

1990

The Latter Days and the Time of the End in the Book of Daniel

Gerhard Pfandl
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pfandl, Gerhard, "The Latter Days and the Time of the End in the Book of Daniel" (1990). *Dissertations*. 129.
<http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/129>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313 761-4700 800 521-0600

Order Number 9106812

The latter days and the time of the end in the Book of Daniel

Pfandl, Gerhard, Ph.D.

Andrews University, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Pfandl, Gerhard. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary**

**THE LATTER DAYS AND THE TIME OF THE END IN THE
BOOK OF DANIEL**

**A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy**

**by
Gerhard Pfandl
March 1990**

Copyright (c) 1990

by

Gerhard Pfandl

All Rights Reserved

THE LATTER DAYS AND THE TIME
OF THE END IN THE
BOOK OF DANIEL

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Gerhard Pfandl

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Gerhard F. Hasel
Faculty Advisor: Gerhard F. Hasel
Professor of Old Testament and
Biblical Theology

William A. Shea
William Shea, Adjunct Professor of
Archaeology and History of Antiquity

Robert M. Johnston
Robert M. Johnston, Professor of
New Testament

Jon Paulien
Jon Paulien, Associate Professor of
New Testament Interpretation

Edwin Yamauchi
Edwin Yamauchi, Professor of
History, Miami University

Raoul Dederen
Raoul Dederen, Dean
SDA Theological Seminary

18. VII. 1990
Date Approved

ABSTRACT

**THE LATTER DAYS AND THE TIME OF THE END
IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL**

by

Gerhard Pfandl

Adviser: Gerhard F. Hasel

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE LATTER DAYS AND THE TIME OF THE END IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Name of researcher: Gerhard Pfandl

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Gerhard F. Hasel, Ph.D.

Date completed: March 1990

This study attempts to investigate the two temporal expressions *b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* (the latter days) and *cēt qēṣ* (the time of the end) in the book of Daniel. Its main objective is to determine the precise meanings of these phrases and the relationship between them.

Chapter 1 presents an historical review of literature on the expression "the latter days" and "the time of the end." The four major schools of interpretation

(Historical-critical, Preterist, Historicist, Futurist-dispensational) and their understanding of these phrases are outlined and the great divergence of opinions among scholars concerning them is noted. Furthermore, the issues and problems which this study addresses are pointed out.

The investigation of the phrase "the latter days" in chapter 2 shows that only in the Akkadian literature do we find any parallel phrases to b°'ah°rîṭ hayyāmîm. However, the Akkadian phrases ana aḥrat ûmê and ina arkât ûmê never appear in a religious context and lack an eschatological meaning. In the OT b°'ah°rîṭ hayyāmîm can refer to various periods in the history of Israel some of which are eschatological, e.g., Deut 4:30; Jer 23:20; 30:24, and others which are not, e.g., Deut 31:29; Jer 48:47; 49:39. In the book of Daniel the expressions b°'ah°rîṭ hayyāmîm (10:14) and b°'ah°rîṭ yômāyā' (2:28) are equivalent. Both phrases refer to the future which began in the time of Daniel and which reaches down to the time of the Messianic kingdom.

The investigation in chapter 3 indicates that the words °ēṭ and qēs by themselves can have an eschatological meaning, e.g., °ēṭ in Jer 3:17; 8:1-8; 18:23; 33:15 and qēs in Amos 8:2; Lam 4:18; and Ezek 7:2,3,6. The phrase °ēṭ qēs or a cognate equivalent does not appear anywhere in the ancient Semitic literature outside of the book of Daniel. It is an apocalyptic terminus technicus found five times in the latter half of the book of Daniel (8:17; 11:35,40; 12:

4,9) and always refers to the apocalyptic end of world history, the final period of time leading up to the absolute End.

The final chapter presents an overall summary and presents certain conclusions concerning the two phrases "the latter days" and "the time of the end" and their interrelationship.

Dedicated with love to my wife, Maureen,
without whose help this dissertation
would never have been completed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	xiv
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
The Purpose of the Study	3
Definition of Terms.	4
Schools of Interpretation.	4
Historical-Critical School	4
Preterist School	5
Historicist School	5
Futurist-Dispensationalist School.	7
Apocalyptic and Eschatology.	8
Limitations.	11
Methodology.	12
Chapter	
I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
The Expression "The Latter Days"	15
Major Interpretations before 1800.	16
The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries	28
The Historical-Critical School	29
The Preterist School	45
The Historicist School	52
The Futurist-Dispensationalist School.	68
Three Interpretations of <u>b^e'ah^a rîṭ</u> <u>hayyāmîm</u> (The Latter Days)	90
Messianic Age Interpretation	90
Dual Interpretation.	92
Indefinite Future Interpretation	94
Summary.	99
The Expression "The Time of the End"	102
Major Interpretations before 1800	102
The Nineteenth and Twentieth Century	105
The Historical-Critical School	106
The Preterist School	111
The Historicist School	118
The Maccabean Interpretation	118

The Roman Interpretation	123
The Papal Interpretation	126
The Mohammedan Interpretation.	129
The Futurist-Dispensationalist School.	132
Studies on ^c ēṭ and qēṣ	141
Summary.	145
Conclusions.	147

II. "THE LATTER DAYS " IN ANCIENT NEAR
EASTERN LITERATURE AND IN THE OLD
TESTAMENT. 149

The Root 'hr and "the Latter Days" in Ancient Near Eastern Literature.	149
Akkadian	150
Historical Texts	151
Legal Texts.	156
Religious Texts.	159
Ugaritic	168
'uhryt	168
'uhry.	173
Aramaic.	177
'ah ^a rī	178
'ahar--'aharē.	181
'ah ^a rāh	182
'ahar.	183
'ōhran	185
Summary.	189
The Latter Days in the OT.	191
The Root 'hr and Its Derivatives in the OT.	191
B ^a 'ah ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm in the OT outside the Book of Daniel	197
Gen 49:1.	201
Num 24:14	209
Deut 4:30	220
Deut 31:29	226
Isa 2:2.	227
Mic 4:1.	244
Hos 3:5.	246
Jer 23:20	252
Jer 30:24	257
Jer 48:47	259
Jer 49:39	262
Ezek 38:16	264
B ^a 'ah ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm in the Book of Daniel	272
Dan 2:28-29.	273
Dan 10:14.	281
Summary.	287
Conclusions.	289

III. THE EXPRESSION "THE TIME OF THE END."	292
The Term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$	292
The Term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ in the Cognate Semitic Languages.	292
The Term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ in Extra-Biblical Hebrew.	294
The Term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ in the OT Outside the Book of Daniel.	296
The Term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ in the Book of Daniel	303
Dan 9:21.	303
Dan 9:25.	305
Dan 11:6	310
Dan 11:13,14	313
Dan 11:24.	316
Chart A: Daniel 2, 7 and 8	326
Chart B: Daniel 8, 9 and 10-12	327
Dan 12:1	333
Dan 12:11.	344
Summary.	345
The Term $\text{Q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$	347
Akkadian	347
Ugaritic	348
Aramaic.	350
The Term $\text{Q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ in Extra-Biblical Hebrew.	357
The Term $\text{Q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ in the OT outside the Book of Daniel.	360
The Term $\text{Q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ in the Book of Daniel	366
Dan 8:19.	366
Dan 9:26.	372
Dan 11:6	379
Dan 11:13.	380
Dan 11:27.	381
Dan 11:45.	384
Dan 12:6	387
Dan 12:13.	391
Summary	394
The Phrase $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ $\text{q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ in the Book of Daniel	395
The Five Occurrences in Daniel	396
Dan 8:17.	396
Dan 11:35.	423
Dan 11:40.	425
Dan 12:4	426
Dan 12:9	430
Summary.	430
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	432
Summary	432
Conclusions.	440
BIBLIOGRAPHY	448

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AAA</u>	<u>Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology</u>
AB	Anchor Bible
<u>ABC</u>	Nichol, F. D., ed. <u>Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary</u> . Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-57.
<u>AfO</u>	<u>Archiv für Orientforschung</u>
<u>AHW</u>	Soden, Wolfram von. <u>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</u> . 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz, 1965-72.
<u>ANET</u>	Pritchard, James B., ed. <u>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</u> . 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers
<u>ANRW</u>	<u>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</u>
<u>AO</u>	<u>Der Alte Orient</u>
AOB	Altorientalische Bibliothek, Erich Ebeling
<u>ASTI</u>	<u>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</u>
ASV	American Standard Version
AT	Altes Testament
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AUM	Andrews University Monographs (Studies in Religion)
<u>AUSS</u>	<u>Andrews University Seminary Studies</u>
<u>BAR</u>	<u>Biblical Archaeology Review</u>

- BASOR** Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
- BBC** Broadman Bible Commentary
- BCOT** Bible Commentary on the Old Testament, C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch
- BDB** Brown, Francis; Samuel R. Driver; Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
- BHS** Ellinger, K. and W. Rudolf, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1967-77.
- Bib** Biblica
- BibOr** Biblica et Orientalia
- BZ** Biblische Zeitschrift
- BK** Biblischer Kommentar
- BKAT** Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
- BSac** Bibliotheca Sacra
- BSC** Bible Students Commentary
- BWANT** Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
- BZAW** Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
- CAD** Oppenheim, A. Leo, et al., eds. The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956-.
- CBC** The Cambridge Bible Commentary
- CBSC** The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
- CBQ** Catholic Biblical Quarterly
- CHAL** Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971.
- DARCOM** Daniel and Revelation Committee Series

- DISO** Jean, Charles-F. and Jacob Hoftijzer. Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- DJD** Baillet, M., J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, eds. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955-1982.
- DSB** Daily Study Bible Series
- EBC** Everyman's Bible Commentary
- ETL** Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses
- EvQ** Evangelical Quarterly
- ExpB** The Expositor's Bible, W. Robertson Nicoll, ed.
- ExpTim** Expository Times
- FRLANT** Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
- GTJ** Grace Theological Journal
- HAL** Baumgartner, W., B. Hartmann and E. Y. Kutscher. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 3rd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967-.
- HAT** Handbuch zum Alten Testament
- HNT** Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
- HSM** Harvard Semitic Monographs
- HTR** Harvard Theological Review
- HTS** Harvard Theological Studies
- HUCA** Hebrew Union College Annual
- HWB** Delitzsch, Friedrich. Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1975.
- IB** The Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- ICC** International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures
- IDB** Buttrick, George A., ed. Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.

IEJ **Israel Exploration Journal**
Int **Interpretation**
ISBE **Bromiley, Geoffrey W., ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979-87.**
JAAR **Journal of the American Academy of Religion**
JAOS **Journal of the American Oriental Society**
JB **Jerusalem Bible**
JBL **Journal of Biblical Literature**
JETS **Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society**
JJS **Journal of Jewish Studies**
JNES **Journal of Near Eastern Studies**
JNSL **Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages**
JQR **Jewish Quarterly Review**
JSOT **Journal for the Study of the Old Testament**
JSS **Journal of Semitic Studies**
JTS **Journal of Theological Studies**
KAI **Donner, Herbert and Wolfgang Röllig. Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966.**
KAT **Kommentar zum Alten Testament**
KB **Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek**
KBL **Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.**
KHC **Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament**
KJV **King James Version**
KPG **Knox Preaching Guides**
LB **Living Bible**
LBC **Layman's Bible Commentary**

LC	Lange's Commentary
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
LXX	The Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
<u>MVAG</u>	<u>Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft</u>
NAB	The New American Bible
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NCB	New Century Bible
NEB	New English Bible
<u>NTTij</u>	<u>Nederlands theologisk Tijdschrift</u>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the NT
NICOT	New International Commentary on the OT
NIV	New International Version
<u>NKZ</u>	<u>Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift</u>
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
NSRB	New Scofield Reference Bible
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Old Testament Message
<u>OTS</u>	<u>Oudtestamentische Studien</u>
PC	Pulpit Commentary
<u>PEFQS</u>	<u>Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement</u>
PG	Patrologia graeca, Migne, ed.
PLO	Porta linguarum orientalium
<u>RA</u>	<u>Revue d'Assyriologie et Archéologie Orientale</u>
<u>RB</u>	<u>Revue Biblique</u>

<u>RestQ</u>	<u>Restoration Quarterly</u>
<u>RevQ</u>	<u>Revue de Qumran</u>
<u>RGG</u>	Galling, Kurt, ed. <u>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</u> . 7 vols. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-65.
<u>RSV</u>	Revised Standard Version
<u>SBB</u>	Soncino Books of the Bible (Series)
<u>Scrip</u>	<u>Scripture</u> , Edinburgh
<u>SSS</u>	Semitic Studies Series
<u>ST</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
<u>TBC</u>	Torch Bible Commentaries
<u>TDNT</u>	Kittel, Gerhard, ed. <u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u> . Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964-81.
<u>TDOT</u>	Botterweck, Johannes G. and Helmer Ringgren, eds. <u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u> . Translated by John T. Willis and David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974-.
<u>TEH</u>	<u>Theologische Existenz Heute</u>
<u>THAT</u>	Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann, eds. 2 vols. <u>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT</u> . Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76.
<u>TOTC</u>	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<u>TRu</u>	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
<u>TSSI</u>	Gibson, John C. L. <u>Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions</u> . 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
<u>TWAT</u>	Botterweck, Johannes G. and Helmer Ringgren, eds. <u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</u> . Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970-.
<u>TWOT</u>	Harris, R. Laird; Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. <u>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</u> . Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
<u>TynB</u>	<u>Tyndale Bulletin</u>

<u>TZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>UF</u>	<u>Ugaritische Forschungen</u>
<u>UT</u>	Gordon, Cyrus H. <u>Ugaritic Textbook</u> . Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
VAB	Vorderasiatische Bibliothek
<u>VD</u>	<u>Verbum Domini</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
<u>VT, Sup</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</u>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<u>WBIC</u>	<u>The Wesleyan Bible Commentary</u>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WS	Wuppertaler Studienbibel
<u>WUS</u>	Aistleitner, Joseph. <u>Wörterbuch der ugaritische Sprache</u> . Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1965.
YOS	Yale Oriental Series
<u>ZA</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</u>
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
ZB	Zürcher Bibel
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentar
<u>ZDMG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</u>
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZTK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At the completion of this dissertation I would like to express my gratitude to those who in one way or another have contributed to this study. I am especially grateful to the chairman of my doctoral committee Dr. Gerhard F. Hasel who inspite of his busy schedule took time to advise me in my research and who in supervising this dissertation has made significant suggestions in the process.

To Drs. William H. Shea and Robert M. Johnston, the other two members of my committee as well as to Dr. Jonathan Paulien, the fcurth reader and examiner from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, who offered valuable comments, both supportive and critical, I present my thanks.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Edwin M. Yamauchi, professor of history at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, who kindly assisted as the external examiner. He not only carefully read the dissertation, but he also provided me with many valuable bibliographic references which have been incorporated into the final draft of this study.

Mrs. Joyce Jones, the dissertation secretary has

been of valuable assistance to me in regard to the mechanical aspects of the dissertation.

I would like to thank the Board of Seminar Schloß Bogenhofen, St. Peter, Austria whose generosity in granting me study leave and financial support made this project possible. And a special "thank you" to my colleague Professor Th. Pfingstl who assisted with the Latin literature.

I am very much indebted to the staff of the James White Library, especially to Mrs. D. Helm and Mrs. S. White who were always willing to go the extra mile when I needed it. A sincere thanks also to the following Universities who allowed me to use their libraries: University of Vienna, University of Munich, University of California in Los Angeles, and Fuller Theological Seminary.

Most of all I am grateful to my wife, Maureen, who not only typed every page of this dissertation, but who was a constant source of encouragement during the long years of this research.

Last, but not least, I thank God who has graciously sustained me in this whole endeavor. May this study contribute to a better understanding of His word.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the book of Daniel can hardly be overestimated. It holds the key to the interpretation of biblical apocalyptic.

One important element in the visions of the book of Daniel are their temporal expressions. They seem to help the reader to place the events portrayed within the stream of history. Two of these temporal expressions, i.e., the phrase "the latter days" (b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ yōmayyā' or hayyāmīm)¹ and "the time of the end" (c'ēt qēs)² are the subject of this study.

Statement of the Problem

In the concluding part of the book of Daniel, it is stated that the book and the words have been closed up and sealed "until the time of the end" (Dan 12:4,9). The question to be asked is, What is meant by the phrase "time of the end"? Is it the end of a period in history, or is it the end of world history? From the internal evidence of Daniel's final chapters, "the end" is characterized by a confluence of the divine judgment of the "king of the

¹Dan 2:28 and 10:14.

²Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; and 12:4,9.

North" (Dan 11:40,45), the deliverance of the saints from the final time of distress, and the resurrection of the dead (Dan 12:2), including the resurrection of Daniel himself (Dan 12:13). Does this indicate an end to world history itself, or does it refer to an end within history?

In regard to the interpretation of the expression "the time of the end" in Dan 8:17, there exists a great variety of opinions. Some scholars see the expression "the time of the end" as an end within history and interpret the phrase to refer to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.) and his assault upon the religion of the Jews.¹ Others apply it to the eschatological "time of the end" before the second coming of Christ. A third group, propagating a dual fulfillment, sees both events contained in the prophecy. Does the book of Daniel use the expression "time of the end," which is only used in this book of the OT, for two different time periods, or is only one time period meant? This issue calls for careful analysis.

A further important issue in the book of Daniel concerns the question: How does the expression "time of the end" (עֵת קֵץ) relate to the phrase "the latter days" (בְּאַחֶרֶיֶת הַיָּמִים)? The latter expression is used a few times in the Old Testament prior to the composition of the

¹For representative literature on each of the views mentioned in this introduction, the reader is referred to the chapter "Review of Literature" (pp. 14-148).

book of Daniel and appears in the book itself (Dan 2:28 and 10:14). Are these expressions synonymous? Are the time aspects they refer to coextensive or not?

The "the latter days" phrase itself calls for careful study. Is it used for the first or the second appearance of the Messiah, or is it an idiomatic expression for the future in general, or does it refer to both?

In the New Testament another expression, i.e., "the last days" is placed in an inalienable Christological setting and the expression becomes a technical idiom for the Messianic or Christian age (Acts 2:17; Heb 1:2). Is this also the meaning or part of the meaning of the phrase "the latter days" in the book of Daniel or in the Old Testament?

Finally, what extra-biblical information can be gathered from cognate languages concerning the two phrases, "the latter days" and "the time of the end"? In what ways may this information contribute to an understanding of these expressions in the book of Daniel and in the OT?

These and related issues provide a glimpse of the topics with which this investigation concerns itself.

The Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the meaning and usage of the two major explicit "end-time" expressions in the book of Daniel. I focus primarily on the expressions "the latter days" and "the

time of the end," but related expressions of time in the book of Daniel are taken into account. It is my purpose to set this in the larger Danielic and OT contexts and to consider the wider Near Eastern linguistic contexts.

I believe that a contextual study of these temporal expressions in the book of Daniel is of vital importance for a proper understanding of Danielic eschatology, and its apocalyptic import.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate the reading of this dissertation, it is mandatory to define some of the basic terms.

Schools of Interpretations

Only a brief description of the various schools of interpretation can be given here. Chapter 1 provides details regarding major interpretational systems used for the understanding of the book of Daniel.

Historical-Critical School: Interpreters who do not consider the book of Daniel as true prophecy written in the sixth century B.C. by the biblical figure of Daniel are considered to belong to the Historical-critical School.¹

¹For example, Leonhard Berthold, Daniel aus dem Hebräisch-Aramäischen neu übersetzt und erklärt mit einer vollständigen Einleitung und einigen historischen und exegetischen Excursen (Erlangen: Johann Jacob Palm, 1806-1808), xviii; S. R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1901), xlvii; Aage Bentzen, Daniel, 2nd ed., HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), 7; J. A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 2-5; André Lacoque, The Book of Daniel (Atlanta:

This school holds that an unknown Jew in the second century B.C. put together the prophecies as *vaticinia ex eventu*.¹ It sees the whole book as "an apocalypse or a reflection of the political and religious situation of the Jewish people under the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes,"² although certain parts are believed to have a prior history and are based on various traditions.

Preterist School: Interpreters of the Preterist School consider the book of Daniel as a revelation from God but limit the fulfillment of its prophecies to the time period which runs from the time of Daniel in the sixth century B.C. to the first coming of Christ,³ or to the end of the Roman Empire.⁴

Historicist School: This is the oldest school of interpreters.⁵ Its adherents believe that Daniel, the

John Knox Press, 1979), 7; John J. Collins, Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees, OTM, (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981), 11.

¹Norman Porteous, Daniel, 2nd ed., OTL (London: SCM Press, 1979), 13; Collins, Daniel, First Maccabees, 11.

²Samuel Nunez, "The Vision of Dan 8: Interpretations from 1700-1900" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1987), 11.

³For example, Moses Stuart, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1850), 65; Otto Zöckler, The Book of the Prophet Daniel, trans. J. Strong, LC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 86.

⁴Samuel Lee, An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy (Cambridge: University Press, 1849).

⁵Its basic outline can be traced back to the Church Fathers who believed that the Roman empire (the fourth kingdom) would be succeeded by ten kings. Amongst these

author of the book, was a historical figure who lived in the seventh-sixth century B.C.¹ They hold that the prophecies of Daniel cover the entire historical period from Daniel's days to the final eschaton without any gap or interruption.²

Futurist-Dispensationalist School: Interpreters of this school, like Historicists and Preterists, accept Daniel's

ten kings (the ten toes of Dan 2 and ten horns of Dan 7) the Antichrist (the Little Horn) would arise and rule for three and a half years (the three and a half times of Dan 7) before Christ's second Advent. See Irenaeus Against Heresies 5.25-26 (ANF 1:553-555); Hippolytus Treatise on Christ and Antichrist 23-28 (ANF 5:209-210); Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, trans. G. L. Archer Jr. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), 32, 37. Similar views were held by the Reformers. In accordance with Historicist principles M. Luther interpreted the fourth empire as the Roman empire. Since he lived long after the dissolution of said empire, he identified the ten horns as "Syria, Egypten, Asia, Grecia, Africa, Hispania, Gallia, Italia, Germania, Anglia." (M. Luther, "Luthers Vorrede über den Propheten Daniel," D. Martin Luthers Deutsche Bibel, Martin Luthers Werke, Weimar ed. vol. 11 [Weimar: Hermann Böhlans Nachfolger, 1960], 13). The Little Horn was for him Mohammed or the Turk (ibid.).

¹For example Hippolytus Scholia on Daniel 1:1,19 (ANF 5:185-186); Jerome's Commentary, 15; Luther, "Vorrede," 3; Albert Barnes, Daniel, 2 vols. (1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 1:45; Edward B. Pusey, Daniel the Prophet (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885), xxiii-lxiv; C. Mervyn Maxwell, God Cares, vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981), 11.

²Cf. Nunez, 10-11. This is true in regard to Dan 2 and 7. In Dan 9 some Church Fathers placed the last week of Dan 9:27 into the future before Christ's second Advent. See for example, Irenaeus Against Heresies 25.3 (ANF 1:554); Hippolytus, Treatise on Christ and Antichrist 43 (ANF 5:213). Clement of Alexandria (The Stromata 21 [ANF 2:329]) placed the last week in the time of the Romans: "The half of the week Nero held sway, and in the holy city Jerusalem placed the abomination; and in the half of the week he was taken away, and Otho, and Galba and Vitellius."

authorship of the book in the sixth century B.C.,¹ but unlike them, they generally do not apply the figure of the Little Horn to the Papacy or another power in the past. Rather they expect that in the future a personal Antichrist will appear who will fulfill what is said of the Little Horn in Dan 7 and of the king of the North in Dan 11:36-45.²

Futurist-dispensationalists can be divided into two groups: (a) those who believe "that there is a gap in the fulfillment of the prophecies of Daniel from the first coming of Christ to seven years before his second coming,³ and (b) those who think that from the destruction of the Roman Empire (the fourth beast in Dan 7:8) to the appearance of the Little Horn (the Antichrist) there will be a number of kingdoms (the ten horns) which are successors to

¹H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel (Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), 8; G. Maier, Der Prophet Daniel, WS (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982), 62; John F. Walvoord, Daniel (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), 11; Gleason L. Archer, "Daniel," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, 12 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 7:4.

²Edward J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 163, 249. Archer, "Daniel," 93; Walvoord, Daniel, 175; Maier, 291.

³Nunez, 431.

the Roman Empire.¹ In this study the first group is called Dispensationalists, the second one Futurists.

These four major schools of interpretation are not iron-clad systems which can in every single instance be neatly separated. At times there is some overlapping² and some interpreters, although primarily following one school, may accept some interpretations from another school as part of their own expositions.³

Apocalyptic and Eschatology

The 1950s saw the rise of a renewed interest in the subjects of apocalyptic⁴ and eschatology in the theological

¹Young, Daniel, 149. Leupold (Daniel, 323) even accepts the Reformers' application of the Antichrist to the Pope, but believes that though the Papacy may be the outstanding manifestation of the Antichrist to date, that does not exclude a further manifestation of a future Antichrist.

²For example: Preterists, Futurists, and Historicists all believe that the author of Daniel lived in the sixth century; Historical-critical scholars do not. On the other hand, Preterists, Futurists, and Historical-critical scholars all apply Daniel 8 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes; Historicists generally do not.

³For example: Chr. Wordsworth ("Daniel," The Holy Bible, vol. 6 [London: Rivingtons, 1872]), is basically a Futurist; he rejects the year-day principle and sees Antiochus IV Epiphanes in chaps. 8 and 11 as a type of the final Antichrist; yet in Dan 7 he applies the Little Horn to the Papacy.

⁴The word "apocalyptic" is properly an adjective, but is today widely used as an abbreviation for the noun "apocalypticism." See G. E. Ladd, "Apocalyptic," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology, ed. W. A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 62-65; John J. Collins, "Apocalyptic," The New Dictionary of Theology, ed. J. A. Komonchak, Mary Collins, and Dermot A. Lane (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 42-43.

world. Books and articles were published¹ and the discussion concerning these subjects has not abated.²

The words "apocalyptic" and "apocalypticism" are both derived from the word "apocalypse" meaning "revelation" and describe a genre of literature which we find (1) in the Bible (Daniel, Revelation, Isa 24-27; Ezek 38-39;

¹For example: J. Lindblom, "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?" ST 6 (1952): 79-114; Joshua Bloch, On the Apocalyptic in Judaism, JQR. Monographs, no. 2 (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952); H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952); Th. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology," VT, Sup 1 (1953): 199-229; George W. Buchanan, "Eschatology and the End of Days," JNES 20 (1961): 188-193; Arvid S. Kapelrud, "Eschatology in the Book of Micah," VT 11 (1961): 392-405; Otto Plöger, Theokratie und Eschatologie, WMANT 2 (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1962); H. D. Preuß, Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung, BWANT 87 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968); Hans-Peter Müller, Ursprünge und Strukturen alttestamentlicher Eschatologie, BZAW 109 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1969); Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit, TEH 157 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1969); Joh. M. Schmidt, Die jüdische Apokalyptik (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969); Joseph Schreiner, Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1969); K. Koch, Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1970).

²For example: Leon Morris, Apocalyptic (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972); Walter Schmithals, Die Apokalyptik (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973); J. J. Collins, ed., "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," Semeia 14 (1979): 1-221; B. McGinn, Apocalyptic Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); K. Koch and J. M. Schmidt, eds., Apokalyptik (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982); Christopher Rowland, The Open Heaven (New York: Crossroads, 1982); A. Lacocque, "Naissance de l'apocalyp-tique," Lum Vie 31 (1982): 4-12; Paul D. Hanson, ed., Visionaries and Their Apocalypses (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); James H. Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1983); John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination (New York: Crossroads, 1984).

Zech 9-14; Mark 13; etc.) and (2) in Jewish literature, particularly in the last two centuries before Christ (Books of Enoch, Book of Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, etc.).¹

The term "eschatology," traditionally meaning the doctrine of the last things, has been in use only since the nineteenth century,² and theologians apply it in two different ways. One group defines the word very narrowly as the end of history and the beginning of the time of eternal salvation.³ The second group defines the word in a broader sense and refers it "to a future in which the circumstances of history are changed to such an extent that one can speak of a new, entirely different, state of things without, in doing so, necessarily leaving the framework of history."⁴

¹John B. Taylor, "Apocalyptic Literature," The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 52.

²E. Jenni, "Eschatology of the OT," IDB, 4 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 2:126.

³Ibid. See also Gustav Hölscher, Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie, Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1925), 3; S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 125-125; S. B. Frost, "Eschatology and Myth," VT 2 (1952): 70.

⁴Jenni, "Eschatology," 126. See also, Th. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology," VT, Sup 1 (1953): 223; Joh. Lindblom, "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?" ST 6 (1952): 81. In the field of "Religionsphänomenologie" the terms eschatology and apocalyptic are used somewhat differently. There eschatology refers to the concept of the last things, i.e., whatever comes after death. Apocalyptic on the other hand is used

Eschatology in this study is understood in a broad sense. It refers to the prophetic expectation of a new age within history. The faithful remnant of the exiled Hebrews will return home and the remnants of the two former kingdoms will become the one people of God ruled by a Davidic king (Jer 30:9). Israel will at last realize its God-given task and prepare the world for the final judgment and the end of world history. The break between the two eons will be so deep that the new age cannot be understood as the continuation of what went before.

If eschatology describes a radical break in the course of history, apocalyptic or apocalyptic eschatology describes the end of history, the end of this world. It is the time when the cosmic battle between the forces of good and evil will finally be finished, when the final judgment will take place and salvation will be consummated, and when this present age will be followed by eternity. Thus, the apocalyptic event is the final eschatological event.

Limitations

This study has a number of limitations:

The numerical time aspects in Dan 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12 such as the "seven times," the "time, times and half a time," the "2300 evenings and mornings," the "seventy

in the sense of "revelation." "Enthüllung dessen, was den ganzen Weltlauf umfaßt, von der Erschaffung der Welt bis zu ihrer Vernichtung." (Geo. Widengren, Religionsphänomenologie [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1969], 440).

weeks," the "1290," and the "1335 days" are not dealt with in exegetical detail.

Since the focus of this investigation is on the two major phrases "the latter days" and "the time of the end" in the book of Daniel, other topics in the book such as the statue in Dan 2, the animal symbols, the stone, the Little Horn, the One like a Son of Man, the judgment, the sanctuary, etc., are dealt with only as they directly relate to the main purpose of this study.

Methodology

The methodology employed in this dissertation consists of historical, linguistic, exegetical, and theological research. The historical research is primarily presented in chapter 1 in which a concise historical review of literature on the expressions "the latter days" and "the time of the end" is provided. The divergence of opinions among scholars concerning the meaning of these phrases becomes apparent. The issues and problems clearly emerge and form the basis of further research. The linguistic research is concentrated in the second chapter which attempts first to investigate equivalent or related phrases to "the latter days" in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic literary texts. It provides relevant information which contributes to a broader setting and more extensive background for understanding the biblical expression "the latter days" from a linguistic point of view. Next, this

phrase is investigated in the biblical literature apart from Daniel in its different literatures and settings. Finally, based on this information, an exegesis of Dan 2:28 and 10:14, where the phrase "the latter days" appears, can be engaged in.

The exegetical and theological research is mainly provided in chapter 3. It is devoted to the phrase "the time of the end." The research based on the exegetical and theological task is informed by the canonical boundaries of the OT and NT. In the first part of this chapter the same methodological procedure as in chapter 2 is followed and equivalent or related phrases to "the time of the end" in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic literary texts are sought. Following this, the use of the words "time" and "end" in the Old Testament and in cognate languages is investigated. Next, attention is given, based upon larger background studies, to all texts in Daniel where "time" and "end" are used individually. Finally, every passage where the phrase "the time of the end" appears (Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9), a phrase unique to the book of Daniel, receives detailed study. The concluding chapter summarizes the findings and places them in the context of the understanding of apocalyptic eschatology in the book of Daniel.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is intended as a general historical survey for the investigation of the two Hebrew phrases *b'ahārīt hayyāmīm*¹ and *cēt qēs*² and the Aramaic phrase *b'ahārīt yōmayyā*³ in the book of Daniel.

The Hebrew *b'ahārīt hayyāmīm* and the Aramaic *b'ahārīt yōmayyā* in the book of Daniel are variously translated as "the latter days,"⁴ "end of the days,"⁵ "days to come,"⁶ or "in the future."⁷ In other OT texts the

¹Dan 10:14. It is also found in Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Isa 2:2; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1.

²Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9.

³Dan 2:28.

⁴KJV, RSV, ASV, NASB.

⁵Goodspeed; ZB has "am Ende der Tage."

⁶NAB, JB, NIV, and Berkley in 2:28; NEB in 10:14; Luther (1964) says "in künftigen Zeiten" in 2:28 and "am Ende der Tage" in 10:14.

⁷NIV in 10:14; LB in 2:28; Louis Segond has "dans la suite de temps;" Version d'Ostervald says "dans la suite de jours" in 2:28 and "dans les derniers jours" in 10:14.

translations "last days"¹ or "time to come"² are sometimes found. The phrase ^{עֵת} ^{קֵץ} which appears only in Daniel is generally translated as "the time of the end."³ Other translations are "final period,"⁴ "crisis at the close,"⁵ "end time,"⁶ or "end of time."⁷

In this historical survey I attempt to provide a concise interpretation of these expressions during the last two centuries. A brief look at the history of interpretation before the nineteenth century serves as a background.

The Expression "The Latter Days"

The expression "the latter days" appears in Dan 2:28 and 10:14. An understanding of this phrase is in each

¹KJV in Gen 49:1 and Mic 4:1; NIV and NASB in Mic 4:1. ZB reads "in den letzten Tagen" in Num 24:14 and Mic 4:1.

²JB in Gen 49:1 and Num 24:14; Luther also has "in künftigen Zeiten" in Gen 49:1. Louis Segond translates "dans la suite de temps" in almost all texts where the expression ^ב ^{אֶרֶץ} ^{חַיִּים} appears.

³KJV, RSV, ASV, NIV, Goodspeed, JB. Luther (1964) says "Zeit des Endes" in 8:17, "zur Zeit des Endes" in 11:40, and "letzte Zeit" in 12:4 and 9. Louis Segond and Version d'Osterwald always use "temps de la fin" except in 8:17 where Louis Segond has "un temps qui sera la fin."

⁴Berkeley.

⁵Moffat.

⁶NAB; NASB in 11:35,40 and 12:9; LB in 8:17 and 12:4. ZB always uses "Endzeit" for ^{עֵת} ^{קֵץ}.

⁷NASB in 12:4.

case dependent on the identification of the content of the visions since the time aspect is contingent on the content of the events portrayed. Therefore, the review of literature on Dan 2 needs to focus to some extent on the interpretation of the four empires,¹ the stone, and the time of its striking; in the case of Dan 10:14 the focus will include Dan 11 since it contains the vision concerning "the latter days."

Major Interpretations Before 1800

The earliest interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's image that is preserved appears in the book Jewish Antiquities of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus (A.D. 37--post 100). When he discusses Dan 2, he does not actually name the kingdoms,² or explain the meaning of the stone,³ but when he comments on Dan 8, which he understood to refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, he says: "In the same manner [as

¹Surveys of the different interpretations are provided by H. H. Rowley, Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959), 67-160, and also Klaus Koch, Das Buch Daniel (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), 182-205.

²He simply paraphrases the biblical text. Flavius Josephus Jewish Antiquities 10. 208-209 (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren, and L. Feldman, LCL, 6:273).

³Ibid., 10.210 (LCL, 6:275). He says: "And Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be." He obviously did not want to offend Roman readers.

he had written concerning Antiochus IV Epiphanes] Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple laid waste."¹ This seems to indicate that, like the rabbis, he identified the fourth kingdom as Rome.²

Subsequent to Josephus, the great majority of Christian interpreters in the first few centuries believed that the four kingdoms in Dan 2 were Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.³ Hippolytus (died A.D. 236) at the beginning of the third century identified the first three empires as Babylon, Persia, and Greece. Of the fourth one he said: ". . . the legs of iron, and the beast dreadful and terrible expressed the Romans, who hold the sovereignty at present."⁴ The same view was espoused by

¹Ibid., 10:276 (LCL, 6:311).

²Ralph Marcus, LCL 6:310-311, note c. The Talmud (I. Epstein, ed., The Babylonian Talmud, [London: Soncino Press, 1935-48]) consistently interprets the fourth kingdom as Rome, e.g., Shebuoth, 6b; ^cAbodah Zarah 2b.

³Because the Assyrian and Babylonian empires were sometimes seen as one empire, Hippolytus identified the head of gold as the Assyrian empire (Scholia on Daniel 2:31 [ANF 5:187]), but the first beast of Dan 7 as the Babylonian kingdom (Fragments from Commentaries: On Daniel 2:1 [ANF 5:178]). The other three powers in both visions were for him Persia, Greece, and Rome (ibid.).

⁴Hippolytus Treatise on Christ and Antichrist 28 (ANF 5:210). Irenaeus (died A.D. 195) before him identified the fourth beast in Dan 7 with Rome, "the empire which now rules" (Against Heresies 5.26.1 (ANF 1:554)). We can assume that the fourth empire of Dan 2 was also the Roman empire for him.

Origen (185-254),¹ Eusebius of Caesarea (265-339),² and Aphraates (died ca. A.D. 345), the ascetic from Mosul in Persia, who, interpreting the image in Dan 2, wrote:

Its head is Nebuchadnezzar; its breast and arms the king of Media and Persia; its belly and thighs the king of the Greeks; its legs and feet the kingdom of the children of Esau.³

For Aphraates, as for the Jewish Sages, the children of Esau were the Romans.⁴

Thus, Cyril of Jerusalem (310-386) could say "that this [fourth kingdom] is that of the Romans, has been the tradition of the Church's interpreters."⁵ This tradition

¹Origen Commentariorum in Genesim 3.37 (PG 12:59). He says: Auro quippe Babyloniorum, Persarum argento, Macedonum aera, ferro denique Romanorum significabatur imperium. It seems that W. Shea overlooked this passage when he said that "no interpretation of Daniel's four-world-kingdom scheme appears in the surviving writings of Origen." ("Early Development of the Antiochus Epiphanes Interpretation," Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol. 2, ed. F. B. Holbrook [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], 277.)

²Eusebius Demonstrationis Evangelicae: Fragmentum Libri XV (PG 22:793).

³Aphraates Select Demonstrations 5.14 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 13:357).

⁴The Jewish Sages believed that the Edomites were the first ones to accept the Nazarene's creed and that they brought the cult to Rome, where it later became the state religion. (Hersh Goldwurm, Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary. Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources. The Art Scroll Tanach Series [New York: Mesorah Pub., 1980], 105).

⁵S. Cyril The Catechetical Lectures 15.13 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 7:108).

was continued by John Chrysostom (344-407)¹ and Jerome (345-413), who stated in his commentary: "Now the fourth empire which clearly refers to the Romans, is the iron empire. . . ." ²

Exceptions to this general consensus were the Neoplatonist non-Christian philosopher Porphyry (233-304), Ephraem Syrus (306-373), Polychronius (died ca. A.D. 430), and later the Egyptian merchant turned monk, Cosmas Indicopleustes (6th century A.D.).³

Porphyry who interpreted the fourth empire as the Syrian and Egyptian kingdoms denied any reference to the Roman empire in the book of Daniel since he believed it was written in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes by an unknown Jew who described past history in the form of prophecy. All prophecies in the book, therefore, were for him *vaticinia ex eventu*.⁴

Ephraem Syrus, Polychronius, and Cosmas Indicopleustes, following somewhat in the footsteps of Porphyry,

¹S. John Chrysostom Interpretatio in Daniele Prophetam 2.214 (PG 56:206-207).

²Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, trans. G. L. Archer, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), 32.

³No exact dates for Cosmas are known. Wanda Wolska-Conus in his introduction to the "Topographie chrétienne" by Cosmas Indicopleustes (Sources chrétiennes, vol. 141 [Paris: Cerf, 1968], 16) says, "son activité se place dans la première moitié du vi^e siècle." An extended article on his life and work can be found in William Smith and Henry Wace, eds., A Dictionary of Christian Biography, 4 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877), 1:692-694.

⁴Jerome, 15.

interpreted the fourth empire to be Greece or the kingdoms following it.¹ This view never won general acceptance in their time.

Consonant with the interpretation of the fourth empire as Rome was the view that "the stone cut without hands" (2:34) signified Christ's first advent and his spiritual kingdom. According to Jerome, Porphyry and the Jews applied the stone to the people of Israel, who would become the strongest power at the end of the ages.² Jerome himself saw the fulfillment in the virgin birth and the growth of Christianity after the four world powers came to an end.³ This was also the view held by several of the earlier Church Fathers.⁴ They no doubt looked to a coming of Christ's literal kingdom still in the future with the full accomplishment of that complete destruction of the

¹Ephraem Syrus, In Daniele Prophetam in Opera Omnia Quae Extant Graece, Syriace, Latine, 6 vols. (Rome: Typographia Pontificia Vaticana, 1737-1743), 2:205-206; Polychronius In Daniele in Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio e vaticanis codicibus edita, ed. Angelus Maius, 10 vols. (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1825-1831), 1:4 (The pagination begins with "one" for each book within each volume in this collection. Thus, 1:4 means volume one of the series by Angelus Maius but page 4 of the book by Polychronius); Cosmas Indicopleustes Topographiae Christianae 2.146 (PG 88:111).

²Jerome, 32.

³Ibid.

⁴E. J. Young (The Prophecy of Daniel [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949], 79) says: "Essentially this was the view held by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Irenaeus and Ephraim of Syria."

image which Daniel described,¹ nevertheless, they believed "the stone being cut without hands" symbolized Christ's incarnation and that his spiritual kingdom had been installed at his first advent.²

¹Irenaeus (Against Heresies 26.2 [ANF 1:555]): "Christ is the stone which is cut out without hands, who shall destroy temporal kingdoms, and introduce an eternal one, which is the resurrection of the just." Tertullian (An Answer to the Jews 14 [ANF 3:172]): "Which evidences of ignobility [Isa 53] suit the FIRST ADVENT, just as those of sublimity do the SECOND; when He shall be made no longer 'a stone of offence nor a rock of scandal,' but 'the highest corner-stone,' after reprobation (on earth) taken up (into heaven) and raised sublime for the purpose of consummation, and that 'rock'--so we must admit--which is read of in Daniel as forecut from a mount, which shall crush and crumble the image of secular kingdoms."

²Justin Martyr (Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew 76 [ANF 1:236]): "For he [Daniel] declares that, in saying 'like unto the Son of man,' He appeared, and was man, but not of human seed. And the same thing he proclaimed in mystery when he speaks of this stone which was cut out without hands. For the expression 'it was cut out without hands' signified that it is not a work of man, but [a work] of the will of the Father and God of all things, who brought Him forth." Irenaeus (Against Heresies 21.7 [ANF 1:453]): "On this account also, Daniel foreseeing His advent, said that a stone cut out without hands, came into this world. For this is what "without hands" means, that his coming into this world was not by the operation of human hands So then we understand that his advent in human nature was not by the will of man but by the will of God." Tertullian (An Answer to the Jews 3 [ANF 3:154]): ". . . that is of our 'people' whose 'mount' is Christ, 'praecised without concisors' hands, filling every land,' shown in the book of Daniel." In the Apostolic Constitutions (Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, 5.3.16 [ANF 7:448]) we read: "Him [Christ] Daniel describes . . . as 'the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, and becoming a great mountain, and filling the earth,' dashing to pieces the many governments of the smaller countries, and the polytheism of gods, but preaching the one God, and ordaining the monarchy of the Romans." This is somewhat at variance with D. Bennett's statement ("The Stone Kingdom of Daniel 2," Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM vol. 2, ed. F. B. Holbrook [Washington: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], 336) who, relying solely on L. E. Froom (The Prophetic Faith of Our

Augustine (354-430) clearly equated the stone-kingdom with the Church when he said:

Now then was the stone cut out without hands before the eyes of the Jews, but it was humble. Not without reason; because not yet had that stone increased and filled the whole earth that He showed in His kingdom, which is the Church, with which He has filled the whole face of the earth.¹

In correspondence with the view that the stone represented the first advent of Christ, the "latter days" were seen as having begun with Christ's incarnation. Speaking of the feet of the statue Jerome says: "For just as there was at first nothing stronger or hardier than the Roman realm, so also in these last days there is nothing more feeble. . . ." ²

Theodoret (393-458) on the other hand clearly placed the smiting of the stone at the second coming of Christ and "the latter days", therefore, was the period preceding it.³

In general the view of the early interpreters concerning the four kingdoms was accepted in the Church

Fathers, 4 vols. [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1950]), says: "The witness of the early centuries regarding Daniel 2 and the stone kingdom favors identifying the fourth kingdom with Rome, the stone depicting the conquest of all earthly kingdoms in connection with the Second Advent." Cf. John G. Gammie, "A Journey Through Danielic Spaces," Interpretation 39 (1985): 144-149.

¹Augustine Tractate 4 on the Gospel of John 4 (NPNF, first series, 7:26).

²Jerome, 32.

³Theodoret Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophete 2.1099 (PG 81:1310).

throughout the Middle Ages and the Reformation era.¹ M. Luther (1483-1549) wrote in his exposition of Daniel: "In dieser Deutung und Meinung [that Rome is the fourth kingdom] ist alle Welt einträchtig, und das Werk und die Historien beweisen's auch gewaltig."²

The stone-kingdom was applied by some to Christ's second coming as Theodoret had done,³ but most interpreters,⁴ particularly during the time of the Reformation, saw it begin at Christ's first advent.⁵

The post-Reformation era saw an increase of interest in the prophecies. Joseph Mede (1586-1638), one of the foremost theologians of his time, considered the four

¹An exception was Joachim of Floris (Concordia Novi ac Veteris Testamenti [Venedig, 1519; reprint, Frankfurt a. M.: Minerva G. M. B. H., 1964], fol 127 r,v) who interpreted the golden head as the kingdom of the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians; the silver was Greece; the third kingdom was the Roman Empire, and the Saracens who seized the territory of Rome were for him the fourth empire.

²Martin Luther, Auslegung des Alten Testaments, Dr. Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften, 23 vols., ed. J. G. Walch (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1881-1904), 6:899.

³For example, Joachim of Floris, fol. 127 v.

⁴For example, The Venerable Bede, The Explanation of the Apocalypse by Venerable Bede, trans. E. Marshall (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1878), 145.

⁵For example, Luther, Auslegung des Alten Testaments, 6:900; John Calvin, Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel, 2 vols., trans. Th. Myers (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948), 1:180. George Joye, The exposition of Daniel the Prophete gathered oute of Philip Melanchton, Johan Ecolampadius, Chonrade Pellicane, and out of Johan Draconite (Geneva, 1545), 30.

kingdoms in Daniel to be the ABC of prophecy.¹ He interpreted them as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.² The stone-kingdom depicted for him the two states of the kingdom of Christ:

The First may be called, for distinction-sake, the Regnum Lapidis, the Kingdom of the Stone; which is the State of Christ's Kingdom which hitherto hath been: The other, Regnum Montis, the Kingdom of the Mountain (that is the Stone grown into a Mountain etc.) which is the State of his kingdom which hereafter shall be.³

Mede's opus became a classic in the field of prophetic interpretation and most writers on Daniel in subsequent centuries referred to him in some way. Particularly the Fifth Monarchy Men⁴ but also the Puritans, in general, drew heavily on Mede's expositions of prophecy.⁵ They eagerly anticipated the return of Christ at which time

¹Joseph Mede, "His Epistles," The Works of the Pious and Profoundly Learned Joseph Mede (London: Roger Norton, 1677), 743.

²Idem, "Discourses on Divers Texts of Scripture," Works, 104.

³Idem, "His Epistles," Works, 743.

⁴The Fifth Monarchy Men were a political and religious group within Puritanism which expected the imminent Kingdom of Christ (fifth monarchy) on earth, a theocratic regime in which the saints would establish a godly discipline over the unregenerate masses and prepare for the Second Coming. See B. S. Capp, The Fifth Monarchy Men (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 14.

⁵We often find in their writings on prophecy references to the "learned Mr. J. Medes." For example, Thomas Vincent, "The Popish Doctrine, which Forbiddeth to Marry, is a Devilish and Wicked Doctrine," Puritan Sermons, 6 vols. (Wheaton, IL: Richard Owen Roberts, 1981), 6:338-340; Thomas Goodwin, The Works of Thomas Goodwin D.D., 12 vols. (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1866), 12:50.

the Regnum Montis would be realized.¹ Mede, therefore, has been called "the father of the premillennialism in the English-speaking churches."²

Mede distinguished between "the last times of Dan 2:44 [sic]" which he saw beginning in the time of the Romans³ and "the latter days" which for him were the 1260 days of Papal supremacy after the demise of Rome.⁴ Matthew Henry (1662-1714), the prince of Puritan expositors, who like Mede identified the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome⁵ applied "the latter days" of Dan

¹Goodwin, 12:53-54. See also Froom, 2:567, 571.

²Peter Toon, ed., Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660 (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1970), 62.

³Mede, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," Works, 654.

⁴Ibid., 655. To make this distinction seems to have been common among expositors in those days. Bryan B. Ball (The English Connection [Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981], 182) quotes a Puritan author who says: "There is a great difference betwixt the last days, and the latter days. For the (last days) Hebrew i 2, and the (last times) 1 Peter i 20 do comprehend the whole time under the Gospel: the time, I say, from Christ's first coming to His second: but the (latter times) I Timothy iv 1 do signify only the latter part of the last times. And as the last times, or days, have their latter times; so again the (latter times) have their (last days) as we may see in the II Timothy iii 1 and in the II Peter iii 3 and of the end of these (last days) of the (latter times) are the (latter days) in this Prophecy to be understood. . . ."

⁵Matthew Henry, An Exposition of the Old and New Testament, 6 vols. (Philadelphia: Ed Barrington and G. D. Haswell, n.d.), 4:807-808. This was generally accepted amongst interpreters in the 17th and 18th century. For example, Henry More, An Illustration of those Two Abstruse Books in Scripture, the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John (London: Flesher, 1685), 84; William Lowth, A

2:28 to the time of Christ's first advent, when the spiritual kingdom of God was set up.¹

In summary, we can say that from the time of the Church Fathers until the age of the Enlightenment and the rise of rationalism with its offspring the historical-critical method, there existed a general consensus in regard to the interpretation of the four empires in Daniel.² Two opinions existed in regard to the time of the setting up of the stone-kingdom, but commentators all agreed that the stone represented Christ's kingdom. The "latter days," therefore, were either a future time before the second advent of Christ³ or the times of the fourth empire,⁴ also called the period of the renovation of the Church which happened at the first advent of Christ.⁵

Commentary upon the Prophecy of Daniel and the Twelve Minor Prophets (London: W. Mears, 1726), 21,24; William Whitla, Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse (London: John Murray, 1922), 155.

¹Henry, 4:805, 808.

²There were some exceptions like H. Grotius (Annotationes in Vetus et Novum Testamentum [London: 1727], 384-385) and H. Broughton (Daniel His Chaldie Visions and His Hebrew: Both Translated [London: Richard Field, 1596], 384-385), both interpreted the fourth empire as the Grecian kingdoms, but they never won any large following.

³John Willison, A Prophecy of the French Revolution, and the Downfall of the Antichrist: Being Two Sermons Preached Many Years Ago (Reprint, London: J. Forbes, 1793), 16-17.

⁴Mede, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," Works, 654, 658. Henry, 805-806.

⁵Calvin, Daniel, 1:156.

In regard to Dan 11, the picture is more varied. Those Church Fathers who commented on Dan 11 (not many did) all saw Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.) in the first and an end-time Antichrist in the second part of the prophecy.¹ The Antiochus Epiphanes interpretation became the standard explanation for the first part of the chapter. The second part (vss. 36-45) was interpreted in a variety of ways. Luther did not look for an end-time Antichrist as the Church Fathers had done, he applied these verses to the Papacy, the Antichrist of history.² J. Calvin saw the Roman Empire in these verses³ and M. Henry, like G. Joye and Porphyry before him, applied vss. 36-45 also to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴ J. Mede and Sir Isaac Newton, on the other hand, interpreted the willful king in vs. 36 as referring either to western⁵ or eastern Rome,⁶

¹Hippolytus Fragments 2.38 (ANF 5:184); Victorinus Commentary on the Apocalypse 13.13 (ANF 7:357); Jerome, 139.

²Luther, Auslegung des Alten Testaments, 6:917. This was also the view of Lowth (122) and some Puritans, for example, Goodwin, 3:110.

³Calvin, Daniel, 2:338.

⁴Henry, 4:867; Joye, 207-208. Both, however, saw Antiochus IV Epiphanes also as a type of the Antichrist. Not so Porphyry (Jerome, 139).

⁵Mede, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," Works, 674.

⁶Whitla, 267-268.

and the kings of the South and the North they applied to the Saracens and the Turks, respectively.¹

Thus we find at the end of the eighteenth century five different interpretations of Dan 11:36-45. The "latter days" in Dan 10:14, therefore, were also variously interpreted. Those who saw only Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Dan 11 applied the "latter days" to the last days of the Grecian Empire.² For those who applied Dan 11:36-45 to an end-time Antichrist, "the latter days" pointed to the time of the end.³ For the others, "the latter days" fell somewhere in between. Some applied them to the time before Christ,⁴ others to the Christian era.⁵

This diversity of interpretation indicates that by the end of the eighteenth century various systems for interpreting the prophecies of Daniel had developed. The implications of this are clearly seen in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to which we turn next.

The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

The later part of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century saw the application of the newly

¹Mede, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," Works, 674; Whitla, 266.

²Henry, 4:861.

³Jerome, 115.

⁴Calvin, Daniel, 2:255.

⁵Lowth, 122, 162.

developed historical-critical method to the book of Daniel. It became a prime object of its critical investigation. The defenders of orthodoxy were not slow in taking up the challenge and a considerable body of literature grew out of this controversy.

At about the same time the Advent Awakening¹ in Europe and America reached its climax in this time period and produced its own corpus of literature on the prophecies of Daniel.

We now survey each school of interpretation as listed in the introduction. Since the corpus of writing of each school is too large for the purpose of this chapter, only a representative number of commentators are investigated. The implications each view has for the understanding of "the latter days" are indicated.

The Historical-Critical School

The history of the Christian Church shows that for about 1700 years the Church accepted the book of Daniel as a book of true prophecy written by Daniel who lived in the sixth century B.C.

¹A movement within Protestant Christianity in the late 18th and early 19th century which emphasized the imminent and visible return of Christ. It culminated in America in the Millerite movement which expected Christ to come in 1844. See further Edwin S. Gaustad, ed., The Rise of Adventism (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); Jerome L. Clark, 1844, 3 vols. (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1968); Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968); Francis D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1944); Froom, 4:15-851.

A new direction in scholarship was introduced by the Deists and Rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries¹ who, taking up the arguments of Porphyry,² denied in part or in toto the authenticity of the book of Daniel as well as its traditional age.

The partial criticisms of B. Spinoza (1632-1677)³ and Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1717)⁴ were revived by A.

¹For an excellent review of the rise and development of biblical criticism and the forces that brought it into existence see Henning Graf Reventlow, The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

²Jerome, 15. Porphyry's main theses were: (1) The book was written by an unknown Jew living in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (2nd century B.C.) rather than by Daniel in the 6th century. (2) In the narration of events up to the time of Antiochus, we have true history, but anything beyond that time is false, since the writer could not know the future. The crux of the argument is his pre-supposition that predictive prophecy is impossible.

³Spinoza claimed the book contained two documents, chaps. 1-7 and 8-12. He referred the latter to the undoubted authorship of Daniel and confessed ignorance as to the origin of the former. Tractatus theologico-politicus, 1674 ed., chap.10, 189, quoted in James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 88.

⁴Sir Isaac Newton wrote: "The book of Daniel is a collection of papers written at several times. The last six chapters contain Prophecies written at several times by Daniel himself; the six first are a collection of historical papers written by others." (Whitla, 145). Yet Newton, who was not an infidel, also said: "To reject Daniel's prophecies is to reject Christianity" (ibid., 155).

Collins,¹ J. D. Michaelis,² J. G. Eichhorn,³ and others in the eighteenth century. Michaelis held that the book of Daniel came from a variety of sources,⁴ and for Eichhorn, the visions in Daniel could only report past events. Predictive prophecy inspired by God did not fit into the picture which the age of Enlightenment had painted of this world. There really was no prophecy in the book of Daniel. Eichhorn said, "Die prophetische Einkleidung sollte demnach

¹Anthony Collins, The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered: In a View of the Controversy Occasion'd by a Late Book Intituled, A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion (London: T. J., 1727), 149-157. On the objections Collins put forward, see S. Nunez, "The Vision of Daniel 8: Interpretations from 1700-1900" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1987), 64.

²J. D. Michaelis, "Daniel secundum septuaginta, ex tetraplis Origenis," Orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek 4 (1774): 1-44.

³J. G. Eichhorn in his second edition of Einleitung in das Alte Testament still defended the historicity of Daniel in the sixth century and maintained that probably parts of chaps. 1-6 and definitely chaps. 7-12 came from the pen of Daniel (Einleitung ins Alte Testament, 3 vols., 2nd ed. [Reutlingen: J. Grözinger, 1790], 3:364). Thirteen years later Eichhorn divided the book in two parts, chaps. 2-6 forming one, and chaps. 1 and 7-12 the other. The former part, he held, was a tradition concerning Daniel written by an earlier Jew, upon which the latter part was engrafted by a Jew of the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. (Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 3 vols., 3rd ed. [Leipzig: Weidmännische Buchhandlung, 1803], 3:421). On the composition of the book, see also George A. Barton, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel," JBL 17 (1898): 63.

⁴Michaelis, 29-30. He says: "Unser Hebräisch=Chaldätscher [sic] Daniel besteht aus acht oder zehn Stücken, die vielleicht zuerst einzeln abgeschrieben wurden, uns nur nachher, damit keines von ihnen verloren gehen möchte, in Ein Buch gesammelt sind."

nur verschönerter Vortrag der Geschichte seyn [sic]."¹ The author had the idea "vergangenen Begebenheiten ein weis-sagendes Gewand umzulegen."²

One of the consequences of this kind of thinking was that Rome could no longer be accepted as the fourth empire in Dan 2. The Romans as established rulers in Palestine were still future for a Jew living in the second century B.C.³ Hence, the view that Greece was the fourth empire, a view which was held by Ephraem Syrus, Polychronius, and a number of interpreters in Church history⁴ was revived,⁵ and basically, this is still the view accepted by all mainstream Historical-critical scholars today.

The first influential commentary written along these lines was by Leonhard Bertholdt in 1806.⁶

¹Eichhorn, Einleitung, 3rd ed., 3:419.

²Ibid., 417.

³That the Romans had contact with Palestine in the 2nd century B.C. is evident from the ancient sources. See F. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 3 vols. rev. by G. Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973), 151-152; J. A. Goldstein, I Maccabees (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1976), 271, 360-361; E. Gruen, "Rome and the Seleucids in the Aftermath of Pydna," Chiron 6 (1976): 73-95.

⁴See Rowley, Darius the Mede, 71.

⁵Eichhorn, Einleitung, 3rd ed., 3:393.

⁶Leonhard Bertholdt, Daniel aus dem Hebräisch-Aramäischen neu übersetzt und erklärt mit einer vollständigen Einleitung und einigen historischen und exegetischen Excursen (Erlangen: Johann Jacob Palm, 1806-1808).

Bertholdt's reasons for rejecting a sixth-century origin of the book of Daniel and placing it into the second were: (1) the use of Greek words,¹ (2) the Hebrew of the last five chapters belonging to a time later than the last Old Testament book,² (3) the inclusion of late ideas and customs,³ (4) the uses of idioms which appear in later works,⁴ (5) the existence of historical mistakes,⁵ (6) the presence of passages a truly great man would not have written about himself,⁶ and (7) the position of Daniel in the canon.⁷

Bertholdt put forward the theory that Daniel is the work of nine distinct authors writing at different time periods.⁸ The writing of chap. 2 is placed in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.),⁹ and in the interpretation of the four empires, he follows H. Grotius¹⁰ who identified Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece as the first

¹ Ibid., 24.

² Ibid., 27.

³ Ibid., 29.

⁴ Ibid., 33.

⁵ Ibid., 34.

⁶ Ibid., 37; e.g., 1:19,20; 5:11,12; 6:4; 9:23.

⁷ Ibid., 39.

⁸ Ibid., 49.

⁹ Ibid., 62.

