Hebrew]/ emphatic state [Aramaic] see especially pp. 257-59) and has convinced some respected scholars that he is right. But whether he is or is not, the task of the exegete must be first and foremost to explain the text. And the text, in this case, written in Hebrew, says *hammélek*. This fact must be our starting point. See also idem, "Some Verses in Daniel in the Light of a Translation Hypothesis," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 349-54; "Hebrew Translation in Daniel," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51 (1960-61): 198-208. See also idem, *The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels* (New York: Ktav, 1979).

[7]See Hardy, "What and Where Is the Futurist Gap in Dan 11?" *Historicism* No. 2/Apr 85, pp. 48-60.

[8]See H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1969), pp. 510-12. Leupold acknowledges the above problem but sets it aside.

[9]Ibid.

[10]This point was made with emphasis by a number of people at the 1919 Bible conference (Washington, DC, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Archives, 1919 Bible Conference). In 1982 and 83 I photocopied large portions of the minutes from the above conference while researching my M.A. thesis. I do not have permission to quote the above sources, but can say that the point about *hammélek* being "the king" instead of "a king" was made by H. C. Lacey on July 8 and twice by M. C. Wilcox on July 9 (in his introductory comments and under point 21 of his presentation).

[11]The "time of the end" (*ʿēt qēṣ*) is a period rather than a moment of time. When the Qumran documents were written the word *qēṣ* had shifted semantically to the point that instead of meaning "end" it also, like *ʿēt*, meant "time" (see N. Wieder, "The Term *qṣ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 [1954]: 22-31). In Daniel this is not the case (Bruce William Jones, "Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel" [Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, dissertation, 1972], p. 199 [n. 25], 208, 218). Otherwise, if in Daniel both *ʿēt* and *qēṣ* meant "time," then the expression *ʿēt qēṣ* would mean the "time of the time," which makes no sense. The above facts have important implications for our dating of Daniel. Word meanings constantly change, but they do not change over night. It takes

time for semantic drift to occur. We know when the Qumran documents, most notably the War Scroll (an expanded commentary on Dan 11), were written. At issue is the relationship of such later documents to Daniel and if we take the evidence provided by Wieder and Jones at face value, Daniel would have to be considerably earlier. In saying this I have Dan 11 specifically in mind. The composition of the historical chapters written in Aramaic are not at issue. Returning to the word in question, it is *ʿēt qēṣ* ("time of the end") as a whole, and not just *qēṣ*, which refers to a period of time in Daniel. The "time of the end" is not the end of time but a period just before it.

[12]See Uriah Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Southern Publishing Assocation, 1944), pp. 280-89.

[13]See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:23-28," *Historicism* No. 15/Jul 88, pp. 4-6.

[14]Repetition also serves a simplifying function in Dan 11. See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:16-22," *Historicism* No. 14/Apr 88, pp. 35-37.

[15]While I have always given lip service to the close link between Dan 11:2-45 and Dan 12:1-3, I have not always understood how close that link is (see Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" [M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983], pp. 105-23). There are reasons why the chapter break comes where it does. Dan 11:29-45 can still be seen as the final third of the chapter, but 12:1-3 must be included with it as an inseparable appendix. The most significant outline break within this expanded section is 11:29-39 as opposed to 11:40-12:3 (see next note).

[16]The fourth empire divides into two phases corresponding in Dan 2 to iron (11:16-28) and iron mixed with clay (11:29-12:3). (This fact has corollaries also in chaps. 7 and 8, i.e., every time the fourth empire is mentioned.) The second phase divides into one period before the "time of the end" (11:29-39) and another during the "time of the end" (11:40-12:3). (The corollary here is in chap. 7 only.) Next the "time of the end" divides into a period of southern dominance over north (11:40a) and a period of northern dominance over south (11:40b-12:3). The period of northern dominance over south divides into a time of success (11:40b-43) and a time of failure (11:44-12:3). The king's ultimate failure is described as it will be seen by the king himself (11:44-45) and by Michael (12:1-3). Michael's followers on earth will be in a position to appreciate both points of view. They will see the one set of events both as a time of trouble and as the consummation of all their hopes. The context for dividing the fourth empire into phases is much broader than one might suppose.