¹⁰ Ibid., 205-206.

three empires and the kingdoms arising out of the Grecian Empire as the fourth.¹ In contrast to Grotius who interpreted the stone as the Roman Empire,² Bertholdt applied the stone to the idealized Messianic kingdom which the Jews were expecting.³

In regard to the "latter days," Bertholdt stated that they were the same time period as the "time of the end" and referred to the last "unmittelbar vor dem Beginn der messianischen Zeit vorhergehenden Epoche."⁴

Of the other Historical-critical scholars in the nineteenth century which we consider in this section, only E. F. C. Rosenmüller followed Bertholdt in regard to the identification of the four empires.⁵ F. J. Maurer,⁶ C. von Lengerke,⁷ G. H. A. Ewald,⁸ A. A. Bevan,⁹ and J. D.

¹Grotius, 384-385.

²Ibid., 384.

³Bertholdt, 215.

⁴Ibid., 530.

⁵Ernst F. C. Rosenmüller, "Daniel," Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, pt. 10 (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1832), 108-109.

⁶Franz J. Maurer, Commentarius Grammaticus Criticus in Vetus Testamentum (Leipzig: F. F. Volckmar, 1838), 92-93.

⁷Caesar von Lengerke, Das Buch Daniel (Königsberg: Verlag Bornträger, 1835), 92, 95.

⁸Georg H. A. von Ewald, Prophets of the Old Testament, 5 vols., trans. J. F. Smith (London: Williams and Norgate, 1881), 5:203.

Prince¹ all understood the four empires to be Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece.² R. Hitzig believed that the second and third empire were the reign of Belshazzar and the Medo-Persian Empire, respectively.³ But there has been very little support for this view.⁴

All the above mentioned scholars, however, agreed on the identification of the stone as the Messianic kingdom,⁵ which was "to be set up 'in the days of those kings', that is when the Greek Empire is in a state of division, and it will last forever."⁶

Ewald speaking about the stone said: "Here we have the New Testament imagery of the Church, particularly as the Shepherd of Hermas works it out."⁷ And Bertholdt saw a

⁹A. A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1892), 66.

¹J. Dyneley Prince, A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), 70-71.

²"This identification is found in Dan 7:5,6 in the Peshitta Version of the book of Daniel, in Ephraem Syrus and in Cosmas Indicopleustes" (Rowley, Darius the Mede, 144-145). It has become the most commonly accepted view among Historical-critical scholars.

³Ferdinand Hitzig, Das Buch Daniel (Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1850), 33-36.

⁴Rowley (Darius the Mede, 142) lists only three interpreters who have taken the same position.

⁵Maurer, 95; Lengerke, 98; Hitzig, 38; Ewald, 204; Prince, 71.

⁶Bevan, 77.

⁷Ewald, 205.

slight connection between the stone and the Church when he said:

Both [stone and mountain] signify only the ideal messianic kingdom which indeed is related to the moral kingdom instituted by Jesus (Joh 18:24-38), the moral Christ; but their relationship is purely an idealistic one.¹

"The latter days," therefore, were seen as the latter time of the Grecian kingdom.² The time of the author (2nd century B.C.), "seine Gegenwart und nächste Zukunft, welche begreiflich ihn am meisten, aber notwendig den Nebukadnezar am wenigsten interessierte."³ Rosenmüller used the more indefinite phrase "later time, future" (temporibus posteris, futuris),⁴ and Bevan simply stated that the phrase 'latter days' "seems to have been suggested by Gen 41:25."⁵

In regard to the interpretation of Dan 11, the scholarly opinio communis of the Historical-critical School in the nineteenth century was that practically the whole chapter applies to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁶

¹Beide [Stein und Berg] bezeichnen bloß das idealische Messiasreich der Juden, das zwar mit dem von Jesus, dem moralischen Christ, gestifteten moralischen Reiche (Joh. 18:24-38) in Zusammenhang, aber bloß in einem idealischen Zusammenhang, steht. Bertholdt, 215.

²Maurer, 95; Lengerke, 98.

³Hitzig, 30.

⁴Rosenmüller, 103.

⁵Bevan, 74.

⁶Maurer, 192-195; Lengerke, 551-560; Hitzig, 211-216; Ewald, 302-304; Bevan, 195-200; Prince, 184-188.

Bevan, speaking of the willful king described in Dan 11:36-39, said:

The portrait of Antiochus here given, as one who "magnifies himself above every god," and who "has no regard to the gods of his fathers," certainly does not appear at first sight to agree with the accounts of the western historians; both Polybius and Livy speak with admiration of the honor which Antiochus paid to the gods. We must, however, remember that though he acquired a reputation for piety among the Greeks by his splendid presents to temples etc. his conduct may have produced a very different impression upon his Oriental subjects, both heathen and Jews. . . . His waywardness and his contempt for established customs were peculiarly calculated to shock Oriental conservatism. When to this we add his persecution of the Jews, it is not surprising that in Daniel he should be represented as a marvel of impiety.¹

In view of this understanding of Dan 11, it was logical that the "latter days" in Dan 10:14 would also be applied to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²

In the twentieth century, the Historical-critical School has produced many commentaries,³ books, and

¹Bevan, 195-196.

²Hitzig, 139,184; Rosenmüller (351) and Prince (167) both explain b'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm with "distant future," however, this distant future in chap. 11 is for them the second century B.C.

³For example, S. R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1901); Karl Marti, Das Buch Daniel, KHC (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901); F. W. Farrar, The Book of Daniel, ExpB (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908); H. T. Andrews, "Daniel," Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1919); Walter Baumgartner, Das Buch Daniel, Aus der Welt der Religion (Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1926); Montgomery, Daniel; Martinus A. Beek, Das Danielbuch (Leiden: Universiteitsboekhandel en Antiquariaat, J. Ginsberg, 1935); Aage Bentzen, Daniel, HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952); J. R. Dummelow, ed., A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: McMillan Co., 1940); Arthur Jeffery, "The Book of Daniel," IB (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956); Eric W.

articles on the book of Daniel.¹ If the quantity of

Heaton, The Book of Daniel, TBC (London: SCM Press, 1956); Carl G. Howie, The Book of Ezekiel: The Book of Daniel, LBC (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1961); James Barr, "Daniel," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley (Sunbury-on-Thames, Middlesex: Th. Nelson, 1962); Th. S. Kepler, Dreams of the Future, Bible Guides, vol. 22 (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963); Norman Porteous, Daniel, 2nd rev. ed., OTL (London: SCM Press, 1979); Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, KAT (Gütersloh: Gert Mohn, 1965); Elias Bickerman, Four Strange Books of the Bible (New York: Schocken Books, 1967); M. Delcor, Le Livre de Daniel (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1971); John J. Owens, Daniel, BBC (Nashville, TN: Broadman, Press, 1971); Raymond Hammer, The Book of Daniel, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); Louis F. Hartman, and Alexander A. Di Lella, The Book of Daniel, AB (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1978); A. Lacocque, The Book of Daniel (Atlanta: J. Knox Press, 1979); James M. Efird, Daniel and Revelation (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1978); J. J. Collins, Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981); D. S. Russell, Daniel, DSB (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981); John G. Gammie, Daniel, KPG (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983); Jürgen-Christian Lebram, Das Buch Daniel, ZB (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984); W. Sibley Towner, Daniel, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984); Toni Craven, Ezekiel, Daniel, Collegeville Bible Commentary (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986); John E. Goldingay, Daniel, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989).

¹For example, August Freiherr von Gall, Basileia Tou Theou: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur vor-kirchlichen Eschatologie, Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek, vol. 7 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926); Walter Baumgartner, "Eine Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung," TRu 11 (1939): 59-83, 125-144, 201-228; idem, "Zu den vier Reichen von Dan 2," TZ 1 (1945): 17-22; Michael J. Gruenthaner, "The Four Empires of Daniel," CBQ 18 (1956): 364-379; J.C. H. Lebram, "Die Weltreiche in der Jüdischen Apokalyptik," ZAW 76 (1964): 328-331; Robert Hanhart, "Kriterien geschichtlicher Wahrheit in der Makkabäerzeit," TEH, n.F. 140 (1967): 7-22; Harald Sahlin, "Antiochus IV und Judas Makkabäus," ST 23 (1969): 41-68; Ferdinand Dexinger, Das Buch Daniel und seine Probleme, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 36 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk Stuttgart, 1969); J. C. H. Lebram, "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel," VT 25 (1975): 722-736; John G. Gammie, "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel," JBL 95 (1976): 191-204; Philip R. Davies, "Daniel Chapter Two,"

literary output indicates anything, it shows that the Historical-critical School has become the dominant force in the interpretation of the book of Daniel today.

By using a representative selection of commentators, I briefly indicate those interpretations which are relevant to this study.

In general, the interpretations given by the expositors of the Historical-critical School in the nineteenth century were accepted, sometimes refined, and used by commentators of this school in the twentieth century.

In regard to the four empires, the view of Ephraem Syrus with Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece has become the standard interpretation of the Historical-critical School today,¹ though some modern Roman Catholic

JTS 27 (1976): 392-401; John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, HSM, vol. 16 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977); John E. Goldingay, "The Book of Daniel: Three Issues," Themelios 2,2 (1977): 45-49; Koch, Das Buch Daniel; Philip R. Davis, "Eschatology in the Book of Daniel," JSOT 17 (1980): 33-53; John G. Gammie, "On the Intention and Sources of Daniel I-IV," VT 31 (1981): 282-292; Hartmut Gese, "Die Bedeutung der Krise unter Antiochus IV Epiphanes für die Apokalyptik des Danielbuches," ZTK 80 (1983): 373-388; M. S. Moore, "Resurrection and Immortality: Two Motifs Navigating Confluent Theological Streams in the Old Testament (Dan 12, 1-4)," TZ 39 (1983): 17-34; G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Interpretation of Dan 7," CBQ 45 (1983): 44-58; Klaus Koch, "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" Int 39 (1985): 117-130.

¹Driver, Daniel, 28-29; Marti, Daniel, 15; Montgomery, 61; Bentzen, 31; Porteous, 47; Plöger, Daniel, 56; Lacocque, Daniel, 51; Towner, 36; Lebram, Daniel, 56; Hartman and Di Lella, 147; Gruenthaner, 207; R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 46; H. Louis Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel, Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, vol. 14 (New York:

interpreters¹ favor Porphyry's view which had Greece as the third and the kingdoms of the Diadochi as the fourth empire.² In general, these interpreters see the kingdoms of the Diadochi as the fulfillment of the phrase "it will be a divided kingdom" (2:41).³ S. R. Driver believes that the two materials iron and clay represent the Seleucides and the Ptolemies, respectively.⁴

There is general unanimity concerning the interpretation of the stone-kingdom as the Messianic kingdom,⁵

Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948), 7; M. Noth, Gesammelte Studien zum AT, Theologische Bücher, vol. 6 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957), 254-255. One variation of this view is A. van Hoonacker's view ("The Four Empires of the Book of Daniel," ExpTim 13 [1902]: 423) who proposed the following sequence for the four empires: Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, the Medo-Persian empire founded by Darius the Mede, and Alexander and his successors. Similarly, J. E. Goldingay (Daniel, 51) identifies the four kingdoms as the regimes of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus. Cf. Edwin M. Yamauchi, "Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel," JETS 23 (1980): 16 n. 19.

¹M. Becher, "Visio de quattuor regnis," VD 4 (1924): 207; C. Lattey, The Book of Daniel (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1948), xxx-xxxi.

²Rowley, Darius the Mede, 139. "It is ironic," says E. M. Yamauchi ("Hermeneutical Issues," 17), "that not only Jewish scholars, such as Bickerman, but also so called 'Christian' scholars now prefer the views of the anti-Christian Porphyry to that of his Christian opponent Jerome."

³Driver, Daniel, 29; Lacocque, Daniel, 52.

⁴Ibid. So also Plöger, Daniel, 57.

⁵Driver, Daniel, 30; Charles, Daniel, 50; Bentzen, 31; Porteous, 50; Plöger, Daniel, 54.

in the broad sense of the term.¹ It is not an extra-terrestrial kingdom,² because "the sphere of that Kingdom is that of its predecessors, only it possesses the everlasting endurance of the natural rock."³ Some scholars recognize that the NT applies the stone to Jesus Christ,⁴ but the emphasis is either on the people of Israel⁵ or on the Christian Church as the Messianic kingdom,⁶ though E. F. Siegman makes a strong case for applying the rock to Christ personally.⁷ He contends: "The rock which destroys idolatrous kingdoms is partly fulfilled in Jesus' condemnation of those who refuse to believe in Him."⁸ After

¹ Referring also to the people of God not only to the person of the Messiah.

² Lacocque, Daniel, 52; Hartman and Di Lella, 149; Goldingay, Daniel, 59-60.

³ Montgomery, 191.

⁴ Montgomery, 192; Howie, 105; Hartman and Di Lella, 150; Edward F. Siegman, "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain," CBQ 18 (1956): 378. The NT texts are Matt 21:44 and Luke 20:18.

⁵ Usually Protestant interpreters; for example, Driver, Daniel, 30; Marti, Daniel, 16; Lacocque, Daniel, 52; Towner, 38; Plöger, Daniel, 50.

⁶ Usually Roman Catholic interpreters; for example, Louis F. Hartman, "Daniel," The Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1958), 451; Gruenthaner who also interprets the stone as the Church goes a step further, he says: "We cannot argue that this kingdom will be restricted to the earth . . . for the new kingdom is said to be everlasting, which supposes that it will endure even after its terrestrial domain has ceased to be" (p. 80).

⁷ Siegman, 378-379.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 379.

referring to Luke 20:18, he says: "Sts. Paul and Peter see the rock testimonies fulfilled in the supreme place of Christ in the Church."¹

Historical-critical commentators are also in agreement on the interpretation of Dan 11 as referring only to the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C.²

Concerning the meaning of the phrase "the latter days" in Dan 2:28 and 10:14, several opinions can be found among Historical-critical scholars.

Some call it an "eschatological" phrase,³ referring specifically to the latter part of the vision. The stone-kingdom, therefore, is sometimes termed an "eschatological kingdom."⁴ G. Kittel points out that the LXX usually

¹Ibid.

²Driver, Daniel, 196; Marti, Daniel, 83; Montgomery, 462-467; Charles, Daniel, 317-318; Bentzen, 81-83; Porteous, 165-168; Plöger, Daniel, 162; Lacocque, Daniel, 231-233; Towner, 162-165; Lebram, Daniel, 121; Goldingay, Daniel, 305.

³Charles, Daniel, 40; Bentzen, 23; Porteous, 44; Plöger, Daniel, 46; Lacocque, Daniel, 45; Towner, 38. Gerhard von Rad, "ἡμετέρα," TDNT, 2:946; G. Fohrer, "Die Struktur der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie," Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie, BZAW 99 (1967): 34.

⁴Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, 162; Towner, 38. There are basically two ways in which scholars understand the terminus "eschatological kingdom." The first view sees a definite restoration of the national kingdom of Israel in the days of the Diadochi or soon after. The hopes in the book of Daniel, says R. H. Charles, are not directed "to the afterworld, with its retributions for the individual, but to the setting up of a world-empire of Israel which is to displace the heathen, to a Messianic kingdom on earth" (Daniel, cxii). D. S. Russell more recently has written:

translates 'ah^ariṭ hayyāmim with eschata, ep eschatou tōn hēmerōn or eschatais hēmerais.¹

Others interpret it simply as "future time."² M. A. Beek says: "To call this an eschatological expression is a misunderstanding. It is a parallel to the Akkadian 'ina arkat ume' and simply means 'in the future'."³ Montgomery⁴ and Towner⁵ translate "after this."

Driver's dictum that this expression always "denotes the closing period of the future so far as it falls within the range of the writer using it"⁶ has become

"It is an earthly kingdom in which the surviving members of the nation will share together with some of the more illustrious dead who will be raised by resurrection to take part in it (12:2). This kingdom, unlike any that have gone before, will be an everlasting kingdom in which evil of every kind will be destroyed (7.18,27)" (The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964], 286-287). This means that though the kingdom is permanent (2:44) it is essentially a continuation of human history in which Israel will have dominion over other nations. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, 163. The second view sees the eschatological kingdom as a heavenly kingdom which will come after the end of the present order. "The old world will be replaced by a new creation and there is no continuity between the two Aeons" (Rudolf Bultmann, History and Eschatology [Edinburgh: University Press, 1957], 30).

¹ Gerhard Kittel, "εσχάτος," TDNT, 2:698.

² Beek, 40. Lebram (Daniel, 54) says it concerns the whole period from Nebuchadnezzar to the end time.

³ Ibid. Dieser Ausdruck ist als eschatologischer mißverstanden, er ist eine Parallele zum akkadischen 'ina arkat ume' und heißt nur 'in der Zukunft'.

⁴ Montgomery, 162.

⁵ Towner, 34.

⁶ Driver, Daniel, 26.

the standard explanation in many commentaries.¹ The sense expressed by it is relative, not absolute, varying with the context. Driver shows how in Gen 49:1 it is used of the period of Israel's occupation of Canaan; in Num 24:14 of the period of Israel's future conquest of Moab and Edom, in Deut 31:29 and 4:30, of Israel's future apostasy and return to God, respectively; and in Dan 10:14 of the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. "Elsewhere," he says, "it is used of the ideal or Messianic age, conceived as following at the close of the existing order of things."² And thus he understands it in Dan 2:28.³

R. H. Charles similarly explains that in Genesis, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Dan 10:14, "it is used of various crises in Israel's history from the settlement in Canaan onwards down to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes." But in the prophets (Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5; Isa 2:2; Jer 48:47; Dan 2:28), "it refers to events and periods still in the future connected with the Messianic age."⁴

K. Marti and O. Plöger take b'ah^arīt hayyāmīm as a terminus technicus for the time of the end (Endzeit) and

¹Montgomery, 162; Jeffrey, 384; Heaton, 129; Portous, 44; Delcor, 78.

²Driver, Daniel, 26.

³Ibid.

⁴Charles, Daniel, 40.

equate it with ēṭ qēṣ (time of the end) in Dan 8:17 and 11:35, 40.¹

J. E. Goldingay, who translates b°'aḥ°rîṭ yômāyā' as "the last part/aftermath of the present days," believes the phrase, though not in itself eschatological, refers to the end part of "the present days."² Thus in vss. 28-29 "in the future" ('aḥ°rê d°nâh) denotes the whole period from Nebuchadnezzar onward, while "at the end of the era" (b°'aḥ°rîṭ yômāyā') "refers more specifically to the events that bring that whole period to a close."³

In conclusion, we can say that Historical-critical scholars in general attribute an eschatological meaning to the phrase "the latter days." It is seen to refer to the days of the Messianic kingdom which should have come in or immediately after the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Thus, for them, the "the latter days" would have been the days of the second century B.C.

The Preterist School

The historical roots of modern Preterism go back to the time of the Counter Reformation. The Reformers on the basis of the Historicist principle of interpretation applied the Biblical prophecies of the Antichrist to the Papacy. M. Luther, for example, firmly believed, that the

¹Marti, Daniel, 14; Plöger, Daniel, 46.

²Goldingay, Daniel, 48.

³Ibid., 49.

willful king in Dan 11:36, 37--the Antichrist--referred to the pope:

Here in Dan 11:37, we have a description of the Antichrist. . . . Now the Antichrist, that is the pope, will not have God nor a legitimate wife and that means, that the Antichrist will despise laws and regulations, customs and principles, kings and princes, principalities in heaven and on earth and accept only his own law.¹

This was also the view of Ph. Melancton,² H. Zwingli,³ and other Reformers.⁴

Several Jesuit scholars undertook the task of refuting this attack on the Papacy. Cardinal Robert

¹Luther, Auslegung des Alten Testaments, 22:844. On page 845 he says: "I believe the pope is the masked and incarnate devil, because he is the Antichrist (Endechrist)." See *ibid.*, 6:918-921.

²In his disputation on marriage Melancton stated: "Since it is certain that the pontiffs and monks have forbidden marriage, it is most manifest and true without any doubt, that the Roman Pontiff, with his whole order and kingdom, is the very Antichrist." (Philippi Melanthonis [sic] Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia in Corpus Reformatorum, 28 vols., edited by Carolus G. Bretschneider [Halis Saxonum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1834-60, reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1963], 12:535).

³In his treatise "Über die wahren Anführer," Zwingli argues: "If they do not know better than to speak scornfully against the Papacy and to spread its deceit, they are to be rebuked for not working on their own improvement. Not because they do any injustice to the Papacy, for I know that in it works the might and power of the Devil, that is, of the Antichrist. Yet I cannot approve their proclaiming the word of God solely because of their hatred against the Pope" (Zwingli, der Staatsmann in Zwingli, Hauptschriften vol. 7, edited by F. Blanke, O. Farner, and R. Pfister [Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1942], 135).

⁴For example, A. Osiander who said: ". . . da der Kaiser Constantinus ist von Rom gezogen, da ist der Endechrist eingezogen" (W. Möller, Andreas Osiander [Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965], 14).

Bellarmino (1542-1621), head of the Jesuit College in Rome, attempted to nullify the prophetic year-day principle as the main proof for the 1260 years of papal tyranny.¹ Francisco Ribera (1537-1591) projected the Antichrist prophecies into the future,² and Luis de Alcazar (1554-1613) contended that these prophecies were already fulfilled in the time of the Roman Empire. Thus, the Papacy could not be the Antichrist.³

Alcazar's interpretation was adopted by Hugo Grotius of Holland, H. Hammond in England, and others, and in time it gained a strong foothold among Protestants. W. Bousset believes that "with Alcazar begins the scientific exposition of the Apocalypse."⁴ His interpretation became the basis for the Preterist and the Historical-critical scheme of prophetic interpretation.

J. G. Eichhorn (1752-1827) republished Alcazar's Preterist interpretation in 1791,⁵ and expositors like N.

¹L. R. Conradi, The Impelling Force of Prophetic Truth (London: Thynne and Co., 1935), 346.

²See p. 68.

³A. Piper, "Johannesapokalypse," RGG, 3rd ed., 7 vols. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959), 3:826. For an extended account of these developments, see Froom, 2:484-532.

⁴Wilhelm Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1906), 94.

⁵Froom, 2:510.

S. Folsom, I. Chase, and Moses Stuart introduced Preterism to the United States.¹

The basic difference between the Historical-critical and the Preterist School, as defined in this study, lies in their philosophical presuppositions. The former denies that the visions in Daniel are true prophecies, the latter does not. Preterists believe that the prophet Daniel in the sixth century B.C. wrote either the whole² or part of the book which bears his name.³

¹See footnote below for bibliographic information.

²Nathaniel S. Folsom, Critical and Historical Interpretation of the Prophecies of Daniel (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1842), vii; Irah Chase, Remarks on the Book of Daniel (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1844), 12; Samuel Lee, An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy (Cambridge: University Press, 1849), 138; Moses Stuart, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Boston: Crocker and Webster, 1850), 400; A. M. Osbon, Daniel Verified in History and Chronologie (New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1856), 14; Henry Cowles, Ezekiel and Daniel (New York: Appleton and Co., 1868), 275; William M. Taylor, Daniel the Beloved (1878; reprint, New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1919), 7; Otto Zöckler, The Book of the Prophet Daniel, LC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 9; J. E. Thomson, Daniel, PC (London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1898); Philip Mauro, The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation (Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, 1944), 14; Robert M. Gurney, God in Control (Worthing, West Sussex: H. E. Walter, 1980), 9-10.

³Johannes Nickel, Grundriß der Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), 205; Johannes Goettsberger, Das Buch Daniel, Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1928), 6; M. J. Lagrange, "Les Prophetes Messianiques," RB, n.s. 1 (1904): 491-520; Denis Buzy, "Les Symboles de Daniel," RB, n.s. 15 (1918): 403-431. Lagrange and Buzy do not actually discuss the date of Daniel, but from the contents of their articles it can be inferred that they accept some parts of the book as coming from the time of Daniel.

Historical-critical scholars do not. Preterists believe in the prophecies of Daniel as revelations of the future. This, as well as the scope which these prophecies have for them--from Cyrus to the Messianic kingdom, that is, primarily the first advent of Christ--clearly differentiates them from the Historical-critical exegetes.¹

Preterists generally see the four kingdoms in Dan 2 and 7 as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and the kingdoms of the successors of Alexander,² though some have the sequence Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.³ R. Gurney has adopted the scheme of Ephraem Syrus with Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece.⁴

General unanimity exists among Preterists as to the identification of the stone-kingdom. Most Preterists agree that the stone refers to the spiritual kingdom of Christ, that is the Church, which he established at his first coming.⁵

As mentioned above, in this they differ from

¹Due to the limited number of Preterist interpreters in the twentieth century, they are considered together with those in the nineteenth century.

²Folsom, 148-150; Chase, 19; Stuart, 173; Cowles, 305-308; Zöckler, 77-78; Buzy, 412; Lagrange, 503.

³Osbon, 47-51; W. M. Taylor, 41-43; Thomson, 70; Lee, 159; Mauro, 116.

⁴Gurney, 30-33, cf. John H. Walton, "The Four Kingdoms of Daniel," *JETS* 29 (1986): 25-36.

⁵Folsom, 154; Stuart, 67-68; Lee, 151; Zöckler, 79; Osbon, 59-61; W. M. Taylor, 49; Cowles, 306; Thomson, 73; Lagrange 497; Buzy, 413; Gurney, 39.

Historical-critical scholars who identify the stone with the Messianic kingdom of God, i.e., Israel's dominion over the nations, which was supposed to come after Antiochus IV Epiphanes but which, in fact, never materialized.

Preterists are also in fair agreement on the interpretation of Daniel 11. Most of them apply the second part of the chapter (vss. 21-45) to the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.¹ Some believe that the last verses of the chapter describe the Roman power.²

As for "the latter days" in Dan 2:28, most Preterists apply them to the Messianic age.³ M. Stuart emphasizes that *b'ah^arîṭ yōmayyā'* is not "a generic expression for any subsequent time or future time, as De Wette and Hävernich assume, but *latter portion of time* = Messianic period, and not to be explained by *'ah^arē d^enāh* in vs. 29."⁴ Yet, other Preterists allot no special importance to the phrase. Cowles states:

The reference made here [2:28] and elsewhere to the time when the events signified by this dream should

¹Folsom, 57; Chase, 79; Stuart, 354; Osbon, 183; Cowles, 434; W. M. Taylor, 196; Zöckler, 254; Thomson, 320; Lagrange, 515; Nikei, 202.

²Lee, 178; Gurney, 147-148. Mauro (140) in particular sees the Herodian dynasty in these verses.

³Stuart, 57; Zöckler, 75; Thomson, 63; Lee applies "the latter days" in some places (100-106, 145) to the Messianic period; in another place (148), he says: "These latter days therefore, and this hereafter, must, of necessity, happen after the times of Nebuchadnezzar, and before those of the establishment of this our fifth kingdom."

⁴Stuart, 57.

take place are altogether indefinite. Thus "what shall be in the latter days" (v.28); "what shall come to pass" (v.29) and "what shall come to pass hereafter" (v.45) give us no certain clue to the precise period. So far as these phrases are concerned, the events might come sooner or later; might spread over centuries before the Christian era, or lie in the future beyond it. We look in vain to these phrases to find definitive marks of future time.¹

As noted above, Preterists generally interpret Dan 11 in reference to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. "The latter days" in 10:14, therefore, are also assigned to this period prior to the first advent of Christ.² Stuart, anticipating Driver's dictum,³ says concerning 10:14:

B^e'ah^ari^t hayyāmim is not necessarily restricted to the latter or final portion of time before the end of the world, but may mean the latter part of any period particularly in the mind of the speaker, specially when this can be understood by those who are addressed. Here it evidently means, the latter part of the period which precedes the coming of the Messiah; for so the sequel of the vision shows it to mean.⁴

In summarizing the Preterist position we find that they have a very straightforward conception of the book of Daniel. The scope of the visions, they believe, is from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the time of the Roman Empire and everything in the visions finds its fulfillment during that

¹Cowles, 303.

²Stuart, 320-321; Cowles, 413. Zöckler (229) says it is the same as in 2:29, the Messianic future.

³See p. 43.

⁴Stuart, 320-321. Mauro (120) thinks "that the period here designated as 'the latter days' is that second term of Jewish history which began at the restoration from Babylon . . . and ended with the destruction of Jerusalem . . . in A.D. 70."

time period. "The latter days" in Daniel are either the Messianic time, i.e., the first century A.D., or the time just prior to it.

The Historicist School

The Historicist School of interpretation is the oldest of the four schools. It can be traced back to some of the Church Fathers such as Irenaeus,¹ Hippolytus,² and Jerome.³ It was taught by Joachim of Floris (1130-1202) in the twelfth century and became the standard interpretation of expositors until the time of the Counter Reformation.

Historicists believe in the divine inspiration of the book of Daniel, that it was written in the sixth century B.C., and that its main prophecies cover the period from the Babylonian Empire to the second coming of Christ.

Historicists of the nineteenth century all believed that the four empires in Dan 2 and 7 represent the kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome,⁴ and that the

¹Irenaeus Against Heresies 5.25 (ANF 1:553-555).

²Hippolytus Treatise on Christ and Antichrist 23-28 (ANF 5:209-210).

³Jerome, 32, 77; cf. Froom, 1:450.

⁴Aaron Kinne, An Explanation of the Principal Types, the Prophecies of Daniel and Hosea, the Revelation, and Other Symbolical Passages of the Holy Scriptures (Boston: Samuel T. Armstrong, 1814), 131-135; William Hales, A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy, 4 vols. (London: C. J. G. and F. Rivington, 1830), 2:495-505; William Miller, Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A.D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years (Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833), 7-8; Charles

Little Horn in Dan 7 is the Papacy.¹ A third factor common

P. Miles, Lectures, Expository and Practical, on the Book of the Prophet Daniel (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1841), 60; George S. Faber, The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy: Or a Dissertation on the Prophecies, Which Treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times, 2 vols. (London: W. E. Painter, 1844), 2:7; Adam Clarke, The Holy Bible, 6 vols. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), 4:586; Thomas R. Birks, The Four Prophetic Empires, and the Kingdom of Messiah: Being an Exposition of the First Two Visions of Daniel (London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1845), 58; Symon Patrick et al., "Daniel," A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament, 4 vols. (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846), 3:646-647; James H. Frere, A Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Esdras, and St. John, Shewing That All the Prophetic Writings Are Formed upon One Plan (London: John Hatchard and Son, 1850), 125-132; J. Cumming, Prophetic Studies: Or Lectures on the Book of Daniel (London: Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co., 1850), 41-74; Albert Barnes, Daniel, 2 vols. (1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 1:156-165; Edward Bickersteth, Practical Guide to the Prophecies, with Reference to Their Interpretation and Fulfillment, and to Personal Edification (London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1852), 168; William Ramsey, An Exposition of the Book of Daniel: with Practical Observations (Edinburgh: Th. Grant, 1853), 50-52; W. R. A. Boyle, The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel (London: Rivingtons, 1863), 114-116; Samuel Tarver, Course and Culmination of Empire According to Prophecy (Louisville, KY: John P. Morton, 1866), 7; William C. Thurman, The Sealed Book of Daniel Opened: Or a Book of Reference for Those Who Wish to Examine the Sure Word of Prophecy (Boston, MA: Office of the "World's Crisis," 1867), 278; James W. Bosanquet, Messiah the Prince or the Inspiration of the Prophecies of Daniel (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1869), 18-19; William H. Rule, An Historical Exposition of the Book of Daniel the Prophet (London: Seeley, Jackson and Halliday, 1869), 71-76; John W. Birchmore, Prophecy Interpreted by History (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1871), 18-21; A. P. Forman, Prophecy (St. Louis: Presbyterian Publishing Company, 1878), 306-409; Robert Nevin, Studies in Prophecy (Londonderry: James Montgomery, 1890), 25; Uriah Smith, The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, rev. ed. (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1944), 93-96; Joseph Tanner, Daniel and the Revelation (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), 160.

¹For example, Faber, 2:60; Birchmore, 43; Frere, 248; Nevin, 82; Tanner, 167; Barnes, Daniel, 2:82-99; U. Smith, Daniel, 103.

to all was their use of the year-day principle in interpreting the time prophecies in Daniel.¹ It is the continuous revelation of the sequence of world empires together with the use of the year-day principle which made Historicists different from other interpreters.² A last point on which there was also general agreement amongst Historicists was the prophecy in Dan 9:24-27. All Historicist commentators agreed that the focus of this prophecy is Jesus

¹For example, Faber, 1:30; Bickersteth, 158; Tarver, 141; Boyle, 154; Thurman, 169; Birks, Four Prophetic Empires, 12; Barnes, Daniel, 2:74; U. Smith, Daniel, 129.

²The Year-Day Principle has been stated by Th. R. Birks (First Elements of Sacred Prophecy: Including an Examination of Several Recent Expositions, and of the Year-Day Theory [London: William E. Painter, 1843], 311) as follows: (1) That the church, after the ascension of Christ, was intended of God to be kept in the lively expectation of his speedy return in glory. (2) That, in the divine counsels, a long period of nearly two thousand years was to intervene between the first and second advent, and to be marked by a dispensation of grace to the Gentiles. (3) That, in order to strengthen the faith and hope of the church under the long delay, a large part of the whole interval was prophetically announced, but in such a manner that its true length might not be understood, till its own close seemed to be drawing near. (4) That, in the symbolical prophecies of Daniel and St. John, other times were revealed along with this, and included under one common maxim of interpretation. (5) That the periods thus figuratively revealed are exclusively those in Daniel and St. John, which relate to the general history of the church between the time of the prophet and the second advent. (6) That, in these predictions, each day represents a natural year, as in the vision of Ezekiel; that a month denotes thirty, and a time three hundred and sixty years. The figure 360 for a prophetic year comes from the comparison between the 3 1/2 times, the 1260 days, and 42 months in Rev 14:6,14, and 13:5, respectively, which are all taken to refer to the same time period.

Christ and that He fulfilled it in His incarnation.¹

On most other points of interpretation one finds a wide range of viewpoints among Historicists. The Little Horn in Dan 8 was seen by some as the Papacy,² by others as the Mohammedan power.³ A. Barnes identified it with Antiochus IV Epiphanes,⁴ Tarver with the Roman emperor Julian (331-363).⁵ The stone-kingdom in Dan 2 was applied to the first advent by some exegetes;⁶ others believed this kingdom would be set up at the second coming of Christ.⁷

Concerning the understanding of Dan 11, most Historicist interpreters in the nineteenth century found in this chapter the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (vss. 21-30), Rome (vss. 31-35), and the Papacy (vss. 36-39).⁸

¹For example, Nevin, 18; Clarke, 4:602; U. Smith, Daniel, 195; Tanner, 62.

²Th. R. Birks, The Two Later Visions of Daniel: Historically Explained (London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1846), 179; Thurman, 286.

³Faber, 2:107; Bickersteth, 112; Tanner, 509; Frere, 248; Nevin, 82; Birchmore, 43.

⁴Barnes, Daniel, 2:109.

⁵Tarver, 69.

⁶Faber, 2:29; Frere, 143; Nevin, 44; Miles, 61; Clarke, 4:573; Barnes, 1:174-175; Patrick, 3:647; M. T. Taylor, 46.

⁷Bickersteth, 171; Tanner, 161; Birks, Four Prophetic Empires, 355; U. Smith, Daniel, 53.

⁸Clarke, 4:611-617; Nevin, 155-187; Tanner, 519-527; Samuel Sparkes, A Historical Commentary on the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel: Extending from the Days of Cyrus to the Crimean War (Binghamton, NY: Adam and Lawyer Printers, 1858), 95-223.

The kings of the North and South were variously interpreted as Russia and England,¹ Turkey and the Saracens,² or Turkey and Egypt.³

Some exegetes, however, divided the chapter differently. Barnes, for example, applied the whole chapter from vs. 21 onwards to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴ Frere assigned the same verses to the French Empire.⁵ And U. Smith saw Rome (vss. 14-30), the Papacy (vss. 31-35), and France (vss. 36-40) in chap. 11.⁶

Opinions were also divided on the subject of "the latter days." "The latter days," said Patrick, "very often signify the times of the Messiah, called the 'last times', or age of the world; and so the expression may be understood here."⁷ Thus for Patrick "the latter days" began with Christ's first advent. Tanner, on the other hand, began "the latter days" with the time of the prophet and had them reach "to the coming of Christ, and to His Millennial kingdom."⁸ Barnes also stated that the phrase

¹Tanner, 525-526.

²Sparkes, 223-259.

³U. Smith, Daniel, 264.

⁴Barnes, Daniel, 2:227-254.

⁵Frere, 354-504.

⁶U. Smith, Daniel, 221-264.

⁷Patrick, 3:646.

⁸Tanner, 518. This is also the opinion of Clarke (4:568).

often has special reference to the Messianic times, but he believed that this was not the sense of "the latter days" in Dan 2:28. There "it denotes merely future times."¹ And it should be translated "future days" rather than "latter days."²

"The latter days" in Dan 10:14 were very often not dealt with by commentators; those who did, understood them the same way as "the latter days" in Dan 2:28. Nevin, after quoting 10:14, wrote:

It appears to be very plainly implied in those statements that the predictions that follow in the 11th and 12th chapters are to be understood as having special reference to Daniel's people--that is, to the Israelites; and also, that the things referred to, however briefly, have particular respect to the future of that people, down to the inbringing of the glory of the latter day, the commencement of the Millennium.³

He seemed to equate "the latter days" with the end-time before or at the beginning of the Millennium. Similarly, U. Smith seemed to place "the latter days" after the end of the 2300 evening-mornings, just before the second advent of Christ.⁴

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Historicist School of interpretation was preeminent in the field of prophetic exegesis. During that century, however, the rise of the Historical-critical School and the

¹Barnes, Daniel, 1:147.

²Ibid.

³Nevin, 155.

⁴U. Smith, Daniel, 208-209.

acceptance of the Futurist principles of interpretation by an ever-increasing number of Protestant interpreters led to a strong decrease in the number of Historicist expositors by the end of the century, as is evidenced by the paucity of Historicist commentators in the twentieth century. To this we now turn.

During the first half of this century Historicists published a few volumes on the book of Daniel,¹ but most of them were not commentaries in the proper sense of the word. The work by Charles Wright has an interesting chapter on the Septuagint version of the book of Daniel, and other works² referring to the book of Daniel in pre-Christian and apostolic times. He also touches on the highlights of each chapter, but he says very little on the time prophecies of Daniel except for the seventy weeks which for him cover the period from 457 B.C. to about A.D. 33.³ He has, however,

¹Charles H. H. Wright, Daniel and His Prophecies (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906); Stephen N. Haskell, The Story of Daniel the Prophet (South Lancaster, MA: Bible Training School, 1908); Justus G. Lamson, The Eleventh of Daniel (Minneapolis, MN: J. G. Lamson, 1909); J. A. Battenfield and P. Y. Pendleton, The Great Demonstration (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1914); Charles Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel (1923; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963); H. N. Sargent, The Marvels of Bible Prophecy (London: Covenant Publishing, 1938); F. G. Smith, Prophetic Lectures on Daniel and Revelation (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, 1941); Clarence H. Hewitt, The Seer of Babylon (Boston: Advent Christian Herald, 1948).

²E.g., The First book of Maccabees; The Third Book of the Sibyllines; The Book of Ben Sira etc.

³Wright, 236.

an interesting remark on the 2300 evening-morning period. After stating that no satisfactory interpretation has been given thus far, he says: "It is quite possible that those 2300 days may be a period of prophetic days or years which still have to run their course."¹ Unfortunately for us, he never discusses the expressions "the latter days" or "the time of the end."

The same must be said of the excellent book by Boutflower, as well as of the less impressive works of Battenfield and Pendleton and of Sargent, a retired Major-General of the British Army. The last two works deal in more topical way with certain interesting aspects and passages in the books Daniel and Revelation. Justus G. Lamson's The Eleventh of Daniel interprets Dan 11 from a Historicist's point of view. He basically follows U. Smith's outline and sees Rome (vss. 16-30), the Papacy (vss.31-35), and France (vss. 36-45) in the chapter. The book by Haskell also follows U. Smith's commentary. Finally, the books by F. G. Smith and Hewitt have good material on prophecy and prophetic interpretation, but neither purports to be a commentary on Daniel.

F. G. Smith, an Amillennialist, brings out the parallels between Daniel and Revelation and highlights many

¹ Ibid., 190.

of the traditional Historicist positions.¹ Hewitt's The Seer of Babylon is a compendium of prophetic interpretation. To each symbol or passage he deals with, he gives an overview of the various interpretations that have been proposed and then gives the reasons for his own position. He does not discuss "the latter days" in Dan 2:28, but after referring to Dan 10:14 he says: "Who would be referred to as Daniel's 'people?' Would it be the Jews? And what would be the 'latter days'; the last days of human history, or the closing days of Jewish national existence?"

He answers by stating that "it is difficult to avoid the inference that the vision pertains primarily to the fortunes of the Jewish nation in the last period of their history as God's chosen people."² Thus, "the latter days" would refer to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and possibly to the first century A.D.

In his interpretation of Dan 11, Hewitt attempts a synthesis of the Historical-critical, the Preterite, and the Historicist views by means of the double-reference principle. On the basis of this principle the "willful king" of vs. 36-45 would be Antiochus IV Epiphanes "as the type, not, indeed, of a last-day Antichrist, but of some powerful northern ruler of the last days of this

¹For example, the four empires in Daniel are: Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome (81); the Little Horn in Dan 7 is the Papacy (85); the year-day principle (92) etc.

²Hewitt, 283.

age."¹ This solution, he says, would bridge the gap between Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the past and the future resurrection in chap. 12. In this case, "the later days" would have a double fulfillment; they would, first of all, refer to the last centuries before Christ and, second, to our own age.²

¹Ibid., 346.

²It is interesting to note that this principle of double or multiple reference appears in the writings of different scholars and interpreters. In the nineteenth century A. Barnes (Daniel, 2:256-257) wrote: "It was no uncommon thing among the prophets to allow the eye to glance from one object to another lying in the same range of vision, or having such points of resemblance that the one would suggest the other; and it often happened that a description which commenced with some natural event terminated in some more important spiritual truth to which that event had a resemblance, and which it was adapted to suggest. . . . Three things often occur in such a case: (1) language is employed in speaking of what is to take place which is derived from the secondary and remote event, and which naturally suggests that; (2) ideas are intermingled in the description which are appropriate to the secondary event only, and which should be understood as applicable to that; and (3) the description which was *commenced* with reference to one event or class of events often passes over entirely and *terminates* on the secondary and ultimate events." B. Ramm (Protestant Biblical Interpretation [Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1956], 234) in this century says: ". . . manifold fulfillment of a generic prophecy preserves the one sense of Scripture. Both promises and threats work themselves out over a period of time and therefore may pass through several fulfillments. And L. Berkhof (Principles of Biblical Inspiration [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950], 153) writes: "The fulfillment of some of the most important prophecies is germinant, i.e., they are fulfilled by instalments, each fulfillment being a pledge of that which is to follow. Hence while it is a mistake to speak of a double or treble sense of prophecy, it is perfectly correct to speak of a two or threefold fulfillment. It is quite evident, e.g., that Joel's prophecy in 2:28-32 was not completely fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Notice also the predictions respecting the coming of the Son of Man in Matt. 24."

Since the 1950s several Historicist commentaries and books on the prophecies of Daniel have appeared.¹ They all agree on the identification of the four empires, the Little Horn in Dan 7, and the year-day principle. On the subject of the Little Horn in Dan 8, however, Filmer revives the theory that the Little Horn in chap. 8 is the Moslem power,² whereas all the others identify the Little Horn in Dan 7 and 8 with the Papacy,³ though Ford, on the basis of the apotelesmatic principle,⁴ sees a prior minor fulfillment in Antiochus Epiphanes.⁵

The stone-kingdom is applied to the second coming

¹F. D. Nichol, ed. The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald 1953-57); George McCready Price, The Greatest of the Prophets (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955); Desmond Ford, Daniel (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1978); Edmund Filmer, Daniel's Predictions (London: Regency Press, 1979); C. Mervyn Maxwell, God Cares, vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981); Prophetie und Eschatologie, Bibelkonferenz Marienhöhe (Darmstadt, 1982); Frank B. Holbrook, ed., Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986); Jaques B. Doukhan, The Vision of the End: Daniel (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987); Arthur J. Ferch, Daniel on Solid Ground (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1988).

²Filmer, 92.

³Nichol, ABC, 4:826; Price, 166; Maxwell, 160; G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the 'Time of the End': A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol. 2, ed. F. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 401; Doukhan, Daniel, 28, 53.

⁴This principle means that a partial or preliminary fulfillment may take place in one age, then long afterward a much more complete fulfillment (Price, 30-31).

⁵Ford, Daniel, 172.

by all Historicists just referred to¹ except that Filmer and Ford also see a reference to the first advent.² Filmer

¹Nichol, ABC, 4:776; Price, 81; Maxwell, 42-43; Douglas Bennett, Symposium on Daniel, 353.

²Filmer, 18; Ford, 99. The arguments for a fulfillment at the first advent were long ago stated by W. M. Taylor (Daniel the Beloved, 46-47). He said: (1) Whatever comes against any single portion of the image may be viewed as directed against it as a whole; and so the advent of Christ, though it came before the final division of the Roman Empire, may be regarded as coming into collision with the spirit by which every form of that empire was animated. (2) The words "in the days of these kings" refer not to the kings of the Roman Empire alone, but to all the kings represented by this composite image, and the meaning is that some time during the history of those kings thus symbolized the God of heaven should set up his kingdom. (3) The great image was not only thrown down, but there was a subsequent process of comminution independent of what would have been produced by the fall. A fall would only have broken it into large blocks or fragments, but this continued smiting reduced it to powder. This would imply, therefore, not only a single shock, but some cause continuing to operate until that which had been overthrown was effectually destroyed, like a vast image reduced to impalpable powder. (4) If the stone refers to the second advent, the vision would altogether ignore the most important fact in the annals of humanity--the Incarnation. (5) The phraseology of Daniel is identical with that employed by Isa 9:7 in predicting the birth of the Messiah. The arguments for a fulfillment at the second advent were summarized by C. H. Hewitt (The Seer of Babylon, 71-72). He stated: (1) Christ was born less than thirty years after the last division of Alexander's empire succumbed to the rising power of Rome, and during the reign of the first Roman emperor. The Church was established under Tiberius, the second emperor. If this be what is meant, then the stone should have struck the image at about the waist line, not at the feet. (2) The smiting of the image under the swift, unexpected impact of the stone suggests a world-shaking catastrophe rather than an obscure event almost unnoticed by the world, and the slow beginnings and relatively slow progress of the Christian movement. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for

says that the phrase "'in the days of those kings' requires that the stone kingdom must have been founded before the fourth empire came to an end."¹ He then quotes Matt 3:2; 4:17; and Luke 17:21 to show that it was founded during the lifetime of Jesus Christ.² On the other hand, he says:

Since the image was struck on its feet, the event described here could not have taken place until long after the Roman empire had fallen, and since it brings to an end the fifth and last period of world history, it must still be future.³

Ford believes that the kingdom was inaugurated at the first advent and will be consummated at the second.⁴ He says: "The consummation will be reached when catastrophically the stone with one blow shatters all worldly opposition and rears the mountain of God."⁵

Concerning "the latter days" in Dan 2:28, it is

them" (vs. 35). Here is no picture of the birth and earthly life and ministry of Jesus. Nothing of this sort can be said to have happened in the first century. (3) According to the position we are examining, the stone kingdom has been running concurrently with the iron legs and with the feet-and-toe powers for nearly two thousand years. This is directly contrary to the representation. For the kingdom of stone destroys all the preceding kingdoms and takes their place; i.e., fills all the earth which they had previously occupied. For these three reasons the theory that the stone is Christ at His first advent and the kingdom it represents is the Church must be rejected.

¹Filmer, 18.

²Ibid., 18-19.

³Ibid., 19.

⁴Ford, Daniel, 99.

⁵Ibid., 100.

interesting to note that many Historicist commentators who deal with the text either refer to or quote the dictum of S. R. Driver who said: "[It] always denotes the closing period of the future so far as it falls within the range of view of the writer using it."¹ Bennett thinks it "refers in general to the future, subsequent to Babylon, but with particular focus on the day when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord."² And Filmer believes that the expression is "used in the Old Testament to indicate the whole Christian era, and that it is equivalent to 'the last days' spoken of in the New Testament."³ Ford again has two applications, the New Testament age as a whole and "the close of this age when the kingdom of glory shall be established."⁴

As can be expected, the enigmatic chapter, Dan 11, has given rise to a variety of views among Historicists. Filmer has the sequence Antiochus IV Epiphanes (vss. 21-30), Rome (vss. 31-35), Byzantine Emperors (vss. 36-39), and the Moslem period (vss. 40-45) which ended in 1922, when the Sultan abdicated, and the Moslem Caliphate was

¹Driver, Daniel, 26. See Nichol, ABC, 4:103; Price, 72; Ford, Daniel, 93.

²D. Bennett, "The Stone Kingdom of Daniel 2," 351. This is also the view of Price, 72.

³Filmer, 13.

⁴Ford, Daniel, 93.

abolished.¹ "The whole of chapter 11," says Filmer, "has now been fulfilled."²

The return of the Jews to Palestine is seen by Filmer as the fulfillment of the first part of Dan 12:1; the time of trouble and the resurrection in vs. 2 he applies to the time before and at the second coming of Christ.³

The other Historicist commentators considered in this part of the review, except for Doukhan and Ford, have the sequence Greece (up to vs. 13 or 15), Rome (from vs. 14 or 16 onward), and the Papacy (either from vs. 21 or 31-44).⁴ The last verse of the chapter is considered unfulfilled prophecy.⁵

Doukhan assigns practically the whole chapter to the Little Horn power, that is the Papacy.⁶ He sees the Roman Empire only mentioned in the phrase: ". . . [Alexander's] kingdom shall be plucked up and given to others [Rome] besides these [the four Diadochi]" (11:4).⁷

¹Filmer, 144.

²Ibid., 145.

³Ibid., 146.

⁴Nichol, ABC, 4:868-877; Price, 283-317; Maxwell, 290-297. Nichol also lists the view of U. Smith who from vs. 36 on sees France as fulfilling these verses.

⁵Nichol, ABC, 4:877.

⁶Doukhan, Daniel, 80.

⁷Ibid., 78.

Ford, like the Preterists and Historical-critical scholars, applies vss. 21-35 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, though the whole passage, he says, is "pertinent as a revelation of Rome also--the power that began as a small despised race . . . and then broke Israel, her Messiah, and her temple."¹ The last verses (36-45) Ford applies to the Antichrist including the Papacy.²

Historicists view "the latter days" in Dan 10:14 the same way as in Dan 2:28, "the final part of whatever period of history the prophet has in view."³ Since the vision in chap. 11 like the vision in chap. 2 reaches to the second advent, "the latter days" describe the period before the events of Dan 12:1 take place.⁴

Concluding our survey of Historicist interpreters we find that a great divergence of opinion is found among them. "The latter days" in Daniel are seen as a general expression for "future" by some, as the Messianic times following the first advent by others, and as the days just prior to the second advent by a third group. Hence, the

¹Ford, Daniel, 267.

²Ibid., 271-276.

³Nichol, ABC, 4:861.

⁴Price, 269; Ford, Daniel, 250.

phrase is eschatological or apocalyptic for some, but not for others.

The Futurist-Dispensationalist School

As mentioned in the introduction to Preterism, one of the defenders of the Papacy against the Reformers' identification of the Pope with the Antichrist was the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Ribera (1537-1591). He applied the Antichrist prophecies in the books of Daniel and Revelation to a future personal Antichrist who would appear in the time of the end and continue in power for three and a half years.

For nearly three centuries this view was virtually confined to Roman Catholicism until early in the nineteenth century it was espoused in England and Ireland by men like Samuel R. Maitland (1792-1866),¹ William Burgh (1800-1866),² James H. Todd (1805-1869),³ John Darby (1800-1882)

¹An Anglican clergyman who in 1826 published a 72 page pamphlet in which he denied the year-day principle (An Enquiry into the Grounds on Which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John Has Been Supposed to Consist of 1260 Years, 2nd ed. [London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1837], 2). In 1830 he wrote another pamphlet in which he denied the application of the Antichrist prophecies to the Pope and the identification of the fourth empire with Rome (An Attempt to Elucidate the Prophecies Concerning Antichrist: With Remarks on Some Works of J. H. Frere [London: Francis and John Rivington, 1853], 3, 8.).

²Irish Futurist who published a treatise on the second advent in which he rejected the identification of the Antichrist with the Pope. Like Maitland he expected a personal Antichrist in the future. (Lectures on the Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ, 2nd ed., enlarged [Dublin: William Curry, Jr. and Co., 1835], 63, 65).

of the Plymouth Brethren,¹ and John Henry Newman (1801-1890),² the famous High Church Anglican who converted to Roman Catholicism and was made a cardinal by Pope Leo XII in 1879.³

A few years after Maitland had written his "Enquiry," Heinrich A. C. Hävernicks (1811-1845), a German Lutheran theologian, published his commentary on Daniel in which he proposed that the division of the fourth empire in Dan 7 into ten kingdoms was still in the future.⁴ He further suggested that the Little Horn in Dan 7 was a future Antichrist and that the Little Horn in Dan 8 represented Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of the future

³Irish scholar and professor of Hebrew at the University of Dublin. He declared that "the fourth kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar's vision is even yet to come," and is not Rome. (Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist in the Writings of Daniel and St. Paul [Dublin: The University Press, 1840], xii, 61-62).

¹The most prominent among the founders of the Plymouth Brethren. He was a voluminous writer on a wide range of subjects. In his writings on prophecy (Studies on the Book of Daniel: A Course of Lectures [London: J. B. Bateman, 1864]), he propagated Futurism.

²In his article "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist," published in The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review 28 (1840): 391-440, he maintains that the Antichrist is yet to come.

³For a more extended treatment of all these authors, see Froom, 3:541, 658-669.

⁴Heinrich A. C. Hävernicks, Commentar über das Buch Daniel (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1832), 560-570.

Antichrist.¹ Both of these views became trade marks of Futurist interpreters, as noted shortly.

During the nineteenth century, Futurist interpreters in the English-speaking countries reacted against the interpretations of Historicists, and those of Germany, against the method of the Historical-critical School. In due course two different types of Futurism developed. One class of Futurists believed that "Israel" in prophecy always referred to literal Israel. Thus, the return of the Jews to Palestine in the time of the end played an important part in their theology. They developed the hermeneutical principle of two peoples of God, one earthly and the other heavenly. Accordingly, they were forced to make a parenthesis in the fulfillment of the prophecies of Daniel from the first coming of Christ to seven years before His second coming. This group is called Dispensationalists.²

¹Ibid., 236, 251.

²Representatives of this type of Futurism were, for instance, S. R. Maitland, W. Burgh, J. H. Todd, J. Darby; Joseph Tyso, Elucidation of the Prophecies (London: Jackson and Walford, 1838); Benjamin W. Newton, First Series of Aids to Prophetic Enquiry (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1850); S. P. Tregelles, Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel, 8th ed. (1847; reprint, Chelmsford: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony, n.d.); William Kelly, Notes on the Book of Daniel (1858; reprint, New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, 1902); Joseph A. Seiss, Voices from Babylon (Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1879); G. H. Pember, The Great Prophecies of the Centuries concerning Israel and the Gentiles, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895); Nathaniel West, Daniel's Great Prophecy: The Eastern Question: The Kingdom (New York: Hope of Israel Movement, 1898).

The second group of Futurists did not accept the principle of two peoples of God. Yet they differed from Historicists "in that they considered the fulfillment of the ten horns of the fourth beast of Dan 7 and the Little Horn of the same vision to be in the future."¹ This group is called Futurists.²

Characteristics which the two groups had in common were: (1) The view that considerable portions of the prophetic chapters of Daniel were yet to be fulfilled; (2)

¹Nunez, 246.

²Representatives of this type of Futurism were, for instance, H. A. C. Hävernack; Johann C. K. Hofmann, Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und im Neuen Testament (Nordlingen: E. S. Bed'sche Buchhandlung, 1841/44); Carl A. Auberlen, The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John, trans. Adolph Saphir (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1856); Ernst W. Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, 4 vols., trans. Th. Meyer and J. Martin, (1872-1878; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1956); Francis P. Kenrick, The Book of Job and the Prophets (Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian, and Piet, 1859); Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, David Brown, A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old and New Testaments, 6 vols. (1866; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1945); Carl F. Keil, The Book of Daniel, BCOT, trans. M. G. Easton (1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949); Theodor F. Kliefoth, Das Buch Daniels (Schwerin: A. W. Sandmeyer, 1868); C. P. Caspari, Zur Einführung in das Buch Daniel (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1869); A. Rohling, Das Buch des Propheten Daniel (Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1876); Christopher Wordsworth, "Daniel," The Holy Bible, 6 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1872); Edward B. Pusey, Daniel the Prophet (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885); Franz Düsterwald, Die Weltreiche und das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen des Propheten Daniel (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1890); J. Fabre D'Enviu, Le livre du Prophete Daniel (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1891); J. Knabenbauer, Commentarius in Daniele prophetam (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1891).

that the days in the chronological periods were literal days; and (3) that the Antichrist was a future

*personal infidel Antichrist, fated to reign and triumph over the saints for 3½ years (the days in the chronological periods being all literal days,) until Christ's coming shall destroy him.*¹

Most Futurists and Dispensationalists² identified the four empires in Dan 2 with Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.³ Concerning the stone-kingdom, however, the two groups held different views. Most Futurists believed that the stone referred to the Messianic kingdom set up at Christ's first advent.⁴ Referring to the phrase "the stone . . . became a great mountain" (2:35), C. Keil said:

The destruction of the world-kingdoms can in reality proceed only gradually along with the growth of the stone, and thus also the kingdom of God can destroy the world-kingdoms only by its gradual extension over the earth.⁵

Dispensationalists, on the other hand, insisted

¹E. B. Elliott, Horae Apocalypticae, 4 vols., 5th ed. (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1862), 4:597.

²That the fourth empire was still in the future was held by S. Maitland and J. H. Todd, as shown above.

³For example, Hävernicks, 563-568; Hengstenberg, 70; Keil, Daniel, 265; Kliefoth, 101; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 7-8; Seiss, 61-63; Pusey, 115; Düsterwald, 28-29; Darby, 9; Tyso, 15; Auberlen, 32; Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 4:392; West, 25.

⁴For example, Hävernicks, 83,84; Hengstenberg, 72; Keil, Daniel, 269; Auberlen, 34; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 8; Pusey, 117. Exceptions to this view were Kliefoth (104-105) and Fausset (Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, 4:391), who applied the stone to the Second Advent.

⁵Keil, Daniel, 271.

that the stone kingdom had reference only to the second and not to the first advent.¹ Seiss observed:

The stone does not here come upon the time of the clay and iron toes of the great image. . . . It is in the days of these toe-kingdoms that it comes and does the breaking. But Christianity, in its greatest vigor, was set up full four hundred years before the Roman empire was divided at all, and a still longer period before those toes were developed, if indeed they be not still future. . . . According to the vision, the appearance of the stone kingdom was followed at once by the complete dissolution of the whole image of temporal dominion; but Christianity has been in the world more than eighteen hundred years, and no damage has it ever done to any human sovereignty or state.²

Concerning the interpretation of Dan 11, Futurists and Dispensationalists generally agreed that from vs. 21 on Antiochus IV Epiphanes is the main actor in the plot. They were also united in the view that he is but a type of the end time Antichrist. Some saw the whole chapter as a description of the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes;³ others believed that in vs. 36⁴ or vs. 40⁵ the figure of Antiochus IV Epiphanes merges into the figure of the

¹Tyso, 15; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 51; Darby, 9; Seiss, 85; West, 40.

²Seiss, 85.

³Hävernick, 488-489; Auberlen, 58; Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 4:451. These interpreters accept as historically valid the statement of Porphyry, repeated by Jerome (139), according to which Antiochus IV Epiphanes undertook an expedition against Egypt in the eleventh year of his reign (166-165 B.C.) and took Palestine on his way.

⁴Keil, Daniel, 463; Kliefoth, 467; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 59; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 220; Darby, 95; Seiss, 279; Düsterwald, 166.

⁵West, 172.

end-time Antichrist and that the last verses of Dan 11 describe only the activities of the future Antichrist.

An exception to this scenario was the view found by W. Burgh, J. Tyso, and S. Tregelles. They saw the long interval between the Syrian history and the Antichrist between vss. 4 and 5.¹ Tregelles argued that in chap. 8 the break comes after the fourfold division of Alexander's empire in vs. 8,² and "just so," he said, "we have in this concluding vision an interval which commences at the fourfold division of the monarchy."³

"The latter days" in Dan 2:28 and 10:14 have been variously interpreted by Futurists and Dispensationalists. Consonant with their view of the stone striking at the first advent, most Futurists apply "the latter days" to the days of the Messianic kingdom, that is, from the days of Christ onward until the final consummation at the second advent.⁴ Hävernicks, however, explains the b°'aḥ°rīt yōmayyā' (latter days) in vs. 28 with mäh dī lehewē' 'aḥ°rē d°nāh (what shall be after this) in vs. 29 and says "the

¹Burgh, 161-163; Tyso, 47; Tregelles, 134.