[17]In regard to Dan 4 and 5 William H. Shea writes, "As a concluding observation, we should not neglect the aesthetic side of this feature of chiastic structure. Various commentators have observed that the type of writing present in Dan 4 and 5 is very repetitious. The dullness of the repetitions to the modern eye recedes in importance, however, when it is realized that these transparently repetitious passages actually form an integral part of the larger literary design of these two chapters. Thus, instead of contributing to boredom, these repetitions should enhance one's appreciation for this work as a carefully crafted piece. The narratives of the two chapters do indeed relate history, but they do so in an aesthetically artistic fashion" ("Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 5, and the Broader Relationships Within Chapters 2-7," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 23 [1985]: 294). But whether or not the writing is also artistic, my point is that repetition is one of its prominent characteristic features.

[18]See Hardy, "Notes on the Linear Structure of Dan 11," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, pp. 21-22.

[19]See Hardy, "The Case for a Typological Interpretation of Dan 11:40-45," to appear in *Historicism* No. 22/Apr 90.

[20]See Hardy, "Dan 11:23-28," pp. 31-38.

[21]Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], p. 516).

[22]Bentzen, *Daniel*, Handbuch zum alten Testament, no. 19 (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1937). Verses for which such syllable counts were done are: 2:20-23 (ibid.,

p. 5); 3:33; 4:7b-9, 11-14, 17-24, 27-29, 31-32, 34 (p. 17); 7:9-10, 13-14, 23-27 (p. 29); 9:24, 27 (p. 39, omitting vss. 25-26); and 11:2-12:4 (p. 45).

[23]Bayer, *Danielstudien*, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, no. 3, pt. 5. See especially p. 181.

[24]Bentzen (see n. 22) gives the following syllable count for Dan 11:36-39 by clause: 36 3+3, 2+2, 3+2; 37 3+4+2; 38 4+4, 3+3; 39 3+2, 3+2+3 (*Daniel*, p. 45). Notice in that in vs. 36 Bentzen's initial 3+3 lumps the initial formula (*wᵉʿāśâ kirṣônô hammélek*) together with clause 1. The excerpt from Bayer (see n. 23) that is available to me merely quotes the Hebrew. But the essential features of his proposed analysis are clear enough. Below they are stated in terms of their differences from that in the present paper. Verse 36 clause 2 is put in two lines rather one ([a] *wᵉʿal ʾēl ʾēlîm*, and [b] *yᵉdabbēr niplāʾôt*). Similarly, vs. 37 clause 3 ([a] *wᵉʿal-kol-ʾlôᵃh*, [b] *lōʾ yābîn*) and vs. 38 clause 1 ([a] *wᵉleʾlôᵃh māʿuzzîm*, [b] *ʿal-kannō yᵉkabbēd*) are stated in two lines each. Bayer sets off the relative clause in vs. 38 clause 2 (*ᵃšer lōʾ-yᵉdāʿûhû ᵃbōtāyw*) separately from *wᵉleʾlôᵃh* and makes the last word of clause 3 the first word of clause 4, i.e., he moves the predicate *yᵉkabbēd* down on the same line with *bĕzāhāb ûbᵉkésep*. The first two clauses of vs. 39, which are especially difficult, Bayer states in four parts ([a] *wᵉʿāśâ lᵉmibṣᵉrê māʿuzzîm*, [b] *ʿim-ʾlôᵃh nēkār*, [c] *ᵃšer hikkîr*, [d] *yarbeh kābôd*). The curious thing about his treatment of vs. 39 is that the relative clause (fragment [c] above) is indented in a way that implies it is more prominent than clause fragments [b] or [d]. As regards the relationship between Bentzen's work and that of Bayer, notice that in vs. 37 Bentzen's 3+4+2 groups Bayer's indentations as (a) major, (b) minor + major, (c) minor + major. One would expect a major indentation (i.e., a smaller indentation) to come first in each group. If this is the level of structural analysis that we rely on to get hold of what Daniel is saying in Dan 11:36-39, we will be a long time finding it.