²The general view of Futurists and Dispensationalists on chap. 8 is that the Little Horn is Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of the future Antichrist. See, for example, Hävernicks, 266; Keil, Daniel, 260; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 37; Auberlen, 54; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 152; Darby, 50.

³Tregelles, 133. This is also the view of Burgh and Tyso.

⁴Keil, Daniel, 101; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 6.

latter days' denote an indeterminate future, the future generally as in Gen 49:1 or Num 24:14."¹ Though in Dan 10:14 he applies the phrase to the Messianic time and to the time preceding it.²

Keil takes issue with Hävernicks and argues that "'aḥ^arîṭ yōmayyā' = 'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm designates here [2:28] not the future generally (Häv.) . . . but the concluding future or the Messianic period of the world's time; see Gen 49:1."³ He then repeats the argument already found by Moses Stuart⁴ that "the latter days" in Dan 2:28 cannot be explained with "what shall be after this" in 2:29, because "'aḥ^arê d^enâh relates to Nebuchadnezzar's thought of a future in the history of the world, to which God, the revealer of secrets, unites His Messianic

¹Hävernicks, 74. Kliefoth (86) uses the same linguistic argument but rejects Hävernicks conclusion. He says: "Das d^enâh v. 29. aber kann nach dem Zusammenhange hier Nichts meinen als den gegenwärtigen Zustand, die Weltlage, wie sie eben durch Nebukadnezar selbst geworden ist und ist. Mithin will nach Daniels Worten Gott dem Nebukadnezar durch diesen Traum anzeigen, was in derjenigen Folgezeit geschehen soll, die eintreten wird, wenn es mit der durch Nebukadnezar begründeten Weltgestalt zu Ende geht." It is not clear whether Kliefoth refers with "Weltgestalt" to the Babylonian realm alone or to all four empires. If the former is correct, "the latter days" would start with the Medo-Persian empire; if the latter, "the latter days" would refer to the second advent.

²Ibid., 440.

³Keil, Daniel, 101.

⁴Stuart, 57.

revelations."¹ Furthermore, every Messianic future event is also an 'ah^arê d^onâh, but the reverse is not the case.²

"The latter days" in Dan 10:14, Keil believes, refer to the same time period as "the latter days" in Dan 2:28. It is "the Messianic world time, in ch. 8:17 [it] is called the time of the end."³ Thus, Keil equates "the latter days" and "the time of the end" and has them both beginning in the time of Christ.

The majority of Dispensationalists also equate the two phrases but apply them to the time of the Antichrist at the end of time, the seventieth week of Daniel 9.⁴ W. Kelly believes this phrase

is put as a sort of frontispiece to the prophecy to show that the great thought of God for the earth is the Jewish people, and the main design of this prophecy is what must befall them in 'the latter days'.⁵

N. West, who translates 'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm as "the afterness of days," considers that phrase to be "a technical expression including all near and far horizons, but eminently the remote."⁶ Whether he limits the far horizon

¹Keil, Daniel, 101.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 419.

⁴Tyso, 24; Tregelles, 133; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 203; Darby, 51.

⁵Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 203.

⁶West, 141.

to the seventieth week, or whether he includes the intervening time is difficult to determine.

A. R. Fausset certainly includes the intervening time between the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the second coming. Commenting on Dan 2:28, he says that "the latter days," literally "in the after days" (vs. 29), "refers to the whole future including the Messianic days, which is the final dispensation (Isa. 2.2)."¹

Th. F. Kliefoth has still another interpretation of "the latter days." He rejects the typical explanations like "in the future," "the Messianic time," or "at the end of days" and, commenting on Dan 10:14, he observes:

Rather it is here as always the time which will come after a certain date which must be indicated by the context. These days which must pass, are, according to vs. 13 those of the Persian kings. Thus the angel still has to report to Daniel what will happen to the people of God during the time which follows the days of the Persian kings after he assured him, that all will be well with the Persian kings.²

During the twentieth century a large number of commentaries written by Dispensationalists have appeared on

¹Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 390.

²Kliefoth, 433. Vielmehr ist es hier wie immer die Zeit, welche nach einem gewissen Termin, der im Zusammenhange angezeigt sein muß, kommen wird. Diese Tage aber, die erst verstreichen müssen, sind laut V. 13. die der persischen Könige; also was in der Zeit, die auf die Tage der persischen König folgt, dem Volke Gottes geschehen wird, hat der Engel dem Daniel noch zu berichten, nachdem er ihm versichert, daß mit den persischen Königen Alles im Reinen sei.

the theological scene.¹ In contrast, only a handful of commentaries were authored by Futurists,² indicating that

¹For example, H. A. Ironside, Lectures on Daniel the Prophet (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1920); A. C. Gaebelstein, The Prophet Daniel (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1955); William L. Pettingill, Simple Studies in Daniel, 3rd ed. (Harrisburg: Fred Kelker, 1914); William C. Stevens, The Book of Daniel (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1915); E. M. Milligan, Is the Kingdom Age at Hand? (New York: George H. Doran, 1924); Clarence Larkin, The Book of Daniel (Philadelphia: C. Larkin, 1929); G. H. Lang, The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1940); Keith L. Brooks, The Certain End (Los Angeles: American Prophetic League, 1942); Louis T. Talbot, The Prophecies of Daniel (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1940); M. R. De Haan, Daniel the Prophet (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947); Arthur Petrie, The Message of Daniel (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publication, 1947); Frederick A. Tatford, Daniel and His Prophecy (London: Oliphants, 1953; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock, 1980); Arthur E. Bloomfield, The End of the Days (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1981); Philip R. Newell, Daniel: The Man Greatly Beloved and His Prophecies (Chicago: Moody Press, 1962); Geoffrey R. King, Daniel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1966); Lehman Strauss, The Prophecies of Daniel (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1969); John F. Walvoord, Daniel (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971); Leon J. Wood, A Commentary on Daniel (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973); Robert D. Culver, Daniel and the Latter Days, rev. ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977); Merrill F. Unger, "Daniel," Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament, vol. 2 (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981); Gordon Lindsay, The Prophecies of Daniel (Dallas: Christ for the Nations, 1982); C. G. Ozanne, The Fourth Gentile Kingdom (Worthing, West Sussex: Henry E. Walter, 1982); John C. Whitcomb, Daniel, EBC (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985); Gleason L. Archer, "Daniel," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, vol. 7 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985). Harry Bultema, Commentary on Daniel (1918 in Dutch; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1988).

²For example, Young, Daniel; P. P. Saydon, "Daniel," A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1953); Philip C. Johnson, The Book of Daniel (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964); B. H. Hall, "The Book of Daniel," WBIC, 6 vols. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969), 3:501-559; H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel (Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969); A. R. Millard, "Daniel," The International Bible Commentary, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids:

evangelical Christianity has by and large adopted the Dispensationalist's position concerning the exegesis of the book of Daniel.

Futurists and Dispensationalists of the twentieth century, with few exceptions, have continued the interpretations of their predecessors concerning the four empires, the stone-kingdom, the little horns, and the kings in Dan 11. Some exceptions are noted here and then we concentrate on their views concerning the latter days.

On the identification of the four empires, G. H. Lang argues that only when Nebuchadnezzar made Babylon the center of a world empire did the first kingdom of prophecy arise.¹ The same, he says, applies to the second and third empires. It was when Cyrus made Babylon the center of his rule, and when Alexander made Babylon his world-center that the second and third kingdoms of prophecy arose. And thus, with the fourth empire, when the future Antichrist makes Babylon² his capital, then the fourth empire will have

Zondervan, 1986); Ronald S. Wallace, The Lord Is King (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979); Gerhard Maier, Der Prophet Daniel, WS (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982).

¹Lang, 29.

²Many Dispensationalists believe that in the time of the end, literal Babylon will be rebuilt and become the seat of Antichrist. See John F. Walvoord, The Revelation of Jesus Christ (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), 262-263; Lang, 33; G. R. King, 76.

risen.¹ Thus, Lang has the kingdom sequence: Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and end-time Babylon.²

C. G. Ozanne, like Lang, identifies the first three empires as Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece. The legs of iron are for him the kingdoms of the North and South (Syria and Egypt) who bridge the gap between the bronze kingdom of Greece and the iron-clay kingdom of the end-time Antichrist.³ Ozanne claims that "Rome is nowhere mentioned in the book of Daniel nor, for that matter, anywhere else in the prophetic scriptures."⁴

Another view in regard to the four kingdoms was advanced by the Catholic Futurist commentator P. P. Saydon. In the interpretation of these kingdoms, Saydon follows the Historical-critical scholar H. Junker who considered the number four as a symbolic expression indicating universality.⁵ We must not ask which historical kingdoms are meant, says Junker, because "the number four for the world empires is not a historical but a symbolic number which he [the author of Daniel] has artificially imposed on the

¹Lang, 29.

²Dispensationalists consider the feet of the image to symbolize a revived Roman Empire comprised of individual kingdoms in the time of the end (Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 50-52).

³Ozanne, 28-30.

⁴Ibid., 31.

⁵Hubert Junker, Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische Probleme des Buches Daniel (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), 8-9.

historical events."¹ Daniel really only knew three kingdoms since the exile.² The figure four is borrowed from a Greek or Iranian schema.³ Saydon, therefore, says Daniel is not predicting a definite number of historical empires, "but all the historical kingdoms, whatever their number from Nebuchodonosor [sic] to the establishment of the kingdom of God."⁴ Yet, Saydon understands the first kingdom to be Babylon and the fourth to be Greece.⁵ Junker's scheme relieves him of the task of identifying the two kingdoms in the middle.

Futurists generally see the stone-kingdom established at the first advent of Christ,⁶ though R. S. Wallace and G. Maier, who in some places espouse a multiple fulfillment theory,⁷ seem to see both advents in Dan 2:45.⁸

¹Ibid., 9. Die Vierzahl der Weltreiche ist keine geschichtliche, sondern eine symbolische Zahl, die er [the author of Daniel] dem Geschichtsbild künstlich aufgeprägt hat.

²Ibid., 10; see also Eduard Meyer, Ursprünge und Anfänge des Christentums, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1921), 2:189.

³Ibid.; see also Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, 37-38; Gall, 267. Cf. G. F. Hasel, "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 against its Near Eastern Environment," JSOT 12 (1979): 17-30.

⁴Saydon, 627.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Young, Daniel, 78; Leupold, Daniel, 123; Millard, 856; Saydon, 627.

⁷Maier, 352-353. On Dan 9:27 he gives the christological fulfillment but goes on to say that a second and third fulfillment can be seen in the Jewish-Roman war (66-

As mentioned above, there is again general agreement between Futurists and Dispensationalists concerning the exegesis of Dan 11.¹ The predictions are seen to relate to Antiochus IV Epiphanes in vs. 21-35, and from vs. 36 on the end-time Antichrist is understood to be the subject of the prophecy.²

No such unanimity exists on the subject of "the latter days." Several Futurists consider the phrase to refer to the Messianic age beginning with Christ's first advent.³ E. J. Young, for instance, says that the primary reference in Dan 2:28 is "to that period which would begin to run its course with the appearance of God upon earth, i.e., the days of the Messiah."⁴ He and H. C. Leupold take the same view on Dan 10:14.⁵ Even though Young himself applies most of Dan 11 to the history of the Syrian kings,

73) and at the end of time with Antichrist's three and a half year rule.

⁸Wallace, 58-59; Maier, 133.

¹Minor differences concern the questions of where the break between the two characters occurs, or whether Antiochus IV Epiphanes is a type of the Antichrist or not, etc.

²For example, Young, Daniel, 241-249; Leupold, Daniel, 493-524; Ironside, Daniel, 202-229; Gaebelien, Daniel, 173-184; Walvoord, Daniel, 264-280, Wood, Daniel, 294-314; Archer, "Daniel," 135-143; G. M. Harton, "An Interpretation of Daniel 11:36-45," GTJ 4 (1983): 205-231.

³Young, Daniel, 70; Saydon, 626; Leupold, Daniel, 105.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 227; Leupold, Daniel, 460.

he still rejects Driver's application of "the latter days" to that period and says it applies only to the Messianic age, because "the central purport of this revelation is concerned with the Messianic age."¹ Leupold's explanation that "this expression refers to the time immediately after the expiration of a certain time that happens to be under consideration"² reminds us of Kliefoth's argument.³ Leupold explains: "When the present series of developments comes to an end, then in the 'after period,' 'ach^arith, other developments will follow."⁴ And in every case, he declares, "this term reaches out into the Messianic age."⁵

A. R. Millard begins "the latter days" at the time of Daniel. He contends: "Within 'days to come' is included the future from that time until a decisive moment, e.g., the Assyrian conquest in Num 24:14-24; . . . here [Dan 2:28] the establishment of the divine kingdom."⁶ When he comes to Dan 10:14, he refers to Gen 49:1 where "the latter days" appear for the first time in the OT, and says: ". . . here, as there the terminal point is the deliverance of

¹Ibid.

²Leupold, Daniel, 460.

³See page 75.

⁴Leupold, Daniel, 460.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Millard, 855.

12:1."¹ From these statements we assume that for Millard "the latter days" embrace the whole period from the prophet's time to the second coming, since he allots Dan 11:40-45 to the time of the future Antichrist.² Similarly, Saydon holds that the expression "latter days" in 10:14 "denotes both the near and the remote future inclusive of the Messianic age."³

Maier, on the one hand, assigns "the latter days" to the end of history, "der Weltgeschichte Resultat und Abschluß."⁴ Then he hastens to add: "Naturally, one cannot narrowly limit the phrase 'the latter days' to the last days of World history."⁵ In his comments on Dan 10: 14, he remarks that in Dan 2:28 the future, including the establishment of the kingdom of God, is meant.⁶ So taking all these statements together we conclude that Maier like Millard sees "the latter days" as the future culminating in the establishment of the reign of God at the second advent of Christ.

Dispensationalist interpreters on this subject can

¹Ibid., 867.

²Ibid., 869.

³Saydon, 639.

⁴Maier, 118.

⁵Ibid. Natürlich darf man die Wendung 'am Ende der Tage' nicht zu stur auf die letzten Tage der Weltgeschichte begrenzen.

⁶Ibid., 367.

be divided into three groups. The first group equates "the latter days" with "the time of the end" and applies them both to the last week of the seventy-week prophecy in Dan 9, just before the second advent of Christ.¹ They believe that the "Times of the Gentiles"² began with Nebuchadnezzar and will last until the second advent of Christ who will come to destroy "Antichrist, the last Gentile World-Monarch."³ Thus, the "latter days" are the last part, the last seven years, of the "Times of the Gentiles."⁴

When the Jews rejected Christ, these interpreters believe, God's covenant with them was suspended, and the people were delivered into the hands of their enemies. When this period is past, God will again deal with the Israelites in their own land under the Abrahamic covenant. "When that time comes," says E. M. Milligan,

. . . then the last of the Seventy of Sevens, or the remaining seven years required to complete the four hundred and ninety years of Daniel's prophecy, will begin to be reckoned; and all the prophecies concerning Israel and Judah will hasten to their speedy consummation. That will be at "the time of the end," or "the end of years," or "the latter days," so frequently mentioned by the prophets to indicate that all intervening time is disregarded.⁵

¹Gaebelein, Daniel, 25; Stevens, 34; Newell, 36; G. R. King, 76; Talbot, 15.

²This phrase is used to designate that period of this world's history, during which political dominion over the earth is vested in the Gentile nations.

³Pettingill, 9.

⁴Stevens, 34.

⁵Milligan, 64.

A second group, represented by R. D. Culver and G. L. Archer, Jr., differentiates between "the latter days" and "the time of the end." They apply "the latter days" to the total time period between Daniel's time and the second coming of Christ, inclusive of the Church age.¹ Culver explains:

The interpretation of "the latter days" must allow it to include not only the first advent and the second advent with the coming of Messiah's future Kingdom, but also the age intervening between the advents in which we now live. We are now, and have been since Jesus came, in the latter days.²

And even before the Messianic times, he says, "many events of what is now Old Testament history are placed 'in the latter days' (e.g. Israel's tribal division in Canaan; cf. Gen 49:1-27), but the reach is always beyond those times to Messiah's times."³

The third group includes the entire history of God's people, i.e., the "days coming after the time of Daniel, with stress on the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and, following the established intervening time gap, on the days of Antichrist."⁴ J. F. Walvoord agrees with Culver in making a difference between "the latter days" and "the time of the end," but he insists that Daniel "does not deal with

¹Culver, 116-118; Archer, "Daniel," 45.

²Ibid., 117.

³Ibid.

⁴Wood, Daniel, 274. So also Unger, 2:1675; and Walvoord, Daniel, 248.

the age between the two advents."¹ Thus "the latter days" deal only with Israel's history. M. F. Unger is of the same opinion when he says: "That temporal phrase comprehends the complete panorama of Israelite history, culminating in the final chapter of the seventieth week and climaxing in the second advent of Christ."²

Concluding this survey of Futurist and Dispensationalist exegetes, we note the great divergence in opinion which we have found. "The latter days" are applied to the Messianic age--beginning with the first advent of Christ; to the last week of the seventy weeks in Dan 9; to the whole sweep of history from the time of Daniel to the second coming; to the OT period plus the last week of the seventy weeks; and to any period that follows the time period of the speaker.

Yet, before taking leave of the commentators, we have to take note of a small but very popular commentary on Daniel by Joyce G. Baldwin.³ Her work does not fit into any of the four categories investigated thus far because she interprets the book of Daniel in harmony with the

¹Walvoord, Daniel, 61.

²Unger, 2:1672.

³Joyce G. Baldwin, Daniel, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978).

idealistic principle of interpretation which is sometimes used to explain the book of Revelation.¹

Baldwin is not so much interested in identifying the symbols in Daniel's visions. She is looking for the timeless principles which lie behind the visions. The reader, therefore, who wants to know if she has Greece or Rome as the fourth empire has to wait until he/she reaches page 147 (out of 210) to find out, and then Baldwin only says, "presumably" the fourth is Rome.²

So in her commentary the four-kingdom scheme becomes a symbol of "the relationship between God's church and the world powers throughout time."³ The Little Horn in Dan 7 stands for "world-rulers, glimpsed through the thin veil of imagery, all inspire terror, the more so as history progresses, for the worst is reserved for the end."⁴ She asks: "Are the four beasts meant to represent between them world dominating figures of all time as four winds represent all possible directions?"⁵ "If so," she says, "this would not rule out the possibility of specific identities of some or all of the kings; they could still be

¹See Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977), 43.

²Baldwin, 147.

³Ibid., 68.

⁴Ibid., 140.

⁵Ibid., 141.

representative figures."¹ For Baldwin, the salient features of the Little Horn in Dan 8 "could apply to more than one political leader known from the history books."² Therefore, she believes that in chap. 8 "we are being introduced to a recurring historical phenomenon: the clever but ruthless world dictator, who stops at nothing in order to achieve his ambitions."³ In Dan 11 she sees the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but he is only "the prototype of many who will come after him, hence the interest shown here in his methods and progress."⁴

We can see now why Baldwin is not very interested in the detailed historical application of the symbols. The message of the book for her, although rooted in history, is ever present. "The latter days," according to Baldwin, are a general expression for "in the future."⁵ The phrase, she says, usually "refers to the events of history as opposed to God's supernatural intervention at the end of time."⁶

I now note some studies which consider the expression b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm in the Old Testament as a whole.

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 160.

³ Ibid., 162.

⁴ Ibid., 192.

⁵ Ibid., 91.

⁶ Ibid., 181.

As indicated above,¹ the phrase "the latter days" appears twelve times outside of the book of Daniel in the Old Testament. Basically, there are three views which scholars have espoused concerning it.

Three Interpretations of
b' 'ah'arît hayyāmîm

Messianic Age Interpretation

In 1891 W. Staerk published an article in which he investigated all the OT texts (except the Aramaic text of Dan 2:28) which use b' 'ah'arîṭ hayyāmîm.² He began his study with Dan 10:14 and found that "the latter days" there refer to the time from the Persian kings to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, i.e., the time preceding and reaching into the Messianic kingdom.³ Then he applied this interpretation to all the other texts. Where his Messianic-age interpretation does not fit, he said, it is either a later interpolation⁴ or "reine Phrase" without a specific meaning.⁵

¹See p. 14, n. 1.

²W. Staerk, "Der Gebrauch der Wendung באחרית הימים im at. Kanon," ZAW 11 (1891): 247-253.

³Ibid., 248.

⁴Ibid., 251.

⁵Ibid., 249. To say that in several texts the expression is a meaningless phrase demonstrates the weakness of his methodology. If the phrase is always post-exilic, as he maintains, then why is it in some places used in a very specific sense--the pre-Messianic days--and in others without any meaning at all? Would not post-exilic Jews always read it with the pre-Messianic-days meaning in mind?

Thus, he came to the conclusion that the phrase "the latter days" is a post-exilic expression which refers to the time "in which, after complete repentance and perfect realization on the part of the people, the expected messianic kingdom would appear as the just reward for the faithful."¹ Thus Staerk considered "the latter days" to be clearly an eschatological phrase.

J. H. Bennetch,² C. Armerding,³ and J. D. Pentecost⁴ also believe that "the latter days" have an eschatological import, yet their understanding is clearly different from Staerk's interpretation. Whereas Staerk applies "the latter days" to the Messianic kingdom which should have come after Antiochus IV Epiphanes; Armerding, Bennetch, and Pentecost, as Dispensationalists, apply it to the last week of the seventy weeks of Dan 9 and the establishment of the millennial kingdom yet in the future.⁵ Bennetch distinguishes between "the latter days" for Israel and "the last days" for the Church (2 Tim 3; 2 Pet 3) and

¹Ibid., 253. In der nach vollkommener Buße und vollendeter Erkenntnis des Volkes das gehoffte Messiasreich als gerechter Lohn für die Frommen erscheinen sollte.

²John H. Bennetch, "The Prophecy of Jacob," BSac 95 (1938): 417-435.

³Carl Armerding, "The Last Words of Jacob: Gen 49," BSac 112 (1955): 320-329.

⁴J. D. Pentecost, Things to Come (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958).

⁵Bennetch, 419; Armerding, "Gen 49," 323; Pentecost, Things to Come, 351.

says: "This means "the last days" of the Church will precede the latter days for Israel."¹

Dual Interpretation

This view holds that the Hebrew idiom *b'ah'arîṭ hayyāmîm* in the Pentateuch does not refer to the Messianic age but to the future, in general; in the prophets, however, many texts, it is believed, do have an eschatological meaning.² Th. Vriezen, for example, selects six passages where, he says, "the eschatological meaning cannot be denied."³ His six passages are: Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39.⁴ It is interesting to note that he does not include Dan 2:28 or 10:14. A similar

¹Ibid., 420. This is based on the view that the Church will be raptured at the beginning of the seventieth week.

²Ladislav Cerny, The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems (Prague: University Karlovy, 1948); Th. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology," VT, Sup 1 (1953): 199-229; Jakob H. Grönbaek, "Zur Frage der Eschatologie in der Verkündigung der Gerichtspropheten." Originally published in Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok 24 (1959): 5-21; now reprinted in H. D. Preuß, ed., Eschatologie im Alten Testament, Wege der Forschung, 480 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978); Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit, TEH 157 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1969); Horst Seebass, " 'ach'arîṭh," TDOT, 1:207-212; Fohrer, 32-58; Hans Wildberger, (Jesaja, 3 vols., BKAT [Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972-1982], 3:81-82) distinguishes between the eschatological and apocalyptic meaning of *b'ah'arîṭ hayyāmîm*, e.g., in Isa 2:2 he sees an eschatological, in Dan 2:28 and 10:14 an apocalyptic meaning of the phrase.

³Vriezen, 202, n. 2.

⁴Ibid.

position is taken by H. Seebass in TDOT. He too has six passages which he considers eschatological, but they are quite different from Vriezen's passages except for the first two--Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5; Ezek 38:16; Dan 2:28; 10:14.¹ G. Fohrer has seven texts which he considers eschatological and he, too, diverges in his selection from the other scholars--Isa 2:2; Jer 23:20; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5; Dan 10:14.²

Peter von der Osten-Sacken follows Fohrer in the selection of texts but questions Fohrer's judgment that in all cases where it is used eschatologically, it is a post-exilic interpolation.³ Von der Osten-Sacken himself connects b^o'ah^ari^t hayyāmim with bā^cē^t hahī' (Jer 31:1) and bayyôm hahū' (Ezek 38:18) and says it refers to the end of the present age, the yôm Yahweh, and the events immediately before and after it.⁴ He then goes on and connects the yôm Yahweh with c^oē^t qēš and thus indirectly equates b^o'ah^ari^t

¹Seebass, TDOT 1:211.

²Fohrer, 34. Fohrer agrees that originally the expression did not have an eschatological meaning, rather it meant "nachfolgende, hinterdreinfolgende Zeit im allgemeinen Sinn" (34). And even where he sees an eschatological meaning he says: "Die Beispiele zeigen, daß die eschatologische Prophetie gewöhnlich nicht ein Ende der Welt und der Geschichte überhaupt meint, sondern die eschatologischen Geschehnisse sich im Rahmen der Völkerwelt abspielen sieht" (45).

³von der Osten-Sacken, 39.

⁴Ibid.

hayyāmīm with ^cēṭ qēṣ.¹ All these termini are eschatological for von der Osten-Sacken.

Indefinite Future Interpretation

In 1961 G. W. Buchanan published an article² in which he took issue with the eschatological view of the phrase "the latter days" which had been the predominant view in the past.³ Buchanan built on B. D. Eerdmans who in 1947 wrote that b^o'ah^arīt hayyāmīm has the same meaning in the Old Testament as the Assyrian ina aḥrat ūmē or ana arkāt ūmī, which means "in the future."⁴

Yet even before Eerdmans, commentators had pointed out the connection between b^o'ah^arīt hayyāmīm and the Akkadian ina aḥrat ūmē or ina arkāt ūmē.⁵ Beek had suggested that "the latter days" should always be translated "in the future,"⁶ and Driver had shown that in

¹Ibid., 42.

²George W. Buchanan, "Eschatology and the End of Days," JNES 20 (1961): 188-193.

³For example, Charles, Daniel, 40; Bentzen, 23; Stuart, 57; Zöckler, 75; Thomson, 63; Tyso, 24; Tregelles, 133; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 203.

⁴B. D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel (Leiden: University Press Leiden, 1947), 322-323.

⁵Driver, Daniel, 26; Montgomery, 164; M. A. Beek, Das Danielbuch (Leiden: Universiteitsboekhandel an Antiquariaat J. Ginsberg, 1935), 40.

⁶Beek, 40.

several OT texts the expression did not have an eschatological meaning.¹

After studying all the usages of *b'ah^ari^t hayyāmim* in the MT and LXX, Buchanan concludes that this term is not a *terminus technicus* of eschatology and that in every Old Testament use of the phrase it makes perfectly good sense if translated by "in the future," "in days to come," or "after this." It is simply a temporal idiom whose theological meaning depends on the context in which it occurs.² Many scholars agree with him.³

In recent years B. Hasslberger,⁴ John T. Willis,⁵

¹Driver, Daniel, 26.

²Buchanan, 190.

³For example, Arvid S. Kapelrud, "Eschatology in the Book of Micah," VT 11 (1961): 396; Hans Kosmala, "At the End of the Days," ASTI 2 (1963): 29; Eva Osswald, "Zum Problem der vaticinia ex eventu," ZAW 75 (1963): 31-32; R. Laird Harris, "The Last Days in the Bible and Qumran," Jesus of Nazareth, Savior and Lord, ed. C. F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1966), 76; Jean Carmignac, "La notion d'eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân," RevQ 7 (1969): 20-21; E. Lipinski, "באחרית הימים dans les textes pre-exiliques," VT 20 (1970): 450; E. Jenni, "אחר 'hr danach," THAT, 1:117; J. P. M. Van der Ploeg, "Eschatology in the Old Testament," The Witness of Tradition, OTS, vol. 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 90; Michael Fishbane, "Varia Deuteronomica," ZAW 84 (1972): 351; K. O. Freer, "A Study of Vision Reports in Biblical Literature" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1975), 106. Freer (106) says ". . . the biblical writers apparently believed that these 'latter days' would be part of the normal historical realm."

⁴Bernhard Hasslberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12, Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, vol. 4 (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1977).

and H. Pehlke¹ have come to the same conclusion. Hasslberger contends that every passage containing *b'aharit hayyamim* must be investigated individually within its context. Conclusions from one passage must not be transferred to another, since a shift in meaning has taken place, he says. In Qumran² and the Targumim, the meaning is eschatological, but in the Bible, Hasslberger feels, all the texts simply mean future.³ He, therefore, rejects P. von der Osten-Sacken's conclusion that in the prophetic writings the phrase "latter days" always has an

⁵John T. Willis, "The Expression *be'acharith hayyamin* [sic] in the Old Testament," RestQ 22 (1979): 54-71.

¹Helmuth Pehlke, "An Exegetical and Theological Study of Genesis 49:1-28" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985).

²*B'aharit hayyamim* in the Qumran texts, where it appears fourteen times (1QpHab 2:5; 9:6; 1QSa 1:1; 4QpIsa^a A8; D1; 4QpIsa^b 2:1; 4QpIsa^c 10; 4QFl 1:2, 12, 15, 19; CD 4:4; 6:11), clearly has an eschatological import. Reading through Florilegium it is apparent that the writer was speaking about the Messianic age (See H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963], 20; J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," JBL 75 [1956]: 176-177; idem, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim," JBL 77 [1958]: 350; D. Flusser, "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2. Sam. VII," IEJ 9 [1958]: 99-109). He emphasizes the re-establishment of the Davidic line in the messianic age by quoting several texts but primarily relying on 2 Sam 7:10-14. The seed promised there is the Messiah who will come in "the end of days" (*b'aharit hayyamim*), "the eschatological period which has already begun" (A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. G. Vermes [Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973], 311 n.). H. Ringgren says: "The community itself is the beginning of the eschatological age" (Faith of Qumran, 154).

³Hasslberger, 190.

eschatological sense,¹ because, Hasslberger says, "he did not take the trouble to investigate these expressions themselves or to test their derivations by means of an exact analysis of the individual passages."²

J. Willis, after briefly examining the fourteen texts in the OT and mentioning the Akkadian and Ugaritic references as well as the Qumran and NT evidence, comes to the conclusion that this expression means "in the future" in most, if not all, the passages examined. The phrase itself is not a technical term for the eschatological or Messianic age. "If a text refers to this age, it is for reasons other than the use of the expression *be'acharith hayyamim*."³

The most recent and one of the most exhaustive studies on *b'aharît hayyamim* is the dissertation by Pehlke. After examining each text in the OT, he summarizes and says:

It was seen in the prophetic writings and Daniel that the expression *b'aharît hayyamim* is not a technical term denoting the end time but refers to an indeterminate time in the future. This also holds true for all occurrences in the Pentateuch.⁴

¹Von der Osten-Sacken, 39.

²Hasslberger, 189, n. 293. Er macht sich dabei nicht die Mühe, die Ausdrücke selbst zu untersuchen und weiter mit Hilfe einer exakten Analyse der einzelnen Stellen, die Ableitungen zu prüfen.

³Willis, 69.

⁴Pehlke, 107.

Before concluding this section we consider the dissertation by B. Jones who has a lengthy section on *b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm*.¹ In the chapter on Daniel's terminology for "end," Jones begins his investigation with the words *'āḥar*, *'aḥar*, and *'aḥ^arôn*, in none of which he finds an eschatological meaning.² Next he looks at the expressions *b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm* and *b^o'aḥ^arîṭ haššānîm* and asks: "Do these expressions refer to an end of the temporal world or an end to history in any of these instances?"³ He then goes through the texts and denies the meaning "end of history" for Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5; Ezek 38:8,16; Jer 48:47; 49:39.⁴ In Deut 31:39; Jer 23:20, and 30:24, he leaves open the possibility that the authors expected history to end.⁵ Jones finds a few texts in the literature from Qumran that use *b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm* in the sense of "end of history."⁶ Concerning Dan 10:14, Jones says: "The phrase could mean 'in future days,' as it does in so many Old Testament passages, but the context also allows a more final possibility, the end in

¹B. Jones, "Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel" (Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972), 220-239.

²Ibid., 220-222.

³Ibid., 222.

⁴Ibid., 222-227.

⁵Ibid., 225, 227.

⁶Ibid., 233.

history."¹ In the interpretation of Dan 2:28, he leaves open the possibility for either meaning--"in the future" or "at the end of history."²

Thus, for Jones, there are several possibilities but never a necessity that "the latter days" refer to an end of history in the OT.

Summary

Our review of literature concerning the phrase "the latter days" has produced the following results:

From the time of the Church Fathers until the eighteenth century there existed a general consensus. They interpreted the four empires in Dan 2 as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The stone was identified either with Christ's first or second advent; hence, "the latter days" in Dan 2:28 were seen either as the times of the fourth empire or as the time before the second advent.

"The latter days" in Dan 10:14 were variously interpreted. Those who saw only Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Dan 11:31-45 applied "the latter days" to the last days of the Grecian Empire. For those who applied Dan 11:36-45 to an end-time Antichrist, "the latter days" pointed to the time of the end. For others "the latter days" fell somewhere in between.

From the time of the seventeenth century onwards,

¹Ibid., 236.

²Ibid., 238.

several schools of interpretation developed and came to full fruition in the nineteenth century. Each school has its distinct understanding of Daniel's prophecies:

(a) The Historical-critical School generally understands Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece to be the four empires in Dan 2. The stone is the Messianic kingdom which should have come in the days of the fourth empire, i.e., Greece. "The latter days," therefore, are seen as the latter time of the Grecian kingdom. Dan 11:21-45 is assigned to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; "the latter days" in Dan 10:14, therefore, are also applied to that time. (b) Most Preterists see the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and the kingdoms of the successors of Alexander. Some have the sequence Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The stone for all Preterists is the spiritual kingdom of Christ. Hence "the latter days" in Dan 2:28 refer to the Messianic age. In regard to Dan 11 and 10:14 they take the same position as the Historical-critical School. (c) Historicists interpret the four empires in Dan 2 as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The stone is either the first or second advent. "The latter days" in this chapter refer, therefore, either to the Messianic age or the time before the second coming. "The latter days" in Dan 10:14 are interpreted to refer to the end-time, since Historicists generally see Rome and the Papacy in Dan 11. (d) Futurists can be divided into two theological schools, dispensational and non-dispensational Futurists. The

former may be referred to as Dispensationalists, the latter as Futurists. There is agreement between both groups as to the four kingdoms: they are believed to be Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Concerning the interpretation of the stone-kingdom, however, Futurists generally refer it to the first advent, Dispensationalists to the second. "The latter days" in Dan 2:28, therefore, refer to the Messianic age for Futurists and to the end-time for Dispensationalists. "The latter days" in Dan 10:14 are variously interpreted. Some Futurists apply them to the Messianic age, others to the end-time, and again others to the whole period from the Persian Empire to the second advent. Dispensationalists also view them differently. Some equate "the latter days" with "the time of the end" and apply both to the end-time. A second group views the whole period from Daniel to the second advent as "the latter days." A third group applies "the latter days" only to the history of the Jews in the OT and to the seven years prior to Christ's second advent when the Jews are believed to be God's messengers once more.

There are individuals in each school of interpretation who view the "latter days" as eschatological and others who consider them non-eschatological. Some believe they refer to a particular future, and others think they refer to the future in general. The same can be seen in the literature which deals with the expression "latter days" in the whole of the OT. Some say "the latter days"

refer to the Messianic kingdom, others think the term refers to the future in general in the Pentateuch and to the end of history in the prophets. A third group believes that the expression "latter days" is a Hebrew idiom simply meaning "future" without any eschatological sense.

The Expression "The Time of the End"

The understanding of the phrase 'ēṭ qēṣ found in Dan 8:17; 11:13,35,40; and 12:4,9 is contingent on the interpretation of the Little Horn in Dan 8 and the king who "will do as he pleases" in 11:36. Depending on the understanding of these two chapters, "the time of the end" is variously interpreted. Dan 8 and 11, therefore, is at the center of this review of literature for this expression.

Major Interpretations before 1800

The early interpreters generally followed Josephus (A.D. 37-post 100)¹ in his explanation of the Little Horn in Dan 8 as Antiochus IV Epiphanes. But they also saw a further fulfillment in the future Antichrist at the time of the end. Jerome (354-413) says: "Most of our commentators refer this passage (Dan 8:9-14) to the Antichrist, and hold that that which occurred under Antiochus was only by way of a type which shall be fulfilled under Antichrist."²

Irenaeus (died A.D. 202) in his description of the

¹Flavius Josephus Jewish Antiquities 10.275,276 (trans. Ralph Marcus, LCL, 6:311).

²Jerome, 87.

Antichrist and his doings at the end of time quotes Dan 8:12, 23 and applies the words to the future Antichrist who will rule three and a half years before Christ comes.¹ Origin (185-254) explains the passage in the same way in his writings against Celsus.² And Hippolytus (died A.D. 236) interprets Dan 8 and 11 by applying them to Antiochus IV Epiphanes,³ but states at the end that Daniel speaks of two abominations (12:11): "the one of destruction, which Antiochus set up in its appointed time, and which bears a relation to that of desolation, and the other universal, when Antichrist shall come."⁴ In Dan 11, Hippolytus sees Antiochus IV Epiphanes only up to vs. 35; he applies vss. 36-45 to the future Antichrist.⁵ Victorinus (died A.D. 303) commenting on the Antichrist in Rev 13 says: "Daniel had previously predicted his contempt and provocation of God"⁶ and quotes Dan 11:45 as evidence.

The "time of the end" in Dan 8, 11, and 12, therefore, has for the Church Fathers a preliminary application to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes but refers primarily

¹Irenaeus Against Heresies 5.25.4,5 (ANF 1:554).

²Origin Against Celsus 46 (ANF 4:594).

³Hippolytus Fragments from Commentaries: On Daniel 2:9, 10, 31-37 (ANF 5:179-184).

⁴Ibid., 3.11 (ANF 5:191).

⁵Ibid., 2.38 (ANF 5:184).

⁶Victorinus Commentary on the Apocalypse 13.13 (ANF 7:357).

to the end-time in history before the second coming of Christ when for a short time the Antichrist will rule this world. Thus Jerome writes concerning the time aspect in the introductory chapter to the last vision in Daniel (10:14) that God shows Daniel what is going to happen to the people of Israel, "not in the near future, but in the last days, that is at the end of the world."¹

The double application of the Little Horn in Dan 8 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the end-time Antichrist, as well as the interpretation of chap. 11, which included Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Antichrist, remained with few exceptions² the standard exposition of Daniel's prophecies until modern times.³ Thus "the time of the end"

¹Jerome, 15.

²Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) suggested that the Little Horn in Dan 8 was the kingdom of Macedonia, from the time that it became subject to the Romans (Whitla, Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel, 220); Theodore Crinsoz (1690-1750) considered the Little Horn of Dan 7 and the Little Horn of Dan 8 to represent the same power, namely, 'the papal power' (Essai sur l'Apocalypse avec les éclaircissemens sur les propheties de Daniel qui regardent les derniers tem[p]s [n.p., 1729], 375, 385); S. Nunez, "The Vision of Dan 8: Interpretations from 1700-1900," (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1987), 59; Thomas Newton (1704-1782) maintained that the Little Horn of Dan 8 represents the Roman Empire (Dissertations on the Prophecies [1782; reprint, Philadelphia: J. J. Woodward, 1839], 248-249).

³Th. Newton (247) wrote: "This Little Horn is by the generality of interpreters both Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, supposed to mean Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, who was a great enemy and cruel persecutor of the Jews. . . . With St. Jerome agree most of the ancient fathers, and modern divines and commentators; but all allow that Antiochus Epiphanes was a type of the Antichrist."

which was associated with the appearance of the end-time Antichrist was generally seen as a future time; yet since the Antichrist was often identified with the Papacy,¹ people during the last millennium believed that they were living in "the time of the end."²

The Nineteenth and Twentieth Century

The phrase *ʿēt qēs* "time of the end" has received a variety of interpretations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Some see it as referring to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (second century B.C.), others to the Messianic age beginning with Christ, a third group applies it to the end-time before Christ's second coming.

As in the previous section on "the latter days," we investigate here the different schools of interpretation to

¹For example, Martin Luther (1483-1546) in his "Response to Ambrosius Catharinus" (1521) identified the Papacy with the Antichrist. D. Martin Luthers Werke, Weimar edition, vol. 7 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhans Nachfolger, 1897), 714, 722, 723. Joseph Mede, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," Works, 647, 657-662; Lowth, 150-152.

²M. Luther, "Luthers Vorrede über den Propheten Daniel," Die Deutsche Bibel, Weimar ed., vol. 11 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhans Nachfolger, 1897), 49, 381. The Puritan, Thomas Parker (1595-1677), wrote: "And therefore as in the time of Christ, the Saints were to be stirred up to watchfulness, because the time of the end was unknown: so now they are to be stirred up to watchfulness, because the time of the end is known" (The Visions and Prophecies of Daniel Expounded: Wherein the Mistakes of Former Interpreters Are Modestly Discovered [London: Edmund Paxton, 1646], 128-129). Puritan expositors had all the time prophecies end about 1650. See Bryan W. Ball, A Great Expectation, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 12, ed. H. A. Oberman (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 115-125.

examine the reasons for this wide divergence in the interpretation of this expression.

The Historical-Critical School

All Historical-critical scholars consider Dan 8 and 11 to be descriptions of the reign of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164) who ruled the Syrian kingdom in the second century B.C. He is the Little Horn in 8:11 and the vile person in 11:21 who massacred many Jews, desecrated their temple, and carried away all the sacred vessels as well as all the gold and silver he could find (1 Macc 1:20-24; 1 Macc 5:11-17).¹

In Dan 8:9, the writer who, it is believed, lived after the events described, refers to the wars of Antiochus IV Epiphanes against Egypt (south), Elymais (east), and Israel (the pleasant land). In vss. 10-14 Antiochus IV Epiphanes is seen assaulting the religion of the Jews (the host of heaven), trampling upon the faithful Israelites (stars), and even magnifying himself against God himself (the prince of hosts). Antiochus IV Epiphanes

¹Bertholdt, 488, 678, 679; Lengerke, 375, 548-560; Maurer, 142, 190-194; Hitzig, 131, 205-215; Ewald, 216, 298-304; Bevan, 132, 186-200; Prince, 145, 179-188; Driver, Daniel, 115, 176-200; Marti, Daniel, 57, 83-89; Montgomery, 333, 446; Charles, Daniel, 204, 297-322; Beek, 76; Bentzen, 71, 81; H. T. Andrews, 530, 531; Jeffery, 473, 524; Heaton, 194, 232; Howie, 125, 136; Kepler, 37, 44; Porteous, 124, 165; Plöger, 126, 162; Delcor, 172, 234; Owens, 431, 451; Hammer, 85, 110-114; Hartman and Di Lella, 235, 294; Lacocque, Daniel, 161, 226-233; Eford, 58, 69, 70; Collins, Daniel, 86, 106; Russell, Daniel, 143, 205-214; Gammie, Daniel, 86, 104; Lebram, Daniel, 98, 119-121; Towner, 120, 151; Craven, 124, 129.

suspended the temple-services for about three years (took the daily sacrifice away for 2300 evenings and mornings), and plundered the temple (sanctuary was cast down). On account of the apostasy of the Hellenizing Jews (by reason of transgression), the Jews had to endure the violent measures adopted by Antiochus IV Epiphanes for the purpose of suppressing the sacred rites of the Jews.¹ These events, it is said, are repeated and enlarged on in Dan 11:21-45.²

Contingent on this interpretation of Dan 8 and 11 is the understanding of "the time of the end" mentioned repeatedly in the visions of chaps. 8 and 10-12 (8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9). In such a context, says Prince, "the expression can only mean the end of the power of Antiochus after whom the kingdom of the saints shall be established."³ Thus, "the time of the end" for Historical-critical scholars is the second century B.C. Driver says that the term is a standing expression in Daniel which means

. . . the period of Antiochus' persecution, together with the short interval, consisting of a few months, which followed before his death (11:35,40), that being, in view of the author, the 'end' of the present condition of things, and the divine kingdom (vii. 14,

¹Driver, Daniel, 115-117.

²Russell, Daniel, 207; Porteous, 124.

³Prince, 149.

18,22,27; xii. 2,3) being established immediately afterwards.¹

Since there are no known historical facts to correspond to vss. 40-45,² this passage, in the eyes of Historical-critical scholars, becomes a true prophecy of the writer which failed.³ W. S. Towner says, historically speaking the writer got it all muddled. "Once again, actual foretelling proves to be much more difficult than prophecy after the fact."⁴

Some Historical-critical scholars believe that "the time of the end" refers to the end of world-history which should have come with the entrance of the *basileia tōn ouranōn* into this world after the death of Antiochus.⁵ Others disagree and argue that *ἑὶς γῆς* does not refer to

¹Driver, Daniel, 121.

²Unless one accepts Porphyrys statement that Antiochus made a fourth campaign into Egypt, though there is no evidence in history for it and historians today completely reject it. Montgomery, 465.

³Marti, Daniel, 88; Farrer, 315; Bentzen, 83; Beek, 83; Jeffery, 537; Hammer, 114; Efird, 70; Gammie, Daniel, 104. Speaking on the theology of chap. 8, Towner (126) had remarked earlier "Whether Daniel 8 was written in Belshazzar's court or during the pogrom of Antiochus IV, the eschatological solution proposed did not in fact arrive." Antiochus died by the hands of his enemies but nothing happened. "The same problem," says Towner, "nags at the heels of chapter 7 as well (the saints have yet to receive the kingdom, so far as we can tell!) and will confront the rest of Dan 7-12 as well."

⁴Towner, 165.

⁵Hitzig, 139; Marti, Daniel, 61; H. T. Andrews, 530; Charles, 215; Bentzen, 82; Hammer, 89.

the end of all time.¹ J. Owens says that, although the phrase is eschatological, it refers to the end of one segment of history--the end of the time of persecution of the Jews and the desecration of the temple.² And D. S. Russell declares:

What is envisaged is not the end of history as such, but rather the end of an historical era and the beginning of a golden age of peace and prosperity. Its setting is essentially "this-worldly", bounded by time and history. In it God will reign as king, sometimes with and sometimes without his "anointed one", the Messiah.³

Historical-critical scholars generally⁴ equate "the time of the end" (cēt qēs); "the latter days" (b'ahārīt hayyāmīm); and "the end of the wrath" or "the last end of the indignation" ('ahārīt hazza'am)⁵ and apply them all to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁶ At the end of this period the kingdom of the saints was to be set up.⁷

¹Montgomery, 346; Owens, 433; Efird, 59; Russell, Daniel, 156.

²Owens, 433.

³Russell, Daniel, 156.

⁴Exceptions would be those scholars who consider "the latter days" to be an idiom for "future" (Beek, 40; Lebram, Daniel, 54), yet even those scholars see the end of that future in the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

⁵Dan 8:19. The indignation is the divine wrath implied in Israel's subjection to the nations, and the persecution by Antiochus IV Epiphanes is the last stage of this time of wrath. Montgomery, 347-348.

⁶Berthold, 530; Hitzig, 184; Bevan, 138,169; Marti, Daniel, 61; Montgomery, 346; Lacocque, Daniel, 169-170; Heaton, 197.

⁷Driver, Daniel, 122.

In Dan 12:4, the "time of the end" is contextually linked with the resurrection in vs. 2. Framed by "that time" in vs. 1 and "the time of the end" in vs. 4, we find in vss. 2 and 3 a description of the resurrection in a prophecy which, so Historical-critical scholars hold, refers to the history of the Syrian kings in the second century B.C. How do they understand the resurrection in this context?

Some consider the first three verses of Dan 12 in the same way as Dan 11:40-45, a "true prophecy" which failed.¹ Nevertheless, ". . . at the level of substantive theological truth claim," says Towner,

the writer of Daniel 12 has dared to go beyond anything yet expressed in Old Testament thought about the future: Every individual has yet another history beyond this world in which to experience the joys and the glory that properly belongs to righteousness.²

A second group feels that the vision has passed from an immediate horizon to another infinitely distant one.³ Most commentators, however, simply explain what Daniel is saying without applying it.⁴ Most if not all of them would probably agree with A. Bentzen that it is an unfulfilled prophecy.⁵ Several interpreters use the

¹Bentzen, 87; Kepler, 45; Towner, 178.

²Towner, 168-169.

³Farrer, 323; Dummelow, 544.

⁴Driver, Daniel, 201; Marti, Daniel, 90; Plöger, Daniel, 171; Montgomery, 471.

⁵Bentzen, 87.

passage for an extended discussion on the nature of man and the resurrection in the OT and NT without further defining the historical sense of the passage.¹ Yet they agree that the author does not teach a general resurrection (it is limited to the Jews) or a final judgment for all men.²

Dan 12:9 is seen as an admonition to Daniel to seal the book since its content is not for him, but for the people in "the time of the end," i.e., the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes when they will be understood.³

Thus, in summary, we can say that "the time of the end" for Historical-critical scholars always has reference to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C. when the Messianic kingdom should have begun. Thus, it is for them an eschatological term.

The Preterist School

Preterists, in general, like all Historical-critical scholars, believe that the Little Horn in Dan 8 and the vile person in Dan 11:21 have found their fulfillment in the person of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴ An

¹Russell, Daniel, 220-223; Heaton, 241-244; Lacocque, Daniel, 234-240.

²Driver, Daniel, 201; Hammer, 116; Plöger, Daniel, 171; Eford, 72.

³Driver, Daniel, 205.

⁴Folsom, 89; Chase, 39, 79; Lee, 178; Stuart, 232, 341; Osbon, 171, 183; Cowles, 381, 424; Zöckler, 175, 247; Thomson, 241, 314; W. M. Taylor, 152, 196; Lagrange, 508, 515; Goettsberger, 64, 84; Mauro, 116; Gurney, 77, 141.

exception to this general consensus is S. Lee who considers the "latter Rule of the Roman power" to be the Little Horn in Dan 8.¹

"The time of the end" in Dan 8:17 is understood to refer to the final period of earth's history by O. Zöckler,² yet others dispute this. J. E. H. Thomson, says: "The time of the end does not mean the end of the world, or of the appearance of the Messiah, for in this vision there is no reference to either of these."³ What is referred to, according to Thomson, is the "end of the indignation" for the Jews under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴ H. Cowles, on the other hand, does see a reference to the Messiah in the expression "time of the end." He, as most Preterist and Historical-critical scholars, equates "the time of the end" with "the latter days" and "the last end of the indignation" and states: "The end here is manifestly, not the final end of all earthly things, but the end of the age before Christ."⁵

Most Preterists apply all of Dan 11:21-45 to

¹ Lee, 165.

² Zöckler, 181.

³ Thomson, 245. So also Stuart, 241.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ H. Cowles, Ezekiel and Daniel (New York: Appleton and Co., 1868), 381. Mauro (149) says it "means the last stage of the national existence of Daniel's people, that is to say, the era of the Herods."

Antiochus IV Epiphanes.¹ In regard to vss. 40-45, they either accept Porphyry's explanation² or they see this passage as a recapitulation of the previous verses.³ Lee, however, assigns vss. 31-45 to the Romans,⁴ Mauro sees the Herodian dynasty in vss. 36-45,⁵ and R. M. Gurney says, the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes ends with vs. 39.⁶ In vss. 40-45 the "him" is Syria, and the kings of the North and South are Rome and Egypt, respectively.⁷

Accordingly, Preterists, in general, apply "the time of the end" to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁸ Zöckler, for instance, says in regard to Dan 11:35:

The time of the end down to which the painful process of purifying is to be continued, denotes, in the sense of this prophecy, the end of the pre-Messianic period as a whole, as appears from chaps. 8:17; 9:27 but it coincides essentially with the end of Antiochus himself.⁹

¹Folsom, 57; Chase, 79; Osbon, 183; Cowles, 434; Zöckler, 254; Stuart, 354; Thomson, 322; Lagrange, 515; Goettsberger, 87.

²Stuart, 355; Goettsberger, 87.

³Cowles, 436; Zöckler, 254; Thomson, 323; Folsom, 57.

⁴Lee, 194.

⁵Mauro, 140.

⁶Gurney, 146.

⁷Ibid., 148.

⁸Folsom, 215; Stuart, 350, 355; Osbon, 183; Cowles, 434; Zöckler, 251, 254; Thomson, 319; Goettsberger, 63, 87; Lagrange, 496.

⁹Zöckler, 251.

For Gurney "the time of the end" is associated with the Greek Empire and the destruction of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In chap. 8 the emphasis is on Antiochus IV Epiphanes;¹ in chap. 11 on the demise of the Greek Empire because "Daniel has made it clear that the sign of Christ's imminent arrival will be the destruction of the Greek Empire."²

An exception to the standard Preterist interpretation is the exposition of Lee who has the Roman consuls and emperors Maximinus, Licinius, and Constantine as the actors in Dan 11:40-45.³ Hence, "the time of the end" for Lee is the latter time of the Roman Empire.⁴

In general, Preterists are consistent in their interpretation of "the time of the end." It is always seen as the time of the Grecian or, in the case of Lee, the Roman Empire. The same holds true for chap. 12,⁵ except for Thomson who applies "the time of the end" in chaps. 8 and 11 to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, "the time of the end" in chap. 12, however, as the end of the world at

¹Gurney, 81.

²Ibid., 147.

³Lee, 194.

⁴Ibid., 190.

⁵Folsom, 215; Cowles, 448; Goettsberger, 88; Stuart, 367; Zöckler, 263; Gurney, 167.

"the consummation of all things."¹ The reasons for it are considered below.

How then do Preterists view the resurrection in Dan 12:2? Various explanations have been put forward. N. S. Folsom proposes a spiritual resurrection among the Jews.² A. M. Osbon thinks the resurrection in 12:2 is a political resurrection of the Jewish people in connection with the fall of their persecutor. Against the objection that the words: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake . . ." can only refer to the resurrection of the body, he says:

Let it be remembered that the Little Horn had cast down the host "to the ground, and stamped upon them," (chapter viii, 10.) Hence their helpless and degraded state is well described by the figure of sleeping in the dust. Out of that state the angel was about to awake them and lift them up.³

Gurney suggests that Dan 12:2 refers to the first resurrection which he understands to mean the resurrection in connection with Christ's first advent (Matt 27:51-53), since for him every historical climax in Daniel points primarily to the first advent.⁴ He goes on and says:

¹Thomson, 337.

²Folsom, 210. Lee (198) applies the resurrection to the spiritual resurrection of the believer with Christ (Rom 6:3-6).

³Osbon, 185.

⁴Gurney, 164-165. He believes that the people raised in Matt 27 were the people Christ preached to in Sheol according to 1 Pet 3:18,19.

"Every time a believer dies, and goes to be with Christ, he or she takes part in the first resurrection."¹

Others believe that the general resurrection at the end of the gospel dispensation is in view here. The contextual discrepancy of applying Dan 12:1 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and 12:2 to the end of time is explained in a variety of ways. Cowles assumes that in view of the persecution, the idea of eternal retribution is introduced here. "Remember (the revealing angel would say), remember for your consolation and for the relief of your burdened heart, that God is surely just, and that his justice will not sleep forever."² This concept of an eternal retribution is shared by J. Goettsberger.³ But he assigns to the whole context a secondary eschatological meaning. He says:

Thus, the affliction of Dan 11:45, which was primarily fulfilled in the Maccabean persecution, is in a way raised above the historical situation and placed into the framework of the eschatological events.⁴

M. Stuart argues from the analogy of the prophecy of Dan 11 with the prophecies in chaps. 2 and 7. Since in chaps. 2 and 7 the Messianic kingdom appears at the end of

¹Ibid., 167.

²Cowles, 449.

³Goettsberger, 38.

⁴Ibid. Damit wird die Bedrängnis von Dn 11, 45, die sich in erster Linie durch die makkabäische Verfolgung erfüllt hat, der Art nach über den Umkreis der geschichtlichen Geschehnisse hinausgehoben und in die Ausmaße der eschatologischen Vorgänge hinein gerückt.

the visions, he believes that Dan 12:2-3 also make reference to the Messianic kingdom.¹ He understands vs. 2 to make the transition from the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the Messianic kingdom. "Instead of repeating the description of the power and greatness of that kingdom. . . . He [the speaker] refers us to the consequences that would ultimately follow under a new dispensation."²

Zöckler does not see any contextual problem in applying Dan 12:1 to Antiochus Epiphanes and 12:2 to the general resurrection. He explains it by stating:

It is evident that in the mind of the prophet that period of trial was the immediate precursor of the end of the world. As he viewed it, the end of the persecution by Antiochus and the advent of the Messiah to introduce a new and eternal period of blessing were substantially coincident. He saw nothing at all of the long series of years that were to intervene between those Old Testament "woes of the Messiah" and his actual birth and incarnation, nor did he observe the many centuries between His first and second advent, between the beginning of the end and the ultimate end of all things because it was inconsistent with the nature of prophetic vision.³

Thomson also believes that Daniel did not see the centuries between Christ's first and second advent and that, therefore, he viewed events, which were chronologically far apart, as being close together.⁴ But he is the only one of the Preterist commentators surveyed in this

¹Stuart, 362.

²Ibid., 363.

³Zöckler, 262.

⁴Thomson, 335.

chapter who believes that the "time of the end" in chap. 12 refers to the time of Christ's second advent. He says: "The end is not the end of the persecution of the days of Antiochus--that is already past; we have now reached the consummation of all things."¹

Thus, for Preterist scholars, "the time of the end" can refer to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the demise of the Grecian Empire, the latter days of the Roman Empire, and to the time of Christ's coming. Consequently, the "time of the end" is an eschatological, at times, even an apocalyptic eschatological phrase.

The Historicist School

The quest to identify the Little Horn in Dan 8:9 has led to a number of different interpretations amongst Historicist commentators. These interpretations may be denominated: the Maccabean, Roman, Papal, and Mohammedan views. We discuss each view in turn and indicate how it affects the interpretation of "the time of the end" in Dan 8:17.

The Maccabean Interpretation

Representatives of this interpretation regard the Little Horn of Dan 8 as a symbol for Antiochus IV Epiphanes,² or for the whole kingdom of Syria.³ They

¹Ibid., 337.

²Albert Barnes, Daniel, 2 vols. (1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 2:108; Rule, 223;

believe that it so clearly describes the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes ". . . that if proper names were substituted for the symbols, what is now prophecy would be an exact and characteristic summary of history."¹ The concrete reasons given for this interpretation by Barnes are:

1. The author of the book of Maccabees applied Dan 8:9 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (1 Macc 1:10).
2. Antiochus fulfilled the specifics of the prophecy:
 - a. He came out of one of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided (Dan 8:8).
 - b. "He waxed great toward the south"--in 170 B.C. he conquered Egypt (1 Macc 1:16-19).
 - c. "And toward the east"--according to 1 Macc 3:21-37 he went to the East to replenish his exhausted treasury.
 - d. "And toward the pleasant land"--on his return from Egypt he invaded Judea (1 Macc 1).
 - e. "He waxed great to the host of heaven . . ."--he robbed the temple, destroyed Jerusalem, and trampled on the princes, and rulers, and people (1 Macc 1 and 2 Macc 8:2).
 - f. "Even to the prince of the host . . ."--he

Boutflower, 14; Hewitt, 214-217.

³Wright, 188.

¹Rule, 223.

suspended the sacrifices, attempted to change God's law, and devastated Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:20-50).

- g. "Cast down the truth . . ."--true religion was abolished (1 Macc 1).
- h. "After 2300 days shall the sanctuary be cleansed"--these six years reach from 171 to 165 when on Dec. 25, 165 B.C., the sanctuary was cleansed under Judas Maccabeus.¹

As indicated above, this interpretation assumes that 1 Maccabees gives an accurate account of the life of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Yet, recently, doubt has been cast upon this assumption,² and further study is called for.

¹Barnes, Daniel, 2:109-116. Main objections to this view as given by U. Smith Daniel (156-158), and Boyle (242-251) are: (1) The symbol of a horn in prophecy denotes a kingdom not an individual monarch. (2) The Little Horn symbolizes a new power. Antiochus IV Epiphanes was the eighth king of the dynasty which was one of the four horns. (3) The Little Horn waxed exceeding great (8:10). Antiochus IV Epiphanes did not enlarge the kingdom of Syria. He left it as he found it--tributary to Rome. (4) The description "a king of fierce countenance" can hardly be applied to the monarch who was frightened out of Egypt by a message from the Romans. (5) It is said "his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power" (8:24). Antiochus' power rested solely on his own kingdom. (6) The Little Horn cast down the place of His sanctuary (8:11). Antiochus IV Epiphanes ceremonially polluted the temple but he did not destroy it. (7) The 2300 days do not fit any time periods of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. (8) The "time of the end" refers to the time period preceding the millennium. (9) The Little Horn was to be broken without hands (8:25). Antiochus IV Epiphanes died from natural causes. This would hardly qualify for the prophetic description "without hands."

²Ricardo Abos-Padilla, Pläydoyer für Antiochus IV Epiphanes. 47 1/2 Thesen über das Buch Daniel (Frankfurt am Main: Pan Text Verlag, 1983), 26. Abos-Padilla's main thesis is that 1 and 2 Maccabees as well as Josephus are

Contingent on this interpretation of Dan 8 is the understanding of "the time of the end" mentioned in 8:17. Accordingly, "the time of the end" in this chapter is referred to as the times of the Messiah at his first advent by Barnes.¹ He affirms:

In justification of this view of the passage, it may be remarked that this is not only the most obvious view, but is sustained by all those passages which speak of the coming of the Messiah as "the end," the "last days," etc." Thus 1 Cor x.11: "upon whom the ends of the world are come."²

When we come to chaps. 11 and 12, we find that Barnes applies the expression "time of the end" again to events in the past, namely, to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.³ But in view of the resurrection in 12:2, he believes that Dan 12:1-4 applies not only to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes but also to the end of time when the resurrection of the dead will take place.⁴ He explains:

primarily pro-Hasmonean versions of the events recorded and, therefore, unreliable. He says: "Die Anklagen von Greuelthaten und Tempelschändungen gehören zu den beliebtesten Mitteln der hellenistischen, römischen und warum auch nicht jüdischen Kriegspropaganda" (ibid). He does not believe that Antiochus IV Epiphanes ever did what 1 Macc 1:44-48 accuses him of. In support for his thesis, he quotes Elias Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1937), 64. See also Klaus Bringmann, Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Juda (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983), 35-36.

¹Barnes, Daniel, 2:118.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 2:240, 246.

⁴Ibid., 2:264.

The order of thought in the mind of the angel would seem to have been this: he designed primarily to furnish to Daniel an assurance that deliverance would come in the time of the severe troubles which were to overwhelm the nation. . . . In doing this his mind almost unconsciously glanced forward to a final deliverance from death and the grave . . . that which began with the deliverance in the times of the Maccabees, ended in the full contemplation of the resurrection of the dead and the scenes beyond the last judgment.¹

Ch. Wright in a similar vein applies Dan 11 to the Maccabean era, but 12:2-4 to the second advent of Christ. He compares this prophecy with other OT Messianic predictions (Isa 7-12; Jer 23:5; Zech 3:8-10) and says: "In all such prophecies the interval between the first and the second advents of the Christ is left without mention."² He seems to apply Dan 12:1 to the first advent of Christ, though he does not clearly state it.

H. Hewitt, by means of his double-reference principle, also has a dual fulfillment of Dan 11:36-12:1.³ Thus, in 12:1, Hewitt believes, the first advent of the Messiah is glanced at, but the proper and complete fulfillment awaits His coming in glory.⁴ "It therefore follows that 'the time of the end' of all the visions of this sealed "book" is the closing days of the present

¹Ibid., 2:263-264.

²Wright, 318. Boutflower follows Wright in this interpretation.

³See above pp. 60-61.

⁴Hewitt, 353.

age."¹ This contradicts what he said earlier in the book, when he dealt with chap. 8. "The time of the end" in 8:17 he clearly refers to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.² He refuses to speculate on further fulfillments and says: "One definite, clear-cut fulfillment in history [Antiochus Epiphanes], . . . is enough to satisfy me."³

The Maccabean interpretation, then, sees "the time of the end" in Daniel primarily as a reference to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Messiah, and in a secondary sense and, particularly in chap. 12, as an apocalyptic eschatological term referring to the end of time.

The Roman Interpretation

The second or Roman interpretation teaches that the Little Horn in Dan 8 was the Roman Empire. Advocates of this opinion claim that Rome alone fulfills all the requirements of this prophecy. Their arguments are:

1. The Little Horn arises while the divided kingdoms of the Macedonian Empire still exist. The next main-power in the east after the Macedonian kingdom was Rome.
2. In the other visions of Daniel, the power which succeeds Greece as the fourth empire is Rome. So in this vision, the power which succeeds Greece must be Rome.

¹Ibid., 360.

²Ibid., 193.

³Ibid., 222.

3. The Little Horn waxed great towards the south, the east, and the pleasant land. Rome conquered Greece, Asia Minor, and Syria in the east, Egypt in the south, and planted her eagles in Palestine.
4. The Little Horn was to cast down the sanctuary. Titus sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the temple.
5. The term "king of fierce countenance" is similar to "a nation of fierce countenance" in Deut 28:49,50, where it speaks of the Romans.
6. The "Prince of princes" is Christ. Rome crucified Christ.
7. The "host of heaven" are the Jews. The "stars" are their leaders. Rome terminated Jewish national existence and slew many of their leaders.
8. Rome began small in the east when it conquered Macedonia in 168 B.C., but it became great and conquered all other powers in the east.¹

¹Birks, 177-180; Boyle, 300-362; A. Clarke, The Holy Bible, 6 vols. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), 4:597-599. Although this view had been held in the eighteenth century by such well-known interpreters as Sir Isaac Newton and Bishop Newton, strong objections were registered against it. Primarily these were: (1) Since the Roman power is the fourth beast of Dan 7, it is inconceivable that the same power should now be represented by a Little Horn. (2) The Little Horn came forth from one of the four horns of the he-goat. The power which it symbolizes must be one springing up in the east and not an invader issuing from the west. (3) If the Little Horn means the Roman Empire at all, it means the whole empire and not only a portion of territory conquered by it, as Sir Isaac Newton maintains. (4) Bishop Newton said the Roman Empire as a horn of the goat was "not mighty by its own power" because it drew its nourishment and strength from Italy. But this only means that it was mighty by its own

Concerning "the time of the end," Birks clearly stated:

The time of the end must thus be the limiting time, or very close of all these visions. In other words, it must be the same with the end of the three times and a half of the Little Horn. Assuming that these denote 1260 natural years, the last of those years will be the time of the end, or season assigned for the exploits of the wilful king.¹

In another place he applies "the time of the end" to "the forty-five prophetic days, which follow the 1290, and complete the last interval of 1335 days."² And of this period he says: ". . . it is probable that more than twenty years have already expired [in 1846]."³ In other words, Birks believed that he was living right in the middle of "the time of the end."

A. Clarke counted the 2300 years from the conquest of Alexander (334 B.C.) to the year A.D. 1966.⁴ Thus "the

power. (5) The Little Horn was broken without hand. This could not be said of the fall of the ancient Roman Empire. Nevin, 80-81.

¹Birks, Two Later Visions, 264. At the same time Birks repeatedly applied "the time of the end" to the whole three and a half times of the Little Horn. He saw a dual meaning in this phrase. The broader meaning referred to the whole period of the three and a half times, the more restricted meaning only to the last portion of it. Ibid., 265, 304-305, 333.

²Ibid., 333.

³Ibid.

⁴Clarke, 4:598.

time of the end," according to Clarke, begins in the twentieth century.¹

Consequently, we can say that the Roman view sees "the time of the end" as an apocalyptic term describing the last period of world history.

The Papal Interpretation

The Papal interpretation which includes pagan and papal Rome under the symbol of the Little Horn in Dan 8² is a significant variation of the Roman interpretation. In addition to the arguments in connection with pagan Rome, the following arguments are used to show that the Little Horn in Dan 8 includes pagan and papal Rome:

1. Historicists generally agree that the Little Horn in Dan 7 is the Papacy. The most prominent symbol that the two visions have in common is the symbol of the

¹Ibid., 618. Clarke saw the resurrection in Dan 12:2 as the future restoration of the Jews.

²For example, Robert Reid, The Seven Last Plagues: or Vials of the Wrath of God (Pittsburgh: D. and M. Maclean, 1828), 48; W. Miller, 13-14; J. N. Andrews, The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days, 2nd ed. (1853; reprint, Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1863), 11-14; David N. Lord, The Coming and Reign of Christ (New York: Frankling Night, 1858), 390; U. Smith, Daniel, 156-186; Haskell, 129; Nichol, ABC, 4:841; Price, 169; Ford, Daniel, 168; Maxwell, 160; G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," The Sanctuary and the Atonement, ed. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshar (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1981), 190; W. H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel," Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol. 2, ed. F. B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 190; Doukhan, 28.

Little Horn. Hence, the Little Horn in Dan 8 should also refer to the Papacy.¹

2. The phrase "time of the end" is an eschatological phrase indicating that the vision reaches beyond the times of the Maccabeans or the Roman Empire.
3. The prophecy of the 2300 evening-mornings does not harmonise with any known historical period in Maccabean history. Interpreted in accordance with the year-day principle it spans the time from the Persian Empire in the fifth century B.C. to the nineteenth century A.D., indicating that the prophecy reaches far beyond the history of the Maccabeans or the Roman Empire.²

¹Shea, "Unity of Daniel," 187-190. He lists the following 11 points which indicate that the two Little Horns include the papal power: (1) Both are identified with the same symbol: a horn. (2) Both are described as "little" at the outset. (3) Both are described as becoming "great" later on. (4) Both are described as persecuting powers. (5) Both have the same target group as object of their persecution. (6) Both are described as self-exalting and blasphemous powers. (7) Both are described as exercising a crafty intelligence. (8) Both represent the final and greatest anti-God climax of their visions. (9) Both have aspects of their work delimited by prophetic time. (10) The activities of both extend to the time of the end. (11) Both are to be supernaturally destroyed.

²Nichol, ABC, 4:844-845. The following arguments have been advanced against this view: (1) The two little horns in Dan 7 and 8 refer to two separate powers, because: (a) The Little Horn of chap. 7 is associated with a beast representing the four empires; that of chap. 8 is associated with a beast which stands for the third empire. (b) The Little Horn in chap. 7 rises directly out of the head of the beast; that of chap. 8 grows out of an already existing horn. (c) The eleventh horn of chap. 7 uproots three horns in its rise. Nothing like this is said of the Little Horn of chap. 8. (d) The Little Horn of chap. 7 is said to be "diverse from" the ten amongst which it arises; no such language is used of the Little Horn of chap. 8.

"The time of the end" according to the Papal interpretation is the time before the end of the world.¹ Says Nichol:

The fact that the last events represented in the vision will be fulfilled at the end of this world's history must be borne in mind when seeking an interpretation of the symbols of the vision.²

This applies also to chaps. 11 and 12. All advocates of the Papal interpretation see the Papacy somewhere in chap. 11 and apply "the time of the end" to the time period which will be concluded with the second advent of Christ and the resurrection mentioned in Dan 12:2.³

(e) The Aramaic for Little Horn in 7:8 is not equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew for Little Horn in 8:9. (f) The Little Horn in chap. 7 is "more stout than his fellows"; in chap. 8 precisely the opposite impression is given. (g) The field of activity of the Little Horn in chap. 7 is the whole extent of the fourth empire; the work of the Little Horn in chap. 8 is restricted to the "pleasant land." (h) In chap. 7 the Little Horn lifts himself up against "the most High" and the "saints of the most High"; in chap. 8, the Little Horn attacks the Jewish people, their high-priest, sacrifices, and sanctuary. (2) A universal empire is never symbolized by a horn but always by a beast. (3) Rome did not rise out of one of the Grecian kingdoms, but far to the west. (4) Rome not only advanced to "the south, and the east, and the pleasant land," but also to the north and the west. The terms of the prediction mark the "Little Horn" power as Asiatic; Rome was principally a European power. (5) The 2300 days mark the period of time during which the sanctuary was to be cast down or defiled. What sanctuary was cast down in 457 B.C.? There is no acceptable terminus a quo for the beginning of the 2300 days, if the year-day principle is used. Hewitt, 170-172.

¹Nichol, ABC, 4:845; Price, 206; Ford, Daniel, 190.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 4:873-878; U. Smith, Daniel, 270-306; Price, 302-330; Ford, Daniel, 270-281.

To sum up: The expression "time of the end" in this view is seen as an apocalyptic term applying to the end of world-history.

The Mohammedan Interpretation

The fourth or Mohammedan interpretation gained a strong following in the nineteenth century¹ and is still held by some expositors today.² According to this opinion, the Little Horn out of one of the four notable ones is the Mohammedan politico-religious power. The evidence produced for this view is:

1. The Little Horn came out of one of the four notable horns: The Egyptian dominion of the Ptolemies included Arabia from whence Mohammed came.³
2. It arose when the transgressors were come to the full: Mohammedanism arose when the papal apostasy had been completed.
3. It was a Little Horn which grew exceeding great: Mohammed had only a few followers in the beginning, now hundreds of millions.
4. The direction of Mohammed's conquests and the growth of his religion correspond to the requirements of the prophecy (south, east, holy land).

¹For example, Faber, 2:107; Bickersteth, 112; Tanner, 509; Frere, 248; Nevin, 82; Birchmore, 43.

²For example, Sargent, 167; Filmer, 92.

³Tanner, 511.

5. It was of fierce countenance: The maxim of Mohammed was "conversion by the sword."
6. It cast down the host of heaven: Mohammedanism persecuted the Church through many centuries.
7. It stood up against the prince of the host: Mohammed considered Christ a prophet but called himself greater than Jesus.
8. He was mighty but not by his own power: His theological system rested on the power of the sword.¹
9. The king shall understand dark sentences: Mohammed knew how to adapt the Koran to the emergencies of his policy or passion.²

The "time of the end" in this view is generally understood to refer to the period immediately preceding the millennium.³ Several commentators have suggested specific dates for the commencement of "the time of the end." J. W.

¹Faber, 2:102-109.

²Nevin, 88. That this theory was beset with difficulties was pointed out by several writers during the last century. Objections to this interpretation included: (1) The Little Horn shall stand up in the latter time of their kingdoms: Islam arose more than six centuries after the fall of the last of the Macedonian kingdoms. (2) The daily sacrifice was already taken away when Mohammed was born. (3) The sanctuary was cast down long before Mohammed, either by the Romans (temple) or the papacy (teaching). (4) No mention is made of any of these activities in the two woe-trumpets in Rev 9 which also refer to the Mohammedan power. (5) The conquest of Mohammedanism was primarily west and north, not east and south, because they came from the south or, if the Turks are meant, they came from the north-east and primarily went west. Frere, 291-305; Boyle, 273.

³Nevin, 79; Sargent, 194.

Birchmore, for example, took the year 1866, the end of the 2300 evening-and-morning prophecy, as the beginning.¹ J. Tanner believed that "the time of the end" began in 1820, at the end of the 1260 years of papal supremacy.² And G. S. Faber, who also held that "the time of the end" followed upon the 1260 years, thought the terminus a quo was 1864. In that year he said,

. . . the short intermediate period styled THE TIME OF THE END will commence. During the lapse of this brief period, which apparently comprehends no more than a single natural year, the vision of the Ram and the He-Goat will be brought to a conclusion, the Mohammedan Little Horn will be broken without hand, the Roman Little Horn with its lawless usurpation will be destroyed, and the Sanctuary will be thoroughly cleansed.³

J. A. Battenfield and P. Y. Pendleton, in 1914, suggested that "the time of the end" is the period A.D. 1913-1972.⁴ Other commentators are less specific.⁵

In brief, the Mohammedan interpretation considers

¹Birchmore, 46. He began the 2300 years in 330 B.C. with Alexander's conquest of Persia.

²Tanner, 524. He considered 606-610 as the period in which the Papacy in the time of the Emperor Phocas gained complete supremacy.

³Faber, 2:126. He considers A.D. 604 the time when the Papacy gained complete supremacy.

⁴Battenfield and Pendleton, 18. In 1913 "the times of the Gentiles" were fulfilled (the seven times or 2520 years of Dan 4) and in 1972 the 2300 years expired.

⁵For example, Bickersteth (157-158) begins "the time of the end" with the Reformation. Filmer (91) says, "the time of the end" begins with the fifth period of world history symbolized by the feet in Daniel's vision, i.e., from A.D. 1071 onward. In 1071 the Turks finally defeated the Roman Empire, according to Filmer. Ibid., 17.

the phrase "time of the end" to be an apocalyptic terminus referring to the time period preceding the millennium. Several commentators have given specific dates for the beginning of "the time of the end," others simply apply it to the time they are living in.

The Futurist-Dispensationalist School

Most Futurists and Dispensationalists interpret the Little Horn in Dan 7 as the end-time Antichrist and the Little Horn in Dan 8 as a reference to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, albeit as a type of the end-time Antichrist.¹ Some Dispensationalists see only the end-time Antichrist in chap. 8,² some Futurists, on the other hand, find no reference to the Antichrist in Dan 8 and assign the whole chapter to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.³ Several commentators from both groups believe that the Little Horn in Dan 7

¹Hävernack, 236, 251; Kliefoth, 227, 273; Keil, Daniel, 260; Auberlen, 39-40, 54; Düsterwald, 140, 145; Pusey, 135-136; Wallace, 144; Maier, 273, 307; Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 4:419, 426; Seiss, 195, 219; West, 71-72, 94; Talbot, 129, 149; De Haan, 203, 223; Tatford, Daniel, 111, 133; Newell, 90, 113; G. R. King, 121, 134; Walvoord, Daniel, 175, 196; Unger, 1643, 1654; Whitcomb, 103, 111, 116; Wood, Daniel, 87, 99, 198, 223; Strauss, 213, 239.

²Pettingil, 78; Stevens, 107; 124-126; Larkin, 140; Lang, 98, 115; Bloomfield, 117, 164; Tregelles, 60, 83. These interpreters equate the two Little Horns of chaps. 7 and 8, whereas the others see only a typological relationship between the Little Horn of Dan 7 (the Antichrist) and the Little Horn of Dan 8 (Antiochus IV Epiphanes). See Archer, "Daniel," 99.

³Young, Daniel, 150, 171; Johnson, 56, 59; Hall, WBIC, 3:537, 539; Saydon, 634; Millard, 862.

refers to the Papacy¹ and the Little Horn in chap. 8 to either the end-time Antichrist² or to Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of the end-time Antichrist.³

A. C. Gaebelein does not see either Little Horn as the Antichrist (he is the first and second beast in Rev 13), so the Little Horn in chap. 7 is the coming prince of Dan 9:26 and the Little Horn of chap. 8 is the king of the North of Dan 11:40.⁴ H. A. Ironside thinks "the Roman Little Horn will be an apostate Christian in league with the personal Antichrist, . . . [and] the Grecian Little Horn is likely to be an utter infidel, the successor to Mohammed."⁵ Leupold, who applies the Little Horn in Dan 7 to the Papacy, says: "Though the papacy may be the outstanding manifestation of the Antichrist to date, that does not exclude other possibilities of fulfillment of this passage."⁶ The Little Horn in chap. 8 he understands to refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of the Antichrist.⁷

¹Wordsworth, "Daniel," 31; Tyso, 22; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 131-132.

²Tyso, 24.

³Wordsworth, "Daniel," 37.

⁴Gaebelein, Daniel, 109.

⁵Ironside, Daniel, 148.

⁶Leupold, Daniel, 323.

⁷Ibid., 361. For other rare interpretations of the Grecian Little Horn, see Nunez, 205 and 342.

The Futurist interpretation of Dan 8 follows closely the Historical-critical and Preterist understanding, except that they see the events in connection with Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of that which will happen to the Church in the time of the end-time Antichrist.¹

The Dispensational exegesis of Dan 8, which is completely different from the Futurist understanding, is well presented by J. Tyso in his book Elucidation of the Prophecies (1838). His main thesis can be gleaned from the title page of his book:

Showing that the 70 weeks, the 1260 days, and the events predicted under the seven trumpets and the seven vials, have not yet taken place, but that they will be accomplished within the space of about three years and a half from their commencement, and probably at no very distant period.²

In his interpretation of chap. 8 Tyso posits a great "chasm" between vss. 8 and 9,³ vss. 1-8 referring to the Grecian history, vss. 9-12 referring to the end-time Antichrist.⁴ He believes that before the coming of Christ the Jews will be returned to their own land and "that they will rebuild the temple and restore the daily sacrifice."⁵ This will set the stage for the rise of the Little Horn (vs. 9), the Antichrist of the last days, who will wax

¹Keil, Daniel, 311.

²Subtitle on the title page.

³Tyso, 23.

⁴Ibid., 18-20.

⁵Ibid., 24.

great and will "take away the daily sacrifice and set up the predicted abomination, profane the sanctuary and the host and tread them under foot in contempt for 2300 literal days."¹ Thus the Little Horn in vs. 9 does not at all apply to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but only to the end-time Antichrist.²

In regard to "the time of the end" in vs. 17, Futurists generally equate "the time of the end" with "the latter days"³ and understand it to refer to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the subsequent century until the first advent of Christ.⁴ C. A. Auberlen says, the fact that the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is called "the time of the end" must not confuse us, "for it is the prophetic expression for the time, which as the time of fulfillment is always seen at the end of the prophetic horizon."⁵

A few Futurist commentators, however, apply the expression "time of the end" only to the end-time before the second advent of Christ.⁶ Like some of the exegetes

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Hävernack, 298; Keil, Daniel, 311.

⁴ Ibid.; Keil, Daniel, 313; Young, Daniel, 176; Saydon, 636; Hall, WBIC, 3:540; Johnson, 61; Wallace, 61; Maier, 312.

⁵ Auberlen, 78, n.l.

⁶ Kliefoth, 271; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 41; Leupold, Daniel, 361; Wallace, 144.

mentioned above,¹ these interpreters see a double fulfillment for the vision in Dan 8. Their argument is that the vision proper (vss. 3-14) refers to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his misdeeds during the years 171-165 B.C. (the 2300 days). Yet, in the explanation of the vision, the angelus interpres goes beyond the Maccabean era and points to the end of time because this whole vision also serves as a type of the great persecution "which will rage against the Church in 'the time of the end,' i.e. in the last day."²

Dispensationalists generally refer Dan 8:17 to the end-time Antichrist.³ An exception is N. West who sees a double application of "the time of the end," namely, to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and to the Antichrist. He says:

The fulfillment of the prophecy lies historically in pre-christian times, a century and a half before the birth of Christ. At the same time its typical "meaning" as an organic and mediating link in a complex chain of prophecy having one end in view, points to a higher fulfillment in the far "Time of the End", and is in harmony with the visions in chaps. ii, and vii. This is confirmed by the fact that though, first of all, the "Time of the End" denotes the near horizon at which the prophet looks, viz. the close of the third empire, B.C. 165, it yet reaches to the "Last

¹For example, Hävernack, 266; Keil, Daniel, 260; Auberlen, 54; Maier, 307.

²Wordsworth, "Daniel," 41. Leupold (Daniel, 361) says: "So the 'end' referred to the absolute end."

³Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 152; Gaebelein, Daniel, 117; Pettingill, 75; Stevens, 124-125; Larkin, 141; Talbot, 154; Lang, 108-109; De Haan, 231; Bloomfield, 171; Strauss, 240; Walvoord, Daniel, 199; Wood, Daniel, 223; Tregelles, 78; Whitcomb, 115; Ironside, Daniel, 149; Newell 118; Seiss, 220.

Indignation" of God against the Jewish apostasy, viii:19, an "End" not yet apparent in history."¹

Those expositors who apply "the time of the end" only to the end-time Antichrist either use the same argument as some Futurists that the vision applies to Antiochus Epiphanes, but that the explanation extends to the end-time Antichrist,² or they posit a gap between vss. 8 and 9 and refer the first part of the chapter to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the rest to the Antichrist.³ Bloomfield, commenting on Dan 8:23, observes: "Here we pass by all the years from Alexander to Antichrist and are brought to 'the time of the end,' as the angel said."⁴

When we come to Dan 11 we find a general consensus among Futurists and Dispensationalists concerning the general outline of the chapter. The majority of exegetes ascribe vss. 21-35 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes⁵ and vss.

¹West, 89.

²For example, Ironside, Daniel, 149; Seiss, 220-221; Strauss, 240; De Haan, 231.

³For example, Tyso, 23; Tregelles, 80; Larkin, 164-165; Stevens, 119, 124-125; Pettingill, 78; Lang, 108-109; Bloomfield, 164, 172.

⁴Bloomfield, 172.

⁵For example, Keil, Daniel, 450; Young, Daniel, 241; Johnson, 87; Hall, WBIC, 3:553; Wallace, 183; Kliefoth, 447; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 54; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 217; Darby, 95; West 157; Gaebelien, Daniel, 173; Ironside, Daniel, 205; Stevens, 195; Talbot, 191; De Haan, 280; Culver 176; Walvoord, Daniel, 264; Wood, 304; Strauss, 334; Unger, 1683; Whitcomb, 150; Lindsay, 66.

36-45 to the end-time Antichrist.¹ Verses 36-39 are sometimes seen as a transition section including a double personality, type and antitype, in one description.²

Variations of this basic outline concern the division of the chapter,³ the identity of the willful king in vs. 36,⁴ and the interpretation of vss. 40-45.⁵

¹For example, Young, Daniel, 249; Leupold, Daniel, 493; Johnson, 87; Hall, WBIC, 3:555; Wallace, 189; Kliefoth, 478; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 220; Darby, 95; Seiss, 279; Gaebelein, Daniel, 184; Ironside, Daniel, 211; Stevens, 204; Milligan, 292; Larkin 225; Talbot, 191; Brooks 50; De Haan, 298; Culver, 176; Newell, 174; G. R. King, 201; Wood, Daniel, 304; Strauss, 340; Unger, 1687; Archer, "Daniel," 146; Lindsay, 68. The reasons given for this switch from Syrian history to the future are summarized by Culver (179-180): (1) A natural break in the thought appears at this point. (2) The known similarity of the history of the past breaks off at the end of vs. 35. (3) A totally new subject is introduced at the beginning of vs. 36. (4) It is not possible to introduce the Antichrist later in the chapter. Walvoord (Daniel, 270) adds that the expression "time of the end" introduces this sharp break in the prophecy.

²For example, Keil, Daniel, 462; West, 171. Keil says this section "partly goes far beyond what Antiochus did, partly does not harmonize with what is known of Antiochus, and finally, partly is referred in the NT expressly to the Antichrist; cf. verse 36 with 2 Thess. 2:4, and ch. 12:1 with Matt. 24:21 . . . in the prophetic contemplation there is comprehended in the image of one king what has been historically fulfilled in its beginning by Antiochus Epiphanes, but shall only meet its complete fulfillment by the Antichrist in the time of the end."

³Several commentators, e.g., Burgh (161-163), Tyso (47), Tregelles (134), and Lang (157) consider vss. 1-4 past history and vss. 5-45 still future. Bloomfield (197) has the Antichrist enter the picture in vs. 20, whereas most interpreters do not see him until vs. 36.

⁴The question is whether the final Antichrist of 1 John 2:18; 4:3 (Whitcomb, 153), is a Jewish Antichrist (Young, Daniel, 249) or the last Roman world ruler (Walvoord, Daniel, 272)? Some commentators surmise that the willful king is primarily Antiochus IV Epiphanes and

Concerning "the time of the end" in Dan 11:35,40 and 12:4,9, Futurists and Dispensationalists with few exceptions¹ apply this temporal phrase to the time before the second advent of Christ.² Yet, Dispensationalists do not believe that "the end" is the end of this world; rather they see it as the end of an era and the beginning of a new one. The new era being the temporal millennium here on earth. N. West explains: "It does not denote the end of history, nor of the planet, nor of nations, but the end of our present age, the 70th week itself in ix:27, the last half of which is seen in vii:25, and xii:7."³ Bloomfield

antitypically the Antichrist (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 4:450).

⁵For instance: Are there three protagonists in these verses (Gaebelain, Daniel, 192) or only two (Archer, "Daniel," 148)? Some interpreters accept Porphyry's statement about an expedition of Antiochus IV Epiphanes into Egypt towards the close of his reign and continue the Antiochus interpretation until vs. 45, though from vs. 36 onwards they see Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a type of the end-time Antichrist (Hävernack, 489-494; Auberlen, 58, 64).

¹Hävernack (494), Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown (4:451), and Auberlen (64) consider "the time of the end" in Dan 11 to refer primarily to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. This is the same interpretation they give to this phrase in Dan 8:17 (see p. 132).

²For example, Kliefoth, 478; Keil, Daniel, 469; Wordsworth, "Daniel," 57; Young, Daniel, 251; Hall, WBIC, 3:555; Johnson, 92; Leupold, Daniel, 520; Wallace, 189; Maier, 408; Tyso, 49; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 227; West, 177; Gaebelain, Daniel, 178-179; Ironside, 230-233; Pettingill, 109; Stevens, 208-209; Milligan, 292; Larkin, 225-226; Talbot, 201; Lang, 169; De Haan, 300; Tatford, Daniel, 209; Culver, 178; Bloomfield, 226; Newell, 177; Strauss, 340; Walvoord, Daniel, 277; Wood, Daniel, 304; Archer "Daniel," 146-147; Whitcomb, 164; Unger, 2:1686.

³West, 177.

adds: "'The end' never means the end of the world, but the goal of all prophecy--the defeat of Satan and the coming of the kingdom of God."¹ Leupold, in contrast, says: "There is nothing in the context that would restrict the force of the word 'end', and so the end of all things must be meant."²

The resurrection in Dan 12:2 has received different interpretations. Futurists usually apply it to the general resurrection at the end of all things.³ Some Dispensation-
alists see a limited resurrection confined to Israel immediately after the Great Tribulation, and prior to the last and general resurrection.⁴ Others believe it refers to the resurrection of all that sleep in the dust after the Great Tribulation; the good rise when Christ comes (first resurrection), the wicked after the millennium (second resurrection).⁵ A third group applies the resurrection to Israel's national and spiritual revival in "the end of time."⁶

¹Bloomfield, 226.

²Leupold, Daniel, 520. Leupold is an Amillennialist; he, therefore, rejects a temporal millennium.

³For example, Young, Daniel, 256; Leupold, Daniel, 529; Keil, Daniel, 483.

⁴For example, Culver, 185; Unger, 2:1692.

⁵For example, West, 197; Lang, 179; Tregelles, 158; Walvoord, Daniel, 288.

⁶For example, Brooks, 56; Gaebelin, Daniel, 200; Ironside, Daniel, 231; Kelly, Notes on Daniel, 255; De Haan, 307; Talbot, 215; Larkin, 259.

This survey of Futurist and Dispensational commentators has shown that for some expositors, depending on the context, "the time of the end" can refer to the end of a time period in history, e.g., the end of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century, as well as to the end of history at the parousia. For others, primarily Dispensationalists, "the time of the end" always refers to the parousia and as such it is an apocalyptic terminus.

Studies on $^{\circ}\text{ēṭ}$ and qēṣ

Consideration is now given to studies which deal specifically with $^{\circ}\text{ēṭ}$ or qēṣ .

B. Jones has a chapter in which he examines qēṣ and some of its cognates, first in the Bible apart from Daniel, then in the Qumran and later Hebrew literature, and lastly in the book of Daniel. In his summary on the use of qēṣ in the Bible apart from Daniel, he says: "We have seen that qēṣ in Biblical Hebrew often means "end" either as the end of a condition or the end of a period of time. . . . In none of the cases we examined was the "end" total or absolute."¹ In Qumran, Jones says it mostly means "time." In a few places it can mean "end, cessation,"² but generally "the Qumran exegetes did not understand qēṣ to mean 'end'; it is clearly an age, a period, and it will be

¹Jones, 195.

²Ibid., 199.

greater than everything that the prophets have spoken."¹

Jones begins his study of qēš in Daniel with an examination of texts where qēš appears without °ēṭ. He concludes that generally qēš is indefinite, referring to an end of a time period in history. In 12:13, however, he sees the resurrection of Daniel and, therefore, says:

We must reckon with the possibility, then, that the qēš in Daniel 12:13 refers to a special kind of "end." Unfortunately, we cannot tell whether the end of history was intended without knowing how the authors understood the resurrection.²

Since °ēṭ qēš is found nowhere else in the Bible or at Qumran, Jones raises the question whether it is a technical term.³ He is inclined to regard it as such but he does not press the point. As to the meaning of °ēṭ qēš, he wavers between "end of a period in history" and "end of history."⁴ Thus he "concludes with uncertainty which must remain until some of the other terminology is examined."⁵ Yet even in his final conclusion, he remains undecided.

I ruled out the possibility of an end to history for some uses of qēš in Daniel, but in other instances it is ambiguous. In 12:13 "the end of days" may mean that time and history will come to an end, or it may, in line with older Biblical usage, simply mean "later," "after a time." It was impossible to determine whether time would continue after the qēš of 8:17,19; 11:27, 35,40; 12:4,9. The word refers to the end of the

¹ Ibid., 203.

² Ibid., 211.

³ Ibid., 215.

⁴ Ibid., 216-218.

⁵ Ibid., 219.

persecution under Antiochus IV, but if a deliberate double meaning is intended, then conceivably the end of the persecution could also be the end of history. I was able to discover no definitive way to know whether "end" in these cases is intended to be understood in a single or a double sense.¹

Freer in his study of the vision reports in biblical literature and comes to the conclusion that because the phrases "the end," "many days," and "latter days" in the Old Testament outside of Daniel normally refer to future historical times, "there is no prima facie reason for assuming that these phrases have other meanings in Daniel."² After briefly touching on a few time expressions in Daniel he concludes by saying:

We would argue, therefore, that the phrase "time of the end" and its synonyms in Daniel have a connotation of cognate phrases elsewhere in the Old Testament. The final events will occur at a time of divine judgment and will include divine intervention on behalf of the elect, but these final events will be on the historical stage.³

M. Wagner disagrees and says Daniel uses *qēs* as an eschatological terminus technicus.⁴ He says:

The time of the end which encompasses the last time of distress as well as the beginning of redemption is raised above the rest of earthly history. In the prophets it stands bolder than ever in a dualistic contrast to the ungodly world since God has determined it (cf. 11:27; 12:7; 8:14; and 12:12).⁵

¹Ibid., 274.

²Freer, 106.

³Ibid., 108.

⁴M. Wagner, " *qēs* Ende," THAT, 2:662.

⁵Ibid. Die Endzeit, welche sowohl die letzte Notzeit als auch die anbrechende Heilszeit umschließt, ist

Qēš as end-time is seen by M. Wagner first in Amos 8:2, "The end has come for my people Israel," then in Hab 2:3, and eight times in Ezekiel.¹ He equates Amos 8:2 with the Day of Yahwe in Amos 5:18-20, and considers both to be eschatological.²

J. Wilch's study of ^cēt̄ and other temporal expressions suggests that ^cēt̄ refers primarily to the relationship between occasions and that its function is "to point to the juncture of circumstances, that is, to the specific occasion produced by this juncture."³ Later, it came to designate the particular occasion itself, and still later it became "nothing more than a superfluous addition or conjunction,⁴ i.e., it lost its character of referring to a definite occasion. The phrase ^cēt̄ qēš in Dan 8:17, etc., is an eschatological terminus technicus according to Wilch.⁵

aus der sonstigen irdischen Geschichte herausgehoben und steht viel stärker als je bei den Propheten in dualistischem Gegensatz zu der dem nahen Untergang entgegentreibenden ungöttlichen Welt. Dieses Ende läßt sich berechnen, da es von Gott genau vorher bestimmt ist (vgl. 11,27; 12,7; 8,14 und 12,12).

¹Ezek 7:2,3,6; 21:30,34; 35:5.

²Wagner, 2:661.

³John R. Wilch, Time and Event (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 161.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 165.

E. Jenni, in his study on ^cēṭ, comes to the conclusion that ^cēṭ by itself is not an eschatological terminus technicus. Qēs, however, is and thus the phrase ^cēṭ qēs in Daniel is to be understood eschatologically.¹

Summary

Our review of literature in regard to the expression "the time of the end" has produced the following facts:

1. The double application of the Little Horn in Dan 8 to Antiochus Epiphanes and the end-time Antichrist as well as the interpretation of chap. 11 which saw Antiochus IV Epiphanes in vss. 21-35 and the end-time Antichrist in vss. 36-45 was the standard interpretation of Daniel's prophecies from the time of the Church Fathers until modern times.
2. Historical-critical scholars generally equate "the time of the end," "the latter days," and "the last end of the indignation" and apply them all to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Thus, "the time of the end" for them always has reference to the second century B.C. when the Messianic kingdom should have begun and as such is an eschatological term.
3. For Preterists, who view Dan 8 and 11 similarly to the Historical-critical School, "the time of the end" can refer to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the demise of the Grecian Empire, the latter days of the Roman

¹Ernst Jenni, "לְעֵת זַיִת," THAT, 2:383.

Empire, as well as to the second advent of Christ. Consequently, the phrase "time of the end" is an eschatological one, and at times, even an apocalyptic phrase in some cases but not in others.

4. The Historicist view comprises four different interpretations of the Little Horn in Dan 8; they are called: the Maccabean, the Roman, the Papal, and the Mohammedan view.
 - a. The Maccabean view sees "the time of the end" primarily as a reference to the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (the Little Horn) and the Messiah, and in a secondary sense, particularly in chap. 12, as an apocalyptic term referring to the end of time.
 - b. The Roman view sees the Roman Empire as the Little Horn and "the time of the end" as an apocalyptic phrase describing the last period of world history.
 - c. The Papal view always applies "the time of the end" to the end of world-history and understands it to be an apocalyptic terminus.
 - d. The Mohammedan view considers the Grecian Little Horn to refer to Mohammed and "the time of the end" to be an apocalyptic expression referring to the time period preceding the millennium.
5. For exegetes of the Futurist-dispensational School, depending on the context, "the time of the end" can refer to the end of a time period in history, e.g., the end of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century

B.C., as well as to the end of history at the parousia. Thus, in some cases, it can have an apocalyptic meaning.

6. Jones in his study of the word *qēs* does not reach any definite conclusions as to whether *qēs* means an end in history or the end of history.
7. Freer in his study of the expression "time of the end" and related phrases comes to the conclusion that the events referred to will be on the historical stage and thus do not carry an apocalyptic meaning.
8. M. Wagner, J. Wilch, and E. Jenni all consider the phrase "time of the end" to be an eschatological *terminus technicus*.

Conclusions

This review of literature shows that there is no *communis opinio* with regard to the meaning of either *b' 'ah^a rīt hayyāmīm* or *ē^t qēs*. Some scholars consider them eschatological or apocalyptic phrases; others do not. Some exegetes believe that depending on the context, one or the other phrase can be eschatological in one place and non-eschatological in another; others feel that the phrases are *termini technici* which always carry the same meaning.

Thus many questions remain open. Do both expressions refer to the same time period or not? To which historical events do they refer? Is the expression "the latter days" a synonym for "future" or does it refer to a

specific time period? Is "the time of the end" an end within the flow of history or the time just prior to the end of history? These and other questions together with the bewildering array of scholarly opinions concerning the meaning of *b'aharîṭ hayyāmîm* and *°ēṭ qēs* indicate that there is a real necessity for an in-depth study of the various interpretations and their presuppositions as well as of the Biblical text and the meaning of the two phrases in order to understand the Danielic thought and eschatology. In the chapters which follow, I propose to apply myself to this task.

CHAPTER II

"THE LATTER DAYS" IN ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LITERATURE AND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In this chapter we investigate, first, expressions similar to the phrase *b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic. Following this, we investigate the Hebrew root 'hr and its derivatives as they are employed in the literature of the OT. Then, attention is given to each of the twelve passages in the OT in which the phrase *b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* appears aside from the usages in the book of Daniel. Lastly, we attempt to investigate the two passages in the book of Daniel where the Hebrew phrase *b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* and its Aramaic equivalent *b^o'ah^arîṭ yômayyā'* are used.¹ In the entire endeavor the immediate and larger contexts are given careful attention.

The Root 'hr and "the Latter Days" in Ancient Near Eastern Literature

The word *'ah^arîṭ* is derived from the root 'hr which appears in most of the other Semitic languages.² The

¹Dan 2:28; 10:14.

²DISO (10) has references to Punic, Moabite, Nabatean, and Aramaic. KBL (34-35) in addition lists

Akkadian *aḫrātaš*, *aḫrātu*, etc.;¹ the Ugaritic, *'aḫr*, *uḫryt*, etc.;² and the Aramaic *'aḫar*, *'aḫ°rī*, etc., are assigned basically the meanings of "after," "afterward," "then," "in the future," etc. A study of these terms in cognate Semitic languages, therefore, may be expected to assist in an understanding of the phrase *b°'aḫ°rīṭ hayyāmīm* in the OT, since they belong to the larger linguistic and cultural background of the Hebrew faith.

Akkadian

The lexical meaning of the Akkadian adverbs *aḫrātaš* and *aḫritiš* is "in the future."³ The noun *aḫrātu* can mean "future" or "posterity, progeny."⁴ The two Akkadian phrases which are usually thought to be closest to the Hebrew *b°'aḫ°rīṭ hayyāmīm*, "the latter days," are *ana*⁵

Akkadian, Arabic, and Ugaritic.

¹CAD, A, 1:193-194; AHW, 21; HWB, 44-45.

²WUS, 14; UT, 355.

³CAD, A, 1:193-194; AHW, 21; HWB, 45; Albert Schott, "Die Vergleiche in den akkadischen Königsinschriften," MVAG 30 (1926):176.

⁴CAD, A, 1:193-194; AHW, 21; HWB, 45.

⁵In these phrases the preposition "an" or "ana" meaning "to, for, up to, toward, against, upon" (CAD, A, 2:100) is interchangeably used with the preposition "ina" which has the meaning "in, on, from, through" (CAD, I/J, 141).

aḥrat¹ ūmê² and ana arkât³ ūmê both meaning "in the future," "in future days."⁴

A study of these words and phrases in their historical, legal, and religious contexts will indicate the meanings in their respective usages in the Akkadian texts and may thus throw light on the understanding of the Hebrew phrase b' 'aḥ^a rîṭ hayyāmîm.

Historical Texts

In the postscript to the laws of Hammurabi (1792-1750 B.C.) appears the following passage:

To the end of time (a-na wa-ar-ki-a-at u-mi), yea for evermore (a-na ma-ti-ma) may the king who shall be (raised up) in the land observe the just words which I have inscribed on my monument. . . ."⁵

The intent of these lines is clear: the king wants to make sure, that all the kings after him shall observe the laws which he has had inscribed on this stone. The time indicated by ana warkiat ūmî begins when the king is dead and ends, as far as Hammurabi is concerned, never.

In a bilingual inscription (Sumerian and Akkadian)

¹Aḥrat is derived from the noun aḥrātu meaning "future" (CAD, A, 1:193).

²ūmê or ūmî is the plural from ūmû "day" (HWB, 306).

³Arkât is derived from the noun arkitu meaning "sequel, future" (CAD, A, 2:281).

⁴CAD, A, 1:194; A, 2:280; AHW, 21; HWB, 45.

⁵G. R. Driver and John C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 2:99, col. 25b, lines 59-65.

celebrating the greatness of Hammurabi's reign the text says: "He made glorious for future days [a-na aḥ-ri-a-at u-mi] the greatness of his power."¹ Again this future must be reckoned from the time of Hammurabi on.

The most common usage of the Akkadian words and phrases paralleling b^o'aḥ^arīṭ hayyāmim in historical texts is in building inscriptions. In these texts the king usually recounts his achievements in building or renovating the temple or house. Then he looks to the future and asks later generations to rebuild or renovate the dwelling should it fall into disrepair.

A few times the terms aḥrataš, arkitu, or aḥratu are used alone² or in conjunction with ana³ or ūmī⁴ to express the thought of future time. But in general the phrases ana aḥrat ūmī or ana arkāt ūmē are used. From the

¹L. W. King, The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, about B.C. 2200, 3 vols. (London: Luzac and Co., 1900), 3:174, col. iv, line 3.

²For example, B. T. A. Evetts, "On Five Unpublished Cylinders of Sennacherib," ZA 3 (1888): 322, line 92; Stephen H. Langdon, Die neubabylonischen Königinschriften, VAB, vol. 4 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912), 74, line 48.

³For example, Erich Ebeling, Bruno Meissner, and Ernst F. Weidner, Die Inschriften der altassyrischen Könige, AOB, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1926), 40, 2 Rs. 6.

⁴For example, J. N. Strassmaier, "Inschriften von Nabopalassar und Smerdis," ZA 4 (1889): 110, line 83; R. Campbell Thompson and R. W. Hamilton, "The British Museum Excavations on the Temple of Ishtar at Niniveh, 1930-31," AAA 19 (1932): 105, line 11.

many examples available,¹ I quote one from the fourteenth and one from the seventh century B.C.²

The Assyrian King Ramman-nirari I (ca. 1325 B.C.) rebuilt an old temple and had a stone tablet inscribed and placed in the temple which is translated in part as follows:

For later times [a-na ar-kat umi]: When this city is old and in a state of disrepair, a later Prince should, in restoring its damage, return my tablet and

¹For example, see Ernest A. Wallis Budge and Leonard W. King, Annals of the Kings of Assyria, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1902), 8, line 9; 22, line 11; 105, line 50; Daniel D. Luckenbill, The Annals of Sennacherib, OIP, vol. 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924), 98, line 93; 116, line 77; 130, line 73; Eberhard Schrader, ed., Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten, 5 vols., KB (Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagbuchhandlung, 1889-96), 1:6, Rs. 9; 1:12, line 11; 2:112, line 63; 2:150, line 13; 2:235, line 108; Maximilian Streck, Assurbanipal und die letzten Assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's, 3 vols., VAB 7 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916), 2:154, line 33; 232, line 23; 234, line 26; 242, line 49; 246, line 77; Evetts, 323, line 93; Riekele Borger, Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien, AfO, Beiheft 9 (1956; reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1967), 28, line 19; 34, line 58; 75, line 36; 76, line 20; Ernst Weidner, Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I. und seiner Nachfolger, AfO, Beiheft 12 (1959; reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970), 6, line 62; 9, line 46; 13, line 84; 25, line 55; 55, line 11; 56, line 8; Samuel Alden Smith, Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals, Königs von Assyrien (668-626 v. Chr.), 3 vols. (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1887-1889), 1:81, col. 10, lines 108-113.

²For reasons of space and to avoid repetition I have chosen only two examples. They are 700 years apart to indicate that the wording of these inscriptions has virtually remained unchanged during these centuries. All other inscriptions listed in the footnote above have basically the same text.

inscription to its original place; then Ašur will hear his prayers.¹

Seven hundred years later the Assyrian king Assurbanipal (669-626 B.C.) rebuilt the house of Šamaš the sun god, and left an inscription for posterity which reads in part:

For whenever, for the future [ina aš-rat ūmê*] (should the following be valid): A later Prince, under whose rule this work de[cayed], should restore it, write my name beside his name, regard my testimony an[d] anoint it with oil. He should bring a sacrifice, lay (it) next to his testimony. (Then) Šamaš will hear [his] prayers.²

The temporal phrases in all these texts point to a distant future when the buildings these kings had erected would fall into a state of disrepair and future kings are urged to restore them. "In other words," says H. Pehlke, "the speaker points to a time which is not yet when the dilapidated condition of the building will be changed into a restored condition."³

¹Schrader, 1:7, Rs. 9-14. Für spätere Zeiten [a-na ar-kat umi]: Ein späterer Fürst möge, wenn jene Stätte alt wird und verfällt, ihre Beschädigungen ausbessern, meine Tafel und Namensschrift an ihren Platz zurückstellen; dann wird Ašur seine Gebete erhören.

²Streck, 232, line 23-26. Für wann nur immer, für die Zukunft [ina aš-rat ūmê*] (soll folgendes gelten): Ein späterer Fürst, unter dessen Regierungszeit dieses Werk ver[fallen ist], soll es aus dem Verfall heben, meinen Namen neben seinen Namen schreiben, meine Schrifturkunde ansehen un[d] mit Öl salben. Ein Opfer möge er darbringen, (es) hinlegen neben seine Schrifturkunde. (Dann) wird [seine] Gebete Šamaš erhören.

³H. Pehlke, "An Exegetical and Theological Study of Genesis 49:1-28" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985), 74.

In other historical texts, "a-na aḥ-ra-ti,"¹ "aḥ-râtan ûmê,"² "aḥ-rat û-mi,"³ or simply "aḥ-ra-a-ti"⁴ are all translated as "in the future"⁵ or "in days to come."⁶

The phrase "ana arkât ûmê" is found on the octagonal prism of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.), copies of which were given in the year 1857 to Rawlinson, Hincks, Talbot, and Oppert to test the alleged decipherment of cuneiform writing.⁷ The inscription reports the military expeditions of the king. In the fifth column the capture of all the kings of the lands of Nairi is described. Tiglath-Pileser I was gracious to these kings; he did not kill them, but they had to swear an oath of fidelity. The respective part of this text reads:

I spared their lives. (When they were brought) captive and bound into the presence of Shamash my Lord I set them free, and an oath by my great gods that for future days [a-na ar-kat ûmê], and for ever [a-na u-um ṣa-a-te], they would pay homage I caused them to swear.⁸

¹Budge and King, 390, Rs 6.

²D. G. Lyon, Keilschrifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1883), 36, line 54.

³Luckenbill, 84, line 53.

⁴Streck, 126, line 73.

⁵Ibid., 127, line 73; Budge and King, 390, Rs 6; Lyon, 37, line 54.

⁶Luckenbill, 84, line 53.

⁷Cyrus Gordon, Forgotten Scripts (New York: Basic Books, Pub., 1968), 67.

⁸Budge and King, 70, line 15.

The future in this text refers to the immediate future beginning the very moment the oath was made. At the same time it reaches into the distant future, even unto the end of days, as the parallel phrase "for ever" indicates.¹

Legal Texts

The phrase *ana arkât ûmî* appears frequently in Babylonian legal documents,² e.g., from the time of Rim-Sin (1822-1763 B.C.) comes the following text:

Whenever in future days [*šumma ana arkât ûmî*] Ili-iriba calls *Hisatum*, his mother, "not his mother" he will lay claim to the house, garden, and property, such as there is. Whenever in future days [*šumma ana arkât ûmî*] *Hisatum* calls Ili-iriba, her son, "not my son," he will lay claim to the house, garden, and property, such as there is.³

¹The oath of fidelity was binding forever, or as long as the parties concerned, i.e., the kingdoms they represented, existed. *Ana um šati* appears several times in Akkadian texts to indicate the thought "for all time," "far into the future." *CAD*, S, 118.

²Felix E. Peiser, Texte juristischen und geschäftlichen Inhalts, KB, vol. 4, ed. E. Schrader (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1896), 4, line 1; 6, II:11; 10, XII:14; 58, II:12; 66, II:11; 70, III:1; 76, II:31; 80, II:1; 84, I:29; 90, IV:36; 96, line 43; 170, line 17; W. J. Hinke, A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series D: Research and Treatises; ed. H. V. Hilprecht (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia, 1907), 175; L. W. King, Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial Tablets in the British Museum (London: British Museum, 1912), 21, line 12; 35, line 26; 40, line 31; 81, III:1; 109, line 20.

³Peiser, 5-7, lines 1-14. Wann immer in künftigen Tagen [*šumma ana arkât ûmî*] Ili-iriba zu *Hisatum*, seiner Mutter, "nicht seine Mutter" sagt, wird er auf Haus, Garten und Besitz, soviel es ist, einen Anspruch erheben. Wann immer in künftigen Tagen [*šumma ana arkât ûmî*] *Hisatum* zu Ili-iriba, ihrem Sohne, "nicht ihr Sohn" sagt, wird er auf Haus, Garten und Besitz, soviel es ist, einen Anspruch erheben.

The "future days" mentioned refer to some future time, probably not too far off, in the life of Ili-iriba and his mother Hisatum.

From the same time period we have a text in which Sin-uzilli has bought a piece of land from Sin-illatsu. In the contract, they agreed that "Never shall in future days [ana arkât ûmî] Sin-illatsu turn around and bring a lawsuit concerning his house, or to claim invalidity [of this contract]." ¹ Again the "future days" refer at best to the rest of Sin-illatsu's period of life.

A law from the Middle Assyrian period² stipulates that a woman whose husband has been taken prisoner by the enemy must wait two years before she can marry again. However, "if afterwards (šum-ma i-na ar-kat UD. MEŠ) her missing husband returns to the country, he shall take back his wife who has been married away (from him). . . ." ³ The "afterwards" begins immediately after the second marriage of the woman. Thus, a relatively near future is indicated by ina arkât ûmê in this context.

The more distant future is included in a sale's

¹"Niemals soll in künftigen Tagen [ana arkât ûmî] Sin-illatsu zur Klage über sein Haus sich umwenden oder Ungiltigkeit [sic] beantragen" (ibid., 6, II:11-15).

²The date of these laws from ancient Assur cannot be precisely determined. Scholars have assigned them a date somewhere between 1450 B.C. and 1250 B.C. See G. R. Driver and John C. Miles, The Assyrian Laws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), 4-6.

³Ibid., 413, line 72.

contract from the time of Assurbanipal (669-626 B.C.). The text reports the sale of Ina-isi-itir's house in Uruk to Irisi for 1 mine 15 shekel. The relevant part of this text reads:

Whenever in later days [ma-ti-ma ina ar-kat ū-mi] any of the brothers, sons, male or female relatives from the house of Ina-isi-itir, whoever rises up and sues or has somebody sue because of the house, applies for invalidity or claims that it is his turn. . . . [text missing].¹

The "future days" in this text include the times of the descendants of Ina-isi-itir, probably for several generations.

Legal contracts of this type generally contain the following phraseology: "Whenever in later days [im-ma-ti-ma i-na ar-ka-ti ū-mi] any one of the brothers, sons, male or female relatives rises up and says. . . ." ² He who does this shall be cursed by the gods³ or pay back the money received with 20 percent interest.⁴

Similarly, Babylonian boundary-stones,⁵ which were

¹Peiser, 170, line 17-22. Wann immer in späteren Tagen [ma-ti-ma ina ar-kat ū-mi] von den Brüdern, Söhnen, Verwandten männlicher und weiblicher Linie(?) vom Hause des Ina-isi-itir, wer da aufsteht und wegen jenes Hauses klagt, klagen lässt, Ungiltigkeit [sic] beantragt, Zugrecht geltend macht, also . . . [text is missing].

²Ibid., 71, III:1-6; 85, I:29-32; 91, IV:36-38; 97, line 43-44; 171, line 17-21.

³Ibid., 73, III:23-26; 85, I:37-39.

⁴Ibid., 91, IV:40; 97, line 47.

⁵The period covered by the boundary-stones published by L. W. King (Babylonian Boundary-Stones) extends from 1450-550 B.C.

employed for the protection of private property, frequently contain the formula: "Whensoever in later days [ma-ti-ma i-na ar-kat u-mi] an agent, or a governor . . . or any official whatsoever who shall rise up . . . [and] take them away. . . ." ¹ He who does this shall be cursed by the gods. ² Here as previously the meaning of ina arkât ûmî is that of an indefinite future time that begins at the moment of the contract, oath, or determination.

Thus from the time of the Rim-Sin (1822-1763 B.C.) down to the time of Assurbanipal (669-626 B.C.), the Akkadian expression ana arkât ûmê is frequently found in legal phraseology and gives the impression of being a legal terminus technicus, indicating the duration of future time during which these documents were legally binding. In some cases it seems to be limited to the life-span of the person concerned, in most other cases it seems to go far beyond by including the times of future descendants.

Religious Texts

The phrases ana ahrat ûmê and ana arkât ûmê so frequently used in historical and legal texts seem to be

¹Ibid., 21, line 12; 35, line 26; 40, line 31; 81, III:1; 109, line 20.

²Ibid., 35, lines 37-38; 41, lines 13-33.

entirely lacking in the religious texts.¹ Though similar phrases are used to express the same thought.

An inscription of the Kassite king Agum-kakrими's (16th century B.C.) recounts the return of the statues of the gods Merodach and Sarpānit from the land of Ḫani.² At the end of this lengthy inscription, the king invokes the blessings of the gods and says:

May Ia and Damkina grant him a life of many days (balāt ūmi arkūti) . . . may Sin give him kingly seed for the future (a-na ūmi arkūti) . . . may Šamaš establish the foundation of his dominion for future days (a-na umi arkūti).³

Agum-kakrими desires a long life, and that his seed and his dominion may remain as long as time lasts.

In the epic of Atrahasis the expression aḫriatiš

¹For example: S. Langdon, The Babylonian Epic of Creation (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923); R. Campbell Thompson, The Epic of Gilgamesh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930); W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); Albert T. Clay, A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform, YOS 5, pt. 3 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922); W. G. Lambert, "Three Literary Prayers of the Babylonians," AfO 19 (1959-60): 47-66; V. Scheil, "Fragments de la légende du dieu zū," RA 35 (1938): 14-25; Erich Ebeling, "Eine neue Tafel des akkadischen Zū-Mythos," RA 46 (1952): 25-41; Schrader, 1:193; 3a: 134-152; 3b: 8-139. The inscriptions in Schrader are actually building inscriptions (primarily in temples) but they contain long passages of adoration and supplication to the gods.

²P. Jensen, "Inscription Agum-kakrими's, d.i. Agum's des Jüngeren," in Schrader, 3a: 134-153.

³Ibid., 151. "Ia und Damkina, die im grossen Weltmeer wohnen, mögen ihm ein Leben langer Tage geben! . . . Sin, die Leuchte des Himmels, möge ihm königlichen Samen für lange Tage geben! Šamaš, der Held, der Held Himmels und der Erde möge die Grundlage des Throns seiner Königsherrschaft für lange Tage festlegen."

umi appears twice in the passage where man is created.¹ According to the text man was to be made from clay, like a figurine, but mixed with the flesh and blood of a slaughtered God:

- 210 From his (the slaughtered God) flesh and blood
 211 Let Nintu mix clay
 212 That god and man
 213 May be thoroughly mixed in the clay
 214 So that we may hear the drum for the rest of the
 time (ah-ri-a-ti-iš u-mi).
 215 Let there be a spirit from the god's flesh.
- 225 From his flesh and blood
 226 Nintu mixed clay
 227 For the rest [of time (ah-ri-a-t[i-iš u-mi]) they
 heard the drum]
 228 From the flesh of the god [there was] a spirit.²

It is not clear from the context what purpose the drum serves or what time period is meant by "the rest of time." In the glossary, W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard translate ahriatiš as "for ever,"³ but even this translation does not make the sense any more explicit. Whatever time period is meant the meaning of the text is obviously that they heard the drum until the end of that particular time period.

The adverb ahritiš appears in a text which is said to have a relationship to the biblical book of Job.⁴ On the tablet AO 4462 in the Louvre which is attributed to the

¹Lambert and Millard, Atrahasis, 47-66.

²Ibid., 59.

³Ibid., 177.

⁴Jean Nougayrol, "Une version ancienne du 'just souffrant'," RB 59 (1952): 239-250.

epoch of Ammiditana (1683-1647 B.C.), the third king after Hammurabi (1792-1750 B.C.), a friend of the "righteous sufferer" pleads his case before God. In his answer, God says to the "righteous sufferer" and his advocate:

You have known the anguish, the fear to its fullest extent.
 Until the end you have suffered its heavy burden.
 The way was obstructed: it is opened to you!
 The path was made smooth for you, grace was bestowed upon you.
 (But) in the future (ah-ri-ti-iš ūmi¹) do not forget your God,
 Your creator, when you have recovered your health. Will you?¹

That the expression ahritiš ūmī in this text within its context concerns the near future is indicated by the following sentence: "When you have recovered your health." Recovery was obviously expected in the near future.

In a prayer to the Babylonian god Marduk (Kassite period, 1600-1200 B.C.) the adverb ahrātaš appears twice.² Unfortunately, the term ahrātaš appears right at the end of the prayer where the text is badly damaged and only a part of the lines are readable:

200. The Lord
 201. [.... make known the mercy].
 202. [.....to the peoples] for [ever] [ah-ra-ta-aš].

¹Ibid., 247. Tu as connu les angoisses, la peur dans toute son étendue; Jusqu'au bout tu as supporté son lourd fardeau. La voie était obstruée: elle t'est ouverte! Le chemin t'est aplani, la grâce t'est accordée! (Mais), à l'avenir [ahritiš ūmi¹], n'oublieras tu pas ton dieu, Ton créateur, quand tu auras recouvré la santé, toi?

²Lambert, "Three Literary Prayers," 60.

203. [...] make known the mercy.

204. [...to] the peoples for ever [aḥ-ra-ta-aš].¹

The translator took the term aḥrātaš in this context to indicate an endless future. The mercies of Marduk or some other god are to be proclaimed henceforth and forever.

In the Akkadian epic "Enuma elish," aḥrātaš is found several times. Marduk, the hero of the story, after having defeated Tiamat, leads the defeated gods bound into the presence of his father. The text then reads:

73. Now the eleven creatures which Tiamat
had made . . . ,

74. Whose weapons he had shattered, which he had tied
to his foot:

75. [Of these] he made statues and set [them] up [at
the Gate] Apsu (saying):

76. "Let it be a token that this may never [aḥ-rā-taš]
be forgotten."²

The last line can also be translated: "This shall be a mark not to be forgotten in the future."³ The intent of the passage seems to be the same as in the previous text. From henceforth these statues shall be an eternal reminder.