In fairness, however, let me state that it is no easy matter to count Hebrew syllables. Questions that arise whenever this is attempted are: What is a syllable? How are the sounds grouped together for counting purposes? Are there some parts of a given word that should not be counted at all? This topic cannot be discussed here. Books have been written on it (see for example Stephen A. Geller, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 20 [Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1987]). But the suggestion that I consider most stimulating along this line is that of Morris Halle and John J. McCarthy, "The Metrical Structure of Psalm 137," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 161-67. The basic concept is that as a poet spoke his syllables would be stressed with progressively heavier weight, such that the heaviest stress in a word comes last. Only those syllables are counted which contribute to the above progression from lighter to heavier stresses. Thus, when intermediate between syllables with heavier stress, syllables with shewa as their vowel would not be counted, nor would certain word-final syllables where a lighter stress follows a heavier one. The lack of a clear concensus as to the ground rules for counting should make us cautious about any analysis based solely on such evidence.

[25]Eissfeldt's claim that Dan 9:24-27 represent poetry is of course correct. For independent support see William H. Shea, "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Dan 9:25," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 18 (1980): 59-63. One hopes that Shea will complete the series of papers, of which the above was to be the first part, along the same lines that it was begun.

[26]See William H. Shea, "The *qinah* Structure of the Book of Lamentations," 60 (1979): 103-7. Another similar reminder is found in vs. 36. The predicate in vs. 36 clause 1 has two active verbs. Clause 2 and clause 3 have one active verb each. The verb in clause 4 is not active but passive, thus lacking a subject. In addition, the clauses get shorter as the verse progresses (ignoring *metheg*). Thus, the following progression is in evidence:

Grammatical Category	Clause 1	Clause 2	Clause 3	Clause 4
Grammatical subjects	2	1	1	0
Predicates	2	1	1	1
Number of words	5	5	4	3

The thing that makes the above reminiscent of qinah meter is the progressive removal or taking away. One starts with more and ends with less.

[27]The fifteen books are listed below, with their first words and a fairly literal English gloss.

Book	Hebrew	English
Exodus	weʾēleh šemôt benê yiśrāʾēl	And these are the names of the children of Israel
Leviticus	wayyiqrāʾ ʾel-mōšeh	And He called to Moses
Joshua	wayhî ʾaḥărê môt mōšeh	And after the death of Moses
Judges	wayhî ʾaḥărê mōt yehôšūᵃᶜ	And after the death of Joshua
1 Samuel	wayhî ʾîš ʾeḥad	And there was a man
2 Samuel	wayhî ʾaḥărê môt šāʾûl	And after the death of Saul
1 Kings	wehammélek dāwīd	And king David
2 Kings	wayyipšaᶜ môʾāb	And Moab rebelled
Ezekiel	wayhî bišlōšîm šānâ	And in the thirtieth year
Jonah	wayhî debar-YHWH	And the word of the Lord
Ruth	wayhî bîmê šepōt haššōptîm	And in the days of the judges
Esther	wayhî bîmê ʾăhašwērôš	And in the days of Ahashuerus (Xerxes)
Ezra	ûbišnat ʾăhat lekôreš	And in the first year of Cyrus
2 Chronicles	wayyithazzēq šelōmōh	And Solomon consolidated

The particle we- takes the form $wa(C)$ when used as the first part of a converted imperfect (where C represents the doubling of whatever consonant follows, commonly y) and the form $û$- before a [+round] consonant or vowel.

[28]One might assume that a potential class of exceptions is found wherever one book is the continuation of another. The scribes, however, did not show this sort of relationship to earlier material by writing "And" but repeating the last few sentences of the one book at the beginning of the other. Thus, the last two verses of 2 Chronicles are repeated at the beginning of Ezra.

[29]The analogy is not obscure. The king, as titular head of the church of Christ on earth, despoils his flock of their gold and silver and transforms the act of doing so into an act of piety. Let two excerpts from a longer discussion serve respectively to make and to balance this point. The setting is Avignon during the fourteenth century: "First there had been Clement V, the timorous pope who had brought the Papacy to Avignon and cowered beneath the French king. Then had come John XXII--the Banker of Avignon they called him. He destroyed the little friars who had arisen with their terrible heresy that Christ and his disciples had been poor men, that the amassing of wealth was contrary to his teaching. It was John who had created the fantastically complex financial system, making church preferments a kind of chess game, at every move of which a shower of gold fell into Avignon. There had been a smell of heresy about him but a deathbed confession had expunged it, and perhaps better evidence of orthodoxy, he had left the treasury richer by four million florins" (E. R. Chamberlain, *The Bad Popes* [New York: Dorset, 1969], p. 131). The second excerpt is less depressing than the first: "Europe knew a

brief cessation from the rapacities of tax collectors, for Benedict [XII, 1334-42], as competent as he was frugal, was able to run the church on less than a quarter of what his predecessors had demanded, and still had enough left over to finance the Italian wars and to found the great palace in Avignon" (ibid.). But it is only slightly less depressing. If the latter's very notable enterprises could be carried forward on a fourth of his predecessor's income, the influx of wealth at Avignon--even under the best of popes--was staggering. What I have described here is one moment taken from a period spanning roughly 1300 years. Other examples could be given.

[30]See n. 1 above.

[31]One might have expected to find *$k^e lat$ ("completion of"), a form derived from $k\bar{a}l\hat{a}$ ("completion") by commonly accepted rules for feminine nouns in construct (reduce the first vowel, change *he* (*h*) to *taw* (*t*). The form *$k^e lat$, however, is unattested.

[32]In Hebrew, unlike English, vowel markings are included only as an aid to pronunciation. The current Tiberian system for marking vowels was developed around the end of the eighth century A.D. (see Ernst Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979], pp. 12-15, 21-27). Before that time only consonant letters were written. A *Qere* reading is an alternative consonant spelling given in the margin without vowels. The *Kethib* reading is retained in the text with vowels. But the vowels in the text pertain to the consonants in the margin. Thus, every *Qere* reading is a mixed form, with the consonants of one word and the vowels of another. There is no confusion once this practice is understood, because it is used consistently. In the present case, *$hakk\hat{i}r$ is a composite form with the consonants of *$hikk\hat{i}r$* "he recognized" (*Kethib*) and the vowels of *$yakk\hat{i}r$* "he will recognize" (*Qere*). There is no reason to reject the *Kethib*.

[33]Some sounds of English resemble each other. We have all had the experience of spelling a word over the telephone and having to follow some letter names with examples ("b" as in boy). The same is true of letter shapes. Some letters are so similar that they invite confusion (e.g., "0" and "O"; "1" and "l"). For this reason people in technical professions draw slashes through their zeros to distinguish them from upper case "O"s (or draw slashes through their "O"s to distinguish them from zeros). Nor are we unique in this regard. Some sounds are similar to the ear, and some letters similar to the eye, in Hebrew as well as English. For example, after the Jews adopted "square script" in Babylon during the exile (see n. 34), the following pairs of letters were very close to each other in form: ב (*b*) and כ (*k*), ד (*d*) and ר (*r*), ה (*h*) and ח (*ḥ*), ה (*h*) and ת (*t*), ו (*w*) and י (*y*) (the letters in question here), ע (*ʿ*) and צ (*ṣ*), כ (*k*) and נ (*n*). "For a large part of the Old Testament we must also consider the possibility of confusion occurring in the Old Hebrew script. Thus in Ps. 19:5 *bhm* may be derived from *bym* through a confusion of *y* with *h*, which was quite similar to it in form. As the Lachish ostraca indicate, the letters *ʾ* and *t*, *k* and *n*, *ʿ*, and *d* were quite similar in the Old Hebrew script, as were also *b* and *r*, *h* and *ḥ*, and *m* and *n* . . . ." (ibid., p. 106). Wurthwein has made the essential point here, but by saying "Old Hebrew script" we imply there is only one of them, whereas in fact the letters were constantly changing in subtle ways. This fact provides the basis for the science of paleography--the study of old scripts. At each stage in its history the letters of any alphabet (or syllabary) will resemble each other in a graded progression from not at all to very closely and as letter forms shift gradually over time the visual associations among them can change. I hypothesize that the set of prototypical shapes in a scribe's mind will always be smaller than the set of letters he draws with them. Otherwise he is doing his work thoughtlessly. The processes that operate in paleography to produce letter changes are therefore the same as those which operate in historical phonology (i.e., in phonology) to produce sound changes.