In another portion of the epic the gods praise Marduk with the following words:

¹Ibid.

²A. K. Grayson, ANET, 502. See also B. Landsberger and J. V. Kinnier Wilson, "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma elish," JNES 20 (1961): 161-163.

³CAD, A, I:193.

105. Most exalted be the Son, our avenger;
 106. Let his sovereignty be surpassing, having no rival.
 107. May he shepherd the black-headed ones, his creatures.
 108. To the end of days [aḥ-ra-taš ūmē], without forgetting, let them acclaim his ways.¹

A. Heidel translates the last line as: "Throughout the days to come let them, without forgetting, make mention of [his deeds(?)]"² This is more in harmony with the use of aḥrataš in historical, legal, and other religious texts where the word appears,³ as well as with the immediate context. The emphasis in our passage is on the future, on the time from now on, not on the end of time.

The last passage in which aḥrataš occurs in this epic is (on Tablet Seven) at the end where the gods after a

¹E. A. Speiser, ANET, 69. So also CAD, A, I:193.

²Alexander Heidel, The Babylonian Genesis, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 50, line 108. S. Langdon (Babylonian Epic, 179, line 86) renders the line as: "Forever that his praise be not forgotten."

³The future, in general, is the import of the word aḥrataš. In addition to the texts considered above, I quote the following examples: On a stela from Nineveh Sennacherib records how he enlarged the site of Nineveh. He made a wide royal road and placed stelas on either side so that in "days to come" (aḥrataš ūme) there might be no narrowing of the royal road (Luckenbill, 153). On a cylinder of Sennacherib is found the following sentence: "And all the deeds which I performed I had written in it, and in the foundations of the palace of my Lordship I left it to future times (aḥrataš). Evetts, 326, line 92. Similarly, in an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar we read: "Alle meine kostbaren Arbeiten . . . schrieb ich auf eine Tafel und stellte sie auf für die Nachwelt (aḥ-ra-ta-aš) (Langdon, Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften, 75, line 44-48). The emphasis is always on the time following the present, on the future per se.

joyful banquet, in solemn assembly, recite the fifty names of Marduk. In appreciation of all that he has done for them they confer upon him fifty titles with all the attributes and abilities of the various gods of the pantheon.¹ The relevant section of the text reads:

- 131. May he shepherd all the gods like sheep.
- 132. May he vanquish Tiamat; may her life be strait and short!
- 133. Into the future [ah-ra-taš] of mankind, when days have grown old,
- 134. May she recede without cease and stay away forever.²

This passage is difficult to understand. The context as stated above is the recitation of Marduk's fifty names, and in light of this, line 131 fits into the context nicely. Not so, however, the next line. E. A. Speiser,³ A. Heidel,⁴ and H. Gressmann⁵ all translate: "May he vanquish Tiamat. . . ." If Tablet Seven is the conclusion of the epic, why is the optative used here? In Tablet Four Tiamat was slain, and Marduk constructed heaven and earth from her body. Has the goddess in some way been resurrected or is Tiamat simply a reference to the sea?

¹Heidel, 10.

²Speiser, ANET, 72. Heidel (59) similarly translates: Until future (generations of) men, when the (present) days have grown old.

³Ibid.

⁴Heidel, 59.

⁵Hugo Gressmann (Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1926], 128) translates: "Er bezwinde Tiamat, ihr Leben beenge und kürze er!"

S. Langdon translates: "Verily he bound Tiamat, distressed her soul and cut it off."¹ This would fit the context, but he is the only translator who places the action in the past.² Now if Tablet Seven was originally an independent bilingual hymn on the names of Marduk which was only later attached to the epic in a Semitic version, as Langdon suggests,³ then this line presents no problem.

The next line is even more difficult. Line 133, sandwiched between two lines whose subject is Tiamat, looks like a parenthetical statement. If left out, the poem would read smoothly:

132. May he vanquish Tiamat; may her life be strait and short!

134. May she recede without cease and stay away for ever.

Yet between these lines we find a sentence consisting of four words without a verb: *aḫrataš niše labariš ūme*.⁴ The two renderings of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary indicate the difficulty this line presents. The scholar who worked on the adverb *aḫrataš* quotes this passage and interprets it as "unto (the last days of) mankind,

¹Langdon, Babylonian Epic, 205.

²W. von Soden ("Neue Bruchstücke zur sechsten und siebenten Tafel des Weltschöpfungsepos *Enuma eliš*," ZA, n.F. 13 [1942]: 25) who indicates some textual problems also translates: "ihr Leben soll beengt und kurz sein."

³Langdon, Babylonian Epic, 16.

⁴Individually these words mean: "in future," "people," "long duration" or "longevity," and "days."

when even the days have grown old."¹ The scholar who investigated the noun *labaru* also cites this line, but he translates: "until future generations, in days to come."² Heidel, similar to the first interpretation, renders the passage as: "Until future (generations of) men, when the (present) days have grown old." One wonders what the phrase "when the days have grown old" is meant to say. Is it intended as a long-range time expression as one can infer from the rendering of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary? Or is it simply saying "when the present has become the past," as Heidel seems to indicate?

Another question is whether line 133 should be joined to the preceding or to the following line? Speiser connects it with the previous sentence thus giving it the following sense: "May he vanquish Tiamat . . . until the days have grown old," i.e., until the end. Langdon joins it to the next line and renders it as follows: "In the future may the peoples when days grow old, proclaim unceasingly, 'Let him rule for ever'."³

This discussion is not intended to solve the question of interpretation, it merely serves to indicate the problem attending this passage. Whichever rendering is accepted, the linguistic and contextual uncertainties make

¹CAD, A, I:193.

²CAD, L, 13.

³Langdon, Babylonian Epic, 207.

it difficult to assign an eschatological meaning to this passage.

Ugaritic

In contrast to Akkadian, there is no corresponding phrase to b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm in Ugaritic. Only a few words in Ugaritic refer to future time, among them the nouns 'uḥryt and 'uḥry.¹

'uḥryt

The nearest equivalent to the Hebrew 'aḥ^arîṭ is the term 'uḥryt, for which C. H. Gordon gives the meaning of "latter end, destiny, lot."² Unfortunately it appears only once in the literature published to date, namely, in the story of Aqhat.³ The text was initially called the Epic of Daniel (Danel), but is presently known as the story or epic of Aqhat from the superscription of one of the tablets.⁴

¹UT, 355. The initial 'u instead of the well-attested initial 'a is explained by Baruch Margalit ("Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic [Part II: KTU 1.19]," UF 16 [1984]: 158) as due to vowel harmony with the theme-vowel [u], corresponding to Hebrew 'aḥ^aor(annîṭ) "backwards" the converse of pānîm "face, front."

²UT, 355. J. Aistleitner (WUS, 14) translates it as "die spätere Zeit."

³2 Aqhat, VI:35. See Richard E. Whitaker, A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 14-15. All textual references are given according to Gordon's Ugaritic Textbook.

⁴J. C. L. Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977), 23. The extant text is contained on three tablets, all discovered in 1930.

The epic of Aqhat is the story of King Danel who undergoes a seven-day rite of incubation in the hope of obtaining a son. The gods take pity on Danel and the son, Aqhat, is born. In the course of time, Aqhat comes into conflict with the goddess Anat, who desires his magnificent bow made for him by the divine craftsman Kothar-and-Khasis. Since Aqhat refuses to give Anat the bow, she orders her henchman Yatpan to kill Aqhat. When Danel finds the remains of his son, he curses the cities nearest the scene of the crime and, in accordance with ancient oriental custom, holds mourning ceremonies lasting seven years. The story breaks off as Pughat, the sister of Aqhat, attempts to avenge the death of her brother.¹

The passage in question comes from 2 Aqhat, VI:35, 36: mt . uḥryt . mh . yqh . mh . yqh . mt . atryt. H. L. Ginsberg translates this as: "Further life--how can mortal attain it? How can mortal attain life enduring?"² J. Gray suggests the rendering: "As for mortal man, what does he get as his latter end? What does mortal man get as his inheritance?"³

¹ Ibid., 24-27.

² H. L. Ginsberg, ANET, 151. In an earlier translation Ginsberg ("The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat," BASOR 98 [1945]: 21), rendered the passage as: "How can a mortal acquire a latter estate? How can a mortal acquire permanence?"

³ John Gray, "The Legacy of Canaan," VT, Sup 5 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 113. "Latter end" is also given by C. H. Gordon (UT 355, no. 138) as one of three possible meanings for 'uḥryt. J. Aistleitner (WUS, 14, n.

The vexing nature of the term 'uḥryt can be gleaned from the great variety of proposed translations. W. F. Albright long ago suggested "other thing."¹ G. R. Driver translated it with "ultimate fate"² and B. Vawter with "future."³ More recently G. F. Hasel has argued that Albright was right "when he pointed out that there is a parallelism between 'uḥryt and aḥryt and that the latter term is related to the Arabic 'uḥrah, 'what is left over, remains.'"⁴ Thus Hasel renders our passage as: "What can mortal achieve for his remnant?/ What can mortal take that is left?"⁵

The context of the passage is Anat's request to Aqhat for his bow. She offers him life and immortality, but Aqhat refuses and says:

Do not lie, o virgin;
for to a hero your lying is unseemly.

150) similarly has "spätere Zeit."

¹W. F. Albright, "The 'Natural Force' of Moses in the Light of Ugarit," BASOR 94 (1944): 33. In footnote 17 Albright says: "This meaning is certain; for the initial vowel cf. Aram. 'oh^oran and Arab. 'uḥra." Thus by Albright our passage reads: "What other things can Death take--what can Death take that is left?"

²G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, OTS, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), 55.

³B. Vawter, "Intimations of Immortality and the OT," JBL 91 (1972): 165.

⁴G. F. Hasel, "'Remnant' as a Meaning of 'Aḥ-rîṭ'" in The Archaeology of Jordan and Other Studies, ed. L. T. Geraty and L. G. Herr (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1986), 516.

⁵Ibid.

As (his) ultimate fate ['uḥryt] what does a man get?
 What does a man get as (his) final lot?
 Glaze will be poured [on] (my) head,
 quicklime on to my crown;
 [and] the death of all men I shall die,
 even I indeed shall die.¹

As noted above the translation of 'uḥryt is strongly influenced by the parallel expression in the next line: mh yqh mt 'atryt which Gibson translates with "What does a man get as (his) final lot?"² M. Dahood has argued strongly for 'uḥryt to mean "future life" or "after-life."³ The context which mentions immortality⁴ seems to support

¹2 Aqhat, VI:34-38, as translated by Gibson (Canaanite Myths and Legends, 109). C. H. Gordon (Ugaritic Literature [Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1949], 90) and Michael D. Coogan, ed. (Stories from Ancient Canaan [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978], 37), agreed with this translation. However, more recently C. H. Gordon ("Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit," Berytus 25 [1977]: 16) has translated the lines as: "As for man what does he get as his destiny? What does man get as his fate?" J. Aistleitner (Die Mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra [Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1964], 72) translates: "Was nimmt (denn mehr) weg ein später Tod (Als) was wegnimmt ein früher Tod!"

²Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 109. On page 142 he explains 'atryt with the Arabic 'atryatu. Gordon (UT, 369) explains it with the Arabic 'atar--destiny.

³M. Dahood, Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963), 48. See also M. Dahood, "Ugaritic Hebrew Parallel Pairs," Ras Shamra Parallels, vol. 1, ed. Loren R. Fisher, AO 49 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1972), 105; idem, "Ugaritic Hebrew Parallel Pairs Supplement," Ras Shamra Parallels, vol. 3, ed. Stan Rummel, AO, 51 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1981), 180. This is also the view of C. F. Whitley, "Koheleth and Ugaritic Parallels," UF 11 (1979): 816.

⁴2 Aqhat VI:27-28. Anat says: "Ask life, o hero Aqhat, ask life and I will give (it) you, immortality and I will bestow (it) on you" (Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 109).

this interpretation. But this is not the only conclusion one can come to.

As indicated above, Aqhat does not believe that man can receive immortality. He chides Anat and says, "Do not lie, o virgin: for to a hero your lying is unseemly."¹ Then follow the two questions under consideration. Dahood translates 'uhryt mh yqh as "Further life--how can mortal attain it?"² But this does not fit the context. The answer which Aqhat gives to his own questions: "Glaze will be poured [on] (my) head, quicklime on to my crown; [and] the death of all men I shall die,"³ shows that he is not thinking of a "future life" beyond death but of life in the future here on earth. He will get old and white haired,⁴ he says, and eventually he will die. His rhetorical questions, therefore, concerned the destiny of man here on earth. And this destiny, he says, is bleak--old age and death. Paraphrasing his questions, we could say: "What does the future hold for mortal man? What is the destiny he receives? Old age and death!" To attribute to 'uhryt the meaning of a "future life" is contrary to the immediate

¹2 Aqhat VI:34.

²Dahood, Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology, 48-49.

³2 Aqhat VI:37-38.

⁴Gibson (Canaanite Myths and Legends, 109, n. 10) says: "There is evidence from Jericho of the plastering of skulls before burial (Gordon), but it comes from Neolithic times; it is safer to take the phrases as a poetic description of the white hair of old age."

context of the passage. It refers to the future and the final destiny of man's life here on earth.

'uhry

The noun 'uhry appears four times in the texts collected by C. H. Gordon.¹ It is used three times in the context of Danel's cursing of the cities. In his grief and anger, Danel curses the three towns which lie nearest to the scene of the murder of his son, calling down banishment and blindness on the inhabitants as well as loss of vegetation on their fields for their share of the guilt. The text as translated by J. C. L. Gibson reads:

The king cursed Qor-[mayim], (saying):
 'Woe to you, Qor-mayim,
 '[near] whom the hero Aqhat was struck down!
 'Be continually a seeker of sanctuary.
 'Be a fugitive now and evermore,
 'now and to all [generations];
 'let every last one make ready a staff for his hand.'
 ('db 'uhry mt ydh)

He proceeded to Mararat-tughullal-bnar,
 he lifted up his voice and cried:
 'Woe to you, Mararat-tughullal-bnar,
 'near whom the hero Aqhat was struck down!
 'May your root not shoot up in the earth,
 'may (your) head droop at the touch of him that plucks
 'you!
 'Be a fugitive now and evermore,
 'now and to all generations;
 'let every last one make ready a staff for his hand.'
 ('db 'uhry mt ydh)

He proceeded to Qart-Abilim,
 Abilim city of prince Yarikh,
 he lifted up his voice and cried:
 'Woe to you, Qart-Abilim,
 'near whom the hero Aqhat was struck down!

¹ Aqhat 155, 162, 169; Text 75:II:28. (UT, 246, 181). Cf. Whitaker, 14.

'May Baal this instant render you blind!
 '<Be a fugitive now> and evermore,
 'now and to all generations;
 'let every last one make ready a staff for his hand.'
 ('db 'uhry mt ydh)
 Daniel proceeded to his house,
 Daniel betook himself to his palace.¹

The translation of the phrase "°db 'uhry mt ydh" has elicited a bewildering array of renderings. C. H. Gordon renders the phrase as "He prepared Destiny, the staff of his hand."² Ginsberg translates: "Again he waves the staff of his hand."³ And M. G. Coogan interprets: "Then he destroyed his royal scepter."⁴

The great diversity in interpretation is due to the fact that it is not quite clear to which part of the passage the phrase belongs. Is it part of the curse as Gibson⁵ and J. Aistleitner⁶ understand it? Or does it

¹Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 119-120.

²Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, 98-99.

³Ginsberg, ANET, 154.

⁴Coogan, 45. Other translations are: "[Sogar jener] den sein Glied als letzten gezeugt" (J. Aistleitner, Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra, 80); "He put down the tip of his walking stick" (Meindert Dijkstra and Johannes C. de Moor, "Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhatu," UF 7 [1975]: 209); "Bending over, he picks up (his walking stick)" (Margalit, 158); "Er machte gleich danach seinen Wanderstab bereit," (M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "°DB and °DB im Ugaritischen," UF 17 [1986]: 108-109).

⁵Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 119-120.

⁶Aistleitner, Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra, 80.

describe what Danel did after he uttered the curse as the majority of interpreters believe?¹

Furthermore, ^cdb and 'uhry have received widely divergent interpretations. Several scholars interpret ^cdb as "prepare, make ready."² B. Margalit renders it as "pick up, raise,"³ whereas M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor see exactly the opposite motion, namely, "put down" as the meaning of ^cdb.⁴ Other translations are "destroy,"⁵ "wave,"⁶ or "beget."⁷

In regard to 'uhry, we find again a large spectrum of opinions. Some take 'uhry as an adverb, either as "then"⁸ or as "again."⁹ Others consider the word to be a

¹Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, 99; Coogan, 45; ANET, 154; Margalit, 158; Dijkstra and de Moor, 209; Dietrich and Loretz, 108-109.

²Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 119-120; Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, 98-99; Dietrich and Loretz, 108. This is also the lexical meaning as given by Gordon, UT, 454, and Aistleitner, WUS, 227.

³Margalit, 157. He takes up an earlier suggestion by E. Ullendorff ("Ugaritic Marginalia II," JSS 7 [1962]: 343-344), who translated the phrase as "he picks up the stick of his hand." Margalit argues for a Ugaritic ^cdb II meaning "to pick up." He refers to the Early South Arabic root ^cdb as a cognate as well as the Hebrew ^czb II found in Exod 23:5.

⁴Dijkstra and de Moor, 209.

⁵Coogan, 45.

⁶Ginsberg, ANET, 154.

⁷Aistleitner, Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra, 80.

⁸Coogan, 45. Similarly, Dietrich and Loretz (108) translate it as "gleich danach".

noun and variously translate it as "destiny,"¹ "the tip,"² or "the last one."³ Lastly, Margalit considers 'uḥry to refer to the act of bending over and thus translates: "Bending over, he picks me up. . . ."⁴

Looking at the larger context we find that Danel is going to each of the three cities in whose vicinity his son was slain and utters an almost identical curse upon each. Every curse ends with the words: "Be a fugitive now and evermore, now and to all generations," followed by the phrase under consideration.

The translation of E. Ullendorff and B. Margalit, ". . . he picks up his stick,"⁵ has much to commend itself since each time the next line indicates where Danel went next. However, the translation of 'uḥry as "bending down" seems strained and without sufficient linguistic evidence.

⁹Ginsberg, ANET, 154.

¹Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, 99.

²Dijkstra and de Moor, 209. "Of course," they say, "'uḥry is the extremity of the stick, like Heb. 'ḥry ḥḥnyt 'the butt of the spear'(2 Sam 2:23)."

³Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 119-120; Aistleitner, Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra, 80. This is also the lexical meaning as given by Aistleitner (WUS, 14).

⁴Margalit, 158. He believes that 'uḥry corresponds to the Heb. 'āḥor(annîṯ) "backwards," the converse of pānîm "face, front." He says: "If UḤRY is not merely a phonetic variant of AḤRY, it may therefore be suggested that it denotes the act of 'bending down/over; stooping' so as to cause protrusion of the backside."

⁵Margalit, 157-158.

I believe that the phrase 'db 'uḥry mt ydh is part of the curse itself and that Gibson's translation expresses the thought correctly: "Let every last one make ready a staff for his hand,"¹ in other words, even the youngest should get ready to be a fugitive.

'Uḥry then seems to indicate the last item in a series of things or the last person from a group of people. In the context above, the word 'uḥry clearly has a spatial and not a temporal meaning.

The fourth occurrence of 'uḥry (75:II:28) is inconclusive, since the text is broken; the line before it is missing and only the letters 'uḥry l . . . can be deciphered.²

Aramaic

The Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew phrase b' 'aḥ' rīt hayyāmīm is b' 'aḥ' rīt yōmayyā'. This Aramaic expression, possibly a Hebraism,³ appears only in Dan 2:28.

¹Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 119-120. Gordon's translation; "He prepared Destiny," does not make sense in the immediate context; and Coogan's suggestion; "Then he destroyed his royal scepter," would mean that he destroyed his scepter three times, which seems unlikely. Dijkstra and de Moor's interpretation, "He put down the tip of his walking stick," has no linguistic foundation; and Ginsberg's, "Again he waves the staff of his hand," is not conclusive either.

²UT, 181.

³Aage Bentzen, Daniel, HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), 22. See also James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 163; Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, KAT (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), 46. Other-

It is not known from any extra-biblical Aramaic texts. Accordingly I will concentrate on the Aramaic root 'hr and its derivatives in Aramaic sources.

'ah^ari

'ah^ari¹, the construct of the Aramaic feminine noun 'ah^ari, is the cognate form of the Hebrew noun 'ah^ari². 'ah^ari is found in two places in the Aramaic texts from Qumran. The first occurrence is in the book of the Giants (1st century B.C.), which was originally a part of the book of Enoch.³ Parts of it were first published by D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik⁴ and M. Baillet.⁵ More recently Milik⁶ and K. Beyer⁷ have published all the material presently available. From the fragmentary character of the text, the following content can be gathered: Referring to Gen 6:1-7 the author elaborately

wise biblical Aramaic has sōp for "end" (Dan 4:8,19; 7:26,28).

¹F. Rosenthal, A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic, PLO, vol. 5 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), 29, paragraph 57; KBL, 1049; Klaus Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984), 508.

²KBL, 1049; CHAL, 397.

³Beyer, 258.

⁴DJD, 1:97-99.

⁵DJD, 3:90, 91.

⁶J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 298-339.

⁷Beyer, 258-268.

recounts the fall of the angels and the origin of the giants, their evil deeds, and their destruction through the flood as well as the salvation of Noah and his sons.¹

In a badly damaged portion of the text, the phrase b'hry 'rkt gbry' appears which Beyer translates as "schließlich die Lebensdauer der Riesen."² Since the lines before and after this phrase are broken, the context is missing. We can only surmise that b'hry, if the translation "finally" is correct, refers to the end of an enumeration of items.

The second occurrence is in a Targum to the book of Job (11 Qtg Job, 1st century A.D.). This Targum was found among the manuscripts discovered by Bedouins in 1956 in Qumran cave XI.³ Since its publication in 1971,⁴ it has produced a sizeable body of literature.⁵

¹ Ibid., 258.

² Ibid., 265, G 10.3.

³ A. S. van der Woude, "Das Hiobtargum aus Qumran Höhle XI," VT, Sup 9 (1963): 322.

⁴ J. P. M. van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude, Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumran (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971).

⁵ For example, B. Jongeling, "Contributions of the Qumran Job Targum to the Aramaic Vocabulary," JSS 17 (1972): 191-197; Jonas C. Greenfield and S. Shaked, "Three Iranian Words in the Targum of Job from Qumran," ZDMG 122 (1972): 37-45; Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Job Targum from Qumran," JAOS 93 (1973): 317-327; Michael Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University, 1974); Takamitsu Muraoka, "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," JJS 25 (1974): 425-443; R. Weiss, "Further Notes on the Qumran Targum to Job," JSS 19 (1974): 13-18; John Gray, "The Masoretic Text

According to most of the printed editions of the text¹ as well as most authors dealing with it, the scroll ends with Job 42:11.² Beyer, however, adds a few more words and it is in these additions that the word 'ah^ari appears.³ The text as given by Beyer reads: "Und Gott segnete Hiob am Ende [b'hry]. . . ." ⁴ Though the text is fragmentary, one can assume from the preceding context, that the "end" refers to the final portion of Job's life before his death. Thus 'ah^ari here refers to the last part of Job's life.

of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum," ZAW 86 (1974): 331-350; Francis J. Morrow, "11 Q Targum Job and the Masoretic Text," RevQ 8 (1973): 253-256; B. Jongeling, C. J. Labuschagne, and A. S. van der Woude, Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations I, SSS 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 1-73; Takamitsu Muraoka, "Notes on the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," RevQ 9 (1975): 117-125; Anthony D. York, "11 Qtg Job XXI, 4-5 (Job 32, 13)," RevQ 9 (1975): 127-129; B. Janowski, "Sündenvergebung 'um Hiobs willen'. Fürbitte und Vergebung in 11 Qtg Job 38:2f. und Hi 42:9f. LXX," ZNW 73 (1982): 251-280.

¹Van der Ploeg and van der Woude, Le Targum de Job, 86; Sokoloff, 102; Jongeling, Labuschagne, and van der Woude, 72. The photographs of the scroll in the book by van der Ploeg and van der Woude also indicate that the book ends with Job 42:11.

²Kaufman, 322; J. Gray, "The Masoretic Text of the Book of Job," 331.

³Beyer, 298. He does not indicate where these additions come from. In 1982 B. Janowski (254-55) had written: "Die Tatsache, daß Z. 8 dieser Kolumne zur Hälfte freigelassen ist, führt zur Frage, ob damit der literarische Schluß des Targums vorliegt oder ob ursprünglich noch eine Übersetzung von Hiob 42:12-17 (und somit möglicherweise eine 39. Kolumne) folgte."

⁴Job 42:12.

'aḥar - 'aḥrê

The plural construct form of the preposition 'aḥar, "after, behind,"¹ is often used to refer to the time after a person's death.

In a deed from the Jewish colony at Elephantine dated to 434 B.C., Ananiah deeds to his wife half of the house. Among the stipulations listed, one finds the following: "A man who would snatch away my house after ['ḥry] my death from Palti and Yehoyishma [his children] shall (have to) give them silver, 10 karsh, by royal weight."² 'aḥrê here refers simply to the time after Ananiah's demise.

In the Genesis Apocryphon (first century B.C./A.D.)³ God says to Abraham: "Rise, walk about, and go (around) to see how great is its length and how great is its width. For I shall give it to you and to your descendants after you ['ḥryk] for all ages."⁴ 'aḥrêka, "after you" again clearly refers to the time after the person's, in this case Abraham's, death.

¹Beyer, 507; KBL, 1049; BDB, 1079.

²Emil G. Kraeling, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), 171, line 21. See also Kraeling, 181, line 14; 239, line 19; 273, line 23.

³Naham Avigad and Yigael Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon (Jerusalem, Hebrew University Press, 1956), 38; E. Y. Kutscher, "Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," JBL 76 (1957): 288-292; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1, BibOr 18 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 16.

⁴Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 61.

'ah^arâh

The morphology of the word 'ah^arâh is somewhat uncertain. G. E. Cooke suggested long ago that it is an emphatic form of 'hr with h for '.¹ More recently it is taken to be a feminine noun,² or a noun with a feminine suffix.³ Cooke translates the word twice as "another"⁴ and once as "posterity."⁵

In a tombstone inscription from the seventh century B.C., one reads of a priest who died and was buried. Cooke translated the passage in question as, "And they did not lay with me any vessel of silver or bronze: with my shroud they laid me, so that for another(?) [lm^en l'hrh] thou shouldest not plunder my couch."⁶ The translation "so that for another" seems rather awkward and hardly seems to suit the context. J. B. Pritchard understands 'hrh as "future" and translates, "lest in the future my couch be

¹G. E. A. Cooke, A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 189.

²DISO, 10; Beyer, 508.

³KAI, 2:276.

⁴Cooke, North-Semitic Inscriptions, 186, 64.13; 190, 65.8.

⁵Ibid., 190, 65.10. This seems to be the best explanation for the word in the text which reads: "Whoever you are who do wrong and drag me away, may Sahar and Mikhal and Nusk make his dying odious, and may his posterity ['hrth] perish" (KAI, 2:226.10); F. Rosenthal, ANET, 505; and TSSI, 97, concur in this translation.

⁶Ibid., 190, 65.8.

removed."¹ This seems to fit the context better and is a more natural rendering of the passage. "In the future" is also the preferred reading in another tombstone inscription. Cooke had again used "another" to translate 'hrh. "But if thou shalt protect this image and couch, may another ['hrh] protect thine."² Although "another" here fits the context better, in view of the similarity of this text with the previous one, the reading "in the future" is again preferred by J. C. L. Gibson³ as well as by Donner and Röllig.⁴ The text then reads: "But if you guard this picture and grave, in the future may yours be guarded!"⁵

'ahar

'ah^arīa', the emphatic masculine form of the adjective 'ahar, which generally means "another" or "future,"⁶ is found in the seventh copy (according to J. T. Milik's numbering) of the book of Enoch.⁷ The passage is commenting on the writings of Enoch and reads:

[That which] (Enoch) wrote and gave to Methusela [his son and to all his brothers,--Enoch the scribe of

¹F. Rosenthal, ANET, 661. KAI, 2:276 similarly has "hinfort" for 'hrh in this passage. So also TSSI, 2:97.

²Cooke, North-Semitic Inscriptions, 186, 64.11-14.

³TSSI, 97.

⁴KAI, 2:275.

⁵TSSI, 97.

⁶Beyer, 508.

⁷Ibid., 247, H 92:1; Milik, 260.

distinction and] the wisest of men and chosen of the sons of [earth to judge their deeds,--he wrote (it also) to his sons] of sons [and] to the future generations [ldry' 'hry'], to all who dwell [on the dry land, in order to do good and peace].¹

The term 'ahar can be translated by "later,"² "afterwards,"³ "then,"⁴ or "therefore."⁵ In a contract between Anani ben Haggai and Pachum, we are told that Anani has borrowed two peras of spelt⁶ from Pachum. Anani pledges: "Later on ['hr] I, Anani son of Haggai shall pay back and give to thee that spelt . . . from the ration which will be given to me from the storehouse of the king."⁷ The rendering "later on" can readily be replaced with "in the future" in this context.⁸ In the same

¹Milik, 260. Beyer (247) concurs with this translation. The text of 1st Enoch in Ethiopic of this passage reads: "Book five, which is written by Enoch . . . (it is written) for all the offspring that dwell upon the earth, and for the later generations which uphold uprightness and peace." James H. Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 1:73.

²Kraeling, 261, 11:3.

³G. R. Driver, Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 25, 4:3; 28, 6:6. A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 223 (Ahiqar, 99).

⁴Cowley, 58, 20:8; 104, 28:10; 218, Ahiqar, 171; Kraeling, 260, 11:6.

⁵Cowley, 37, 13:5.

⁶The favorite Egyptian grain for flour.

⁷Kraeling, 261, 11:3,4.

⁸Kraeling (262) says: "'hr begins a new sentence: 'Afterward', 'In the future'."

document the frequent construction "if . . . then" appears. Anani says: "And if I do not pay back and give thee the spelt . . . then ['ḥr] I, Anani, shall become liable to pay thee a fine of one karsh. . . ." ¹ 'aḥar is here used to introduce the apodosis in this conditional sentence.

'ōhrān

The adjective 'ōhrān² or 'aḥ^orān,³ meaning "another,"⁴ is used in the phrase mḥr 'w ywm 'ḥrn which appears frequently in the Aramaic papyri. Cowley translates it as "Tomorrow or on a later day,"⁵ and Kraeling renders it "If tomorrow or another day."⁶

On the basis of certain parallels in an Akkadian document from Ras Shamra (14th century) and in a Demotic document of the seventh century, J. J. Rabinowitz comes to the conclusion that the phrase should be rendered as "tomorrow, or the day after (tomorrow)."⁷ As an idiomatic expression, it would stand for "in the future." He states that the phrase corresponds to the biblical tmwl šlšwm

¹Ibid., 261, 11:5,6. See also Cowley, 104, 28:10; 218, Ahiqar, 171.

²Beyer, 508.

³BDB, 1079; KBL, 1049.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Cowley, 11, 5:6,8; 27, 9:8,13.

⁶Kraeling, 143, 2:7,9,12,13; 205, 7:21.

⁷Jacob J. Rabinowitz, "The Meaning of the Phrase tmwl šlšwm in the Aramaic Papyri," JNES 14 (1955): 59.

(yesterday, the day before yesterday). Thus he concludes that the "indefinite future in our phrase, like the indefinite past in the biblical phrase, is expressed by the first two members in the unending series of days."¹

This interpretation makes good sense when we consider the following Elephantine marriage document from the year 449 B.C. After listing the financial stipulations the text reads:

¹Ibid. The document from Ras Shamra to which Rabinowitz refers has been published by F. Thureau-Dangin and transliterated in part as follows: "ša-ni-tam šum-ma ur-ra-am še-ra-am A-zi-ra-nu ù Abdi-A-da-tum mâr Bu-ra-na ù mâru-šu-nu mâru mârî-šu-nu i-tûr<-ru>-nim a-na lib-bi-šu-nu l bilat kaspam ú-ma-lu-nim a-na šarri" (F. Thureau-Dangin, "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra," *Syria* 18 [1937]: 252). His translation of the text is as follows: "D'autre part, si demain, après-demain A-zi-ra-nu ou Abdi-A-da-tum, fils de Bu-ra-na ou leurs enfants, (ou) les enfants de leur enfants reviennent sur leur accord 1 talent d'argent ils paieront ou roi." After pointing out that the phrase *urram šêram* occurs also in Akkadian texts from Boghazkoi, Thureau-Dangin says in a note: "Il est probable que, de mem que *ûmam urram* signifie 'aujourd'hui, demain', c'est-à-dire 'tous les jours' (cf. Lewy, MVAG 35, 3, p. 24, note c), *urram šêram* signifie 'demain, après-demain,' c'est-à-dire 'à l'avenir'" (ibid., 252 n.1.). The respective part of the Demotic document reads as follows: "As Amun [liveth], as Per o liveth, as he is well and as Amun giveth him the victory, [there belongeth not to me, or to son, daughter, brother, sister, any man in the whole land(?)] that shall be able to . . . tomorrow or the second morrow(?)" (F. L. Griffith, Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, III, 58; quoted by Rabinowitz, 59). Rabinowitz interprets "tomorrow or the second morrow" as "in the future" and notes that the phrase *mhr 'w ywm 'hrn* occurs in the Aramaic papyri precisely in the same context in which the corresponding phrases occur in the document from Ras Shamra and in the Demotic document, namely, in the clause in which the maker of the document declares that neither he nor his representative shall in the future contest the validity of the legal transaction evidenced by the document (Rabinowitz, 59-60).

If tomorrow or another day Anani rises up on account of her(?) and says, "I divorce Tammut my wife," the divorce money is on his head . . . if tomorrow or another day, Tammut rises up and says, "I divorce my husband Anani." . . . If tomorrow or another day Ananiah should die, Tammut shall have power over all the goods. . . . If tomorrow or another day, Tammut should die. . . .¹

Four times we have the expression *mhr 'w ywm 'hrn* which Kraeling translates with "If tomorrow or another day." Since this is a literal translation, it is stiff, even somewhat unnatural. If we replace it with the phrase "If in the future," as Rabinowitz suggests, the passage becomes smooth to read and also makes perfect sense.

The same applies to a Grant of Building Rights from the year 471 B.C. The agreement allows Koniya to build some kind of structure between his house and Mahseiah's which are adjacent. The contract states:

This portico shall adjoin the side of my house from the ground upwards, from the corner of my house at the upper end to the house of Zechariah. Tomorrow or on any later day I have no power to restrain you from building above (or upon) this portico of yours. . . . If Koniya dies tomorrow or on a later day no son or daughter . . . shall have power to restrain Mahseh or his son from building above this portico of his.²

Again if we replace the literal translation "tomorrow or on any later day" with the dynamic rendering "in the future," the passage is again smooth and clear.

¹Kraeling, 143, 2:7-12.

²Cowley, 11, 5:5-9.

The same applies to all the other passages where this idiomatic phrase appears.¹

Finally, we consider the phrase *wl ywmn 'hrnn* which appears in the story of Ahiqar, the wise counsellor of the Assyrian kings, Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. Since Ahiqar has no sons of his own, he adopts Nadin his nephew to make him his successor. After Nadin is installed as counsellor of the Assyrian king, he wrongfully accuses Ahiqar of corrupting the land. Esarhaddon becomes filled with rage and sends out one of his officers to kill Ahiqar. When the officer meets Ahiqar, Ahiqar says to him:

. . . I am the same Ahiqar who once, long ago, rescued you from an undeserved death, [when] King Esarhaddon's father [Sennacherib] was so angry with you [that he sought to kill you.] I took you [directly to my own house and provided for you there, as a man would care for his own brother. I concealed you from him, saying, I have killed him, until an oppor[tune ti]me. Then, after a long time [*l'dn 'hrn wlywmn 'hrnn*], I presented you to King Sennacherib and cleared you of the charges against you in his presence, so that he did you no ha[rm]. . . . Now it is your turn to treat me as I treated you. Do not kill me, (but take me to your house un[til] the times change [*lywmn 'hrnn*].²

In both cases *wlywmn 'hrnn* has the meaning of "later on." The same applies to the phrase *wbywmn 'hrnn* in the sentence, "And in after days he shall eat. . . ."³ as

¹Ibid., 2, 1:4; 27, 9:8,13; Kraeling, 143, 2:13; 205, 7:21.

²J. M. Lindenberger, "Ahiqar," The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols., ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1985), 2:496, lines 46-52. See also Cowley, 213, lines 49-57.

³Ibid., 180, 71:4. *'hrnn* is the plural masculine form of *'hrn*.

well as to the phrase ^cd 'ḥrn in the following text: "I, Anani . . . shall not be able to say, 'I gave [the house] to thee in affection as remainder portion(?) on the document of thy marriage until another (time) [^cd 'ḥrn]." ¹

Summary

In Akkadian historical texts, the terms *aḥrataš*, *aḥritiš*, *aḥratu*, and the phrases *ana aḥrat ūmē* or *ana arkāt ūmē* always indicate a future time. It can be the immediate or the remote future.

In Akkadian legal texts, the phrase *ana arkāt ūmē* can be considered a legal *terminus technicus*, indicating the time during which a particular document is legally binding. That time always starts with the time of the writer.

The Akkadian phrases *ana aḥrat ūmē* and *ina arkāt ūmē* do not appear in religious texts. However, the phrase *aḥritiš ūmi* indicates the near future and the term *aḥrataš* seems to refer to the future in general. At times it appears that even an endless future seems to be in view.

The only text with a possible eschatological meaning is found in the epic "Enuma elish." The passage is, however, beset with so many difficulties and uncertainties that no definite conclusions can be drawn from it.

¹Kraeling, 249, 10:9,10. Kraeling notes, "The question here is whether these words end a sentence or begin a new one, in which case one would render 'Later on'. This very expression is found at the beginning of a sentence in Dan 4:5."

This investigation does not support the claim that the Akkadian phrase *ina aḫrat ūmē* is eschatological in nature.¹

The term 'uḫryt appears only once in the Ugaritic literature and refers to the end of a man's life.

The Ugaritic term 'uḫry has received a variety of interpretations. Some consider it to be an adverb with the meaning "then," while others take it as a noun to mean "destiny" or "the last one." The relatively few instances where it is used in the extant Ugaritic literature, it seems to indicate the last person from a group of people, the remnant. Thus it has only a non-temporal meaning.

The Aramaic term 'aḫ^arī, the closest equivalent to the Hebrew 'aḫ^arīt, appears twice in the Aramaic texts from Qumran. Once it is translated "finally," the second time it refers to the final portion of Job's life.

The plural construct form of the Aramaic preposition 'aḫar, "after," is often used to refer to the time after a person's death.

The Aramaic noun 'aḫ^arāh as well as the adjective and the adverb 'aḫar refer to the future, in general.

The Aramaic adjective 'ōḫran or 'aḫ^oran in the phrase mḫr 'w ywm 'ḫrn or used by itself also refers to the future, in general, though at times it points to the time of death of a person.

¹Against André Lacocque, The Book of Daniel (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 45.

The Latter Days in the OT

Our attention is now turned to the Hebrew phrase *b' 'ah^ari^t hayyāmim* which appears twelve times in the OT outside of the book of Daniel (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Isa 2:2; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1) and twice in the book of Daniel (in 2:28 in Aramaic and in 10:14 in Hebrew). Since *'ah^ari^t* derives from the root *'hr*, it has our first attention. Then we study its derivatives in the OT. Finally our attention is turned to the longer phrase itself in the twelve texts listed above.

The Root 'hr and Its Derivatives in the OT

The root *'hr* appears about 1,140 times in the OT.¹ The denominative verb *'āhar* is used mainly in the Piel² with the meaning of "tarry," "delay," or "defer."³

The preposition *'ahar* which appears predominantly⁴ in its plural construct form *'ah^arê* can mean "after," "behind," in a local⁵ or temporal sense.⁶ And in its

¹ E. Jenni, " *חַר* 'hr danach," THAT, 1:112.

² Ibid., 113. The verb appears only seventeen times, fifteen times in Piel and one time each in Qal and Hiphil.

³ BDB, 29; KBL, 31; HAL, 34; R. L. Harris, " *חַר* ('āhar) *tarry, delay, defer*," TWOT, 1:33.

⁴ Over six hundred times; Jenni, THAT, 1:112.

⁵ BDB, 29; KBL, 32; HAL, 34.

⁶ Ibid.

nominal form, it has the import of "back" or "end" as in 2 Sam 2:23, ". . . therefore Abner struck him in the belly with the butt end ['aḥ^arê] of the spear, so that the spear came out at his back ['aḥ^arê].

The adjective 'aḥ^ar generally has the meaning of "other," "another."¹ Sometimes it carries the sense of "following," "next" as in Gen 17:21, "But my covenant I will establish with Isaac, whom Sarah will bear to you at this season next ['ḥr] year."

The adjective 'aḥ^arôn is used fifty-one times in the OT. It can have a local and a temporal sense. In its local meaning "behind," "beyond," it is primarily used in reference to the "west," "the Western Sea" which lies beyond the land of Israel as in Deut 11:24, ". . . from the river, the river Euphrates as far as the Western ['aḥ^arôn] Sea."² In its temporal sense it can be translated by "later," "next," or by "future."³

The term 'aḥ^arîṭ is of special significance for our study since it is an essential part of the expression b^e'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm. There is some uncertainty in regard to the derivation of 'aḥ^arîṭ. Some hold that "'aḥ^arîṭ is a

¹From a total of 166 occurrences, 63 times it is used in the expression 'ēlōhîm 'aḥ^aērîm, "other gods," mainly in Deuteronomium (25x) and Jeremiah (25x), see Jenni, THAT, 1:112-113. Cf. S. Erlandsson, "אֲחֵר 'achēr," TDOT, 1:201; TWAT, 1:218; Harris, TWOT, 1:33.

²BDB, 30; KBL, 33; HAL, 35.

³Ibid.

feminine abstract of an adjective derived from 'ḥr, 'after', 'behind',¹ formed by the i of adjectives of relation plus the feminine tau termination."² Others believe that it is a derivative of the adverb 'aḥar.³

'aḥ^arîṭ is an abstract noun the meaning of which must often be determined by the context in which it is used.⁴ It appears sixty-one times in the Hebrew OT and once in the Aramaic portion of the OT.⁵ A few times it has the sense of "remnant"⁶ or "posterity," otherwise it always has

¹HAL, 34; CHAL, 11.

²G. W. Buchanan, "Eschatology and the 'End of Days'," JNES 20 (1961): 188. See also Jenni, THAT, 1:111; and Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch, trans. A. E. Cowley, 2nd Eng. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 281, paragraph 95t.

³Rudolf Meyer, Hebräische Grammatik, Sammlung Göschen, 3 vols. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1969), 2:77. See also H. Seebass, "אֲחָרִית 'ach^arîṭh," TDOT, 1:207; TWAT, 1:224.

⁴Seebass, TDOT, 1:207; TWAT, 1:224.

⁵Gerhard Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958), 50-51. See also Abraham Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Bible (Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sepher" Publishing House, 1983), 42.

⁶Commentators are not agreed on the exact number of texts where 'aḥ^arîṭ means "remnant." Lisowsky (50-51) lists Ps 37:37,38; 109:13; Jer 31:17; Ezek 23:25(2x); Dan 11:4; Amos 4:2; 9:1. Seebass (TDOT, 1:209) says only Amos 4:2; 9:1; Num 24:20; and Ezek 25b are clear examples for the meaning "remnant." G. F. Hasel ("The Origin and Early History of the Remnant Motif in Ancient Israel" [Ph.D. diss. Vanderbilt University, 1970], 200-203) accepts the translation "remnant" only in Amos 4:2; 9:1; and Ezek 23:25. He says "posterity" fits best in Jer 31:17. Other texts where, according to Seebass (TDOT, 1:209), "posterity" is the possible meaning are Ps 109:13 and Dan 11:4. In 1986 Hasel ("'Remnant' as a Meaning of 'Aḥ^arîṭ," 524)

a temporal meaning except for Ps 139:9 where a local meaning is clearly indicated by the context, "If I dwell in the remotest ['ah^arîṭ] part of the sea. . . ."

E. Jenni, who also considers 'ah^arîṭ as an abstract noun, believes that since there are no special forms of the comparative or superlative for adjectives in Hebrew, and since time as an abstract entity cannot be separated from the context of time, 'ah^arîṭ in the sense of "that which comes after" makes sense in all OT texts. He says:

Depending on whether the time period the speaker is considering is limited or unlimited 'ah^arîṭ has more comparative (later time = following time, future) or superlative (last time = exit, end) coloring, whereby a final point in the sense of a mere break (qēs from qṣṣ "to cut off" for that) is never meant.¹

Jenni's explanation seems to hold good for most of the sixty-two texts in the OT. But there are a few passages where 'ah^arîṭ seems to have the meaning of qēs, for example, in Num 23:10b, "Let me die the death of the upright, and let my end ['hryty] be like his." This is a good example of a synonymous parallelism where "end" parallels "death." Thus 'ah^arîṭî in this context stands

accepted "remnant" as the meaning for 'ah^arîṭ also in Deut 24:20 and Ps 109:13.

¹Je nachdem ob der dem Sprechenden vorschwebende Zeitraum unabgegrenzt oder abgegrenzt ist, erhält 'ah^arîṭ mehr komparativische (spätere Zeit = Folgezeit, Zukunft) oder superlativische (letzte Zeit = Ausgang, Ende) Färbung, wobei aber nie ein Endpunkt im Sinne des bloßen Abbruchs (dafür--qēs von qṣṣ "abschneiden") gemeint ist. Jenni, THAT, 1:115.

for the cessation of life and is basically the same as the *qēs kōl bāsār*, "the end of all flesh" in Gen 6:13.¹

Generally *'ah^arīt* is what makes up that which comes after (the future), as well as what results from a situation or an action (the end).² In Deut 8:16, Moses says to Israel: "[Yahweh] fed you in the wilderness with manna . . . that he might humble you and test you, to do you good in your future (*b^a'ah^arīteka*)." H. Seebass observes: "'acharith is the time after the wilderness period, not the end (result)."³ Similarly in Job 42:12, we read, "And the Lord blessed the latter days [*'hryt*] of Job more than his beginning." *'ah^arīt* here refers to the time which came after the trials of Job and which lasted 140 years.⁴ Also in Prov 25:8, we have a temporal, or, in Jenni's terminology, a comparative use of "after": "Do not go out hastily to argue your case; otherwise, what will you do in the future [*'ah^arīt*]." *'ah^arīt* here designates the time after the case has been argued.⁵

¹So also Num 24:20; Ps 73:17. The same applies to the *'ah^arīt* (*ha*)*šānāh* in Deut 11:12. See also *BDE*, 31; *KBL*, 33; *HAL*, 35.

²Seebass, *TDOT*, 1:207.

³*Ibid.*

⁴Job 42:16.

⁵So also Deut 8:16; 32:20; Jer 5:31; Dan 8:23; Prov 19:20; 29:21; Eccl 10:13. In Dan 8:19 *'ah^arīt* is probably eschatological since it is parallel to *ē^t qēs*. ". . . the future period of the indignation" would be a possible translation.

A logical or superlative use of "after,"¹ signifying the end result, the outcome of things in the future, is found in Amos 8:10: "Then I shall turn your festivals into mourning . . . and the end ['hryt] of it will be like a bitter day." The outcome of their apostasy, says Amos, will be the captivity and it will be "a bitter day."

Solomon states in Prov 14:12: "There is a way which seems right to a man, but the end ['hryt] is the way of death." The logical end result of man's attempt to go his own way, independent from God, is death. Many other texts can be cited for this use of 'ah^ari^t.²

Finally, in some texts, 'ah^ari^t means the same thing as "future life." Prov 23:17,18: "Do not let your heart envy sinners, but live in the fear of the Lord always. Surely there is a future ['hryt] and your hope will not be cut off." Similarly in Prov 24:14: "Know that wisdom is thus for your soul; if you find it, then there will be a future ['hryt]. . . ." For the wicked, on the other hand, "there will be no future ['hryt].³ It is not

¹Seebass, TDOT, 1:208.

²Isa 46:10; 47:7; Jer 12:4; 17:11; 50:12; Dan 12:8; Job 8:7; Prov 5:4,11; 14:12,13; 16:25; 20:21; 23:32; Eccl 7:8. In Lam 1:9 and Deut 32:29 'ah^ari^t is translated "future" in the NASB, but in both cases "doom" (RSV) is to be preferred. Israel did not consider its doom or fate, i.e., the outcome of its action.

³Prov 24:20. Contrary to Seebass, TDOT, 1:209 and Jenni, THAT, 1:115.

simply the future, in general, but the future life which the wicked will not have.

In our study thus far we have seen that 'ah^ariṭ can refer to the future, in general, to an end or a result of an action in one man's experience, as well as to the end in a man's life, and in Dan 8:19, where it is parallel to cēt qēs, possibly to the end of history.¹

B^a'ah^ariṭ hayyāmīm in the OT Outside the Book of Daniel

It has been stated above² that 'ah^ariṭ is generally that which comes after the speaker's point of time. Thus a literal translation of b^a'ah^ariṭ hayyāmīm may be "in the afterwards of days,"³ but since this is a rather awkward phrase in English, I retain the expression "in the latter days" when referring to b^a'ah^ariṭ hayyāmīm, in general.

The translation of 'ah^ariṭ by eschatos⁴ and b^a'ah^ariṭ hayyāmīm by ep eschatou tōn hēmerōn or similar

¹For further discussion see p. 331.

²See p. 195.

³This corresponds to the lexical definition of "Folgezeit," HAL, 36. See also Gerhard v. Rad, Das erste Buch Mose, 4 vols., ATD (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964), 4:369. Harris (TWOT, 1:34) translates the phrase with "the end of the days."

⁴Buchanan (189, n. 5) has pointed out that only once (Deut 11:12) is 'ah^ariṭ rendered by the word sun-teleia, the word used in Dan 11:36 and 12:7 for the expected end. In Deut 11:12 it refers to the end of a year.

phrases in the Septuagint¹ has led to the assumption that *b'ahārīt hayyāmīm* is a *terminus technicus* indicating the eschatological age.² It should be noted, however, that the Greek term *eschatos* itself does not necessarily denote the last days or the end of this world, rather it refers to the "furthest," the "utmost," the "extreme," "what comes last" of whatever its subject is.³ Nevertheless, the Greek translation of *b'ahārīt hayyāmīm* has come to signify in Christian theology "the end of the days," "the end of the universe as it at present exists."⁴

Among Historical-critical scholars the interpretation of *b'ahārīt hayyāmīm* has given rise to two

¹*ep eschatou tōn hemērōn* appears four times (Num 24:14; Jer 23:20; 49:39 [LXX 25:19]; and in the LXX version of Dan 10:14); *ep eschatōn tōn hēmerōn* seven times (Gen 49:1; Deut 4:30; Jer 30:24 [LXX 37:24]; Ezek 38:16; Dan 2:28; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1); *en tais eschatais hēmerais* once (Isa 2:2) and *eschaton tōn hēmerōn* once (Deut 31:29).

²W. Staerk, "Der Gebrauch der Wendung באחרית הימים im at. Kanon," *ZAW* 11 (1891): 247. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959), 262, n. 1. H. W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 1. Hosea*, BKAT, 2. Auflage (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 80.

³G. Abbot-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the NT*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937), 182. W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 313. Babylon is called the least (*eschatē*) of the nations (Jer 50:12; LXX 27:12). *Eschatos* can refer to the outcome of a situation (Eccl 10:13), as well as to the uttermost parts of the sea (Ps 139:9; LXX 138:9). In regard to time, it can refer to the later years of a man's life (Job 8:7; 42:12; Prov 5:11) or simply to "future" in general (Prov 19:20).

⁴H. Kosmala, "At the End of the Days," *ASTI* 2 (1963): 28.

views. The older Literary-critical School claims that there is no pre-prophetic or pre-exilic-prophetic eschatology in the sense of an end to the present order;¹ hence, all the eschatological passages in the pre-exilic prophets are seen as post-exilic interpolations or the like.² The History-of-religion School argues that there are eschatological oracles in the books of the OT and that there is even an older popular eschatology which had its origin in mythology and in the experience of natural disasters like floods, earthquakes, fires, and storms.³

Both positions assume that b^e'ah^ariṭ hayyāmim

¹J. Wellhausen, Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, 6. Auflage (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907), 152. Gustav Hölscher, Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie, Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1925), 14-15. Mowinckel (He That Cometh, 126) says: ". . . the earlier 'writing prophets' had no eschatological message, but uttered prophecies related to the contemporary historical situation, and were prophets not of bliss but of doom. . . ."

²Hölscher, 4.

³Hugo Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitischen-jüdischen Eschatologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905), 18, 66, 235, etc. He says on page 66: "Wir sahen, daß in vorprophetischer Zeit eine feste, jedermann geläufige Theorie bestand, die Welt werde untergehen durch Erdbeben, Sturm, Feuer oder Fiut Jahves." See also Hermann Gunkel, Genesis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1901), 482; Ernst Sellin, Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912), 111, 115, 118, etc.; Lorenz Dürr, Die Stellung des Propheten Ezechiel in der israelitischen-jüdischen Apokalyptik, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen (Münster i. W.: Aschendorfsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), 69, 70, 74, 75, etc.; H. Gressmann, Der Messias, FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929), 75; Paul Volz, Jesaja II, KAT (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), XX.

always means "in the last days" or "at the end of the days," and generally take it as an eschatological concept.¹ Yet many scholars in the past and present have rejected this interpretation of *b'aharit hayyamim* in the OT.² Some consider all occurrences of *b'aharit hayyamim* non-eschatological,³ others believe that some of the texts in the prophets are eschatological.⁴ This divergence of

¹Mowinckel, 262; Gressmann, Der Messias, 225, n. 1; Dürr, 103.

²August Dillmann, Die Genesis, 2 vols., Kurzfassetes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1875), 2:473; John Skinner, Genesis, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910), 513, n. 1; Eduard König, Die messianischen Weissagungen des AT (Stuttgart: Chr. Belser A. G., 1925), 107-108; B. D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel (Leiden: University Press Leiden, 1947), 140; Th. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology," VT, Sup 1 (1953): 202; Buchanan, 190. Arvid S. Kapelrud, "Eschatology in the Book of Micah," VT 11 (1961): 395; Kosmala, 29; Martin Noth, Numbers, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 192; Martin Rehm, Der königliche Messias, Eichstätter Studien, n. F. 1 (Kevelaer, Rheinland: Butzon und Bercker, 1968), 240, n. 20; Jean Carmignac, "La notion d'eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân," RevQ 7 (1969): 20-21; Otto Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1972), 26; E. Lipinski, "בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים dans les textes preexiliques," VT 20 (1970): 445; Seebass, TDOT, 1:211. Hans Wildberger, Jesaja, 3 vols. BKAT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972-1982), 1:81; Walter Gross, Bileam, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 38 (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1974), 319; J. T. Willis, "The Expression *be'acharith hayyamin* [sic] in the OT," RestQ 22 (1979): 69.

³Buchanan, 190; Kosmala, 29; Willis, 70; Carmignac, 20-21; Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel, 323; Gross, 319-320; Arnold B. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel, 7 vols. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968), 2:264.

⁴Vriezen, 202; Dillmann, Genesis, 451; Skinner, Genesis, 513, n.1; König, Die messianischen Weissagungen, 108; von Rad, Das erste Buch Mose, 4:369; Seebass, TDOT, 1:211-212; Wildberger, 1:81-82.

opinions calls for a reinvestigation of the OT evidence.

We now turn to the study of the twelve passages in which the expression *b^o'ah^ariḥ hayyāmim* appears outside the book of Daniel. Related Hebrew expressions such as *bayyōm hahū'* (Isa 2:11,17,20; Mic 4:1,6; 5:10) and *'ah^arē kēn* (Jer 46:26; 48:47; 49:6, 39; Joel 2:28) are discussed as we encounter them in the texts.

Gen 49:1

יִקְרָא יַקְוֵב אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
הַאֲסֻפּוּ וְאִגְדָּה לָכֶם אֶת־אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא אֲתֶם בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים:

And Jacob called his sons and said: Gather together¹ and I will tell you what will happen² to you in the latter days.³

This verse is the prose introduction to a poem which is generally called "The Blessing of Jacob."⁴ However, because the blessing appears only in vs. 28 and the pronouncements over some of his sons are more like

¹Niph. imp. pl.--"be gathered together." The setting of this scene is given in 48:2. Jacob on his death-bed blesses Joseph and his two sons (vss. 15-20) and then calls his other sons to his bedside.

²yiqra' for yiqreh as in Gen 42:4,38 and Exod 1:10.

³LXX: *ep eschatōn tōn hēmerōn*, "in the last days." English translations of the texts investigated are my own.

⁴Skinner, *Genesis*, 508. Ch. T. Fritsch, *The Book of Genesis*, LBC (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959), 122; Julian Morgenstern, *The Book of Genesis* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), 299; Arthur S. Peake, "Genesis," *A Commentary on the Bible* (London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1919), 165.

curses instead of blessings,¹ some prefer to call this chapter "The Testament of Jacob."² Others maintain that these criticisms are not curses but blessings in disguise, since ". . . they point out to the tribes involved the sin that the tribe as a whole is most exposed to and against which it should be particularly on guard."³

There are basically two ways scholars have viewed this chapter. Some consider the "Testament" to be a collection of old tribal songs and memories written during the period of the Judges or the early monarchy.⁴ They

¹See Jacob's words concerning Reuben, Simeon, and Levi.

²Robert Davidson, Genesis 12-50, CBC (Cambridge University Press, 1979), 301; A. Dillmann, Genesis, 2:444; A. E. Speiser, Genesis, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1964), 361.

³H. C. Leupold, Genesis (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942), 1162. G. Ch. Aalders (Genesis, 2 vols., BSC, trans. William Heynen [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981], 2: 269) admits that the statements regarding Simeon and Levi are actually curses, but says, ". . . the fact remains that it was a divinely effective curse," he therefore retains the blessing concept.

⁴W. Gunther Plaut, The Torah (New York: Union of Hebrew Congregations, 1981), 307; Claus Westermann, Genesis, 2 vols., BKAT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 3:250-252; Skinner, Genesis, 509; Dillmann, Genesis, 2:447; Fritsch, 123; Michael Maher, Genesis, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982), 264; Peake, "Genesis," 165; Davidson, 301; J. R. Dummelow, ed. A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: MacMillan Co., 1940), 44; von Rad (Das erste Buch Mose, 4:368-369) does not give any date for this collection of aphorisms, but he does say, ". . . diese Sammlung [ist] schon in verhältnismässig alter Zeit--spätestens in der des Jahwisten-entstanden." Concerning the supposed Canaanite background of Genesis 49, see Bruce Vawter, "The Canaanite Background of Genesis 49," CBQ 17 (1955): 1-18; J. Coppens, "La Benediction de Jacob," VT, Sup 4 (1956): 97-115.

argue that all the utterances have in view the geographical and historical conditions of the period from the Judges to David and that they entirely pass over the time Israel spent in Egypt, the Exodus, the mission of Moses, and the spiritual prerogative of Levi.¹ Thus, "the poem is a series of vaticinia ex eventu, reflecting the conditions and aspirations of the period that saw the consolidation of the Hebrew nationality."²

Other interpreters reject the vaticinia ex eventu explanation and maintain that the aged Jacob was given a revelation of what would take place in the lives of his descendants in the future.³ H. Pehlke has pointed out that the "latter days" can hardly refer to any time in the personal future of Jacob's individual sons. By this time they were all grown up⁴ and would change very little in their character, if at all. Thus "the latter days" refer to a changed condition in the family of Jacob. "By using the literary device of a metonymy the individual sons of

¹ Skinner, Genesis, 508; Dillmann, Genesis, 2:446; Peake, "Genesis," 165.

² Skinner, Genesis, 509.

³ Aalders, Genesis, 2:267; C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 3 vols., trans. James Martin, BCOT, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952), 1:387; Leupold, Genesis, 1160; John P. Lange, Genesis, LC, trans. Tayler Lewis and A. Gosman (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1915), 648; Derek Kidner, Genesis, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1967), 215.

⁴ Reuben, the oldest son, was about 68 years old. See E. H. Merrill, "Fixed Dates in Patriarchal Chronology," BSac 137 (1980): 248.

Jacob have become, in the mind of the author, the 12 tribes."¹

C. F. Keil, arguing against the vaticinia ex eventu explanation, suggests that the prophetic character of the poem does not consist in "the prediction of particular historical events," but rather in "the purely ideal portraiture of the peculiarities of the different tribes."² "The critics," says Leupold, "make of these generalized statements specific allusions to particular events or situations and so gain ground for their type of interpretation."³

One must admit, however, that some of the prophecies did find striking historical fulfillments in the history of Israel.⁴ But these fulfillments, some scholars say, are only symbols pointing forward to the greater fulfillments in the future. J. P. Lange has summarized the argument as follows:

True it is, that the period from the time of the Judges to that of David appears as the determinate foreground view of the seer, but this is, itself, a symbolic

¹Pehlke, 102.

²Keil, Pentateuch, 1:389.

³Leupold, Genesis, 1164.

⁴In Gen 49:7 God says, "I will divide them [Simeon and Levi] in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel." According to Josh 19:1-9, the only tribe besides Levi which did not receive a portion of the land was Simeon. The tribe of Simeon received only a number of cities in the territory of Judah (Gen 49:8). Judah became the most prominent tribe in Israel (Gen 49:20). Asher occupied a very fruitful part of Canaan, etc.

configuration, in which he looks through, and beholds the whole Messianic future, even to its close, though not in its perfectly developed features.¹

Thus the term "the latter days" in Gen 49:1 is applied to different periods in history. On the one end of the spectrum are those scholars who believe that "the latter days" are the days of the conquest or the monarchy.² On the other end of the spectrum are those interpreters who believe the expression b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm is an eschatological term referring to the Messianic age, "the advent of the promised Saviour,"³ though the fulfillment of the prophecy in Gen 49 is partly seen in OT times. Keil says:

. . . we must not restrict 'the end of days' to the extreme point of the time of completion of the Messianic Kingdom: it embraces the whole history of the

¹Lange, Genesis, 649.

²Willis, 55-56; Kapelrud, 395; Peake, "Genesis," 165; Skinner, Genesis, 508; Davidson, 301; Eva Osswald, "Zum Problem der vaticinia ex eventu," ZAW 75 (1963): 31; E. H. Maly, "Genesis," Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 45. The Jewish scholars Rabbi Shemuel ben Meir (1085-1174) and Abraham Ibn Ezra (1092-1167) considered the phrase "that which shall befall you in the last days" to mean "how you will each fare in the conquest of Canaan, and what you will each inherit therein" (A. Cohen, The Soncino Chumash [Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino Press, 1947], 302). The prophecy concerning Judah (vs. 10) is seen as a reference to the Davidic monarchy (Skinner, Genesis, 524) or a later interpolation from a period "when the Messianic hope had already been proclaimed by the prophets of Judah" (Dillmann, Genesis, 2:465). On Gen 49:10, see Kevin Smyth, "The Prophecy Concerning Judah: Gen 49:8-12," CBQ 7 (1945): 290-305; Edwin M. Good, "The 'Blessing' on Judah, Gen 49:8-12," JBL 82 (1963): 427-432.

³Robert S. Candlish, Studies in Genesis (1868; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1979), 746. So also Keil, Pentateuch, 387; Lange, Genesis, 649.

completion which underlies the present period of growth.¹

C. Wordsworth limits "the latter days" to the time period between the first and the second coming of Christ.² In support he quotes Heb 1:2; 1 Pet 1:5; 2 Pet 3:3; and 1 John 2:18. Thus "the latter days" cover now almost 2000 years. Another 1800 years are added by J. G. Murphy who has "the latter days" begin with the time of the conquest or even earlier. He says, "The after days are the time intervening between the speaker and the end of the human race."³ H. C. Leupold and Th. Whitelaw do not go back quite that far; they begin the "latter days" with the conquest. Whitelaw says, ". . . the period must not be restricted to exclusively Messianic times . . . but must commence with what to Jacob was the era of consummation, the days of the conquest."⁴

¹Keil, Pentateuch, 387. So also John H. Bennetch, "The Prophecy of Jacob," BSac 95 (1938): 419. Gunkel (478) considers the phrase to be a term of prophetic eschatology, yet believes that from Jacob's point of view "the latter days" were the time of David.

²Christopher Wordsworth, "The Five Books of Moses," The Holy Bible (London: Rivingtons, 1869), 187.

³J. G. Murphy, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Genesis (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1866), 507.

⁴Thomas Whitelaw, Genesis, PC (London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1913), 523. See also Leupold, Genesis, 1167.

A number of commentators reject all the above mentioned interpretations and understand "the latter days" as simply indicating the future,¹ without specifying it further. Some qualify it by calling it a "distant future."²

Taking all that has been said into consideration and looking at the context of Gen 49:1, we come to the following conclusions: Jacob at the end of his life looks into the future and under prophetic inspiration he predicts major developments issuing from his sons and their descendants. He sees them settled in Canaan, notices the two leading and prominent figures in their history--Judah, on the one hand, and Joseph or Ephraim, on the other,³ and possibly points to the Messiah who will come from one of them.⁴ Since Jacob is primarily describing the future

¹Aalders, 270; Kidner, Genesis, 215; Maher, 264. Dillmann, Genesis, 2:451; Speiser, 364; Dummelow, 44; Henry Alford, The Book of Genesis (1872; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1979), 206; R. Laird Harris, "The Last Days in the Bible and Qumran," Jesus of Nazareth, Savior and Lord, ed. C. F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1966), 75; Willis, 55; Gross, 319; Lipinski, 447.

²Maly, 45; B. Jacob, The First Book of the Bible, Genesis, trans. E. I. Jacob and W. Jacob (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 329.

³Ten of the twenty-five verses deal with Judah and Joseph.

⁴The meaning of the word Shiloh in Gen 49:10 is still unknown. It is either a cryptic reference to the Messiah or it is a prophecy of David and his dynasty. Most commentators have opted for the first possibility. For a detailed discussion on the subject, see Smyth, 293-300, and Skinner, Genesis, 520-524. Note that there is no NT

history of his descendants, i.e., Israel, b'aharit hayyamim is best translated by "in the future" or "in the days to come" as the RSV, NEB, and NIV have done. This future began to be realized with the conquest and continued into the future, from a NT perspective at least until the first advent of Christ.¹ We may, therefore, suggest then that b'aharit hayyamim in this text primarily refers to the future, in a general way, a future in which the prophesied events would be expected to take place. Yet, if Gen 49:10 is a reference to the Messiah, then this text would refer to an eschatological future in which a pre-Messianic order would be succeeded by a Messianic one.² Based on these suggestions, I surmise that the prophecies of Jacob span the whole period from the conquest to the appearance of the Messiah.³

allusion to Gen 49:1.

¹It is difficult to see how, after the rejection of Christ by the Jews, these blessings could still be applied to the Jewish people.

²According to our definition of eschatology in the Introduction, pp. 10-11.

³This was also Calvin's view. He said, ". . . in this prophecy is comprised the whole period from the departure out of Egypt to the reign of Christ: not that Jacob enumerates every event but that, in the summary of things on which he briefly touches, he arranges a settled order and course, until Christ should appear." John Calvin, Genesis, 2 vols., trans. John King (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948), 2:442.

Num 24:14

וַיִּשְׁמַע ה' וַיִּגַּד לְעַמִּי לְכֹהֵן
אֲנִי אֵשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה הָעָם הַזֶּה לְעַמְּךָ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים:

And now behold, I am going to my people,¹ and I will counsel you² as to what this people will do to your people in the latter days.

The setting of this verse is the fourth oracle of Balaam. Balaam, prophet and villain,³ has three times prophesied at the request of Balak, and each time he has blessed Israel instead of cursing it. Now Balak is angry, he claps his hands in disgust (cf. Job 27:23) and tells

¹The LXX has *ton topon mou* (to my place), the Peshitta *l'arši* (to my land). Both possibilities seem to fit the context better (see vss. 11 and 25).

²*yōs* "give counsel," "advise," BDB, 419; KBL, 390; HAL, 405. Some have supposed it was on this occasion that Balaam gave the infamous counsel mentioned in Num 31:16. The Jerusalem Targum says: "Come now, I will counsel thee how thou art to act with this people. Lead them into sin: for else thou canst have no power against them. Nevertheless these people are to prevail over thy people at the end of the days." The Targum Jonathan is even more explicit: "Go, furnish tavern houses and employ seductive women to sell food and drinks cheaply, and bring this people together to eat and drink and commit whoredom with them, that they may deny their God; then in a brief time will they be delivered into thy hand, and many of them fall. Nevertheless, after this they will still have dominion over thy people at the end of the days," cited from J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum, 2 vols. (London: Longman, 1862; reprint, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968), 2:429-431. Cf. Michael S. Moore, The Balaam Traditions (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

³Balaam is at one and the same time a divinely inspired Gentile prophet and the villain who told Balak how to lead Israel into sin. See J. R. Baskin, "Origen on Balaam: The Dilemma of the Unworthy Prophet," Vigiliae Christianae 37 (1983): 22-35; George W. Coats, "The Way of Obedience," Semeia 24 (1982): 53-79.

Balaam to go home, which he does. But before he leaves, "he goes on to give the final and most magnificent oracle [concerning Israel] which God commands him to utter."¹ In "the latter days," he says, "a star shall come out of Jacob" and he shall "batter the brow of Moab and destroy all the sons of tumult."²

Our understanding of "the latter days" in this passage hinges on the identification of "the Star" in vs. 17. Who is he? Both the Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan show that rabbinical Judaism was convinced that Balaam here spoke of the Messiah.³ "This view is also reflected in the name, given by Rabbi Akiba to the pseudo-Messiah of the days of emperor Hadrian (A.D. 132), Bar Kochba 'Son of the Star'."⁴ Through Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Cyprian,⁵ the Messianic interpretation became general among Christian interpreters, and for centuries

¹John Sturdy, Numbers, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 178.

²Num 24:17.

³Targum Onkelos: "When a king shall arise out of Jacob, and the Meshiha be anointed from Israel, He will slay the princes of Moab, and Reign over all the children of men." Targum Jonathan: "When the mighty King of Jacob's house shall reign, and the Meshiha, the Power-scepter of Israel, be anointed, He will slay the princes of the Moabae" (Etheridge, 2:309-310, 430).

⁴A. Noordtzij, Numbers, BSC, trans. Ed van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 231.

⁵Justin Martyr Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew 106 (ANF, 1:252); Irenaeus Against Heresies 3.9.2 (ANF, 1:422); Cyprian Treatise 12.2.10 (ANF, 5:519).

this view was considered to be the only correct exegesis of vs. 17.¹

The rabbinic scholar Rashi (1040-1105) explained the star as a reference to David who smote Moab according to 2 Sam 8:2.² And in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Christian scholars as well began to question the identification of the star with the Messiah.³ Since then three streams of interpretation have emerged.

First, there are those scholars, mainly from the nineteenth century, who continue the traditional interpretation.⁴ They argue:

1. The reference to one Israelite king is against the analogy of the other prophecies in the Pentateuch and against the analogy of Balaam's prophecies, inasmuch as these nowhere refer to a single individual.
2. The scepter does not designate a ruler, but dominion in general.

¹Noordtzij, 231.

²Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary: Numbers, trans. M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann (London: Shapiro, Valentine and Co., 1946), 120.

³The earliest was Verschuir in his "Dissertatio de Oraculis Bileami" in 1773. See Noordtzij, 231.

⁴E. W. Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, 4 vols., trans. Theod. Meyer and James Martin (1872-1878; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1956), 1:99-103; R. Winterbotham, Numbers, PC (London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913), 319; George Bush, Notes, Critical and Practical on the Book of Numbers (New York: Ivison and Phinney, 1858), 395.

3. In Gen 49:10, Judah does not receive the promise of a single king, but of the kingdom--the Israelite kingdom.
4. The Israelite kingdom attains to the full height of its destiny only in and with the Messiah; thus the prophecy centers in Christ.¹

Second, there is a considerable number of scholars in this century that take the prophecy as a vaticinium ex eventu written in or after the time of David and referring to him.² They believe the references to Moab, Edom, Seir, etc., indicate that the prophecy deals with the history of Israel. "David, as the conqueror of both Moab and Edom (2 Sam 8:13; 1 Kgs 11:15), would alone seem to satisfy the reference."³ M. Noth says:

It is highly probable that what is conceived of here is the future glory of King David and that it is the historical emergence of David that forms the background to this discourse.⁴

¹Hengstenberg, 1:100-101.

²George B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), 370; Martin Noth, Das vierte Buch Mose, 168; F. L. Moriarity, "Numbers," The Jerome Biblical Commentary (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968), 96; H. H. Guthrie, Jr., "The Book of Numbers," The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1971), 96; Klaus Seybold, "Das Herrscherbild des Bileam-orakels Num. 24, 15-19," TZ 29 (1973): 9; Dieter Vetter, Seherspruch und Segensschilderung, Calwer Theologische Monographien, Reihe A; Bibelwissenschaft, vol. 4 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974), 47; Sturdy, 178; Walter Riggans, Numbers, DSB (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 187.

³G. B. Gray, Numbers, 370.

⁴Noth, Numbers, 192. See also Osswald, 32; Kapelrud, 395; Willis, 56. W. Robertson Nicoll (Numeri,

Third, we find scholars who combine the two previous views and believe that the prophecy found a preliminary fulfillment in the reign of David and the kings following him, but that it points beyond these kings to the true king of Israel, the Messiah.¹

To determine the validity of these views, we need to pay attention to vs. 17 which is the center of Balaam's fourth oracle:

ExpB [New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908], 311) rejects the vaticinia ex eventu idea, but comes to almost the same conclusions. Nicoll (ibid., 312) does not see David or an individual king as the fulfillment of this prophecy. He says, "The oracle of Balaam refers to the virility and prospective dominance of Israel, as a nation favored by the Almighty and destined to be strong in battle." He cannot accept Balaam as a Messianic Prophet. He calls him ". . . a political prophet: to class him among those who testified of Christ is to exalt far too much his inspiration and read more into his oracles than they naturally contain."

¹Noordtzij, 232; John Peter Lange, Numbers, LC, trans. and enl. Samuel T. Lowrie and R. A. Gosman (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), 140; F. C. Cook, ed., Exodus-Ruth, The Bible Commentary, abr. and ed. J. M. Fuller (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), 239; Gordon Wenham, Numbers, TOTC (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), 178; J. de Vaulx, Les Nombres, Sources Biblique (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1972), 291. C. F. Keil (Pentateuch, 3:194) holds what may be called an "extended fulfillment" view whereby he sees one fulfillment of the prophecy extending from David to the eschaton. He says: "The fulfillment of this prophecy commenced with the subjugation of the Edomites by David . . . but will not be completed till 'the end of the days', when all the enemies of God and His Church will be made the footstool of Christ (Ps cx.1sq)."

וַיֵּרְאֵנִי וְלֹא שָׁמָּה אֲשׁוּרֵנִי וְלֹא קְרֹב
 דֶּרֶךְ כּוֹכַב מִיִּצְחָק וְגַם שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל
 וְחַקֵּץ סֵאתַי מֵאֵב וְלִקְרָקֵר כָּל-בְּנֵי-שֵׁת׃

I see him, but not now, I behold him, but not near; a star shall come¹ out of Jacob, and a scepter² shall rise out of Israel and smite³ the temples⁴ of Moab and the skull⁵ of the sons of Seth.⁶

¹Dāraḳ, "tread, march." KBL, 217; HAL, 222; BDB, 201.

²The LXX has anthrōpos, "a man," the Syriac reads "a prince," and Targum Onkelos "an anointed one." The term šēbet denotes a staff of wood (Ezek 19:11) about the height of a man, which ancient rulers bore as insignia of honor (Amos 1:5; Zech 10:11). There is no evidence in the Bible that a scepter was actually handled by a Jewish king. References to a scepter in Israel are all of a metaphorical character and describe it simply as one of the insignia of power (Gen 49:10; Ps 2:9; 45:6). J. M'clintock and J. Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, 12 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, Pub., 1888), 9:401. On priestly scepters see André Lemaire, "Probable Head of Priestly Scepter from Solomon's Temple Surfaces in Jerusalem," BAR 10.1 (1984): 24-29, and Michal Artzy, "Pomegranate Scepters and Incense Stand with Pomegranates Found in Priest's Grave," BAR 16.1 (1990): 48-57.

³Māḥas, "smite, wound severely," BDB, 563; "smite, break to pieces," KBL, 514; HAL, 541.

⁴pē'āh, "side, corner," BDB, 805; KBL, 749. Metaphorically the word refers to the temples of one's head, HAL, 858.

⁵The MT reads qarqar which is the Pilpel of qārar "to tear down," BDB, 903 (see Isa 22:5). This reading is accepted by most English translations (KJV, RSV, NEB, NASB). BHS, however, suggests that we read with the Samaritan Pentateuch and Jer 48:45, qodqōd "head, crown of the head." BDB (903) and KBL (858) also accept the reading qodqōd for qarqar, as do NIV and JB. Because of the parallelism between "the temples of Moab" and "the skull of the sons of Seth," the reading "skull" for "destroy" has been accepted in this study.

The word "star" (koqab) can function as a metaphor in the OT. It is used primarily with reference to the children of Israel. God's promise to Abraham to make his seed like the stars of heaven is frequently quoted when reference is made to God's mighty acts in Israel.¹ The angels of heaven are compared to stars in Job 38:7, "When the morning stars² sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

The eleven patriarchs are symbolized by stars in Gen 37:9. In Dan 8:10 and 12:3 the leaders and teachers of God's people are compared to stars.³ Thus, the reference in Num 24:7 to "a star" coming out of Jacob, standing in parallel to "a scepter" rising up in Israel, most likely refers to a royal person. This "king" shall smite the Moabites who, at the time the oracle was given, were attempting to destroy Israel.

According to Gen 19:30-38, the Moabites were

⁶Since b^onê šēt is roughly equivalent to "sons of Adam," i.e., "all mankind," several interpreters prefer to translate šēt as "defiance," (KBL, 1014); "tumult" (Noordtzij, 232); "pride" (G. B. Gray, Numbers, 368), or "strife" (NEB). G. Wenham (Numbers, 179) finds in this text a reference to the "sons of Shut." He says: "The Šutu are mentioned in the Egyptian execration texts (c. 1900 B.C.) as living somewhere in Palestine, and it seems easier to take this remark to refer to them."

¹For example, Deut 1:10; 10:22; 28:26; 1 Chr 27:23; Neh 9:23.

²The LXX translates "angels of God." The same meaning of "stars" is probably found in Isa 14:13.

³Cf. Rev 1:20.

descendants of Lot and thus kinsmen of the Israelites. Early in the time of the Judges, Eglon, king of Moab, invaded Canaan and oppressed Israel for eighteen years (Judg 3:12-30). Saul fought with the Moabites (1 Sam 14:47), and David as a fugitive entrusted his parents to the king of Moab (1 Sam 22:3-4).

After David became king, he defeated the Moabites, levied them with heavy tribute and killed about two-thirds of their warriors (2 Sam 8:2, 12). This mass execution of Moabite males seriously weakened the Moabites for many decades. After Solomon's death, Moab broke free but was again subdued by Omri.¹ Towards the close of Ahab's reign or after his death (2 Kgs 1:1), they rebelled and, according to the Moabite Stone,² regained their independence. They continued to trouble Israel (2 Chr 20:1-30; 2 Kgs 13:20; 24:2) and the prophets often denounced the Moabites as a type of the enemies of the kingdom of God.³ According to cuneiform sources, the Moabites paid tribute to the

¹J. R. Kautz, III ("Moab," ISBE, 3:393) says: "The Moabite Stone's report that Omri subjugated Moab suggests that Israel's dominion had not continued unbroken from Solomon."

²A black basalt stele found in 1868 by the German missionary F. Klein in Transjordan. The stone records the revolt of Mesha king of Moab against Israel (W. F. Albright, ANET, 320-321). It is a supplement to 2 Kgs 3; yet, at the same time, it is in conflict with the biblical data. See P. D. Miller, "Moabite Stone," ISBE, 3:397. Cf. Andrew Dearman, ed., Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

³For example, Isa 15; 16; 25:10; Jer 9:26; 25:21; 27:3; 48; Ezek 25:8-11; Amos 2:1-2; Zeph 2:8-11.

Assyrian kings,¹ and Josephus reports that they were subjugated by Nebuchadnezzar.² They ceased to have an independent existence as a nation and were finally absorbed by the Nabateans.³

Returning now to the three views of interpretation considered above,⁴ I believe that the dual-fulfillment view has the greatest merit in the exegesis of Num 24:17. Balaam looks into the future and sees Israel settled in the land and living under a ruler who smites the Moabites and conquers Edom. In the same breath he proclaims what will happen to Amalek and the Kenites.

These prophecies found an initial fulfillment in the time of Israel's monarchy.⁵ David was the star who came forth from Jacob and who slew the physical enemies of

¹Luckenbill, 30, line 56.

²Flavius Josephus Antiquities of the Jews 1.ii.5.

³Ch. F. Pfeiffer, H. F. Vos, and J. Rea, Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia, 2 vols. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), 2:1145.

⁴See pp. 211-213.

⁵We have seen above that David was the Israelite king who conquered Moab. Edom was also conquered for the first time by David and almost exterminated (1 Kgs 11:14-17). Amalek was thoroughly overthrown by Saul, acting under the directions of Samuel (1 Sam 15:7-8), and never appears to have regained any national existence. Little is known of Kenites who are pictured as being on friendly terms with the Israelites (1 Sam 15:6; 27:10; 30:29). Nevertheless, they probably shared the lot of all the inhabitants of Palestine except Judah and were transplanted to some far off country by the Assyrians, where their existence as a separate people was lost. Winterbotham, 320-321.

Israel. Yet, he was only a type of that greater star, the Messiah, who came to defeat the enemy of "all Israel." The following reasons may be advanced to support the view of an initial fulfillment through David the king of Israel and a final, typological fulfillment through the Son of David, the Messiah:

First, all the other oracles of Balaam apply to the history of Israel subsequent to the settlement. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the fourth oracle also has some reference to the history of Israel.

Second, the *Sitz im Leben* of the star-prophecy is the Moabite king's attempt to put a curse on Israel. Yet, instead of cursing Israel, Balaam predicts that Israel will one day smite Moab. This interplay between Balak's request and Balaam's prophecy must not be overlooked.

Third, Num 24:17 does not necessarily envision a complete destruction of Moab. The verb *māḥaṣ* meaning "to smite through, wound severely, shatter,"¹ or "break in pieces"² is not one of the strong words Moses could have used, if he meant to express total annihilation.³ *Māḥaṣ* is

¹ BDB, 563.

² KBL, 514; HAL, 541.

³ Stronger verbs would have been *māḥaq*, "utterly destroy, annihilate" (BDB, 563; HAL, 541) or *hišmīd*, "exterminate" (BDB, 1029; KBL, 985).

often rendered "wound"¹ or "injure."² In Ps 68:24 it has the meaning "to plunge."³ Thus, the fact that Moab was not annihilated by David does not militate against the double fulfillment of this verse.

Fourth, the final fulfillment through Christ is indicated by the NT allusions to Num 24:17.⁴

Based upon these considerations, it may be sound to suggest "the latter days" in vs. 14 refer to the future in general. It is not the immediate future. This seems indicated by 17a: "I see him, but not now, I behold him, but not near."⁵ In view is not only the time of David, but a time beyond it. "The latter days" seem to look towards the eschatological future in which the Messiah shall appear. Thus the translations "in the days to come" or "in the future" seem to fit the context best.⁶

¹The KJV uses "wound" in Deut 32:39; 2 Sam 22:38; Job 5:18; Ps 18:39; 68:22; 110:6; Hab 3:13. The NIV uses "wound" in Deut 32:39; in most other texts it renders māḥaṣ by "crush."

²NIV in Job 5:18.

³NIV.

⁴Matt 2:2; Luke 1:78; 2 Pet 1:19; Rev 2:28; 22:16. John T. Willis (57, n. 10) only mentions Rev 22:16 and says that this "can hardly be shown to be an unequivocal allusion to Numbers 24:14." Willis seems to be correct, but all the allusions together do make a point. A. Dillmann (Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua [Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1886], 160) mentions that in Egyptian writing the star is a symbol for "god."

⁵Gross, 320.

⁶R. A. Gosman (Lange, Numeri, 140) the translator of Lange's commentary, has an interesting comment on this

Deut 4:30

וּמִצָּר לְךָ וּמִצָּאוּךָ כָּל הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים וְשָׁבָתָּ
 עֲרִידָתָהּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ בְּקוֹלוֹ:

In your distress when all these things have come¹ upon you in the latter days, then you will return to Yahweh your God and listen to his voice.

The setting of this passage is the first address of Moses "across the Jordan in the wilderness."² In the first three chapters of Deuteronomy, the address of Moses contains an account of the experience of Israel after they left Egypt. In the fourth chapter, the historical recollection continues and reaches its climax, but its format is changed. Deut 4 is in essence a miniature sermon on the covenant and the law, in which the historical recollection assumes a subsidiary role.³ It has been noted that the

verse which we quote here in full: "'The end of days' denotes the horizon of a prophetic utterance. It begins when the prophecy enters its actual fulfillment. For Jacob, whose hope and desire were limited largely to the dwelling of his descendants in the land of promise, the end began at the time of Joshua; but for Moses and Balaam, who saw that this possession of the promised land did not give perfect rest, 'the end of days' could only be when the strifes and hindrances should be removed, the enemies overcome. The end to them began with the line of David. The prophecy then received its preliminary and partial fulfillment. But that fulfillment was only relatively perfect, since the entire opposing powers to the people of God were not yet destroyed. There remained yet a future and wider fulfillment. 'The end of days' was not yet complete."

¹Qal affirmative 3. pl. with suffix 2. sg. masc. and waw consecutive from *māṣā'*. Literally: "when these things have found [encountered] you . . ."

²Deut 1:1.

³Peter C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976), 129.

literary structure of this chapter resembles in many ways that of the Near Eastern suzerainty treaty. There is a preamble (vss. 1 and 2), reference is made to historical acts (vss. 10-22) and to treaty stipulations (vss. 2,6,23); blessings and curses are mentioned (vss. 26-40), and God calls upon heaven and earth (vs. 26) to act as witnesses.¹

It is within this context that the verses concerning the dangers of idolatry appear (vss. 25-31).² If in the course of time Israel should give in to idolatry (vs. 25), then, as Moses testifies, they shall perish from the land (vs. 26) and be scattered among the peoples (vs. 27) where they will have to worship idols (vs. 28). But if in "the latter days" of tribulation the people repent and return to God (vss. 29-30), He will accept them because the basis of this covenant is mercy (vs. 31).³

Commentators generally apply this prophecy to the history of Israel before, during, and after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities.⁴ J. A. Thompson states:

¹John A. Thompson, Deuteronomy, TOTC (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), 102.

²The pericope actually starts with vs. 15, but we are dealing here with the immediate context of vs. 30.

³George Adam Smith, The Book of Deuteronomy, CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1918), 67.

⁴Craigie, 141. J. A. Thompson, Deuteronomy, 107. G. A. Smith, Deuteronomy, 69. J. Ridderbos, Deuteronomy, BSC, trans. Ed M. van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 89. Joseph Reider, Deuteronomy, The Holy Scriptures (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1937), 55.

In fact, on more than one occasion during Israel's history some of her people went into exile, but notably following the fall of Samaria (2 Kgs 17:6) and the fall of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 24:14f.) God's warning thus came to fulfillment.¹

"The latter days," therefore, are not seen as an eschatological term, but merely in the sense of "in the future."² Driver thinks "here it is used of the period of Israel's return to God, forming the close of its history so far as contemplated by the writer,"³ but he does not spell out what period he thinks is meant.

Several writers, however, do attribute an eschatological meaning to "the latter days" in this passage.⁴ For W. J. Schroeder it is "die messianische Zeit der Vollendung"⁵ and M. Unger calls it "the Great Tribulation of the end-time."⁶ Keil believes that the scattering "among the peoples" (vs. 27) refers to all the dispersions which came

¹J. A. Thompson, Deuteronomy, 107.

²J. A. Thompson, Deuteronomy, 108; Craigie, 141; J. Ridderbos, Deuteronomy, 90; Reider, 56; Anthony Phillips, Deuteronomy, CBC (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 36; A. D. H. Mayes, Deuteronomy, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1979), 156; W. L. Alexander, Deuteronomy, PC (London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1897), 74; Harris, "The Last Days," 75; Buchanan, 189, n. 7; Willis, 57.

³Samuel R. Driver, Deuteronomy, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), 74.

⁴Wilh. Julius Schroeder, Das Deuteronomium, Lange's Bibelwerk (Bielefeld: Verlag von Velhagen und Klasing, 1866), 64. Merrill F. Unger, Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament, 2 vols. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), 1:240. Keil, The Pentateuch, 3:313.

⁵Schroeder, 64.

⁶Unger, 1:240.

upon the Jews ". . . even down to the dispersion under the Romans, which continues still, so that Moses contemplated the punishment in its fullest extent."¹ "The latter days" for Keil, as we have seen in Gen 49:1, stretch all the way from the OT to the end of the age.

The passage under consideration speaks of physical, literal Israel as a covenant community in a literal land who are warned of the danger of making themselves literal idols of wood and stone. If they do this, they are warned, they will literally perish in the land and be literally scattered among the nations. But God also foresees that when this happens in "the latter days," i.e., sometime in the future, they will turn to the Lord and He will accept them.

We know that in the history of Israel this did literally happen. Soon after the death of Joshua, Israelites intermarried with the Canaanites and served Canaanite gods (Judg 3:5-7). Consequently, the Lord gave them into the hands of their enemy, the king of Mesopotamia (vs. 8). When the Israelites realized what was happening to them, they cried unto the Lord and he raised up Othniel who delivered them and who judged Israel in peace for forty years (vss. 9-11).

This pattern of apostasy followed by oppression, a crying unto the Lord, and finally deliverance is found

¹Keil, The Pentateuch, 3:313.

repeatedly in the book of Judges (3:5-9; 12-15; 4:1-24; 6:1-7:25; 10:7-11:33). On the face of it, Deut 4:30 seems to speak to this situation, but the context speaks of a scattering among the nations (vs. 27). Deut 4:29 says: "But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God . . ." Thus the immediate context indicates that Moses is not speaking of these repeated apostasies in the book of Judges, but about a specific time, "the latter days," when apostasy will be followed by a dispersion among the nations.

In the days of the Israelite monarchy, idolatry often proceeded from the house of the kings. Solomon built high places for the gods of his many wives (1 Kgs 11:1-8). Jeroboam I (c. 930-910) established the worship of the golden calves in Bethel and Dan (1 Kgs 12:26-33),¹ and Ahab

¹It is commonly assumed that the calf worship introduced by Jeroboam I was not idolatry in the true sense of the word. Since the presence of Yahweh was visualized at these places, as it was above the ark in the temple in Jerusalem, it was really Yahweh, it is said, who was worshipped there. C. F. Keil, The Book of the Kings, BCOT (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872), 198; John Gray, I and II Kings, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 290; Richard D. Nelson, First and Second Kings, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987), 81. Nevertheless, the narrator insists that Jeroboam's sacrifices were to these calves rather than to Yahweh (1 Kgs 12:32). These calves were certainly open to misinterpretation by the worshippers of Jeroboam's time and particularly by those one or two generations removed from Jeroboam. "The plurality of shrines inevitably reflected the local multiplicity of Canaanite Baal worship, implying a Yahweh of Dan and another Yahweh at Bethel" (Nelson, 81). Furthermore, the two calves are mentioned as one of the reasons why Israel had to go into exile (2 Kgs 17:16). Cf. J. Oswalt, "The Golden Calves and the Egyptian Concept of Deity," EvQ 45 (1973): 13-20.

(874-853) introduced Baal worship in Israel (1 Kgs 16:30-33). His daughter Athaliah, queen of Judah, did the same for the Southern Kingdom (2 Kgs 11:1-18). The situation got even worse in the days of Manasseh (687-642), who built altars for all the host of heaven in the house of the Lord (2 Kgs 21:1-9).

During this long period of repeated apostasies, there have been periods of reformation and revival, notably in the reigns of Asa/Jehosaphat (911-848), Hezekiah (715-687), and Josiah (639-609), but these reforms were usually short lived. Finally God fulfilled his threat of retribution toward his people. The people of the Northern Kingdom went into exile in 722 B.C.; those of the Southern Kingdom in 605, 597, and 586 B.C.

These periods of exile seem to have turned Israel from idolatry, because the remnant that returned from exile as well as the people who had remained in the land never again seem to have fallen into the sin of idolatry. Thus the events which led to the periods of exile and the return from them seem to be first and foremost the fulfillment of Deut 4:30. "The latter days" in this passage, therefore, seem to refer to days of the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities which at the time of the prediction in Deut 4:30 were still far off in the future. They were the eschatological "latter days" for the kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the sense that these two nations ceased to exist as independent entities in history.

Deut 31:29

כִּי יָדַעְתִּי אַחֲרַי מוֹתִי כִּי
הַשֵּׁתָה תִּשְׁחָתוּן וְסָרְתָם מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֶתְכֶם וְקָרָאתֶם
אֶתְכֶם הָרְעָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים כִּי־תַעֲשׂוּ אֶת־הָרַע בְּעֵינַי יְהוָה
לְהַכְעִיפוֹ בְּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיכֶם:

For I know that after my death¹ you will act utterly corrupt² and turn away from the way³ which I have commanded you; but you will meet⁴ trouble in the latter days, for you will do that which is evil⁵ in the sight of Yahweh, provoking him to anger with the works of your hands.⁶

This text is a part of Deut 31 which contains Moses' farewell address to the people. In vss. 16-21, Yahweh announced to Moses that after his death the people would go astray and turn to idolatry, so that divine anger should be kindled against them. In view of this, Moses was directed to write a song and teach it to the people, that it might be a witness against them after they had apostatized from the path in which Moses had led them.

In vs. 29 Moses recounts to the people what Yahweh had told him they would do in "the latter days." As far as

¹For emphasis the phrase "after my death" is placed before instead of after *kī* as it is in Gen 18:20 and 1 Kgs 8:37. See Reider, 296; Ehrlich, 2:340.

²*Hašhēt* inf. abs., for emphasis.

³*swr*, "turn away," as in the case of the golden calf; see 9:12,16.

⁴*qr'* is a parallel form of *qrh* as in Gen 49:1.

⁵LXX (Codex Vaticanus) reads *to ponēron*, "the evil."

⁶An allusion to idols made by human hands. See Deut 4:28; Jer 25:14.

we know, there is no commentator who places these events into the Messianic era. The reference is clearly to the apostasy in the period of the Judges' (Judg 2:11-16) and later.¹ Hence "the latter days" refer to a general future equal to "in the coming days,"² "future",³ or "days to come."⁴

Isa 2:2⁵

וְיָנֶה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים גִּבּוֹן יְהוָה בֵּית יִדְוָה
בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשְׂא מִגְבְּעֹת וְנִהְרֹוּ אֵלָיו כָּל-תְּהוֹמֹת :

And it shall come to pass⁶ in the latter days,⁷ the mountain of the house of Yahweh⁸ will be established⁹

¹R. K. Harrison, "Deuteronomy," The New Bible Commentary Revised (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), 227.

²Craigie, 369.

³Driver, Deuteronomy, 344; Reider, 296; W. L. Alexander, 481; Buchanan, 189; Harris, "The Last Days," 75.

⁴Phillips, 207; Mayes, 380; Willis, 58.

⁵The parallelism with Mic 4:1-3 is dealt with below. See pp. 244-245.

⁶There is no other example of a prophecy beginning with w⁶hāyāh. F. Delitzsch (The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2 vols., BCOT, trans. James Martin [1877; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950-1954], 1:111) explains it by stating that the perfect consecutivum "derives the force of a future from the context alone."

⁷We have seen in Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30 and 31:29 that b⁷'ah⁷rîṭ hayyāmîm refers to a future time, the extent or end-point of which depends on the context. It can be eschatological, but it is not an eschatological terminus technicus. Whether it has an eschatological meaning in this text or not is determined by our investigation.

⁸In vs. 3, "the mountain of the house of Yahweh" is called Zion, i.e., Mount Moriah.

as the head of the mountains.¹ And it will be raised above the hills,² and all the nations will stream to it.³

Commentators agree that the passage describes the ideal future age for Israel, which for many is connected with the coming of the Messiah. The question on which they differ is the fulfillment aspect. When did, or should have, or will this time come to pass? To what period in history do "the latter days" refer?⁴

¹Nāḵôn--Niphal affirmative 3 sg. masc. of kwn, "be firm." In Niphal "be set up, established," (BDB, 465; KBL, 426; HAL, 442). The world and God's throne are established according to Ps 93:1,2. The house which became Samson's grave (Judg 16:26) was resting (naḵôn) on two pillars. The meaning is given in connection with the next phrase.

²B°rō'š--"on the top," (BDB, 910); "at the head of," (KBL, 864). It does not necessarily refer to physical elevation. Here it can have the same meaning as b°rō'š hācām, "at the head of the people" (Deut 20:9; 1 Kgs 21:9, 12). What is indicated here is the spiritual exaltation of the temple mount in the eyes of the nations (cf. Isa 19:16-25; 43:8-13; 60:1-7), (Willis, 59). The temple mount will be firmly established as the leading center of worship and nothing can deprive it of this prerogative. Karl Marti, Das Buch Jesaja, KHC (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900), 25.

³The previous thought is repeated. The worship of Yahweh will ultimately triumph over all the other religions practiced in the world.

⁴Nāhar, "flow, stream," (BDB, 625; KBL, 599; HAL, 639). This verb is used only with people "flowing together." Apart from Isa 2:2 and Mic 4:1, it is only used in Jer 31:12 where the redeemed shall come to Zion and "flow together to the goodness of the Lord," and in Jer 51:44 where the nations shall no more flow together to worship Bel in Babylon.

⁵In the same chapter, Isaiah uses the expression bayyôm hahû' three times (vss. 11, 17, 20). Is it synonymous with b°'ah°rîṭ hayyāmîm, as Willis (69) claims? Or does it refer to a specific point in time? The phrase bayyôm hahû' is not specifically an eschatological formula. It can refer to a historical event in the past (Exod 32:28;

Three major interpretations of opinion can be discerned among commentators. The first one considers the passage to be a description of the Messianic age and applies it to the Gospel era.¹ "These last days," says L. G. A. Roberts, "are between the first coming of our Lord to suffer, and His returning again in Glory."² Several of these expositors point out that although the prophecy began

Judg 3:30; 4:23) or in the future (Deut 31: 17-19). Often it is used as a temporal adverb (Gen 15:18; 26:32; 30:35; 48:20; Exod 5:6; Num 9:6; Deut 27:11; etc.), or as an introduction to specific prophecies which can be eschatological (Isa 4:2; 5:30; 10:20,27; 11:10,11; 12:1,4). Since Isa 2:6-22 is contrasting the judgment day concerning the house of Jacob with the previous picture of the ideal age for Israel, I suggest that *bayyôm hahû'* in these texts does not refer to the same time period as *b'ahârîṭ hayyāmîm*. But it often has the same meaning as *b'ahârîṭ hayyāmîm* in that it refers to events in the indefinite future (Amos 8:3,9,13). For a general discussion of the expression *bayyôm hahû'*, see Peter A. Munch, The Expression *bayyôm hahû'*: Is It an Eschatological terminus technicus? Avhandling utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1936); Horst D. Preuß, Jahwehglaube und Zukunftserwartung, BWANT, 87 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968), 174-5; E. Jenni, "Dⁿ jôm Tag," THAT 1: 707-726; Hans Wildberger, "Jesajas Verstandnis der Geschichte," VT, Sup 9 (1963): 112-3; M. Saebo, "Dⁿ jôm," TWAT, 3:568-570; Simon J. de Vries, Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Time and History in the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975), 57-136.

¹Edward J. Young, The Book of Isaiah, 3 vols., NICOT, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965), 1:98; H. Renckens, The Prophet of the Nearness of God--Isaiah, trans. James M. Boumans (De Pere, WI: St. Norbert Abbey Press, 1969), 85; Ebenezer Henderson, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1857), 18; Delitzsch, Isaiah, 1:113; Lawrence G. A. Roberts, Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah (London: Covenant Pub. Comp., 1931), 8; Albert Barnes, The Prophet Isaiah, 2 vols. (New York: R. Worthington, 1881), 1:93; J. Ridderbos, Isaiah, BSC, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 54.

²Roberts, 8.

to be fulfilled with Christ's first advent, there are aspects of this prophecy which will not be fulfilled until his second advent.¹ As far as the judgment in vs. 4, for instance, is concerned, Roberts says, "This is clearly not yet fulfilled."²

The second interpretation, applies Isa 2:2 only to the period after the second advent. The glory of the Millennial Kingdom is said to be in view.³ In the last days, God will restore his ancient people Israel to their land and will make Jerusalem his capital, from which his laws will go out into all the world.⁴ His original purpose for Israel will ultimately not be thwarted, inspite of "her

¹George Rawlinson, Isaiah, 2 vols., PC (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913), 1:31; Carl W. E. Nægelsbach, The Prophet Isaiah, LC, trans. Samuel T. Lowrie and Dunlop Moore (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 57; H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Isaiah, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), 1:75-78; Joseph A. Alexander, Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, 2 vols. (1846; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1953), 1:98; Alfred Jenour, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (London: R. B. Seeley and Sons, 1830), 79-80; T. R. Birks, Commentary on the Book of Isaiah (London: Rivingtons, 1871), 27; T. K. Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890), 15.

²Rawlinson, 31.

³H. A. Ironside, The Prophet Isaiah (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1952), 19; W. E. Vine, Isaiah (London: Oliphant, 1946), 17; Alfred Martin and John A. Martin, Isaiah: the Glory of the Messiah (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983), 39; Gleason D. Archer, "Isaiah," The Biblical Expositor (Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Co., 1960), 129; William Kelly, An Exposition of the Book of Isaiah (1871; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1979), 100.

⁴Ironside, Isaiah, 19.

present intransigence."¹ In this view, "the latter days" refer to the time after the second advent of Christ.

The third interpretation sees the prophecy as an expression of the writer's faith in the future of the Hebrew religion--that eventually it would conquer the whole world.² O. Kaiser says:

Just as in the creation of the world . . . God revealed himself as the ultimate Lord and judge of the whole world, so he will finally appear in the consummation of the world's confused history as the one who alone can give enduring peace to humanity through his word, which judges men and forgives their sins. The nations, inwardly convinced of God's deity by the new creation, will willingly submit to his decision . . . The nations will voluntarily renounce their arms, by forging their weapons into agricultural instruments, which will help to bring about peace and further the real task which man has been set, of making the earth serviceable (cf. Gen 26:28; Ps 8:5-7).³

Some interpreters of this school of thought think that "Mount Zion is to be physically raised, so as to assume the position assigned to the mythical mountain of the gods, which reached from earth to heaven,"⁴ others

¹Archer, Isaiah, 129.

²H. G. Mitchell, Isaiah (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1897), 111; Eduard König, Das Buch Jesaja (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1926), 57; Henry S. Gehman, "The Ruler of the Universe," Int 11 (1957): 271; John F. A. Sawyer, Isaiah, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), 1:25.

³Kaiser, 28. So also Wildberger, Jesaja, 1:83; G. B. Gray, The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols. ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), 1:45. Joseph Jensen, Isaiah 1-39, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 56-57; G. H. Box, The Book of Isaiah (London: Pitman and Sons, 1908), 31.

⁴Box, 32. So also Sawyer, 1:25; K. Budde, "Zu Jesaja 1-5," ZAW 49 (1931): 186; Gray, Isaiah, 1:45. On

interpret it figuratively--the fame of Yahweh will eclipse that of all other divinities.¹

B. Wiklander considers Isa 2:1-4 as the introduction to Yahweh's lawsuit with the false rulers (Isa 3:1-15) and the apostate nation (Isa 3:16-26).² At the same time Isa 2:1-4 is seen to parallel Isa 4:2-6, thus forming an inclusio of this lawsuit procedure (Isa 2:5-4:1).³ He, therefore, equates "the latter days" in Isa 2:2 with "on that day" (bayyôm hahû') in Isa 4:2 and says, the passage as a whole

had the capacity of being associated by some of the audience with the delayed realization of the covenant promises concerning a glorious future for the elected people of Yahweh.⁴

Wiklander repeatedly places the fulfillment of it into "the remote future"⁵ without further defining it.

G. B. Gray connects this "golden age for Israel"

the mythical mountain of the gods, see Box, 363. Hans Joachim Kraus, Psalmen, BKAT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), 343-345; idem, Worship in Israel (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), 201-205; W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, HNT 21 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926), 283-285.

¹Mitchell, 112; Jensen, 58; König, Jesaja, 55.

²Bertil Wiklander, Prophecy as Literature, Coniectanea Biblica, OT Series 22 (Malmö: Liber Förlag, 1984), 221, 224.

³Ibid., 225.

⁴Ibid., 230.

⁵Ibid., 20, 147, 230, 231, 233.

with the Messianic age;¹ others see no reference to the Messiah.² A number of these scholars consider the passage eschatological³ though not apocalyptic.⁴ No attempt to date these events is made, and the question of fulfillment is left open. "The prophet does not pretend to give us a blueprint of future events," says H. S. Gehman, "nor do we have to assume that the completion of God's plan will take place physically or geographically in Jerusalem."⁵

B^o'ah^arīt hayyāmim is understood to mean no more than "in the future" or "after this" by some.⁶ It is also defined as ". . . the final period of the future so far as it falls within the range of the speaker's perspective,"⁷

¹G. B. Gray, Isaiah, 1:45. So also Harris, "The Last Days," 75; Marti, Jesaja, 24; Staerk, 249. I. W. Slotki (Isaiah, SBB [London: Soncino Press, 1949], 9-10) thinks Isa 2:2-4 describes the Messianic age in the "remote future, when wickedness will disappear and the Kingdom of God be firmly established." If he is an orthodox Jew, he is probably still waiting for the Messiah.

²König, Jesaja, 57-60; Ehrlich, 4:10; Willis, 59.

³Gehman, 271; Budde, "Zu Jesaja 1-5," 185; Dürr, 91; Gross, 319; Otto Procksch, Jesaja I, KAT 9 (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1930), 62; Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja, 4. Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922), 37; J. Vermeylen, Du prophete Isaie a l'apocalyptique, 2 vols. (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1977), 1:121.

⁴Wildberger, Jesaja, 1:82; Kaiser, 29; Volkmar Hertrich, Der Prophet Jesaja 1-12, ATD, 3. Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), 27.

⁵Gehman, 271.

⁶Jensen, 57; Sawyer, 24; Vermeylen, 121.

⁷G. B. Gray, Isaiah, 44.

"at the end of the current dispensation,"¹ "the consummation of history,"² or "the age which follows on the full visible establishment of God's sovereignty in the earth."³ These definitions can either mean that the events described are still future or that they were supposed to have happened at a particular point in Israel's history but, in fact, never did happen.⁴

The first interpretation which considers the Messianic age as the fulfillment of Isa 2:2-4 claims the support of the NT. For example, in the LXX b°'ah°rīt hayyāmīm in Isa 2:2 is translated by the phrase en tais eschatais hēmerais. Exactly the same phrase is found in Acts 2:17 for the expression "the last days." The Greek eschatou tōn hēmerōn for the "last days" in Heb 1:2 is the same phrase which the LXX used to translate b°'ah°rīt hayyāmīm in Num 24:14; Jer 23:20; 49:39; and Dan 10:14.⁵

Thus E. J. Young says: ". . . the New Testament definitely and clearly applies the phrase in this

¹König, Jesaja, 55. He says the first four occurrences of b°'ah°rīt hayyāmīm (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; and 31:29) have only a relative meaning, "aber an seiner fünften Stelle (Jes 2:2) ist jener Ausdruck absolutiert und bedeutet 'am Schlusse der damals laufenden Heilsgeschichte'."

²Kaiser, 26; A. S. Herbert, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, CBC (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 35.

³Box, 32.

⁴Willis, 59.

⁵See also Jas 5:3; 1 Pet 1:5,20; 2 Pet 3:3, and 1 John 2:18.

eschatological sense to that period which began to run its course with the first advent of Jesus Christ."¹ Yet he recognizes that if Isa 2:2 is applied to the NT Church, then "the language of the prophet cannot be interpreted in a consistently literal sense."² The picture in Isa 2:2 becomes only a vehicle for expressing the truths of salvation and blessings which are the characteristics of the age of grace.³ Although this view is very appealing, it does have serious drawbacks. First, the NT never quotes Isa 2:2. Second, the passage must be divided with some portions applying to the time after the first advent and others to the time after the second advent.⁴ Last, the interpretation of the symbols is rather subjective. Young spiritualizes them, e.g., the mountain of the Lord is the Church,⁵ whereas Delitzsch believes that it refers to the literal Mount Moriah.⁶

The second interpretation, which applies Isa 2:2 to the time after the second advent, seems to have the

¹Young, Isaiah, 1:98 See also Delitzsch, Isaiah, 1:113. Leupold (Isaiah, 2:75) also considers "the latter days" as a reference to the Messianic age but applies the particular scene in Isa 2:2 to the time after the return of Christ.

²Ibid., 99.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 107; Delitzsch, Isaiah, 1:116.

⁵Ibid., 102.

⁶Delitzsch, Isaiah, 1:114.

advantage that it takes the text as it reads. It simply projects the fulfillment into the future, since there was none in the past.¹ This view rests on the assumption that God's promises concerning the land and the nation of Israel are unconditional and will find a fulfillment in Palestine at the establishment of the Millennium.²

These interpreters recognize that Israel has been in and out of its land at least twice in its history because of its repeated disobedience, but according to the New Scofield Reference Bible, this, too, was according to God's plan.

The gift of the land is modified by prophecies of three dispossessions and restorations. . . . Two dispossessions and restorations have been accomplished. Israel is now in the third dispersion, from which she will be restored at the return of the Lord as King under the Davidic Covenant.³

The three dispossessions are the Egyptian (Gen 15:13-14), the Babylonian (Jer 25:11-12), and the present

¹Today this view is primarily propagated by Dispensationalists.

²The NSRB has the following comment on Gen 12:2, "God made an unconditional promise of blessings through Abraham's seed to the nation Israel to inherit a specific territory forever," (19) and on Deut 30:3 it says: "It is important to see that the nation has never as yet taken the land under the unconditional Abrahamic Covenant, nor has it ever possessed the whole land" (251). W. W. Barndollar (The Validity of Dispensationalism [Des Plaines, IL: Regular Baptist Press, 1964], 65) states that nowhere in Scripture has the promise in Gen 12:1-3 been revoked, "therefore we must believe that it still is bona fide in its intent. God cannot violate His Word."

³NSRB, 24. See also John F. Walvoord, Israel in Prophecy (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 72-74.

one. For this third dispossession, the NSRB goes back to Deut 28:62-65. It takes this prophecy, disregards the whole Old Testament period, and applies it to the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of A.D. 70.¹

However, where does Scripture state that there were to be three dispossessions? In Deut 28:1-2 God says, ". . . if you will diligently obey the Lord your God . . . to do all His commandments . . . all these blessings shall come upon you." Among these blessings are mentioned victory over the enemy (vs. 7) and prosperity (vs. 11), and in vs. 13 God says, "And the Lord shall make you the head and not the tail, and you only shall be above, and you shall not be underneath, if you will listen to the commandments of the Lord your God. . . ." From vs. 15 on, God shows the other side of the coin, "But it shall come about, if you will not obey the Lord your God, to observe to do all His commandments . . . all these curses shall come upon you and overtake you." Then follows a long list of curses, among them ". . . you shall become a horror, a proverb, and a taunt among all the people where the Lord will drive you" (vs. 37), ". . . and you shall be the tail" (vs. 44), and ". . . the Lord will scatter you among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other end of the earth. . . ." (vs. 64). On what basis can it be said that this prophecy was fulfilled only in A.D. 70? It would seem

¹NSRB, 251.

that the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles were very fitting fulfillments of these prophecies.

To claim that the Babylonian captivity was only a limited one, and, therefore, does not count as fulfillment of Deut 28:64,¹ is not very convincing. The Israelites in the Northern Kingdom were scattered throughout the Assyrian empire after 722 B.C.² A portion of the people of Judah were taken to Babylon during Nebuchadnezzar's reign and a large group fled to Egypt, according to Jer 43:5. All three events must be seen as a fulfillment of Deut 28:64.³

The blessings as well as the curses in Deut 28 were contingent on the obedience or disobedience of Israel (Deut 28:1,15). When Israel failed in its mission to bring to the world its saving knowledge and blessing, God permitted its enemies to lead the people into exile.

Yet God did not forsake his people in captivity. He planned to renew His covenant with them (Jer 31:10-38; Ezek 36:21-38). All that he had promised might yet come to

¹Barndollar, 66.

²2 Kgs 17:6.

³Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon were the principle powers of the then known world. To insist that "from one end of the earth to the other end of the earth" means "worldwide" by today's standard is invalid. If so, one must also take the second half of vs. 64 literally. Have Jews literally served idols of wood and stone during the past 1900 years? They were led into exile because they served these idols (Deut 29:25-28). There was no more idol worship after the Babylonian exile; A.D. 70, therefore, cannot be the primary fulfillment of Deut 28:64.

pass if they would only love and serve him (Jer 33:6-18).¹ Alas, the history of Israel after the exile shows that they still failed to live up to God's expectations. When the Jewish leaders rejected Christ's claim of being Israel's Messiah, he declared: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt 21:43). This meant that Israel as God's elect people would be replaced by a people who would accept Jesus as the Messiah and proclaim His message of the kingdom of God.

Jesus described this new people when he said: "I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 8:11). But "the children of the kingdom (i.e., Israel according to the flesh), shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt 8:12).

H. K. LaRondelle commenting on this passage says:

In this light it becomes evident that Christ did not promise the kingdom of God--the theocracy--to another "generation" of Jews in the far future, as dispensationalist writers favor, but rather to Christ-believing people from all races and nations, "from the east and the west." In short, His Church ("My Church," Matthew 16:18) would replace the Christ-rejecting nation.²

¹F. D. Nichol, ed., The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-1957), 4:31-32.

²Hans K. LaRondelle, The Israel of God in Prophecy, AUM, vol. 13 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 101. See also Oswald T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub.

Decades before the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities God showed Israel through his prophets, including Isaiah, what he wanted them to become and to have. Isaiah's second sermon (Isa 2-4) begins with a lucid description of the ideal future kingdom and its impact upon the nations (2:1-4).¹ In the future times of the restored kingdom, the benefits of the true religion would be extended to all people. Worship at the temple on Mount Zion would be so attractive that people from far and near would come to participate in it. It would excite a deep spiritual interest everywhere and the effect of Israel's influence would be to put an end to wars and to prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah. In regard to Isa 40-66, which is thematically similar to Isa 2:2-4, H. K. LaRondelle says:

More than any other prophet's words, Isaiah's predictive prophecies of chapters 40-66 stand out as the great promises of Israel's restoration after the Assyrian-Babylonian exile. In these accumulating assurances of Israel's gathering out of the great dispersion, the prophetic focus is not exclusively on the physical descendants of Jacob who are committed to worship Yahweh. Isaiah envisions that among postexilic

Co., 1945), 78.

¹Although there is no direct reference to the Messiah in this chapter, the parallels to 9:1-7 seem to indicate that there is some connection between this ideal future kingdom and the appearance of the Messiah. Most commentators place these events into the Messianic era, but the text is not unequivocal. It can also refer to the time prior to the Messianic kingdom.

Israel, many non-Israelites would be gathered who have chosen to worship the God of Israel.¹

It is important to remember that all the restoration promises given to the Israelites² were given in anticipation of their return from captivity.³ They do not apply to any resurrection of the Jewish theocracy in the future.⁴ The promises of national greatness and prosperity were conditional,⁵ they were dependent on the obedience of the people.⁶ The condition was not met; therefore, the blessings never materialized in the way God had planned it for literal Israel.

W. Kelly argues that "when prophecy is made conditional, its true character is annulled."⁷ Yet when a promise like Deut 28 is introduced with an "if . . . then" statement, no amount of reinterpretation can turn it into an unconditional promise. The true character of a prophecy

¹LaRondelle, 87. E. G. White (Prophets and Kings [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1917], 703) says that the covenant promises were to have "met fulfillment in large measure during the centuries following the return of the Israelites from the land of their captivity."

²Isa 10:24-34; 14:1-7; 61:4-11; Jer 16:14-16; 23:3-8; 29:10-13; 30:3-12; Ezek 34:11-16 etc.

³Nichol, ABC, 32.

⁴Against Walvoord, Israel in Prophecy, 120-121; Barndollar, 69-70; NSRB, 714.

⁵White, 704.

⁶Deut 28:1 clearly shows the condition, ". . . if you will diligently obey. . . ."

⁷Kelly, Isaiah, 27.

is established by taking into account its total picture.

Isa 2:2-4 points to a future age in which the present course of history will be changed and a new beginning will be made. In this future age, Jerusalem will reach the zenith of its importance and influence of which the Davidic and Solomonic era was but a faint glimmer. G. F. Hasel, speaking on Isaiah's eschatology, says that the future time is but a return to the ideal past, "Heilszeit and Urzeit correspond to each other."¹ But the ideal age, according to Isa 2, will be much more than the past ever was.

The third view seems closest to the truth, though I differ from most scholars in this group in one important aspect. Isa 2:2-4 is not simply the writer's hope for the future, but what God had planned for Israel after the exile, if the nation had fulfilled the condition of obedience.

J. T. Willis lists five points which suggest that the prophecy of Isa 2:2-4 was expected to be fulfilled within OT times. (a) He says, the spiritual exaltation of the temple mountain in Jerusalem in the eyes of the nations of the world is in harmony with other OT texts (e.g., Isa 19:16-25; 43:8-13; 60:1-7; Jer 3:17; 12:14-17; 16:19-21; Zeph 2:11; 3:9; Zech 8:20-23; 14:16-19). (b) The

¹Hasel, "The Origin and Early History of the Remnant Motif in Ancient Israel," 324. Idem, The Remnant, AUM, vol. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972), 255.

exaltation of the temple mountain in Mic 4:1 stands in contrast to its envisioned destruction in Mic 3:12. If the temple mountain in Mic 3:12 refers to the physical mountain in Jerusalem, so must the other in Mic 4:1. (c) The beating of swords into plowshares has not been realized thus far.

Apparently this dream belongs to that group of OT hopes which were never fulfilled and never will because God's people are unfaithful to him (cf. the principle underlying this in Jer 18:7-10 and note a specific example of it in Jonah 3:4,10).¹

(d) Isaiah says the realization of the prophecy depends on the "'house of Jacob' (not the church or Christians) walking in the light of the Lord (Isa 2:5)."² (e) "The contexts of Isa 2 and Mic 4 suggest that *be'acharith hayyamim* refers to the same general period as *bayyom hahu'*, 'in that day' (cf. Isa 2:11,17,20; Mic 4:6; 5:10)."³

We may conclude that *b'aharit hayyamim* in Isa 2:2 is eschatological in the sense that the ideal future kingdom which should have come after the exile, if Israel had remained true to God, would have issued into a golden

¹Willis, 59. Isa 2:2-4 has often been used to support Postmillennialism (Loraine Boettner, The Millennium [Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958], 25, 342. Roderick Campbell, Israel and the New Covenant [Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1954], 90-91), but to wrench the prophecy out of its immediate context (the future of literal Israel) and apply it only to spiritual Israel in the future is doing violence to the text.

²Ibid., 60.

³Ibid.

age in which God's plan with Israel would have been realized and at the end of which the Messiah would have appeared.¹

Mic 4:1

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים יְהוָה יֵרֵד מִבְּיַת יְהוָה
 וְנִבְנוּ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא הוּא מִגְבְּעָה
 וְנִבְנוּ עָלֶיהָ עָמִים

And it will come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of Yahweh will be established as

¹On the basis of Lev 26, Deut 28 and similar texts I believe that ethnic and local predictions concerning Israel were conditional. Any fulfillment of these prophecies in the time after Christ will be a fulfillment on the spiritual level, e.g., the prophecies in Isa 65 and 66 will be fulfilled on the new earth but without the literal geographical, national or human aspects like "Tarshish, Pul, and Lud" (Isa 66:19) or death (Isa 65:20). This does not mean that the coming of the Messiah was in any way conditional on the obedience of Israel. The Messiah was promised to Adam and Eve (Gen 3:15) long before Israel existed. In fact, the Messiah came in spite of Israel's disobedience, but his reception was different from what it should have been (John 1:11). The prophets frequently tell us that it was not God's plan that Israel should have experienced repeated apostasies and the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities (Jer 3:14,22; Ezek 18:23; Hos 6:1; Amos 5:4-6 etc.). Isa 2 and similar passages indicate that God had a different history in mind for Israel. If His people had remained loyal to God they would have been "the head and not the tail" (Deut 28:13), they would have evangelized the world, prepared the nations for the coming of the Messiah and John 1:11 would never have been written. The Messiah would still have died for the sins of mankind, but Israel as a nation would not have been rejected. Conditionality in this context applies only to the material and spiritual blessing God had promised to Israel. See further, William G. Johnson, "Conditionality in Biblical Prophecy with Particular Reference to Apocalyptic," 70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy, DARCOM vol. 3, edited by F. B. Holbrook (Washington: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 259-287.

the head of the mountains. And it will be raised above the hills, and peoples will stream to it.¹

Since this is almost an exact parallel to Isa 2:2, the question of the origin of the oracle has been the subject of scholarly debate for a long time.² Most commentators today believe that both Isaiah and Micah were quoting from an anonymous earlier writer or that the passage was later interpolated into both books.³ The origin of the oracle does not seem to play a decisive role for the expression under investigation.