[34]"All the manuscripts and fragments of the Hebrew Old Testament which have come down to us from Jewish sources, from the earliest examples, e.g., the Qumran texts (cf. pp. 30ff.) and the Nash Papyrus, are with few exceptions written in the script still in use

today known as the square script (*kᵉtāb mᵉrubbāʿ*) or the Assyrian script (*kᵉtāb ᵓaššûrî*) from its place of origin. This script was in general use in the time of Jesus: the allusion to the letter *yodh* as the smallest in the alphabet (Matt. 5:18) would be true only of the square script. This script was derived by a gradual process of development from the Aramaic script, which used extensively . . . ." (ibid., p. 3).

[35]C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), vol. 9, *Ezekiel, Daniel*, p. 466.

[36]Ibid.

[37]There is no separate collective number in Hebrew. Collectives are treated morphologically as either singular or plural. The tendency was always for collectives to be treated as plural but over time this tendency became more and more pronounced. In chap. 2 of his book, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 12 [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976], p. 27-84), Robert Polzin proposes a list of features that are characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew but which cannot be traced to Aramaic influences. In the fourth item of this list Polzin states: "Collectives are construed as plurals almost without exception" (ibid., p. 40). He continues, "Moreover in the following parallel passages, the Chronicler construes as plural a collective which Sam or Kings had construed as singular:

1 Chr 11:13	*wᵉhaʿām nāsû*
2 Sam 23:11b	*wᵉhāʿām nās*
2 Chr 23:21	*wayyiśmᵉḥû kol ʿam hāᵓāreṣ*
2 Kgs 11:20	*wayyiśmaḥ kol ʿam hāᵓāreṣ*" (ibid., p. 41).

See also Gesenius (E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English ed. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910]) 132.g, where all examples of collectives construed as plurals are drawn from pre-exilic sources (Gen 30:43; 1 Sam 25:18; 13:15; Isa 9:1; 1 Sam 2:14). What I draw from the above facts is that when the angel says "every god" in Dan 11:37 clause 3 what he has in mind is a collective reference to all deities and that such a reference cannot be taken as an appropriate antecedent for *ʿal kannô*.

[38]James A. Montgomery cites two main views in regard to *ḥemdat nāšîm*. (1) It is a female deity (Nanai-Anaitis-Astarte-Mylitta), "goddess of women and their passions" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927], p. 462). (2) It is a male deity (Tammuz-Adonis) (ibid.). Thus, the genitive can be taken either subjectively ("desire of women" means a desire that women have, women are the subject of the action) or objectively ("desire of women" means a desire that others have for women, women are the object of the action). The reference to women mourning for Tammuz in Ezek 8:14 ("Then he brought me to the entrance to the north gate of the house of the Lord, and I saw women sitting there, mourning for Tammuz") should be studied in this context, as Montgomery points out, but doing so will tell us more about Ezekiel than it will about Daniel.

[39]See Hardy, "'The One Desired by Women' in Dan 11:37," in this issue of *Historicism*.