There are three textual differences which, however, are hardly noticeable in translation.⁴ This poem of glorious hope for Jerusalem (Mic 4:1-4) is preceded by a long passage with major judgment motifs concerning Judah and Jerusalem (chaps. 1-3).

The immediate context in Mic 4 refers to exile and return from Babylon (vs. 10), and what God had planned for

¹For textual comments, see Isa 2:2, pp. 227-228.

²For an extended review of the question see G. B. Gray, *Isaiah*, 1:42-44; Rehm, 244-245; Henri Cazelles, "Qui aurait visé, à l'origine, Isaie 2:2-5?" *VT* 30 (1980): 409-420.

³For example, Leupold, *Isaiah*, 1:75; Kaiser, 25; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:77; G. G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Book of Isaiah," *IB* 12 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 5: 180; Herbert, 34.

⁴The Hebrew text of Micah has the word "established" after "the mountain of the house of the Lord," Isaiah has it before. Micah adds the pronoun "hû'" for emphasis in "It [hû'] will be raised." In the last phrase Isaiah uses *kol haggôyim*, "all the nations," whereas Micah has *°ammîm*, "peoples."

Judah after the return is described in the setting of "the latter days." "Jerusalem was to be the focal point of humanity, and its supremacy was to be acknowledged by all."¹ Thus, b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm in this context seems to refer to the future which reaches down to the times of the Messiah who is announced in Mic 5.

Hos 3:5

אַחַר יָשׁבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבִקְשׁוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם
וְאֶת־דָּוִד מֶלְכָם וְסִחְרוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְאֶל־טוֹבוֹ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים׃

Afterwards the sons of Israel will return and seek Yahweh their God and David their king; and they will come trembling² to Yahweh and to his goodness in the latter days.³

Hosea, the eighth-century prophet of the northern

¹Leslie C. Allen, The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976), 324.

²Pāḥad 'el yhwh "come trembling to Yahweh" means "with deep penitence," as in Mic 7:17. LXX has ekstēsontai epi tō kuriō "shall be amazed at the Lord."

³Some scholars see the whole verse or at least the two phrases, "David their king" and "in the latter days," as later additions. See William R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905), 216. Hans W. Wolff, Hosea, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 57; Jörg Jeremias, Der Prophet Hosea, ATD 24/I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983), 57-58. But Grace I. Emmerson (Hosea an Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective, JSOT, Supplement Series 28 [Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1984], 102-103) has correctly pointed out that the deprivation described in vs. 4 concerns the political and the cultic sphere. The restoration, therefore, should also embrace these two aspects. In the present form, vs. 5 satisfies this requirement, but if the reference to the Davidic king is excised, the text fails to do so.

kingdom, is told to marry a wife of harlotry and have children of harlotry (1:2).¹ After Gomer has borne three children, whose names² are symbols of God's judgments on Israel, she leaves her husband and finally ends up on the slave market.³ In chap. 3 Hosea is told to buy her back. Being once more in legal possession of her, Hosea at first isolated her so that she could not "play the harlot," and he himself refrained from going in to her (3:3). Vs. 4 explains the actions of vs. 3: "As Gomer was deprived of her conjugal rights as a wife, so faithless Israel would be deprived of her civil and religious privileges"⁴ for many days. This is the context of our passage which states that

¹On Hosea's marriage see: H. H. Rowley, "The Marriage of Hosea," in Men of God, Studies in OT History and Prophecy (London: Thomas Nelson, 1963), 66-99; W. Rudolph, Hosea, KAT (Gütersloh: Gert Mohn, 1966), 40-49; Stephan Bittner, Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea, Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975); James L. Mays, Hosea, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 22-27; Harper, 206-211; Wolff, Hosea, 13-17; R. Gordis, "Hosea's Marriage and Message" HUCA 25 (1954): 9-35; H. Schmidt, "Die Ehe des Hosea," ZAW 42 (1924): 245-272; A. Heermann, "Ehe und Kinder des Propheten Hosea," ZAW 40 (1922): 287-312; F. C. Fensham, "The Marriage Metaphor in Hosea for the Covenant Relationship between the Lord and his People (Hos 1:2-9)," JNSL 12 (1984): 71-78; Joseph Schreiner, "Hosea's Ehe, ein Zeichen des Gerichts," Bib.Z 21 (1977): 163-183; H. L. Ellison, "The Message of Hosea in the Light of His Marriage," EvQ 41 (1969): 3-9.

²"Jezreel" meaning "God scatters"; "Lo-ruhamah" meaning "no pity" or "no mercy"; "Lo-ammi" meaning "not my people."

³Wolff (Hosea, 61) thinks she may have become someone's personal slave or a temple prostitute.

⁴D. Miles Bennett, Hosea: Prophet of God's Love (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975), 45.

"afterwards," after a period of time not further specified, the sons of Israel would return to the Lord their God and to David their king.¹ All this would take place in "the latter days."

T. K. Cheyne understands Hos 3:3 as referring to the captivity of the ten tribes and "the latter days" as the time after the captivity when they return to serve their God.² J. L. Mays thinks the Judean redactor added this phrase "to note that this return belongs to the final period of history."³ Others are less specific and take "the latter days" as an expression for "future"⁴ or simply as "later" from the viewpoint of the prophet.⁵

Although Hos 3:5 is not printed in poetic form in BHK or BHS, it seems to manifest a synonymous parallelism

¹The return to Yahweh is several times connected with the service to David. See Jer 30:9; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25.

²T. K. Cheyne, Hosea, CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1889), 60-62. Many scholars pay little attention to "the latter days" in vs. 5 since they see it as a later amplification of the text reflecting exilic and postexilic salvation thinking. For example, Bruce Vawter, Amos, Hosea, Micah, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981), 90; D. Ryan, "Hosea," A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1969), 681; Harper, Amos and Hosea, 224. Wolff, Hosea, 63; Rudolph, Hosea, 94; J. S. Ward, Hosea, A Theological Commentary (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966), 63-64.

³Mays, 60.

⁴Emmerson, 102.

⁵D. M. Bennett, Hosea, 47.

of thought. The two elements of the parallelism may be read as follows:

Part A: Afterwards the sons of Israel will return
 Part B: In the latter days they will come trembling
 Part A: and seek Yahweh their God and David their
 king
 Part B: to Yahweh and to his goodness (expressed in
 the Davidic kingship).¹

There is also a chiastic structure in this verse:

A Afterwards
 B the sons of Israel will return . . .
 B¹ they will come trembling . . .
 A¹ In the latter days.

G. I. Emerson notes that in this verse 'aḥar "afterwards" is parallel with 'aḥ^arīṭ hayyāmīm, "the latter days."² To separate these two expressions and make them apply to two different events would mean that first the Israelites return (šwb) to Yahweh and later they come trembling (phd) to Yahweh. Why should a converted people --šūb in this context implies a true conversion³--come

¹See also Francis I. Andersen and David N. Freedman, Hosea, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1980), 307.

²Emerson, 104.

³V. P. Hamilton, "שׁוּב (shūb) (re)turn," TWOT, 2:909. See also Mays, 59. Andersen and Freedman (307) observe: "There is no indication of the means that Yahweh will use to bring about this return. The whole chapter emphasizes the inactivity of Yahweh, in contrast to c 2. In other prophetic writings the return of Israel to Yahweh is matched by Yahweh's turning back to his people (Zech 1:3; Mal 3:7). There are two biblical traditions on this point. One is illustrated by Deut 30:1-10 and 1 Kings 8:4-5; the people's repentance in exile is the turning point for recovery of their lost relation with their God. The other tradition copes more drastically with the inability of the people to turn, and ascribes all the initiative to God; this is illustrated by Ezek 36:24-31. Here the

trembling to Yahweh at a later time? Hos 3:5 speaks of one "returning to Yahweh" in the future. The question is, to what time period does "afterwards" or "in the latter days" refer?

Interpreters, who believe that there will be a general conversion of the Jews in the time of the end, apply Hos 3:5 to this event.¹ "The latter days" stand for the Millennial Kingdom and King David is the Messiah. "In that day, when Messiah takes the reins of government into his hands, Israel will flock to Jehovah and recognize Him once more as their God."²

There are others who see it differently. E. B. Pusey begins "the latter days" with the NT times (since then we are living in the last dispensation of God) and says, "The prophecy has all along been fulfilled during this period to those, whether of the ten or of the two tribes, who have been converted to Christ, since God ended

people are brought back, unrepentant, by God himself; they are cleansed, spiritually transformed, called "my people," given grain and all good things (cf. 2:24), and reestablished in the land . . . Repentance is the result, not the condition, of Yahweh's love. Hosea's cryptic remarks cannot be tied to either tradition."

¹Charles L. Feinberg, The Minor Prophets (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), 27; Frederick A. Tatford, The Minor Prophets (1974; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publisher 1982), 51; Derek Kidner, Love to the Loveless. The Message of Hosea, The Bible Speaks Today (Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1981), 44; C. F. Keil, The Minor Prophets, 2 vols., BCOT (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1858), 1:72; C. Jerdan, Hosea, PC (1913; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977), 93.

²Tatford, Minor Prophets, 51.

their temple-worship."¹ J. Calvin goes even further back and has "the latter days" beginning at the return of the people from Babylon. They will last until the coming of Christ.²

For the following reasons it may be best to take the "many days" in Hos 3:4 to begin with the Assyrian captivity in 721 B.C.: (1) Hosea lived and worked in the northern kingdom. (2) He prophesied just before the downfall of Israel. (3) Any faithful Israelite languishing under the Assyrian oppression would have connected the "many days" with the events experienced. They were meant to end with the return from the Babylonian captivity after 539 B.C. God expected his people not only to return to Palestine but also to him. To a certain extent, there was a return to Yahweh,³ but Hos 3:5 seems to envision something much greater than what happened after 539 B.C.

The question of fulfillment centers around the

¹E. B. Pusey, The Minor Prophets, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), 1:45. See also Homer Hailey, A Commentary on the Minor Prophets (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972), 146.

²John Calvin, Commentaries on the "Twelve Minor Prophets" 2 vols., trans. John Owen (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950), 1:136.

³The civil and religious institutions of which they were deprived during "the many days" (Hos 3:4) were to a certain extent reinstated after the Babylonian exile. Zerubbabel, the grandson of king Jehoiachin of Judah (1 Chr. 3:17-19), and Jeshua, the high priest, reinstated the daily sacrificial service, and after some delay, rebuilt the temple (Ezra 3:1-13; 5:1-6:15). Zerubbabel was also the first governor of post-exilic Judah (Hag 2:2).

identity of "David their king." Is he the resurrected David in the Millennial kingdom, simply a descendant of David, e.g., Zerubbabel, or the Messiah? Biblical evidence seems to favor the last solution.¹ And the history of the Jews seems to support this idea. In Rabbinic Judaism, "David was regarded as the prototype of perfect kingship (Ezek 34:23; 37:24) and the Targum of Jonathan identifies him here with the King Messiah."²

Thus, if our suggestions are sound, then Hosea looks beyond the exile to "the latter days," i.e., the eschatological age of the Messiah, when Israel would be expected to return wholeheartedly to Yahweh and his Messiah.

Jer 23:20

לֹא יָשׁוּב אֶת־יָדָה
 עַד־עֲשֵׂתוּ וְעַד־הִקִּימוּ מִזְמוֹת לִבּוֹ
 בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים הַתְּבוֹנְנוּ כִּי בִינָה:

The anger³ of Yahweh will not turn back until he has

¹Jer 30:9; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25. In the NT the Messiah is called the son of David (Matt 21:9, 15) and he called himself "the offspring of David" (Rev 22:16).

²Tatford, Minor Prophets, 51.

³The term 'ap in Hebrew refers first of all to the nose (Deut 33:10), the nostrils (Gen 2:7), as well as to the whole face (Gen 19:1), BDB, 69; HAL, 74. Through the act of breathing, emotions can be expressed, and since the nose dilates in anger, 'ap also expresses the anger of man and God. God's anger manifests itself in a consuming flame (Jer 17:4; Isa 30:27; 65:5). It is a raging storm which sweeps everything away (Jer 30:23; Isa 30:30). It is a bitter intoxicating drink which makes men reel and stagger (Jer 25:15; Isa 51:17,28). Throughout the Bible, God's

performed and carried out¹ the intents² of his heart. In the latter days you will clearly understand it.³

anger is thought of as the reaction of Deity to sin and as such it is free from the imperfections always associated with it in men. R. P. C. Hanson ("The Wrath of God," ExpTim 58 [1946-47]: 218) says: "God's wrath is the other side of God's love seen in relation to one who has rejected God's love; and without God's wrath His love would be the love of a god who was unworthy to be the Creator and Ruler and Redeemer . . . of the universe." See further, Leon Morris, "The Wrath of God," ExpTim 63 (1951-52): 142-145; John L. McKenzie, "Vengeance Is Mine," Scrip 12 (1960): 33-39; J. Boehmer, "Zorn," ZAW 44 (1926): 320-322; S. Erlands-son, "The Wrath of YHWH," TynB 23 (1972): 111-116; Herbert M. Haney, The Wrath of God in the Former Prophets (New York: Vantage Press, 1960); A. T. Hanson, The Wrath of the Lamb (London: S. P. C. K., 1957); J. Bergmann, "אָנאַפּ 'ānaph," TDOT, 1:348-350; E. Johnson, "אָנאַפּ 'ānaph," TDOT, 1:350-360; R. V. G. Tasker, The Biblical Doctrine of the Wrath of God (London: Tyndale Press, 1951); Paul Volz, Das Dämonische in Jahwe (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1924); Walter Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 2 vols., OTL., trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 1:258-269; Helmer Ringgren, "Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns," Tradition und Situation, Schilderungen zur AT Prophetie, Festschrift für A. Weiser, ed. E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), 107-113; Abraham J. Heschel, The Prophets, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 2:59-86.

¹Hiph. of qwm, literally "cause to stand," "establish" (BDB, 879; KBL, 833). In Scripture it is sometimes used to express two aspects of God's actions in history: (1) God raises up people or nations to direct the course of his people (Deut 18:15,18; Jer 6:17; 29:15; Amos 6:14; Hab 1:6); (2) history itself is the work of Yahweh. He makes sure that the promises to the fathers (Deut 8:18) to David (2 Sam 7:25), and the words of his prophets (1 Sam 3:12; 1 Kgs 12:15; Jer 28:6; 29:10; 30:24; 33:14) are fulfilled. Amsler, "אָפּ qūm aufstehen," THAT, 2:640.

²M^czimmāh "purpose, device" (BDB, 273; KBL, 510). When referring to men the word usually means evil plans and schemes (Gen 11:6; Ps 10:2,4; 21:12; Jer 11:15). Where God is the subject, it is used mainly in regard to God's purposes in judgment against wicked nations or men (Jer 4:28; 30:24; Lam 2:17; 51:11-12; Zech 1:6; 8:14). H. Wolf, "אָפּ (zāmam) purpose, devise, consider," TWOT, 1:244.

³Instead of an infinitive absolute, we find the noun bīnāh for emphasis. LXX reads noesousin "they will

This text belongs to a passage (23:9-40) in which Jeremiah, who prophesied during the last few decades before Jerusalem fell in 586 B.C., upbraids the false prophets in Judah. In vss. 9-15 he exposes their ungodly manner of life ("adultery and walking in falsehood") and in the following verses (16-22) he denounces them as impostors ("they speak a vision of their own imagination").

Within this context Jeremiah repudiates their message, "Calamity will not come upon you" (vs. 17). "No," says Jeremiah, "the storm of the Lord has already gone forth and it will not stop or return until it has accomplished what it was designed to do." And then follows the sentence, "b'ah^ari^t hayyāmim you will clearly understand it." When are these "latter days"?

Most commentators place the oracle in Jer 23:9-40 in the time of Zedekiah¹ just prior to the fall of _____
understand it."

¹C. F. Keil, The Prophecies of Jeremiah, 2 vols., BCOT, trans. David Patrick (reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), 1:325; John Bright, Jeremiah, AB, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1965), 155; J. A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980), 498; H. Freedman, Jeremiah, SBB (London: Soncino Press, 1949), 164; R. K. Harrison, Jeremiah and Lamentations, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), 119; Helmut Lamparter, Prophet wider Willen, Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1964), 203; A. W. Streane, Jeremiah and Lamentations, CBSC (London: C. J. Clay, 1891), 147; Charles L. Feinberg, "Jeremiah," The Expositor's Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 160; Irving L. Jensen, Jeremiah, Prophet of Judgment (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), 71; Robert P. Carroll, The Book of Jeremiah, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 460-461; W. L. Holladay, A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 1-25,

Jerusalem.¹ The "storm of the Lord" that "has gone forth" would in this view be the judgment of the Southern kingdom in 586 B.C.² or the captivity as a whole,³ and "the latter days" would be the time of or after this judgment. Then the Jews would clearly understand that the calamities which had come upon them were the divine judgment upon their sins.

In days to come a greater and nobler vision of God and his purposes would open their eyes to the truth of what was now being proclaimed to them. They would learn that only through the judgment now to befall them could they be drawn into a new and deeper relationship with God and realize as never before what their vocation to be his people meant and entailed for them and the world.⁴

This seems to be a widely accepted interpretation of the text and the majority of the commentators, therefore, interpret "the latter days" as a non-eschatological,

Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 634.

¹C. W. E. Nägelsbach (The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, LC, trans. S. S. Asbury [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915], 207) thinks the king addressed is Jehoiakim. Historical-critical scholars do not date the chapter since they believe it is a collection of sayings which, at least partly (vss. 23-40), stems from a Deuteronomic author after the time of Jeremiah, e.g., E. W. Nicholson, Jeremiah 1-25, CBC (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 192. But there is no unanimity in regard to what is from Jeremiah and what is not. D. P. Volz (Studien zum Text des Jeremia [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1920], 194) begins the later additions with vs. 19, whereas J. P. Hyatt ("Jeremiah," IB, 5:989-990) says the passage "shows no evidence of Deuteronomic editing."

²J. A. Thompson, Jeremiah, 498; Carroll, 461.

³Unger, 2:1404.

⁴Nicholson, Jeremiah 1-25, 198.

non-messianic future.¹ But there may be other considerations. The fact that this prophecy was fulfilled through the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and the Babylonian captivity does not ipse facto make it non-eschatological. The judgment which Jeremiah announced was for the people of Judah an eschatological event within their history. It was a "day of the Lord" for them (Jer 25:29-33). Thus, one may designate it "eschatological."

A few interpreters apply "the latter days" to New Testament times when the judgments of God shall be fully understood, because Israel's rejection shall become fully manifest.² The judgments, according to Th. Laetsch, are not "merely the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah, but also the purification of the people by means of judgments and

¹T. K. Cheyne, Jeremiah, PC (London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913), 516; J. A. Thompson, Jeremiah, 498; F. Cauley and A. R. Millard, "Jeremiah" The New Bible Commentary Revised (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), 644; Feinberg, Jeremiah, 167; Bright, 152; Streane, 164; Lamparter, 212; Nägelsbach, Jeremiah, 213; Wilhelm Rudolph, Jeremia, HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947), 131; A. W. Blackwood, Commentary on Jeremiah (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1977), 177; Lipinski, 450; Gross, 319; Willis, (61) believes that "since in both passages the prophet's audience will understand the full significance of Yahweh's wrath, the 'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm which he envisions must come within the lifetime of his hearers." M. F. Unger (2:1404), a staunch Dispensationalist, agrees that "the latter days" here refer to the Babylonian captivity, but adds: "The ultimate scope of this prediction embraces the final Dispersion and regathering of Israel, and their conversion to the Messiah at the second advent."

²Theo Laetsch, Bible Commentary: Jeremiah (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1965), 199; Keil, Jeremiah, 1:360.

the final glorification of His kingdom."¹ Thus Keil says, in a similar vein, that it refers to the Messianic future, the last period of the world's history, which began with Christ.² But in view of the context "the latter days" were "the last days" for Israel as a monarchy. Henceforth, Israelites were to serve other nations instead of a king from their own midst. Accordingly, "in the days to come" (b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm), after judgment has been meted out, the nation would perceive the truth of Jeremiah's words and warnings.

Jer 30:24

עַל־אִשׁוֹב־חַרֹּן־אָפְרָיִם
 עַד־עֲשֵׂתֵי־יַעֲרֻקִימוֹ מִזְמוֹת לְבָבוֹ
 בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים הַתְּבוֹנֵנוּ כֹּה׃

Yahweh's fierce³ anger will not turn back until he has performed and carried out the intents of his heart. In the latter days you will understand it.

This text is almost a verbatim repetition of Jer 23:20.⁴ Jer 30 and 31 are often called "The Book of

¹Keil, Jeremiah, 1:360.

²Ibid. Harris, ("The Last Days," 75) and R. K. Harrison (Jeremiah and Lamentations, 121) think a Messianic interpretation is possible but not necessary. Staerk (249) sees only the Messianic age in this text.

³Harôn, literally "burning" (BDB, 354, KBL, 332). It always refers to God's anger and usually precedes 'ap (L. J. Wood, "חָרָה (hārâ) burn, be kindled," TWOT, 1:322).

⁴At the beginning of the verse the word "fierce" (harôn) has been added to intensify the idea of a judgment in wrath. By dropping the word bînâh at the end of the verse, less is made of the acuteness of perception (Keil,

Consolation."¹ Jeremiah, in the name of Yahweh, announces the restoration of Israel. The captives, whose agony is described in vs. 6, will be brought home again (vs. 10). The city will be rebuilt (vs. 18). Once more Israel will be God's people (vs. 22). In the process, God will destroy the enemy (vs. 8) and establish a ruler from their midst over them which he calls "David the King" (vs. 9).

At the end of this restoration passage, our judgment text appears to indicate that before all this is going to happen, Israel will be punished for its sins. The same thought appears in vs. 11, thus vss. 23 and 24 are not contrary to the general character of the chapter.²

Interpretations of this chapter differ widely. Some apply it to the future restoration of Israel in Palestine, its conversion, and the rule of the Messiah in the Messianic-Davidic kingdom.³ In this case "the latter days" are still future. Other interpreters see only the restoration of literal Israel after the Babylonian

Jeremiah, 2:13).

¹J. Lust, "'Gathering and Return' in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," Le livre de Jeremie, Bibliothika Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (Leuven: University Press, 1981), 131; Harrison, Jeremiah and Lamentation, 133.

²Against Nægelsbach, Jeremiah, 262. See also Lamparter, Prophet wider Willen, 301; E. W. Nicholson, Jeremiah 26-52 (Cambridge: University Press, 1975), 58.

³Feinberg, Jeremiah, 204; Jensen, Jeremiah, 87; Unger, 2:i416-1419.

captivity,¹ whereas another group looks beyond the restoration of literal Israel to the Messianic kingdom which began with Christ.²

In my view, Jer 30 paints a picture of the future of Israel similar to the one in Isa 2. It describes the ideal kingdom as it was envisioned after the return from exile. The people were to accept their divine destiny outlined in Deut 28:1-14. Accordingly, as in Jer 23:20, "the latter days" refer to the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and beyond when Israel would recognize the dimension and the validity of the judgment of God upon them.

Jer 48:47

וְיִשְׁבְּתִי שְׁבוּת־מוֹאָב בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים נְאֻם־יְהוָה
 עַד־הַיּוֹם מְשֻׁמֵּט מוֹאָב:

Yet I will restore the captives³ of Moab in the latter days, declares Yahweh. Thus far the judgment of Moab.⁴

¹Blackwood, Jeremiah, 211; E. W. Nicholson, Jeremiah 26-50, 52-58; Cheyne, Jeremiah, 2:1-3; J. A. Thompson, Jeremiah, 553-563; Rudolf, Jeremia, 163; Willis, 61; Harris, "The Last Days," 75; Gross, 319.

²Lamparter, 296; Streane, 205; Laetsch, 243; Keil, Jeremiah, 2:6, 11, 12.

³šebūt meaning "captivity" (BDB, 986; KBL, 940) is found 34 times in an idiomatic combination with the verb šûb, "return," to speak of a captivity, which is or will be terminated, e.g., Jer 32:44; 33:7,11; 49:6. G. Cohen, "שָׁבָה (shābā) take captive," TWOT, 2:896.

⁴The LXX omits this verse. H. Seebass (TDOT, 1:211) surmises that is because at the time the LXX was written Moab no longer existed and its fate could no longer

Jer 46-51 comprises a series of oracles announcing judgment upon foreign nations. In Jer 48 the Moabites, who traced their origin to Lot (Gen 19:37) and who were traditional enemies of Israel since the days of the Exodus (Num 25), are told what the future holds for them--disaster upon their cities and inhabitants. All of Jer 48 except the very last verse is a description of calamity, war, destruction, and God's judgment upon Moab. In "the latter days," however, Moab shall be restored again.

Some expositors claim that a territorial restoration of a remnant of Moab in millennial times is promised here.¹ Others think that, as with Egypt (Jer 46:26), the prophecy was limited in time and as circumstances improved for these nations, a later redactor appended a word of hope to these prophecies.² A few suggest that in NT times remnants of Moabites were converted to Christianity and thus the prophecy was fulfilled.³

The history of Moab is not well known, but one can assume that Moab, like Judah, submitted to the Babylonians

be changed.

¹Unger, 2:1455; Feinberg, Jeremiah, 307; H. A. Ironside, Notes on the Prophecies and Lamentations of Jeremiah 3rd ed. (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1943), 264. So also Harrison, Jeremiah and Lamentation, 178, and Solomon B. Freehof, Book of Jeremiah (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1977), 263.

²Rudolph, Jeremia, 235; Lamparter, 238.

³Keil, Jeremiah, 2:235; Laetsch, 340.

when Nebuchadnezzar advanced into Palestine after his victory over Necho at Carchemish in 605 B.C. When Jehoiakim rebelled in 598 B.C., Moab remained loyal and even assisted the Babylonians in subjugating the kingdom of Judah (2 Kgs 24:2).¹ Again in 589, when Zedekiah renounced his allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar, the Moabites remained pro-Chaldean. Yet, subsequently, it seems they did revolt against Babylon (Jer 27:3-6), perhaps because of Nebuchadnezzar's exactions for his building programs.² According to Josephus, the Babylonian king defeated Moab and Ammon in 581 B.C.³ and probably deported a large part of their populations, for "archaeological explorations have shown that Transjordan was largely depopulated before the middle of the 6th century B.C."⁴ The Moabites presumably shared in the return of the various displaced peoples after Cyrus of Persia had conquered Babylon in 539 B.C.⁵ During the time of the Persian rule, Moab, like Edom, fell victim to an invasion of Arab tribes from the desert, "with the result that the

¹Bright, 323.

²A. H. van Zyl, The Moabites (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), 155-156.

³Josephus Jewish Antiquities 10. 9. 7 (trans. R. Marcus, LCL, 6:259).

⁴G. M. Landes, "Ammon," IDB, 4 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 1:112. See also J. A. Thompson, "Moab, Moabites," Illustrated Bible Dictionary, 3 vols. (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 2:1016.

⁵J. Barton Payne, Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), 346.

Moabites eventually lost their identity and merged with the Nabatean Arabs, forming part of the Nabatean kingdom in the time of Christ."¹

Jer 48:47² was probably fulfilled in the return of the displaced Moabites after Cyrus of Persia took control of Babylon in 539 B.C. "The latter days" would then refer to the days of the Persian restoration. Therefore, "in the future" would be an acceptable translation of b'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm in this text.

Jer 49:39

בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים אָשׁוּב אֶת־שְׁבִית עִלָּם נְאֻמְיָהוָה:

In the latter days I will restore the captivity³ of Elam, declares Yahweh.

Again this verse comes at the end of a series of judgment sayings against foreign nations. This time

¹Siegfried H. Horn, Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1960), 728. Cf. I. Eph^al, The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent 9th-5th Centuries B.C. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983).

²Willis (61) sees a typical thought pattern of Jeremiah in this verse. Several times Jeremiah speaks of restoring the fortune of Israel and Judah (30:3, 18; 31:23; 32:44; 33:11,26). In 49:6 he will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites, and there he uses the phrase 'ah^arê ken "after this, afterwards" which appears 48 times in the OT. It is used 4 times as a temporal conjunction or adverb meaning "after" or "afterwards," in connection with common historical events in the past or the future. Only three times (Isa 1:26; Jer 16:16; Joel 3:1) is there a possible eschatological context. In 49:6 the meaning seems to be the same as in Jer 48:47.

³š^obîṭ (CHAL, 358). This reading is supported by the LXX.

against Elam. Commentators have treated it the same way as the word concerning Moab in 48:47. Dispensationalists again apply this verse, as they have the previous passage one, to the Millennium.¹ Yet since Elam (as well as Moab) have long ago disappeared as a people in history, it is difficult to see how this verse can be applied eschatologically to the Millennium.²

Elam with Susa as capital was an important state situated east of Babylon. After a long history of conflict with Assyria, it was conquered by Ashurbanipal ca. 640 B.C. Thereafter, little is known of its history.³ From the Babylonian Chronicles we learn that Nabopolassar after defeating the Assyrians restored to Susa the Elamite gods captured by the Assyrians during the campaigns of 642-639 B.C. This was to acknowledge the help he had received from Elam.⁴

According to a fragmentary text of the Babylonian Chronicles, Nebuchadnezzar in his ninth year (596 B.C.) clashed with the king of Elam and defeated him.⁵ That Elam

¹ Ironside, Jeremiah, 270; Feinberg, Jeremiah, 315.

² For example, Unger 2:1459; Feinberg, Jeremiah, 315; Freehof, 271.

³ Bright, 338.

⁴ D. J. Wiseman, Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), 8:51, lines 15-17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 73, lines 16-20. The signs which remain point to the (unnamed) king of Elam (*ibid.*, 36).

was a province of Nebuchadnezzar's empire after that time is indicated in Dan 8:2 where reference is made to Shushan in the province of Elam. After the overthrow of Babylon, Elam was absorbed into the Persian empire.¹

In the context of Jer 49,² there is little doubt that the enemies of Elam (vs. 37) are the Chaldeans who were used as God's agents. In this case, "the latter days," as in Jer 48:47, would then be the time of the Persian restoration.³ E. A. Leslie, who thinks vs. 39 is a later addition, says vs. 39 "reflects the change experienced by Elam when it had come under the power of the Persians."⁴ "In the future" would again be an acceptable translation of b^e'ah^ari^t hayyāmim in this instance.

Ezek 38:16

וְעָלִיתָ עַל-עַמִּי¹⁶
 יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּעֹנֵן לְבָסִית הָאָרֶץ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים תִּהְיֶה וְהִבְאִיתִיךָ
 עַל-אֲרָצִי לְמַעַן דַּעַת הַגּוֹיִם אֲתִי בְהַקְדִּישִׁי בְךָ לְעֵינֵיהֶם גּוֹי :

¹Horn, 300. On Elam and Susa see Pierre Amiet, Elam (Auvers-sur-Oise: Archée Editeur, 1966); W. Hinz, The Lost World of Elam (New York: New York University, 1972); L. de Meyer, H. Gasche, and F. Vallat, eds., Fragmenta Historiae Aelamicae (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1986); F. Vallat, Suse et l'Elam (Paris: A.D.P.F., 1980).

²In 49:30 Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned as God's agent.

³Payne, Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy, 347.

⁴Elmer A. Leslie, Jeremiah (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 209, n. 5.

You will come up against¹ my people Israel like a cloud² to cover the land. In the latter days I shall bring you against my land that the nations shall know me when I am sanctified before their eyes through you, O Gog.³

Ezekiel 38 and 39 constitute a continuous prophecy which describes how Gog of the land of Magog invades Israel from the north with his hordes to destroy the people after they have returned from exile and settled in their land again. But the Lord vindicates His holiness by wiping out the invaders, so that their bodies are scattered on the mountains of Israel to be a prey for wild beasts. It takes seven months to bury their remains in the valley of Hamongog and their weapons provide the people of Israel with firewood for seven years.⁴

Identification of Gog with a historical figure has often been attempted, but with little success.⁵ Many

¹cālāh c'al is frequently used to describe the action of going into war against somebody, e.g., Jdg 18:9; 1 Kgs 20:22; 2 Kgs 12:18; 17:3; 18:13; 23:29; Isa 36:1, etc. H. F. Fuhs, "גלג cālāh," TWAT, 6:92.

²Possibly a reference to the shadow a cloud casts. Ezekiel compares it to a military horde invading the land. See also vs. 9. R. B. Allen, "גלג (c'ānān) cloud, cloudy," TWOT, 2:684-685.

³That God's holiness is demonstrated through the destruction of a nation is also indicated in Lev 10:3, Num 20:13, and Ezek 28:22.

⁴John B. Taylor, Ezekiel, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969), 242-243.

⁵Front runner is the Lydian monarch Gyges who appears on Assyrian monuments as Gugu, corresponding as closely as is possible to the Hebrew Gog. John Skinner, The Book of Ezekiel, ExpB (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908), 369. On the historical background of Ezek 38

commentators, therefore, consider him a symbolic figure, the personified head of the forces of evil which are intent on destroying the people of God.¹

The context of our passage describes the invasion by Gog, and vs. 16 explains that it is actually God who brings Gog against Israel, not to destroy his people but to vindicate his honor among the nations. Gog becomes the object through which God manifests his great power in the sight of the nations and thus they recognize his sovereignty.²

How are we to understand these chapters? M. F. Unger says the restoration promises (chaps. 33-37) of Ezekiel comforted the exiles and encouraged them to trust that in the new era ahead restoration from Babylon could be hoped for--thus, ". . . presaging an ultimate far greater

see E. Yamauchi, Foes from the Northern Frontier (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 19-27.

¹Taylor, Ezekiel, 244; Carl G. Howie, The Book of Ezekiel. The Book of Daniel, LBC (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1961), 75; Keith W. Carley, Ezekiel, CBC (Cambridge: University Press, 1974), 255; Nichol, ABC, 4:704; Patrick Fairbairn, Ezekiel (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1876), 422; S. Fisch, Ezekiel, SBB (London: Soncino Press, 1950), 253; Skinner, The Book Ezekiel, 370. In Jewish eschatology Gog and Magog are the tribes who shall lead all nations in an attack upon Israel prior to the coming of the Messiah. "Sanhedrin," The Babylonian Talmud, 2 vols., trans. H. Freedman (London: Soncino Press, 1935), 1:630, n.1. For more detailed study, see W. F. Albright, "Gog and Magog," JBL 43 (1924): 378-385. J. D. Myres, "Gog and the Danger from the North in Ezekiel," PEFQS 64 (1932): 213-219.

²Ezek 38:23.

regathering from a final worldwide scattering to the earthly Davidic Kingdom (2 Sam 7:8-15; Ezek 33-48)."¹

It is this ultimate fulfillment which he sees in chaps. 38 and 39. These events in "the latter days" will take place "in the first half of Daniel's seventieth week, when Israel will be at peace under a seven-year security pact with the head of the revived Roman power."²

At the other end of the theological spectrum, we find K. W. Carley who believes that the restoration promises concern only the exiles in Babylon, and the destruction of Gog is nothing but the fulfillment of earlier prophecies (Isa 5:26; Jer 4-6) and an affirmation of divine protection for the people and the land after the restoration.³ In Carley's view, these chapters are not eschatological;⁴ he, therefore, never mentions the Messiah. He admits that those prophecies were not realized as the prophet had hoped, "but Ezekiel must have been a focus of

¹Unger, 2:1561. See also Robert Brunner, Ezechiel, 2 vols., ZB (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1969), 2:95.

²Ibid., 1577.

³Carley, 247, 254. Many scholars see mythological and late elements in the prophecy about Gog. See Alfred Bertholet, Hesekiel, HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1936), 124, 131; G. E. A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951), 372, 406-408; Howie, 73-77; Aelred Cody, Ezekiel, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 185.

⁴Ibid., 256. The same view is taken by Willis (62) who says, "The time envisioned is after the return of the first group of Jews from Babylon (536 B.C.)." Gross (319) says in Ezek 38:16 the eschatological sense is "unnötig."

hope for those concerned about the purpose of life in his deeply troubled times.¹

W. Zimmerli has basically the same view as Carley on Ezek 33-37. In chap. 38, however, he sees something new happening. "A first step is taken on the way to apocalyptic, the aim of which is to set up a sequential order of future events."² These future events include, for Zimmerli, the setting up of the Messianic kingdom because "the latter days" for him, and here he quotes Staerk,³ describe "the time in which, after complete repentance and perfect realization on the part of the people, the expected Messianic kingdom would appear as the just reward for the faithful."⁴ All this is seen in the terms of the OT economy.

A different view is taken by Keil who applies the restoration promises not only to the returnees from the

¹Ibid., 322.

²W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2 vols., Hermeneia, trans. J. D. Martin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 2:304.

³Staerk, 253.

⁴Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 306. The uprising of foreign powers against the people of God as an eschatological event in connection with the Messianic kingdom is also seen by G. R. Beasley-Murray, "Ezekiel," The New Bible Commentary Revised (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), 681; Arnold J. Tkacik, "Ezekiel," The Jerome Bible Commentary (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1969), 362; John T. Bunn, "Ezekiel," The Broadman Bible Commentary (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1971), 345; Fisch, Ezekiel, 253; J. B. Taylor, Ezekiel, 245; Isaac G. Matthews, Ezekiel, An American Commentary on the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1939), 142; Skinner, The Book of Ezekiel, 367; Staerk, 248; Dürr, 104; Harris, "The Last Days," 75.

Babylonian exile, but beyond that to the NT Israel.¹ "The true restoration of Israel as the people of the Lord," he says, "commenced with the founding of the new kingdom of God, the 'kingdom of heaven', through the appearing of Christ upon the earth."² Keil sees the invasion of Gog as taking place in the final future in "the latter days" which to him is the Messianic age, here at the end of time,³ when Israel after the flesh will again be part of God's people.⁴

P. Fairbairn, like Keil, sees two stages of fulfillment in the restoration promises. The first stage is the literal fulfillment beginning with the return from the Babylonian exile, the second stage or the spiritual fulfillment began with Christ. Both are, for him, inherent in the prophecy. The second stage is exemplified in the promise of the shepherd David (34:23). If David is not to be taken literally, Fairbairn says, why should the rest of

¹C. F. Keil, The Prophecies of Ezekiel, BCOT, trans. James Martin (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1876), 126-127. The return from Babylon, Keil says, "was nothing more than a pledge of the future and complete restoration of Israel."

²Ibid., 127.

³Ibid., 157, 163. He equates 'ah^arîṭ haššānîm (vs. 8) with 'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm (vs. 16).

⁴Keil (ibid., 127) believes that in the end Israel as a people will also be converted to Christ, "Then will 'all Israel' be raised up out of its graves, the graves of its political and spiritual death and brought back into its own land, which will extend as far as the Israel of God inhabits the earth."

the prophecy only be understood according to the letter?¹
 "The prophet foretells simply the nature of the coming future under the form of the old landmarks and well-known relations."²

What then is the place of literal fulfillments?
 "As soon as a prophecy was uttered," Fairbairn says, "it was the duty of the Lord's people to look for the fulfillment in the most exact and literal manner."³ After the fall of Babylon, some amongst the exiles did this. But the opportunities were not used as they should have been, only a small number returned to Judah.

Still, with all the shortcomings and imperfections that existed, a certain fulfillment of the most literal kind began at an early period to be given to the prophecy and had Israel but seen in all this the hand of God, and viewed the whole in connection with his unchangeable righteousness, there should certainly have been nothing wanting to complete the correspondence between the description of the prophet and the facts of history; the fulfillment would have been, not partial and temporary, but full and permanent, while the old relations lasted; and even when they changed, the good for the natural Israel, so far from ceasing, would only have risen to higher sphere, and passed into nobler realization.⁴

Thus the restoration promises could not have been completely fulfilled under the old covenant, nor were they

¹ Fairbairn, 375. Skinner (Ezekiel, 316) would reply that as in 1 Kgs 12:16 "David" stands for the Dynasty, so here it is used in a figurative sense. ". . . the Messiah will be one who comes in the spirit and power of David."

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 390.

⁴ Ibid., 390-391.

intended to be altogether fulfilled any time according to the letter.¹ What was looked for in the future, Fairbairn says, could only meet with its "full and adequate accomplishment in Christ, who is certainly the David of the promise."²

In Ezek 38 and 39, Fairbairn sees the spiritual struggle between the Church and heathenism which began "when Christ, the new David, came to lay the everlasting foundations of his kingdom, and asserted his claim to the dominion of the earth as his purchased possession."³ The "latter days," therefore, began for Fairbairn, as for Keil, with Christ.

I am inclined to the view of Fairbairn in regard to the restoration promises. As outlined above in connection with the exegesis of Isa 2, I believe that God's promises could have found a fulfillment in the OT with literal Israel. Even Ezek 38 and 39 would have met a literal fulfillment after the Jews returned from exile if they had been faithful to the Lord. Because they persistently refused to heed the warnings and admonitions of the prophets, the condition of prosperity pictured in Deut 28:1-14

¹ Ibid., 412.

² Ibid., 413. In contrast to Keil, Fairbairn (390) does not believe that literal Israel will once again be a part of God's plan in the future.

³ Ibid., 430.

was never realized.¹ "Consequently, the combination of heathen nations could not come down upon a people dwelling in the prosperity indicated."²

"The latter days" in Ezek 38:16 point towards the future after the exile when this prophecy could have found a fulfillment but did not. On the basis of Rev 20:8 the prophecy will have a complete fulfillment after the Millennium when the forces of evil will finally be eradicated from this world.³ This apocalyptic fulfillment is only a fulfillment in type, since the prophecy in Ezekiel is given in terms of the OT economy, limited to Israel in Palestine and the nations surrounding it.⁴

The phrase *b' 'ah' rîṭ hayyāmîm* in Ezek 38:16 seems to be eschatological, even apocalyptic, since in the NT the struggle against God on the part of the vast hosts of the wicked called "Gog and Magog" is followed by the establishment of the kingdom of God here on earth (Rev 21).

B' 'ah' rîṭ hayyāmîm in the Book of Daniel

The phrase "the latter days" appears in Dan 2:28

¹Nichol, ABC, 4:703. See also footnote 1 on page 244.

²Ibid.

³This is also the view of H. L. Ellison (Ezekiel: The Man and His Message [Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1967], 134).

⁴W. A. Schebo (Gog and Magog [St. Paul: W. A. Schebo, n.d.], 35) identifies Gog with Satan and the Beast from Rev 13. He sees only the last conflict in Rev 20 as the fulfillment of Ezek 38.

and 10:14. Since an extensive review of literature concerning this expression has been provided above,¹ I now concentrate on the texts themselves.

Daniel 2:28-29

בָּרָם אֵתִי אֱלֹהֵי בְּשֵׁמַיָא גִלְיָא רִזִּין וְהוֹדַע לְמַלְכָא נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר
 מָה דִּי לְהוּמָא בְּאַחֲרֵית זְמַנָּא יְהִלְמֵד וְהוּגוּ רְאשֵׁיךָ עַל־מִשְׁכְּבֵךָ
 דְּנִנְה הוּא : אֲנִתְהוּ מַלְכָא רְעִינְךָ עַל־מִשְׁכְּבֵךָ סְלִקוּ מָה
 דִּי לְהוּמָא אַחֲרֵי דְנִנְה וְגִלְיָא רִזִּין הוֹדַעַךָ מָה־דִּי לְהוּמָא :

But there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries² and he has made known to king Nebuchadnezzar what will be in the latter days. This was your dream and the visions³ of your head⁴ upon your bed. As for you, O king, on your bed your thoughts turned to⁵ what should happen after this, and he who reveals mysteries has made known to you what will take place.

These texts belong to the Aramaic portion of the book of Daniel which begins in the middle of Dan 2:4 and

¹See chap. 1.

²The Aramaic word *rāz*, "secret" (BDB, 1112; KBL, 1123), the plural of which is *rāzīn* appears nine times and only in Daniel (2:18,19,27,28,29,30,47 [2x]; 4:6 [E. 4:9]). It always refers to that which God revealed to Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel in chap. 2. The word *rāz* is an Iranian loanword (see Rosenthal, 59). On the possible Iranian influence on Judaism see R. Frye, "Qumran and Iran" in J. Neusner, ed., Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) 3:167-173; and J. Barr "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity," JAAR 53 (1985): 201-233.

³The plural *hezwê* of *hezû*, "vision" (BDB, 1092; KBL, 1074) parallel to "your dream" seems to refer to the individual pictures shown to Nebuchadnezzar in his dream. Gerhard Maier, Der Prophet Daniel, WS (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982), 119.

⁴"The visions that passed through your head" (JB).

⁵Literally, "your thoughts came up."

extends to the end of Dan 7. The phrase b°'aḥ°rīt̄ yōmayyā' is a literal rendering of the Hebrew b°'aḥarīt̄ hayyāmīm which as far as we know appears nowhere else in the Aramaic literature.¹ The meaning of the Hebrew expression, therefore, is important in determining the sense of its Aramaic counterpart.

In Dan 2 Nebuchadnezzar had a dream which deeply disturbed him. To avoid being deceived he demanded from his wise men to tell him the dream before interpreting it. When none of them could do so, opportunity was given to Daniel who by the power of God was able to tell the king what he had dreamed and to interpret the dream for him.

The immediate context of Dan 2:28 describes the situation where Daniel is brought into the king's presence

¹In all the passages in the OT where the Targumim reproduce the phrase b°'aḥ°rīt̄ hayyāmīm, they render it by b°sōp̄ yōmayyā'. Robert H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 40. The word sōp̄, "end" (BDB, 1104) is really the equivalent of the Hebrew "qēs" (KBL, 652; Patterson, "שׁוֹפ (sūp) come to an end, cease," TWOT, 2:620). The Aramaic sōp̄ appears in Dan 4:8,19 (E. vss. 11,22), 6:27 (E. vs. 26), 7:26,28. In 4:8,19 it has a spatial sense, "unto the end of all the earth" and in 6:26,28 it refers to the end of the Little Horn and the end of the vision. Only in 6:27 does sōp̄ have a temporal meaning, "his [God's] dominion shall be unto the end," i.e., forever. Thus, the Aramaic sōp̄ does not have an eschatological meaning in the Bible. The Hebrew sōp̄ also means "end." It appears only in Eccl 3:11; 7:2; 12:13; 2 Chr 20:16; and Joel 2:20. Only in Eccl 7:2 "that is the end of all men" does the Hebrew sōp̄ have a final meaning, otherwise it refers to the end in a spatial (2 Chr 20:16; Joel 2:20) or in an abstract sense, e.g., "the end of the matter" (Eccl 12:13). In Eccl 3:11, where sōp̄ refers to the works of God which he does from the beginning to the end, sōp̄ has a temporal but non-eschatological meaning.

and declares his readiness to interpret the dream (2:24-30). In vs. 27 we read:

Daniel answered before the king and said, "As for the mystery about which the king has inquired, neither wise men, conjurers, magicians, nor diviners are able to declare it to the king.

"the mystery"--rāzâh. What was the mystery of secret about which the king inquired? The king had gone to sleep with the affairs of his kingdom on his mind. He had wondered what the future had in store for him and his successors. He, Nebuchadnezzar, had just begun a brilliant reign. How would it end and what would follow? (vs. 29). What the king expected was some information concerning the future of his kingdom. It is important to keep this in mind when reading the next verse.

"neither wise men. . . ." Arioch had pointed to Daniel and said: "He (Daniel) can make known." Daniel disclaimed any such ability and pointed out that man cannot perform that which is the prerogative of God alone.¹

However, there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries, and he has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will take place in the latter days. This was your dream and the visions in your mind while on your bed. (vs. 28)

"God in heaven. . . ." Daniel now introduces the king to the true God who dwells in heaven in contrast to the visible idols of Babylon who cannot reveal secrets.²

¹Edward J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel (Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 70.

²Ibid.

At the same time Daniel tells the king that his dream is an inspiration from the one true God.¹

"in the latter days"--b^o'ah^arīt yōmmayyā'. If this phrase were a hapax legomenon and we had only the context to go by, what would be our conclusion? We would naturally conclude that Daniel referred to the time which Nebuchadnezzar had in mind. If the dream was the divine answer to Nebuchadnezzar's query, what else could we expect?

Our investigation of the twelve OT texts in which b^o'ah^arīt hayyāmim appears has shown that the meaning of the phrase varies with the context. The context of Dan 2:28 seems to indicate the future of the Babylonian realm; this was uppermost in the mind of Nebuchadnezzar. But what God showed him concerned not only the future of the Babylonian realm but the future of world history down to the end of time.

Nebuchadnezzar saw the future of his kingdom as well as the future of the three empires succeeding him. He saw the rise of many subsequent nations which would coexist but not unite. Finally he saw that God would set up his own kingdom which would last forever. (vs. 45)

B^o'ah^arīt yōmayyā' then does not refer to just the last, the eschatological part of this vision as some have

¹C. F. Keil, The Book of Daniel, BCOT, trans. M. G. Easton (1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 100.

suggested,¹ though the focus is on the final events, the setting up of the kingdom of God. It seems to refer to the whole future history of the world which lay before Nebuchadnezzar. Barnes is right when he says, "The phrase means what we should express by saying, hereafter--in future times--in time to come."² He recognizes that at times "the latter days" have reference to the Messianic age, but he believes that in this context it is not used in this sense, here "it denotes merely future times."³ This is also the opinion of several other authors.⁴ Daniel 2:29 holds an important place in this context:

As for you, O king, while on your bed your thoughts turned to what would take place in the future; and He who reveals mysteries has made known to you what will take place. (vs. 29)

"in the future"--'ah^arê d^onâh. This phrase appears only twice in the Aramaic of the OT, and only in Dan 2 (vss. 29 and 45). Commentators generally agree that this

¹Ibid., 101. Young (Daniel, 70) says, "It thus has primary reference to that period which would begin to run its course with the appearance of God upon this earth, i.e., the days of the Messiah." See also O. Zöckler, The Book of the Prophet Daniel, LC, trans. James Strong (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 75; H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1949, reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), 123; Desmond Ford, Daniel (Nashville: Southern Publishing Assn., 1978), 93.

²Albert Barnes, Daniel, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 1:147.

³Ibid.

⁴Joyce G. Baldwin, Daniel, TOTC (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978), 91; Harris, "The Last Days," 75; Willis, 63.

expression is non-eschatological, that its literal translation is "after this" and that it refers to future time in general, to the days or time which will come after the present, "after these days."¹ Those who hold to the eschatological meaning of *b'aharît yômayyâ'* differentiate between "the latter days" and "after this."² They argue that since Daniel is primarily an apocalyptic book God first focuses on the final portion of the vision by using the eschatological term "the latter days" and then refers to the total time span of the vision with the phrase "after this." Keil says:

The expression *b'aharît yômayyâ'* of ver. 28 is not explained by the *mâh dî leh'wê' 'aharê d'nâh* of ver. 29, but this *'hry dnh* relates to Nebuchadnezzar's thoughts of a future in the history of the world, to which God, the revealer of secrets, unites His Messianic revelations.³

Those who see "the latter days" as an idiomatic phrase for "future" equate it with *'aharê d'nâh*.⁴

The differentiation between *b'aharît yômayyâ'* and

¹Keil, Daniel, 111; Young, Daniel, 71; Willis, 63; Buchanan, 190; Kosmala, 30; Leon J. Wood, A Commentary on Daniel (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973), 65; Baldwin, 91; Zöckler, 79.

²Keil, Daniel, 101; Young, Daniel, 71; Wood, 65; Zöckler, 79.

³Ibid.

⁴Baldwin, 91; Buchanan, 189, n. 8; Kosmala, 30. It is interesting to note that the LXX renders *'aharê d'nâh* both times (vss. 29 and 45) by *ep eschatôn tōn hēmerōn*. Theodotion, on the other hand, uses *meta tauta* (Buchanan, 190). Did the translators of the LXX consider *'aharê d'nâh* an eschatological term?

'ah^arê d^anâh for the sake of keeping the former as an eschatological expression is difficult to maintain. First, there is an interesting parallelism between vss. 28 and 29 which must not be overlooked:

- vs. 28 God reveals secrets and makes known to the king.
 vs. 29 The revealer of secrets makes known to you
- vs. 28 what shall be in the latter days (b^a'ah^arît yômayyâ')
- vs. 29 what shall be after this ('ah^arê d^anâh)
- vs. 28 the visions of your head upon your bed
 vs. 29 your thoughts on your bed

To insist that what God makes known to the king in vs. 28, i.e., "what shall be in the latter days," is something different from what God makes known to him in vs. 29, i.e., "what shall be after this," is against the parallelism and flow of thought in this whole passage. The subject matter of the story is the king's dream, the whole dream, not only the final part of it. Thus, if "after this" refers to the whole vision as all admit, then "the latter days" must also refer to it.

Second, the general nature of these two temporal expressions is further emphasized by the third temporal phrase used in vs. 29, "what shall come to pass (mâh dî leh^awê'). This phrase is also clearly non-eschatological. It reiterates that God is going to reveal to Nebuchadnezzar exactly what he asked for--the future of his kingdom and those after it. Now it is true, the vision does not stop with the history of successive empires, the vision leads up

to the climax of history, the setting up of the heavenly kingdom, but all the temporal expressions embrace the total time span.

To insist that b°'aḥ°rîṭ yômāyā' here refers only to the final period of world history, because Daniel emphasizes the eschatological events, does not do justice to the immediate context of Dan 2:28.

Third, a comparison between vss. 28 and 45 in Dan 2 points to same conclusion. In Dan 2:28 the prophet says, "He [God] has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will take place in the latter days." In vs. 45 he says:

Inasmuch as you saw that stone was cut out of the mountain without hands and that it crushed the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold, the great God has made known to the king what will take place in the future ('aḥ°rê d°nâh); so the dream is true, and its interpretation is trustworthy.

In vs. 28 where the vision as a whole is introduced, Daniel uses b°'aḥ°rîṭ yômāyā', which is supposed to be an eschatological term. In vs. 45, where he specifically speaks about the ushering in of the Messianic kingdom, he uses 'aḥ°rê d°nâh, and there seems to be general agreement that it is not eschatological. If b°'aḥ°rîṭ yômāyā' is really an eschatological term and 'aḥ°rê d°nâh is not, one would expect that the former expression be used in vs. 45 and the latter in vs. 28.¹

¹Then the texts would read something like this: vs. 28, "God has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will take place in the future," and vs. 45, "Inasmuch as you saw . . . the great God has made known to the king what will take place even in the latter days." In other words,

Fourth, the 'aḥ^arē d^anāh in Dan 2:29 and 45 constitute a frame for the whole vision. Thus, Daniel at the beginning and at the end of the vision states that God revealed to Nebuchadnezzar what was to come "after this," i.e., after the present time. And Dan 2:28 in parallel with 2:29 points out the same.

These reasons lead me to the conclusion that 'aḥ^arē d^anāh in this context is a synonym of b^a'aḥ^arīt yōmayyā', that both refer to future, in general, and that this future reaches down to the end of time and includes the setting up of God's stone-kingdom.¹ Thus, b^a'aḥ^arīt hayyāmim in Dan 2:28 has the same meaning as b^a'aḥ^arīt hayyāmim in Gen 49:1 and Num 24:14.

Daniel 10:14

וּבֹאֲתִי לְהַבִּינְךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר-
יִקְרָה לְעַמְּךָ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים כִּי עוֹד חֲזוֹן לַיָּמִים :

And I have come to make you understand that which will happen to your people in the latter days, because there is yet a vision for those days.²

"God is not only showing you the future of your realm and those following you, he lets you see what will happen right at the end of history."

¹A. R. Millard ("Daniel," The International Bible Commentary, ed. F. F. Bruce [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986], 855) correctly says, "Within days to come is included the future from that time until a decisive moment, e.g., the Assyrian conquest in Num 24:14-24; Israel's rebellion in Deut 29:39 [sic]; here the establishment of the divine kingdom." See also Maier, 118, 367.

²The plural yāmim with the preposition l^a is used 17 times in the OT (Gen 1:14; 7:4; Deut 4:32; Judg 17:10; 2 Sam 14:26; 2 Chr 21:19; 29:17; Job 30:1; 32:4,6; Esth 9:26;

The last three chapters of the book of Daniel constitute one unit. In Dan 10 we have the report of a vision which is followed by the audition in Dan 11 and 12. The vision in Dan 10 prepared Daniel for the audition in which the content of the revelation is given.

The time of the vision, according to Dan 10:1, was "the third year of Cyrus" (536 B.C.), the place was the bank of the River Tigris. Daniel had been praying and fasting for three weeks in order to understand God's plan for the future of his people (vs. 12). After explaining the delay (vs. 13), the angel says (vs. 14), "Now I have come to give you an understanding of what will happen to your people in the latter days." The second half of vs. 14 in Hebrew reads, "kī 'ôd ḥāzôn layyāmîm,"¹ which literally means "for yet a vision for the days." Some interpreters understand this to mean ". . . the vision is for many

Ezek 12:27; 22:14; Dan 8:26; 10:14; 12:12). l'yāmîm is used for short periods of time, e.g., "7 days" (Gen 7:4); "8 days" (2 Chr 29:17) as well as for long ones, e.g., "one year" (Judg 17:10), "two years" (2 Chr 21:19). Sometimes it refers to an indefinite time period, e.g., "days that are past" (Deut 4:32); "in the process of time" (2 Chr 21:19). In Ezek 22:14 (. . . can thine hands be strong, in the days that I shall deal with thee?) "the days" refer to the judgment of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and thus have eschatological import. In Dan 8:28 and 12:12, "the days" refer to the time period lying between Daniel and the eschatological time of the end. In each passage the context must decide the meaning of l'yāmîm.

¹A few Hebrew manuscripts have l'mô'ēd, "regarding the appointed period," which is closer to the Hebrew of Hab 2:3. See Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, The Book of Daniel, AB, (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1978), 265.

days," i.e., it points to distant future¹ or "the time of the vision will cover quite a period yet to come."² Others understand it to mean, "there is still a vision regarding those days,"³--"those days" being "the latter days" just mentioned.

The latter interpretation seems to be the correct one since *ôd*, here in the sense of again,⁴ most likely refers back to the vision and interpretations of Dan 8 and 9. Consequently, this phrase seems to emphasize that there is still another revelation to come concerning the future of God's people.

The understanding of "the latter days" in this verse again varies considerably. A number of dispensationalist interpreters see a gap in Dan 11 between vss. 35 and 36 which is supposed to extend from the time of the Maccabees to the last three and a half years before Christ's second advent. These last three and a half years are accordingly "the latter days."⁵ Other scholars see the

¹J. Dyneley Prince, A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), 167; Maier, 368; Barnes, Daniel, 2:202; Keil, Daniel, 419.

²Arthur Jeffery, "Daniel," IB (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 507; Ford, Daniel, 244.

³Montgomery, 412; Zöckler, 229; J. E. H. Thomson, Daniel, PC (London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1898), 294.

⁴Ibid.

⁵A. C. Gaebelein, The Prophet Daniel (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1955), 178-179. So also Wood, Daniel,

days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes as "the latter days,"¹ still others the Messianic age.² J. Baldwin interprets "the latter days" as "in the future,"³ and Maier similarly as "die Zukunft einschließlich der Errichtung des Gottesreiches."⁴

In Dan 10:14, the prophet is told that the angel has come to give him understanding of what will happen to his people in "the latter days." The prophecy in the form of audition which is then given in Dan 11 and 12 runs from the days of the prophet, i.e., from the days of the Persian kings (Dan 11:2) down to the very climax of human history, the resurrection (Dan 12:2).⁵ Since this prophecy deals primarily with the history of mankind between these events, only a few verses at the end actually deal with the time of

304. S. P. Tregelles (Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel 8th ed. [1847; reprint, Chelmsford: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony, n.d.], 134) has the break between vss. 4 and 5.

¹Jeffery, 507; Norman Porteous, Daniel (London: SMC Press, 1979), 154, 165.

²Young, Daniel, 227; Keil, Daniel, 419; Zöckler, 229; Leupold, Daniel, 460. Bert H. Hall ("The Book of Daniel," WBIC 6 vols. [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969], 3:549) refers "the latter days" to the days between the prophet and the Messianic age.