[40]Traditionally Romans were stoics. Over time, however, there was an increasing openness to sun worship. "Julius Caesar's conversion of the Roman state to the Egyptian solar year was another milestone along the same route. Sun cult and solar calendar are closely related, and as the Republic passed to Empire, the religion of the Sun gained ever wider acceptance among the Romans. The birthday of the Invincible Sun (*dies natalis solis invicti*), which fell shortly after the winter solstice, was celebrated with pomp in the Empire. After Nero, who styled himself the 'New Helios,' the cult of the Sun and its association with Imperial ideals had a marked vogue. The Severan Emperors openly embraced it as their own, and no one knew or remembered or cared that the Baal of Heliogabalus was originally a sky god not a sun

god and that the Emperor's name was Elagabalus. Finally Aurelian constituted the worship of Sol Invictus as the official cult of the Empire" (F. E. Peters, *The Harvest of Hellenism: A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the Triumph of Christianity* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970], p. 443). There is an appealing oneness about the sun. It has no competitors, no detractors. It alone reigns supreme in the sky. In Persia, however, light was made to serve the opposite but equally appealing notion of twoness--light in contrast with darkness. For every day there is also a night.

[41]John J. Collins argues at length that the dualism of the Qumran War Scroll is Persian in origin. "The War Scroll does not derive its basic structure from the Canaanite chaos myth, but from the Persian dualism of light and darkness" (idem, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Vetus Testamentum* 25 [1975]: 604). This is the most useful of Collins' papers that I have read. Its value lies in the distinction the author makes between the book of Daniel and the War Scroll in regard to Persian dualism. Thus, the great controversy motif in Daniel is not Persian in origin, but the elaboration of that concept in the War Scroll is. This is an important fact. Earlier in his paper Collins states: "Specifically, I wish to study the difference between the two books in their basic conception of holy war, a difference which, I believe, marks a highly important point of transition in the development of Jewish apocalyptic" (ibid., p. 597). Having done so, Collins must go on to account for such things as the direction of change (from more foreign influence to less), the relative development of the holy war motif in the two documents (from elaborate to simple), and the implications of dating Daniel not only later than the War Scroll but much later. The alternative I prefer is to date Daniel much earlier.

[42]See Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, p. 280-83.

[43]E. R. Chamberlain has done a very readable, if selective, job of providing such documentation in his book, *The Bad Popes* (New York: Dorset, 1969).

[44]The city of Babylon is not north from Judea but east. (Jerusalem is slightly below 32° north latitude, Babylon is slightly below 33°.) And yet, due to the route they took, whenever a Babylonian army came down into Judea they were always marching south when they got there. So for Jews living through these events the Babylonians were considered a northern power. We may not have the same geographical concepts that the biblical prophets had, but should realize that they had them. In Scripture Babylon is consistently identified with the north.

[45]The ultimate source of hostility toward God's people is Satan. And incidentally, there is no conspiracy of silence in the Bible concerning his activity. He exists and is hostile toward us. His role in Scripture must be correctly understood, or else it will be incorrectly understood. When Paul says, "And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will overthrow with the breath of his mouth and destroy by the splendor of his coming" (2 Thess 2:8), the ultimate fulfillment of the prediction requires that the ultimate example of lawlessness be revealed. We have not seen this yet.

[46]See Hardy, "A Brief Note on Rev 12:1 and 17:3-6," *Historicism* No. 9/Jan 87, pp. 42-44.

[47]Conservative Protestants who deny that a spiritual body (the church) could inherit Israel's covenant relationship with God should realize that the literalistic style of interpretation to which they appeal was used by the Jewish leadership of an earlier age to make precisely the same point. As a direct result of such exegesis Israel was unprepared to accept Jesus as their Messiah (see Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* [Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, p. 16]). He spoke of spiritual things and they wanted something more tangible, more literal, than what He had to offer. It was a fatal error. "Without recognizing Jesus Christ as the Key, the Root, and the Center to all God's covenants with Israel (Revelation 22:16), any 'literal' understanding of God's ancient covenants would only be a dramatic misunderstanding, any claim to its promised blessings, a presumption. . . . Only when the Jew accepts the New Testament message that Jesus is the Messiah of prophecy and receives Christ as the Lord and Savior of his heart, will the darkening

veil be removed from the Old Testament letters and will he be able to understand the true literal meaning of Scripture, the original truth-intention of the Old Testament" (ibid., p. 19).