³Baldwin, 181.

⁴Maier, 367. So also Barnes, Daniel, 2:202; George McCready Price, The Greatest of the Prophets (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955), 268-269.

⁵The beginning and ending of this prophecy is clearly indicated by the words of the angel in Dan 11:2 "Now I will show you. . . ." and Dan 12:4 "But you, O Daniel. . . ."

the end, we must ask: "Do 'the latter days' refer only to the last part of the prophecy in Dan 11 and 12, or to the whole sweep of history presented therein?"

In order to answer this question we go back to the words of the angel who said: "I have come to make you understand that which will happen to your people in the latter days. . . ." Who are the people referred to? The expression "your people" appears again in Dan 11:14 and 12:1. Does this phrase provide a chronological link between Dan 10:14 and Dan 12:1, i.e., are "the latter days" the same as "that time" in Dan 12:1?

In Dan 10:14 "your people" clearly refers to the Jews, the people of whom Daniel was one. Any other meaning would have had to be explained to Daniel to be comprehensible to him.¹ Again in Dan 11:14, God, referring to the Jews, calls them "your people," i.e., Daniel's people. And when we look at Dan 11 as a whole we find that more than half the verses in this chapter actually deal with historical events prior to A.D. 70, i.e., prior to the final destruction of the Jewish state. Thus, when the angel says, "What will happen to your people in 'the latter days'. . . ," these "latter days" must include the events of the first half of Dan 11. During the first century A.D.

¹In Dan 9:15, 16, and 19 Daniel in his prayer to God uses the phrase "your people," i.e. God's people, when referring to the Jews. In Dan 9:20 he identifies himself with them and calls them "my people." Conversely God refers to them in Dan 9:24 as "your people."

the shift from literal to spiritual Israel took place¹ and the rest of Dan 11 deals with the history of spiritual Israel who are now "your people" in Dan 12:1.² Furthermore, the phrase "at that time" in Dan 12:1 refers back to the time of the end in Dan 11:40 and not to "the latter days" in Dan 10:14. Disregarding the chapter divisions, Dan 12:1-4 is part of the scenario which begins in Dan 11:40. Thus, I conclude that "the latter days" in Dan 10:14 are to be understood in the same way as in Dan 2:28. They refer to the whole sweep of history which is outlined in Dan 11 and 12, i.e., the future which began in the time of Daniel and end with the second coming of Christ. I concur with R. L. Harris who says, "Even in Dan 10:14 the phrase 'latter days' (AV and RSV) is not exclusively eschatological. . . . It would seem that the words 'future days' would be an adequate translation."³

¹Dispensationalists who reject this interpretation believe that only the history of literal Jews was revealed to Daniel in these verses. See Walvoord, Daniel, 248; Wood, Daniel, 274.

²When Daniel in Dan 12:1 heard "your people" he most probably understood the term as referring to the Jews. From Daniel's perspective the Jews were to be God's people until the end. We do not know whether Daniel understood that literal Israel would be replaced by spiritual Israel. Nevertheless, the NT makes it quite clear that after the cross the term "Israel" does not exclusively refer to the literal descendants of Abraham, but also to all those who have accepted Christ (Gal 3:28,29).

³Harris, "The Last Days," 75. So also Buchanan, 188, and Willis, 64.

Summary

In the OT, 'aḥ^arîṭ by itself can refer to the future, in general (Deut 8:16; Job 42:12; Prov 25:8), to the end or the result of an action in a man's experience (Amos 8:10; Prov 14:12), as well as to the future life of the righteous man (Prov 23:17,18; 24:14). In Dan 8:19, where it is parallel to c'ēṭ qēṣ, it seems to refer to the end of the world.

In Gen 49:1, b' 'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm is best translated as "in the future" or "in the days to come," since the fulfillment began after Israel entered Canaan. Yet, if Gen 49:10 is a reference to the Messiah, then this text also makes reference to an eschatological future.

In Num 24:14, "the latter days" refer to the future, in general. In view is first of all the time of David in which the prophecy found an initial fulfillment. Yet David was only a type of that greater star, the Messiah. As in Gen 49:1, b' 'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm looks towards the eschatological future in which the Messiah shall appear. Thus the translations "in days to come" or "in the future" seem to fit the context best.

In Deut 4:30, "the latter days" refer to the days of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles which for Moses were "in the future." They were the eschatological "latter days" for the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, respectively, in the sense that these two nations ceased to exist as independent monarchies in history.

The b°'ah°rît hayyāmîm in Jer 23:20 and 30:24 refer to the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and beyond, when Israel would understand the dimension and the validity of the judgment of God upon them. "The latter days" in these texts are eschatological since they were "the last days" for Israel as a monarchy.

In Deut 31:29, b°'ah°rît hayyāmîm is best translated by "in the future" or "in the coming days," since the reference is clearly to the apostasy in the Judges' period and later.

B°'ah°rît hayyāmîm in Isa 2:2 and Mic 4:1 is eschatological in the sense that the ideal future kingdom which should have come after the exile, if Israel had remained true to God, would have issued into a golden age in which God's plan with Israel would have been realized, and at the end of which the Messiah would have come.

Hosea 3:5 looks beyond the exile to "the latter days," i.e., the eschatological age of the Messiah, when Israel would wholeheartedly return to Yahweh and his Messiah.

In Jer 48:47 and 49:37, "the latter days" refer to the time of the Persian restoration. "In the future" would therefore be an acceptable translation of b°'ah°rît hayyāmîm in both texts.

"The latter days" in Ezek 38:16 refer first of all to the time after the exile when this prophecy could have found a fulfillment. Rev 20 indicates that the prophecy of

Ezekiel will find a complete fulfillment after the Millennium when the forces of evil are finally eradicated from this world. This gives Ezek 38:16 an eschatological, even apocalyptic, import since the complete fulfillment of this prophecy coincides with the end of history as we know it.

B^o'aḥ^arîṭ yōmayyā' in Dan 2:28 and b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm in 10:14 are equivalent expressions referring to the future history of earthly kingdoms viewed from the standpoint of Daniel. This future history begins in Dan 2 with Nebuchadnezzar and in chap. 10 with the Persian kings. In both cases, it reaches down to the end of time when human history will be replaced by God's eternity. Thus, the phrase b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm/yōmayyā' in Daniel has an eschatological aspect, but it is not an eschatological terminus technicus.

Conclusions

Based on our investigation we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic do not provide any evidence for an eschatological meaning of b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm. The closest Akkadian equivalent to the Hebrew b^o'aḥ^arîṭ hayyāmîm is ana aḥrat ūmê or ina arkât ūmê, "in future days," which refers either to the future, in general, or to a specific point in the future when a certain event will take place. These Akkadian phrases, as

far as we know, never appear in a religious context and lack an eschatological meaning. The claim that *ina aḥrat ūmē* in Akkadian is an eschatological term has not been sustained by this investigation.

There is no equivalent phrase to *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm* in Ugaritic. The word *'uḥryt* "end," "destiny," appears only once and refers to the end of a man's life. Thus, it is not truly eschatological in meaning. Death is a person's end of life.

The Aramaic equivalent to *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm* is *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ yōmayyā'*. As far as we know, it appears only in Dan 2:28. The word *'aḥarī* "end" which is found twice in Aramaic texts from Qumran refers to the latter end of Job's life once and is translated "finally" the second time.

(2) The Hebrew phrase *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm* in the OT outside of the book of Daniel refers to: (a) a specific future period in the history of Israel which in some cases is eschatological (Deut 4:30; Jer 23:20; 30:24), but in others it is not (Deut 31:29; Jer 48:47; 49:39); (b) the future history of Israel beginning with the conquest or the monarchy and reaching down to the time of the Messiah (Gen 49:1 and Num 24:14); (c) the Messianic age as such (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5) or to the time preceding it (Ezek 38:16).

(3) In the book of Daniel the expressions *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ hayyāmīm* (10:14) and *b' 'aḥ^a rīṭ yōmayyā'* (2:28) are equivalent. Both phrases refer to the future which began in

the time of Daniel and reaches down to the time of the Messianic kingdom. Thus, in both texts the phrase has an eschatological, even apocalyptic import in the sense that the eschaton is part of "the latter days."

(4) The context remains decisive for each case for the meaning of *b°'ah°rīt hayyāmīm*. If the context refers to events in the history of Israel, the translation "in the future" or "in days to come" may be preferable to "latter days."

(5) The phrase *b°'ah°rīt hayyāmīm* in itself is not an eschatological *terminus technicus*, because its contextual settings and varieties of usages allow it to be employed in different ways as we have shown.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPRESSION "THE TIME OF THE END"

This chapter concerns the expression $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ $\text{qē}\text{ṣ}$, "the time of the end" which appears only in Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; and 12:4,9. An investigation of this expression may be aided by tracing first the individual words in several cognate languages of the ancient Near East, and by noting their usage in Hebrew both in the OT, and in extra-biblical Hebrew texts. This terminological study provides the larger setting for the second part of this chapter where Danielic material receives attention, particularly the texts in the book of Daniel where $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ and $\text{qē}\text{ṣ}$ or the expression $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ $\text{qē}\text{ṣ}$ is used.

The Term $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$

The Term $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ in the Cognate Semitic Languages

The term $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ with the meaning of "time" is found, outside of Hebrew, only in Phoenician and Punic.¹ The Phoenician language was used for more than two millennia;

¹DISO, 224; E. Jenni, "ṢṢ $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ Zeit," *THAT*, 2:370-385. Older reference works still give the Akkadian enu/ittu as an equivalent to $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$, but it is not recognized in newer works any more since the root for it is taken to be $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$ and not $^{\text{c}}\text{ē}\underline{\text{t}}$.

Punic, the language spoken at Carthage, was a descendant of late Phoenician.¹

The Phoenician texts from Karatepe (9/8th century B.C.), collected by A. Dupont-Sommer,² contain a passage which lists annual sacrifices: "sacrifice annuel, 1 boeuf, et au temps (c̄t) du labour, 1 mouton, et au temps (c̄t) de la moisson, 1 mouton."³ The meaning of c̄t in "ploughing-time" and "harvest-time" is clearly chronological.

On the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar, king of Sidon (4th century B.C.), is an inscription in which the king says twice, "I was snatched away (by death) before my time (nqzlt bl c̄ty). . . ."⁴ c̄t in this context has the signification of "life-time." The king died before he had reached the end of a normal life-span.

There are Punic texts collected in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum where c̄t always appears with the preposition "b̄" in the sense of "in the time of . . ." and is always followed by a name or a series of names.⁵

Imperial Aramaic of the 5th century B.C. employs

¹H. Jacob Katzenstein, "Phoenicia, Phoenicians," Encyclopaedia Judaica, 16 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1971) 13:471-481.

²A. Dupont-Sommer, "Azitawadda, Roi des Danouniens," Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archeologie Orientale 42 (1948): 161-188.

³Ibid., 178.

⁴Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, 5 parts (Paris: Reipublicae Typographeo, 1881-1950), 3:3, 12.

⁵Ibid., 132:4; 165:1; 170:1.

the term $^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$ quite frequently with the preposition "k" to form the adverb "now."¹ Time and again we find sentences beginning with either $k^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$ or $w^c k^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$.² J. R. Wilch considers this use of $k^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$ in Aramaic letters a terminus technicus for introducing an order as well as the body of a letter and translates it with "now, according to the occasion. . . ."³

These uses of $^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$, whether in Phoenician, Punic, or Aramaic, are of a purely chronological nature.

The Term $^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$ in Extra-Biblical Hebrew

In extra-biblical Hebrew, $^c\bar{e}\bar{t}$ primarily has the meaning of the adverb $^catt\bar{a}h$ "now." A papyrus from Murabacat (8th century B.C.) reads: "I send my greetings to your

¹G. R. Driver, Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 103.

²Ibid., $k^c\bar{t}$; 23, line 3:6; 24, line 4:2; 30, line 8:3; 33, line 10:4; 34, line 11:2; 35, line 12:3,6,9; $wk^c\bar{t}$: 21, line 1:1; 24, line 4:1; 25, line 5:1,2; 28, line 7:1; 30, line 8:1; 32, line 9:1; 33, line 10:1; 34, line 11:1; 35, line 12:1; 37, line 13:1; A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 53, line 17:2,3; 62, line 21:3,4; 89, line 26:1,22; 119, line 31:3; 135, line 38:3; 138, line 39:3; 159, line 54:11; 162, line 56:1; 170, line 65:4; 187, line 76:3; 212, Ah 16. Eduard Sachau, Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911), $k^c\bar{t}$: 23, T 3:3; 36, T 6:4; 44, T 8:1; T 9:22; 55, T 12:3; 138, T 37:1; 213, T 58:4:2; 241, T 67:1:3; 250, T 71:7; $wk^c\bar{t}$: 34, T 5:2; 36, T 6:3; 138, T 37:1.

³John R. Wilch, Time and Event (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 134-137.

family. And now ($w^{\circ}e\bar{t}$), do not listen to every word which one says to you. . . ."¹

Several Ostraca from Tell Arad (6th century B.C.) use $e\bar{t}$ the same way: "To Eliashib. And now ($w^{\circ}e\bar{t}$) give the Kittim 4 baths of wine."² The Lachish letter 2:1-3, employs $e\bar{t}$ followed by $kayy\bar{o}m$, "May Yhwh let hear my Lord tidings of peace even now ($e\bar{t} kayy\bar{o}m$) even now ($e\bar{t} kayy\bar{o}m$)."³ In letter 6:2 the words are strung together and their separation has led to variant views concerning their meaning. E. Jenni⁴ and H. P. Müller⁵ read, " $e\bar{t} h\bar{a}e\bar{t}$ hazzeh--"at this time," whereas H. Torczyner⁶ at an earlier time divided the words as follows, " $'att\bar{a}h e\bar{t} zeh$," and translated, "you are even now." In view of the grammar⁷ and the use of $e\bar{t}$ in all the other texts, H. Torczyner's reading is to be preferred, although in essence there is very little difference between "now" and "at this time."

¹P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les Grottes de Murabba'at, DJD, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 96.

²TSSI, 1:51, 53.

³Harry Torczyner, Lachish I: The Lachish Letters (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 37.

⁴Jenni, THAT, 2:370.

⁵Hans-Peter Müller, "Notizen zu althebräischen Inschriften I," UF 2 (1970): 234, n. 62.

⁶Torczyner, 117.

⁷ $e\bar{t}$ is feminine whereas zeh is masculine. $e\bar{t}$ designates only the proper accusative which "at this time" is not. See Torczyner, 106-108.

As in the cognate languages, we find only a chronological use of ʿēṭ in extra-biblical Hebrew.

The Term ʿēṭ in the OT Outside the Book of Daniel

In the OT ʿēṭ appears about 300 times,¹ of which 270 occurrences carry the meaning "time". The etymological derivation of ʿēṭ is disputed. Some scholars take ʿeṭ as a derivative of ʿānāh "to answer" or "to be occupied,"² others derive it from ʿādāh "go on, pass by."³ The root yāʿad "to appoint a time" was also proposed⁴ and is incorporated in the most recent edition of HAL.⁵ F. Delitzsch expresses the opinion that the Aramaic root ʿanaṭ "now" might be a possibility.⁶

¹Counts by various scholars differ slightly: Abraham Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Bible (Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sepher Publishing House," 1983), 931-932, has 294 occurrences, Jenni, THAT, 2:371 has 296, and Wilch, 20, has 297.

²BDB, 773; Eduard König, Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT (Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), 354; L. J. Coppes, "ʿēṭ. Time, space of time, appointed time, proper time," TWOT, 2:680. Cf. James Muilenburg, "The Biblical View of Time," HTR 54 (1961): 234.

³Wilhelm Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, trans. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1905), 661; Alexander Harkavy, Student's Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary (New York: Hebrew Publishing Co. 1941), 555.

⁴Conrad von Orelli, Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit genetisch und sprachvergleichend dargestellt (Leipzig: Lorentz, 1871), 47.

⁵HAL, 851.

⁶Friedrich Delitzsch, Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum AT (Leipzig:

The etymological origin of עֵת remains uncertain. However, the primary use of עֵת is said to be qualitative, i.e., it "relates to time conceived as an opportunity or season."¹ Yet the quantitative or chronological use of עֵת is also found (Judg 11:26; 1 Kgs 6:1). In a significant passage on "time," that is in Eccl 3:1-9, עֵת has both meanings. On the one hand, the list gives "times" known in terms of the content; on the other hand, the purpose of the whole passage "is to emphasize the frustrating effect of time on human life and labour, whether because God has appointed the events beforehand or for some other reason."² The real message of the passage is not simply that there is a time and a place for everything, rather it lies in the question in vs. 9: "What profit hath he who worketh in that wherein he laboreth?" The answer must be: "It does not profit him, unless he is able to incorporate the 'risk' of time."³ The uncertainties of time, and the common experience of all men that after a life of toil we all leave this

Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886), 116.

¹Coppes, TWOT, 2:680. See also Thorleif Boman, Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1960), 139; John Marsh, The Fullness of Time (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), 20; G. A. F. Knight, A Christian Theology of the Old Testament (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959), 314.

²J. Barr; Biblical Words for Time, 2nd ed. (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1969), 103.

³"Er hat keinen Ertrag, sofern er das 'Risiko' der Zeit nicht einplanen kann." Kurt Gallig, "Das Rätsel der Zeit im Urteil Kohelets (Koh 3,1-15)" (ZTK 58 [1961]:2).

existence naked as we came into it, is a dominant theme in Ecclesiastes.

The term *ʿēṭ* by itself can refer to events of a qualitative and recurring nature, e.g., the time of rain (Ezra 10:13), the migratory time of birds (Jer 8:7), as well as to nonrecurring events, e.g., the times of birth and death (Eccl 3:2), the time to build the temple (Hag 1:2), the time of Jacob's trouble (Jer 30:7). A specific point of time is in view in Job 22:16: "wicked men . . . which were cut down out of time."

The plural form *ʿittîm* indicates mostly the sum of different events in time as in Ezra 10:14: ". . . let all them which have taken strange wives in our cities come at appointed times. . . ." Sometimes *ʿittîm* refers to a period of time as in Ezek 12:27: ". . . he prophesieth of the times that are far off," or 2 Chr 15:5: "And in those times there was no peace to him. . . ." Jenni points out that *ʿittîm* refers to the content or substance of time in only two places. They are Ps 31:15: "My times are in thy hand . . . ," and 1 Chr 29:29, 30: "Now the acts of David . . . are written in the book of Samuel . . . with all his reign and his might, and the times that went over him." In both cases the "times" do not so much refer to chronological times as to the content and substance of and the event in time.¹ Once, in Neh 9:28, *ʿittîm* takes on the meaning

¹Jenni, THAT, 2:378; cf. Barr, Biblical Words for Time, 123.

of pa^cam: ". . . and many times didst thou deliver them according to thy mercies."

It is noteworthy that ^cēṭ frequently appears with prepositions like b^e, l^e, k^e, ^cad, min, and 'al to indicate a point or period of time. The extended period of time during which the tabernacle rested at Gibeon is indicated by bā^cēṭ in 1 Chr 21:29: "For the tabernacle of the Lord . . . and the altar of burnt offering, were at that season (bā^cēṭ) in the high place at Gibeon."

The adverbial phrase bā^cēṭ hahî' "at that time" which occurs 68 times in the OT can refer to a point or period of time in the past (Gen 21:22: "And it came to pass at that time. . . .")¹ or to a particular point in the future at which God's acts will be revealed. These acts can be judgments as in Jer 8:1-3: "At that time, saith the Lord, . . . death shall be chosen rather than life. . . ." or Zeph 1:12: "And it shall come to pass at that time that I will search Jerusalem with candles, and punish the men that are settled on their lees. . . ." ² They can refer to the fulfillment of God's salvific promises as in Jer 3:17: "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; . . . ," or Zeph 3:19,20: "Behold at that time I will undo all that afflicted thee . . . at that time I will

¹Moses in Deuteronomy in recounting the history of Israel constantly uses this phrase, e.g., Deut 1:9,16,18; 2:34; 3:4,8,12 etc.

²See also Jer 4:11; Amos 5:13; Micah 3:4.

bring you again. . . ."¹ These texts point to the eschatological future of Israel which God wanted to bring in after the return from exile.

In the same way, *bā^cēṭ* *hahî'* in conjunction with *bayyāmîm hāhēm* points to the eschatological future of Israel in Jer 33:15: "In those days, and at that time, I will cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land," and Joel 3:18: "And it shall come to pass in that day that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk. . . ."²

The time of God's judgments is expressed by *ēṭ* in conjunction with a host of other terms. Jer 6:15 speaks of "the time of visitation (*b^cēṭ p^cqadtîm*),"³ in 18:23 it is "the time of thine anger (*b^cēṭ 'app^ckā*)," in 51:6: "the time of the Lord's vengeance (*ēṭ n^cqāmāh*)," and in 51:33: "the time of harvest (*ēṭ haqqāšîr*)." Isa 13:22 calls the day of Babylon's judgment simply "her time (*cittāh*)," as does Ezek 22:3 in regard to Jerusalem's judgment: "The city sheddeth blood in the midst of it, that her time (*cittah*) may come." Finally, Ezekiel refers to it as "the time of the final punishment⁴ (*b^cēṭ c^cwōn qēš*)" (21:30). Only in

¹See also Isa 18:7; Jer 31:1.

²See also Jer 50:4,20.

³See also 8:12; 10:15; 46:21; 50:27,31; 51:18.

⁴*c^cwōn* is here taken in the sense of punishment, as in Gen 4:13 (HAL, 756).

Ezek 30:3 is $^c\text{ē}\text{ṭ}$ directly linked with the Day of the Lord: "For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near, a cloudy day: it shall be the time ($^c\text{ē}\text{ṭ}$) of the heathen," although there are other texts where the context seems to speak about the Day of the Lord without expressly mentioning it.¹

H. D. Preuß has argued that neither bayyôm hahû' nor yôm yhwh nor bā $^c\text{ē}\text{ṭ}$ hahî' nor bayyāmîm hāhēm are in themselves eschatological.² He sees a development from a non-eschatological sense to an eschatological meaning. This may well be so, particularly with regard to the phrase bayyôm hahû', but it is also possible that from the beginning the context always indicated whether a particular phrase was used eschatologically or not.³

In summary we can say that $^c\text{ē}\text{ṭ}$ in the OT is not an eschatological term per se.⁴ But at times it is used in an

¹ Isa 13:22; Ezek 7:7,12; 21:30,34.

² Horst D. Preuß, Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung, BWANT 87 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968), 170-176.

³ André Lefèvre ("L'expression 'en ce jour-là' dans le livre d'Isaïe," Mélanges Bibliques, Travaux de L'institut Catholique de Paris 4 [Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1957], 179), who has made a study of bayyôm hahû' in Isaiah says: "Pour sa valeur temporelle, nous sommes également d'accord avec Munch pour affirmer qu'elle dépend du contexte: la formule n'a donc pas par elle-même de valeur eschatologique. Elle n'en a pas moins une aptitude à prendre ce sens. Jamais dans Isaïe 'ce jour là' ne renvoie à un jour banal, à une date, mais toujours à une manifestation de la puissance de Yahweh."

⁴ The use of $^c\text{ē}\text{ṭ}$ in the Qumran writings is essentially the same as that in the OT (Wilch, 143). Of the thirty-five occurrences listed by K. G. Kuhn (Konkor-

eschatological context¹ and, therefore, acquires an eschatological sense.

danz zu den Qumrantexten [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960], 172-173) about half concern specific dates or times. The Essenes had a special calendar which they believed was revealed by God and which was to be followed when fixing the dates of the religious feasts (A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. G. Vermes [Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973], 73, n. 2. See also Roger T. Beckwith, "The Modern Attempt to Reconcile the Qumran Calendar with the True Solar Year," RevQ 7 (1970): 379-396; idem, "The Qumran Calendar and the Sacrifices of the Essenes," RevQ 7 (1971): 587-591; idem, "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," RevQ 10 (1980): 167-202; idem, "The Earliest Enoch Literature and Its Calendar: Marks of their Origin, Date and Motivation," RevQ 10 (1981): 365-403). In 1 QS 1:14 we read: "And they shall make no single step from all the words of God concerning their times (b^oqissêhem), they shall not anticipate their times (cⁱttêhem), nor delay them for any of their feasts (môc^adêhem). It seems that the Essenes attached great importance to their special calendar. Members of the community were charged in 1 QS 9:13 with doing "the will of God according to all that had been revealed season by season, and to learn all understanding discovered throughout time, together with the decree of time (hâcⁱttîm w^e'êṭ ḥôq hâc^eṭ)." And according to 1 QS 8:4 they were to walk according to "the norm of the time (hâc^eṭ)." (I have followed the translation of E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran [Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964]). c^eṭ as a period of time is found in CD 1:13 where it is said of official Judaism: "They are those that have departed from the way; it is the time (hâc^eṭ) of which it is written 'Like a stubborn heifer Israel was stubborn.'" (Further references to c^eṭ as a period are found in CD 10:5; 4 QF 12:1; Qp Ps 37 b4; 1 QH 8:23). In two texts (D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Qumran Cave I, in DJD I [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955], 126-127) c^eṭ is joined with c^olām to express the thought of "time without end, forever," and a similar expression is found in 1 QM 14:13 where it reads: "We shall exalt thy glory at all times (b^okôl cⁱttîm)."

¹For example Amos 5:13, the end of the unjust in Israel; Ezek 7:7, the end of Israel; Isa 13:22, the destruction of Babylon; Joel 4:1, the judgment of Israel's oppressors. In all these passages the context refers to the day of Yahweh.

The Term ^cēṭ in the Book of Daniel

The term ^cēṭ appears sixteen times in the book of Daniel, but never before Dan 8.¹ In this section we consider usages of the term ^cēṭ without qēs. The phrase ^cēṭ qēs in Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4 and 9 is dealt with later.

Dan 9:21

יָעוֹד אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר בְּהַסְלָה וְהֵאִישׁ גַּבְרִיאֵל אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי
בְּחִזּוֹן בְּהַחֲלָה מִעַף בִּיעָף נִגַּע אֵלַי בְּעֵת מִנְחַת-עֶרֶב:

While I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision earlier, came flying.² He reached me³ at the time (^k^cēṭ) of the evening sacrifice.

Dan 9 consists of three sections: a brief introduction (vss. 1-3), the prayer of Daniel (vss. 4-19), and the seventy-weeks prophecy (vss. 20-27). The visions in Dan 2, 7, and 8 indicated that the earthly powers will come to an end, that the eternal kingdom will be established

¹Dan 8:17; 9:21,25; 11:6,13,14,24,35,40; 12:1(4x), 4,9,11.

²^{mu}^cāp bī^cāp, literally "wearied with weariness." C. F. Keil (The Book of Daniel, BCOT, trans. M. G. Easton [1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949], 335) considers this to be similar to Daniel's situation in Dan 8:17,27. The ancient versions assumed that ^y^cp (being weary) was confounded with ^w^p (fly) and translated either tachei pheromenos "quickly flying" (LXX), so also the Vulgate cito volans, or petomenos "flying" (Theodotion). Most modern translations follow the LXX (KJV, RSV, NEB, NIV, JB). The NASB following the MT reads, "[Gabriel] came to me in my extreme weariness. . . ." Cf. N. Porteous, Daniel, 2nd rev. ed., OTL (London: SCM Press, 1979), 139.

³For this meaning of nāga^c, see 2 Sam 5:8 and Jonah 3:6.

and that the saints will not be destroyed. In Dan 8 the vision is somewhat different and Daniel is troubled because he does not fully understand the vision in Dan 8 (see 8:27). The opening of Dan 9 refers to the end of the seventy-year captivity in Babylon¹ and Daniel expected a change in his peoples' fortune, yet the vision in Dan 8 had spoken of 2,300 "evenings and mornings." Was the captivity somehow to be prolonged?

In Dan 9:4-19 we find Daniel's remarkable prayer, his confession of sin, and his petition for God's grace upon his people. In answer to Daniel's prayer, the angelus interpres, Gabriel, is dispatched by God to make Daniel "understand" (Dan 9:22) that part of the vision in Dan 8 which he did not understand (Dan 8:27).²

The phrase k^cēṭ in Dan 9:21b indicates a specific point in time, the time of the evening sacrifice. K^cēṭ

¹The date in 9:1 is deliberately mentioned to call attention to the fact that Babylon had fallen (539 B.C.) and the new power was in its first year of its sovereignty. The prophecy in Jer 25:11 was given in 605 B.C. (Jer 25:1), in the same year Nebuchadnezzar had taken captive Daniel, his friends, and certain other royal hostages (Dan 1:3), so 539 B.C. brings us close to the end of these seventy years counted from 605 B.C. on. G. Maier, Der Prophet Daniel, WS (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1982), 322.

²On the link between Dan 8 and 9, see J. Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study," AUSS 17 (1979): 1-22; William H. Shea, "The Relationship Between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9," The Sanctuary and the Atonement, ed. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshar (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), 228-250.

more than $b^{\circ}c\bar{e}t$ or $l^{\circ}c\bar{e}t$ ¹ expresses an exact point of time, e.g., $k^{\circ}c\bar{e}t$ maḥar, "at this time tomorrow."² Thus $c\bar{e}t$ here is clearly of a chronological nature providing the time and the setting of the revelation in the evening of the day.

Dan 9:25

וְיָתַר עַל-מִשְׁכַּל מִן-מִנְעַם דָּבָר לְהָשִׁיב וּלְבָנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם
 עַד-מִשְׁחָה גִיד שְׂבָעִים שָׁבָעָה וְשָׂבָעִים שְׁשִׁים וּשְׁנַיִם חֹשֶׁבַע
 וּנְבֻטָה רַתִּיב וְהָרוּחַ וּבְצֹק הָעֵתִים:

Know and understand, that from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the prince shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks:³

¹ $B^{\circ}c\bar{e}t$ and $l^{\circ}c\bar{e}t$ express a point of time in a more general way, "as often as" (Jer 2:17), "when" (Jer 6:15) "at the time, when" (Job 6:17); "toward evening" (Gen 24:11), "a time of healing" (Jer 8:15), etc.

²E.g., Exod 9:18; Jos 11:6; 1 Sam 9:16; 1 Kgs 19:2; 20:6, etc., cf. Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), # 262.

³The MT has an athnach after the words "seven weeks" which makes the Messiah appear after the first time period of seven weeks. However, since the punctuation marks were not finalized until the ninth/tenth century (E. Würthwein, Der Text des Alten Testaments, 4th ed. [Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1973], 29), we follow the punctuation of the LXX, Theodotion, Vulgate, and Peshitta, which was taken over by many English versions (KJV, ASV, JB, NASB). According to this punctuation, the Messiah appears after $7+62 = 69$ weeks. See Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks," 12-17; W. H. Shea, "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Dan 9:25," AUSS 18 (1980): 59-63. Furthermore, it is possible that the Masoretic punctuation reflects an anti-Christian bias. E. B. Pusey (Daniel the Prophet [New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885], 190 n. 1) quotes Rashi, unfortunately without giving the source, who says that the separation was made "on account of the heretics," i.e., Christians. (See also Roger T. Beckwith, "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation," Rev Q 10 [1981]: 522).

the street and trenches¹ shall be built again,² even in troublous times (ûb^ošôq hâ^cittîm).³

This verse reveals the terminus a quo of the seventy weeks mentioned in vs. 24.⁴ We do not go into an

¹Theodotion reads "plateia kai teichos" (street and wall). The expression r^ohōb w^ohārûš has always baffled interpreters. R^ohōb is the open square or place in a town (Gen 19:2), and hārûš has been taken to be the same as the Akkadian hārîšu which is the city moat (HAL, 338; AHW 326). But to have a moat for a hilltop town in an arid environment is rather unlikely. J. D. Prince (A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899], 249), therefore, suggested to read "public places and trenches" referring hārûš not to a city moat but to the irrigation ditches of the gardens, following the use of the related word hārîš in the Mishna. (See J. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim [Leipzig: Gustav Engel, 1867], 284). This has recently been confirmed when the word was found in Aramaic inscriptions and the Copper Scroll from Qumran, where it means a "conduit." (W. Sibley Towner, Daniel, Interpretation [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984], 143).

²In conjunction with another verb šwb can have the meaning of "again," e.g., Gen 26:18. (CHAL, 362).

³Theodotion reads "ekkenōthesontai hoi kairoi (the times shall be exhausted). For the background to this prophecy, see the comments on 9:21.

⁴We shall give a brief synopsis of the major views of this prophecy (see G. F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus and the Nature of Prophecy, DARCOM, vol.3, ed. F. B. Holbrook [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1968], 3-63).

1. The Historical-Critical school sees in Dan 9:24-27 a description of events in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes which was written after the events as a record (vaticinium ex eventu) not as a true prophecy. The first 7 weeks of the 70-week period are counted from 586 B.C. (destruction of Jerusalem) to 538 B.C. (decree of Cyrus to rebuild the temple), the second period of 62 weeks extends from 538-171 B.C. (the date of the murder of Onias III, the "anointed one" of vs. 26), and the last week ends in 164 B.C. with the rededication of the temple desecrated by Antiochus IV Epiphanes at the middle of the week. One serious flaw of this scheme is the fact that the number of

extended exegesis since we are only interested in the phrase "troubulous times." Depending on the interpreter's viewpoint, the "troubulous times" belong either to the first seven weeks or to the sixty-two weeks. Most of those who place them in the period of the seven weeks begin them

years from 538 to 171 is not 434 years (62 weeks), but only 367. This discrepancy is usually explained by stating that the writer in the second century followed an incorrect computation. (S. R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, CBSC [Cambridge: University Press, 1901], 146).

2. The Historical-Messianic interpretation is the traditional Christian view. This view dates the 70 weeks from the return of Ezra in 457 B.C. (G. F. Hasel, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27," Ministry 49 [1976]: 14D; Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," 49-51). The respective dates are 408 B.C. for the completion of the restoration of Jerusalem, A.D. 27 for the appearance of the Messiah, and A.D. 34 for the termination of the 70th week. The crucifixion of Christ is placed in the middle of the last week at A.D. 31.

3. The Dispensational school generally takes 445 B.C. as the terminus a quo and by using lunar years (360 days) the 483 years end in A.D. 32 at which time they believe Christ was crucified. The one week of seven years is placed into the future as the week of great tribulation at the end of human history. (Robert Anderson, The Coming Prince [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1957], 121-129. John F. Walvoord, Daniel [Chicago: Moody Press, 1971], 223-237).

4. The symbolic interpretation has the 70 weeks span the time from 538 B.C. (return of the Jews) to the second Advent. Since the numbers are taken symbolically, no calculations are made. The first seven heptads end with Christ, the next 62 heptads extend from the first to the second Advent and the last heptad brings the 62 heptads to a close, i.e., it runs concurrent with the last part of the 62 heptads (H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel [Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969], 403-440). A variation of this interpretation has the terminus ad quem in A.D. 70. The one who confirms the covenant is, therefore, Christ and not the Antichrist at the end of time as held by Leupold. (Bert H. Hall, "The Book of Daniel," WBIC, 6 vols. [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969], 3:547).

either in 539/8 B.C. with the decree of Cyrus in Ezra 1,¹ in which case the forty-nine years are considered to be merely a symbolic number,² or in 445/444 B.C. with the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus (464-424 B.C.) in Neh 2.³ A third view begins the seven weeks in 458/7 B.C. with the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus in Ezra 7.⁴ In each view the *ṣôq hā^cittîm* are considered to be the "oppression and opposition which God's people suffered during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (cf. Neh 4:1ff; 6:1ff; 9:36-37)."⁵

Those who consider the *ṣôq hā^cittîm* as part of the sixty-two weeks make a break after "7 weeks" and translate: "Then for 62 weeks it shall be built again. . . ."⁶ For them the seven weeks cover the period from the fall of

¹E. J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 202; J. C. Baldwin, Daniel, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978), 169-170; Hall, 3:547. Leupold, Daniel, 418.

²Young, 206; Baldwin, 171; Hall, 3:547; Leupold, Daniel, 405; John E. Goldingay, Daniel, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), 258.

³Philip R. Newell, Daniel: The Man Greatly Beloved and His Prophecies (Chicago: Moody Press, 1962), 147; Albert Barnes, Daniel, 2 vols. (1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 2:161; Maier, 340; Harold W. Hoehner, Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977), 126-128.

⁴Gleason L. Archer, "Daniel," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, 12 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 7: 114; F. D. Nichol, ed., The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-1957), 4:853; Hasel, "The Seventy Weeks," 15D.

⁵Young, 206. Cf. Maier, 346; Hasel, "The Seventy Weeks," 15D.

⁶RSV, NEB.

Jerusalem in 586 B.C. to the Return of the Jews in 538 B.C.¹ Accordingly, the sixty-two weeks begin in 539 or 538 B.C. and extend to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.² The times of trouble are the whole period of the sixty-two weeks,³ and an illustration of them is seen in the story of Ezra-Nehemiah.⁴

¹James A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 379-380; Driver, Daniel, 146; K. Marti, Das Buch Daniel, KHC (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901), 69; R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 106; Aage Bentzen, Daniel, 2nd ed., HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), 75. Several interpreters place the fall of Jerusalem in the year 587 B.C. and end the 49 years with the fall of Babylon (Porteous, 141) or the Return of the Jews in 538/537 B.C. (L. F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, The Book of Daniel, AB [Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1978], 251; D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, OTL [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964], 197; idem, Daniel, DSB [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981], 187; Towner, 142; Carl G. Howie, The Book of Ezekiel, The Book of Daniel, LBC [Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1961], 131; André Lacoque, The Book of Daniel [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979], 195; M. McNamara, "Seventy Weeks of Years," New Catholic Encyclopedia, 17 vols. [New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967], 13:141-142). Others, on the basis of Jer 25:1 and 11, go back to 605/604 B.C. for the beginning of the first week, i.e., the 49 years, and end it with the accession of Cyrus in 558 B.C. (E. König, Die messianischen Weissagungen des AT [Stuttgart: Chr. Belser, 1925], 311). For an extended review of these interpretations see Hasel, "Interpretations," 3-63.

²Montgomery, 380; Russell, Daniel, 187; idem, Jewish Apocalyptic, 197; Hartman and Di Lella, 251; Towner, 143; Porteous, 141; Driver, Daniel, 146; Howie, 131; Bentzen, 74-75. Lacoque (Daniel, 195) goes back to 605 B.C. (the date of Jeremiah's oracle, see Jer 25:1,11) and has the 434 years running from 605-171 B.C.

³Driver, Daniel, 138-139; Bentzen, 74; Towner, 143.

⁴Montgomery, 380; Hartman and Di Lella, 251; Driver, Daniel, 139.

Almost all interpreters then see the events portrayed in Ezra-Nehemiah as a fulfillment of the $\text{šôq hā}^{\text{c}}\text{ittîm}$. Some limit them to the seven weeks, others apply them to the whole period of the sixty-two weeks. The term $^{\text{c}}\text{et}$ in Dan 9:25, therefore, is primarily a chronological time period in history which for most expositors ends before the Messiah arrived.¹

Dan 11:6

יִלְבָּזוּ שָׁנִים יִתְחַבְּרוּ וּבֵת מֶלֶךְ-הַנֶּגֶב תָּבוֹא אֶל-מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן
 לַעֲשׂוֹת מִישָׁרִים וְלֹא-תִסָּעֵר כִּי־הָיוּ וְלֹא יִמְדֹּל חֲרָטִי וְתִנָּתֵן
 הִיא וּמְבִיאֶיהָ וְהַלְלָהּ וּמְחֹזְקֶיהָ בְּעַתָּים:

And at the end of several years² they³ shall make an alliance, for the daughter of the king of the south shall come⁴ to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm,⁵

¹Only those interpreters who understand the time references symbolically and apply the sixty-two weeks to the Christian era have these "troublesome times" going right to the end. In this case, $^{\text{c}}\text{et}$ would also acquire an eschatological meaning or at least reach into the eschatological era. (See Leupold, 424-425; Keil, Daniel, 373-375).

²Theodotion reads *meta ta etē autou* (after his years).

³The subject of *yithabbārū* are the king of the South and "one of his princes" introduced in vs. 5.

⁴The verb *bw'* in the sense of coming for marriage is found in Josh 15:18; Judg 12:9.

⁵As in 10:10 and 18, the hand is a metaphor for help and assistance. "The meaning is: she will not retain the power to render the help which her marriage should secure; she shall not be able to bring about and to preserve the sincerity of the covenant; and thus the king of the south . . . shall become subject to the more powerful king of the north" (Keil, Daniel, 434).

neither shall he stand, nor his arm:¹ but she shall be given up,² and they that brought her, and he that begat her,³ and he that strengthened her in these times (bā^cittīm).

Dan 11 is part of the second "commentary vision" (Dan 10-12) given to Daniel. As in the vision in Dan 9, there are no striking symbols here, only explanations. The symbolic visions end in Dan 8:14, what follows are explanations and enlargements of the symbolic visions.

In Dan 11:2 the commentary vision proper begins with the Persian and Grecian empires. The "mighty king" in vs. 3 is the empire of Alexander which is succeeded by the four kingdoms of the Diadochi in vs. 4. One of these Diadochi is the King of the South and another one is the King of the North. In history the Ptolemies became the

¹The ancient versions (Theodotion, Symmachus, Vulgate) and several modern commentators read zar^cō (his seed) for z^crō^cō (his arm) referring it to the child of Berenice and Antiochus II (Driver, Daniel, 167; Bentzen, 76; Hartman and Di Lella, 257; Lacoque, Daniel, 215); Arthur Jeffery, "The Book of Daniel," IB [New York: Abingdon, 1956], 515). Marti (Daniel, 78) takes arm as a metaphor for help (Hilfsmittel) and says, "auch die Hilfsmittel des Syrerkönigs, halten nicht stand."

²Niphal, preformative, 3 sg. f. This use of nātan is unique in Hebrew, "one would expect it to be followed up by lammāweṭ 'to death' as in Ezek 31:14" (Hartman and Di Lella, 266).

³Again the ancient versions (Theodotion, Symmachus) and several modern commentators read w^cyaldāh (her child) for w^chayyol^cdāh (Marti, Daniel, 79; Lacoque, Daniel, 216; Hartman and Di Lella, 257). Keil (Daniel, 435) explains hayyol^cdāh as a participle with a 3. sg. f. suffix, wherein the article represents the relative pronoun 'āšer. This would refer to her father who could also be the one who strengthened her; others refer the latter to her husband, Antiochus II (Montgomery, 430; Driver, Daniel, 167; Hartman and Di Lella, 266).

"King of the South" and the Seleucids the "King of the North."

Thus in vs. 6 a Ptolemaic princess comes to the king of the Seleucid empire to seal an alliance, but according to the text, the plan was to fail. In history this happened in 252 B.C. when king Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt (285-246) and king Antiochus II Theos of Syria (261-246) attempted to guarantee peace between their countries by making a peace treaty under the terms of which Antiochus II was to marry Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy II. Antiochus divorced his wife Laodice and married Berenice. When he found he did not like Berenice, he divorced her, too, and took Laodice back again. She, however, had Berenice, her infant son, and her attendants assassinated. Not long afterward the king himself was poisoned to death and Laodice became queen.¹ Thus the prophecy of vs. 6 was fulfilled.

The word *bā^cittîm*, therefore, whether it belongs to vs. 6 or vs. 7 is of no consequence for our study,² refers to the time of those kings, i.e., the third century B.C. On this commentators agree.³

¹Archer, "Daniel," 130.

²Because of the Hebrew syntax, several commentators place *bā^cittîm* at the beginning of vs. 7 (Marti, Daniel, 79; Bentzen, 76; Montgomery, 430-431; Hartman and Di Lella, 257).

³Keil, Daniel, 435; Maier, 378; Leupold, Daniel, 482; Marti, Daniel, 79; Driver, Daniel, 167.

Dan 11:13-14

13 וְשׁוֹב מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן וְהַעֲמִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ רַב מֶלֶךְ
הָרָאשׁוֹן וְלִקְחַן הַעֲתִים שָׁנִים יָבֹא כּוֹא בְּחֵיל גָּדוֹל וּבְרִכּוּשׁ
רַב: 14 וּבְעֵתִים הָהֵם רַבִּים יַעֲמְדוּ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב וּבְנֵי אֶרֶץ
עַמָּךְ יִשְׂאוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חֲזוֹן וּבְשָׁלוֹ:

And the king of the North will return, and raise an army greater than the former, and at the end of times of years [after some years] (ûl^oqēs hā^oittīm šānīm) he will come¹ with a great army and with much supply. And in those times (ûbā^oittīm hāhēm) there shall many stand up against the king of the south: and violent men of your people shall exalt themselves to fulfill the vision; but they shall fall.

The context of this passage indicates that in the course of history, the King of the South would defeat the King of the North (vss. 11,12). In vs. 13 the King of the North, the subject of vs. 13, will after some years again seek to conquer the King of the South. His activities are described by the three verbs šûb (he returns), ʿāmad (High --he causes to stand), and bō' (he comes). And when he comes, "in those times," the "many" and the "violent men of your people," the subjects of vs. 14 will take the opportunity and rise against the King of the South.

The l^oqēs hā^oittīm šānīm in vs. 13, literally "at the end of the times, years," is very obscure. The

¹The translation of the idiom yābō' bō' with "certainly come" (KJV) is an exception -and contrary to grammatical usage. The Infinitive absolute expresses emphasis when it immediately precedes the finite verb, and duration or repetition when it follows it. J. Weingreen, A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), 79. Another exception to the rule is 2 Kgs 5:11.

hā^cittîm looks like an addition since the usual phrase is l^oqēs šānîm¹ or miqqēs šānîm.² Many scholars think it is a dittography from vs. 14³. A. A. Bevan surmises it "may have been added by a scribe in order to explain the vague term hā^cittîm in accordance with ūl^oqēs šānîm in vs. 6."⁴ Whatever the case, the meaning of the phrase seems to be "at the end of several years."⁵

In history the defeat of the King of the North (vss. 11,12) took place at the Battle of Raphia in 217 B.C. when Antiochus III (223-187) was soundly defeated by Ptolemy IV (221-204). Antiochus III was forced to cede all of Phoenicia and Palestine to Ptolemy IV, but in the years following, he enlarged his empire in the east and in the west. "At the end of several years" in 203 B.C. (14 years after Raphia), Antiochus III advanced once more against the King of the South, who at that point was the four-year old

¹2 Chr 18:2; Dan 11:6.

²Gen 16:3; 14:1; Exod 12:41; Deut 15:1; 31:10; Jer 34:14; 2 Sam 15:7; 1 Kgs 2:39; Isa 23:15,17; Ezek 29:13; 2 Chr 8:1.

³Charles, Daniel, 287; Marti, Daniel, 80; Montgomery, 438; Bentzen, 78; Hartman and Di Lella, 258.

⁴A. A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1892), 180.

⁵In Dan 10:2 we find the expression "three weeks of days" (š^olōšāh šābu^cîm yāmîm) indicating that three literal weeks are meant. Analogously here we have "times" defined by "years." Thus the phrase "at the end of times pertaining to years" emphasizes that literal years are in view.

Ptolemy V (204-181).¹ Furthermore, there was unrest in Egypt at that time. Egyptians were rioting against their Greek overlords.² These Egyptians, Antiochus III, and Philip of Macedon, with whom Antiochus had made an alliance, as well as a possible pro-Seleucid faction in Jerusalem,³ all rose against Ptolemy V and eventually

¹Archer, "Daniel," 131.

²C. Mervyn Maxwell, God Cares, vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981), 288. The Rosetta Stone stems from this period and records the concessions made by Ptolemy V to the Egyptians.

³Archer, "Daniel," 132. Jerome (Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, trans. G. L. Archer, Jr. [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958], 125) and many commentators after him identified the "robbers of thy people" (KJV) with the pro-Egyptian group around the high priest Onias III, who, during the conflict between Antiochus the Great (232-187) and the generals of Ptolemy, fled to Egypt and was honorably received by Ptolemy. In the region of Heliopolis, Onias built a temple, offered sacrifices, and claimed that he was fulfilling the prophecy written in Isa 19:19, "There shall be an altar of the Lord in Egypt, and the name of the Lord shall be found in their territories." Temple and city were destroyed over 250 years later by the Romans. D. A. Schlatter ("Die B^onê parišîm bei Daniel: 11,14," ZAW 14 [1894]: 145-151) identified the b^onê parišîm, which means "breakers down," "those who break the law" (in Jer 7:11 it is translated robbers), with the family of Tobias (2 Macc 3:11) who took the side of Antiochus in the conflict mentioned above. They secured the high priesthood and were robbing the people through the Syrian taxes (see also Marti; Daniel, 80 and Bentzen, 80). Another school of thought believes that we are here introduced to the rising power of the Romans (Desmond Ford, Daniel (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1978), 263; Nichol, ABC, 4:869; Maxwell, 291). Maxwell (291) says, "As a fact, it was in the days of Antiochus III that the Romans did enter the history of the eastern Mediterranean. When they learned that Antiochus III had made an alliance with Philip of Macedon against Ptolemy V of Egypt, they feared the development of a new superpower in the Middle East and warned Philip and Antiochus III to stay out of Egypt. Their warning amounted to a kind of Mediterranean "Monroe Doctrine" or "Cuban Policy." The Romans did rob the Jews

succeeded in curtailing Egypt's power. The *ittim* in vs. 14 refer to this time period around 200 B.C. in the history of Syria and Egypt.

Dan 11:24

וּבְשִׁלְוָה וּבְמִשְׁעָנִי מְדִינָה יָבוֹא
וְעָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר לֹא עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו וְאֲבוֹת בְּנֵי וְשִׁלְל וְרָכִישׁ
לָהֶם יָבוֹר וְעַל מְבַצְרִים יִחַשֵׁב מִחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ וְעִדְרֵתָ:

With ease¹ shall he (the contemptible person) enter² into the richest places³ of the province; and he shall do that which neither his fathers nor his father's

of their independence in 63 B.C., and later in A.D. 70 and 135 destroyed temple and the city of Jerusalem respectively. The fact that "they shall fall" is taken to mean that "this enemy shall not forever endure" (Ford, 263). But as George McCready Price (The Greatest of the Prophets [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955], 284) has pointed out, "After taking all things into consideration, it seems better to apply this expression to some faction among the Jewish people, who were seeking to do evil that good might come."

¹Theodotion reads *en euthēnia* (with prosperity).

²The expression *b*šalwāh* together with *bō'* appears already in vs. 21c where it describes the entrance of the "vile person." It is intended to emphasize the way this person appears--without warning, in times of peace--since later on he does not act peaceably at all.

³The word *b*mišmannē* has usually been taken as the adjectival noun "fatness" describing *m*dīnāh*--the plural expressing the superlative (Jeffery, 526; Montgomery, 453; Hartman and Di Lella, 269). Because this word appears only in two other texts (Isa 10:16; Ps 78:31) in plural and there it means "distinguished people," (In Gen 27:28-29, the word comes from *šāmān* [HAL, 613]), Bernhard Hasslberger (Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12, Münchner Universitätsschriften: Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, vol. 4 [St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1977], 253) assumes the same meaning here and follows Bevan (188) who translated, "In peace and with honorable men of the land he will present himself."

fathers did; he shall scatter among them¹ plunder and spoil, and riches. And he shall devise² plans against the strongholds,³ but only for a time (w^ec ad cēt).

The subject of this verse is the contemptible person of vs. 21. Vss. 21-24 are a summary of his rapid rise to power. People will rally round him, taken in by his inducements and flatteries. Vss. 25-27 give an illustration of his treacherous dealings and vss. 28-35 describe his dealings with God's people and His sanctuary.

Who is this contemptible person? Commentators generally apply this prophecy to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.)⁴ Yet at the same time some admit that there

¹Lāhem refers back to the small party mentioned in 11:23 (Hartman and Di Lella, 270).

²Mah^ašābāh can be an idea, a plan or a clever invention (HAL, 542). In this text, it can refer to either of the latter two. The RSV translates, "He shall devise plans against the strongholds."

³Theodotion reads ep Aigupton (against Egypt).

⁴Young, Daniel, 241; Baldwin, 191; Hall, 3:553; Newell, 176; Barnes, Daniel, 2:227; Leupold, Daniel, 494; Maier, 387; Archer, "Daniel," 136; Montgomery, 450; Driver, Daniel, 177; Prince, 179; Bentzen, 81; Russell, Daniel, 207; Lacoque, Daniel, 226; Porteous, 165; Towner, 157; Howie, 157; Keil, Daniel, 450; Hartman and Di Lella, 294; Jeffery, 524; Marti, Daniel, 83; Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, KAT (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), 157; G. A. F. Knight, "The Book of Daniel," The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), 449; J. J. Collins, Daniel. First Maccabees. Second Maccabees, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981), 106; R. Hammer, The Book of Daniel, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 110; O. Zöckler, The Book of the Prophet Daniel, LC, trans. J. Strong (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 247; H. A. Ironside, Lectures on Daniel the Prophet 2nd ed. (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1920), 202; J. C. Lebram, Das Buch Daniel, ZB (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984), 119; E. W. Heaton, The Book of Daniel, TBC (London: SCM Press, 1956),

are considerable difficulties with this interpretation.¹ Some exegetes try to alter the text to which Ch. Wright says, "These modern attempts to correct the text of Daniel so as to bring it into closer harmony with the records of Maccabean times are, however, highly suspicious."²

From the earliest commentaries on Daniel onward, interpreters have often seen more in Dan 11 than simply the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes who by all counts was a relatively unimportant king in world history. Hippolytus who wrote in the third century A.D. applied Dan 11:36-45 to the Antichrist,³ Jerome in the fourth century saw Antiochus from vs. 21 on as a type of the Antichrist,⁴ and Chrysostom at the beginning of the fifth century found the Antichrist throughout the whole chapter.⁵

232; R. M. Gurney, God in Control (Worthington, West Sussex: H. E. Walter, 1980), 141; A. B. Michelson, Daniel and Revelation (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1984), 13.

¹J. E. H. Thomson, Daniel, PC (London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1894), 314; Charles H. H. Wright, Daniel and His Prophecies (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), 292-293. Cf. H. H. Rowley, "The 'Prince of the Covenant' in Daniel 11:22," ExpTim 55 (1943-44): 25-26, who suggests the young son of Seleucus Philopator, also named Antiochus, as the prince of the covenant.

²Wright, 305.

³Hippolytus Fragments from Commentaries: On Daniel 2:38-39 (ANF 5:184).

⁴Jerome said concerning Dan 11:21 that Antiochus IV Epiphanes "is to be regarded as a type of the Antichrist, and those things which happened to him in a preliminary way are to be completely fulfilled in the case of the Antichrist" (Jerome, 129).

⁵Chrysostom Adversus Judaeos V, 7(PG 48:894).

Several commentators follow Jerome and see a double application of vss. 21-45. They view Antiochus as a type of the real contemptible person--the Antichrist.¹ Others see the double application begin at vs. 36,² still others feel that from vs. 36 onward the text deals only with the future Antichrist.³ F. A. Tatford calls the king in vs. 36 "the future ruler of Israel, the 'worthless shepherd' of Zech 11:17, and the one whom the Patmos seer described as the 'false prophet'."⁴ Walvoord, on the other hand, thinks this king is the future Roman world ruler, "the same individual as the little horn of Daniel 7 and the beast out of the sea of Revelation 13:1-10."⁵

P. Mauro has a different and rather novel explanation of vss. 36-45. He believes that these verses speak of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.) and his dynasty. Dan 12:1 is

¹Maier, 387; Baldwin, 192; Ford, Daniel, 266; G. R. King, Daniel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1966), 231; Newell, 175.

²Young, Daniel, 241; Archer, "Daniel," 143; R. Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and D. Brown, A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old and New Testaments, 6 vols. (1866; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 4:450.

³Leupold, Daniel, 511; Hall, 3:555.

⁴Frederick A. Tatford, Daniel and His Prophecy (London: Oliphant, 1953; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock, 1980), 203.

⁵Walvoord, Daniel, 272.

for him the birth of Christ, and the resurrection of 12:2 is the resurrection of those spiritually dead.¹

Recently, Frank W. Hardy made a study of Daniel 11 from the Historicist point of view.² He examined the structure of Dan 11 in terms of both chiastic and linear outline formats and interpreted the chapter in accordance with the Historicist principle of interpretation which states "that all of God's dealings with mankind are characterized by ongoing involvement and take place within an extended historical matrix of ordinary experience."³

Therefore, if God is constantly with His people in history, one would expect that fact to be reflected in prophecy. We would expect then that in a condensed summary of history, which spans the time from the Persian kings (11:2) to the resurrection (12:2), inspired by the God who actively works in history to save mankind, we would find at least some reference to the Saviour, through whom that work is effected.⁴

Thus, Hardy states at the beginning of his study:

it would be incongruous to apply Dan 11:2-35 to one very limited span of past time in myopically close

¹Philip Mauro, The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation (Swengel. PA: Bible Truth Depot, 1944), 128.

²Frank W. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983).

³Ibid., 65. A corollary of this divine activity on earth through history is Christ's priestly ministry in heaven.

⁴Ibid., 12.

detail, and then [arguing against Futurists] to apply the remaining verses to another very limited span of future time.¹

Neither of them would have a reference to the cross.

In his study of the structure of Dan 10-12, Hardy found that: (1) the whole passage is broadly chiasitic in form with 11:22 as its apex,² and (2) that its linear structure reveals two separate references to Christ (11:22 and 12:1) corresponding to the two advents of Christ.³

¹Ibid. The question concerning the import of Antiochus IV Epiphanes has been raised before (Baldwin, 191), but no satisfactory answer has yet been found.

²Ibid., 105-122. His chiasitic structure is as follows:

1. 10:1	Beginning and Ending	12:13
2. 10:2,3	Waiting in Affliction	12:7,11,12
3. 10:5	The Man dressed in Linen	12:6,7
4. 10:14	Your People	12:1
5. 10:7	Seeing and Understanding	12:10
6. 10:19	Accepting and Pursuing	
	Information	12:8
7. 10:21	Book or Scroll	12:4
8. 10:13,21	Michael	12:1
9. 11:1	Beginning and Ending	11:45
10. 11:2	Named Countries	11:41
11. 11:2	Initiative	11:40
12. 11:3	Superior Response	11:40
13. 11:6	Mutual Recognition	11:30,32,39
14. 11:7,10	Fortresses	11:31,38,39
15. 11:8	Gods, Gifts and Captivity	11:38,43,33
16. 11:12	Self-Exaltation	11:36,30,33
17. 11:14	The Vision, the Temple and the Daily Sacrifice	11:31
18. 11:15	Siege Ramps and Invasion	11:29
19. 11:20	Emphasis on Wealth	11:24
20. 11:20	Battles and Wars	11:25
21. 11:21	The Contemptible Person	11:23
22. 11:21	The Villains Rise to Power	11:23
	The Prince of the Covenant	
	11:22	

³Ibid., 129-148, 162-163.

If the chiastic structure reveals the exegetical center of the chapter, then Onias III should be the most important player on the stage, according to most exegetes. However, he is not; again, most interpreters see Antiochus IV Epiphanes as the main figure, even though he is not at the center of vs. 22. For Historicists, says Hardy, "there is no conflict whatever between the exegetical and structural facts under discussion. The exegesis centers on Christ in vs. 22 and so does the chiasm."¹

In the linear structure the identification of "the prince of the covenant" by Hardy is Christ.² His

¹Ibid., 241.

²Ibid., 88. He uses the following diagram to make his point:

Dan 9:26	9:25	11:22
māšīaḥ	māšīaḥ nāgīd	nāgīd b°rīt

The two phrases māšīaḥ nāgīd and nāgīd b°rīt appear only in these texts and are, therefore, open to interpretation. Hardy quotes Eusebius (The Ecclesiastical History I.vi.11 [trans. Kirsopp Lake, LCL, 1:54-55) and Jerome (Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, 102) to show that the māšīaḥ nāgīd in 9:25 has traditionally been understood to refer to Christ, and "if 9:25 refers to Christ, Dan 11:22 also refers to Christ" (Hardy, 89). Historicist and Futurist interpreters identify the māšīaḥ nāgīd with Christ, but Futurist exegetes do not draw the same conclusion in regard to the nāgīd b°rīt in 11:22. The māšīaḥ nāgīd in 9:25 is not an "anointed leader" (Hartman and Di Lella, 240) but "an anointed one, a prince" (William H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, DARCOM, vol. 3, ed. Frank B. Holbrook [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], 88), in other words, one who is at the same time a Messiah and a King. (See also G. Hasel, "מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד," TWAT, 5:218). It is interesting to note that 9:25 and 11:22 are the only places in the OT where a nāgīd is destroyed (cut off or broken), though this does not prove that they are one and the same person.

Historicist view moves on to the Second Advent in Dan 12:1 and rests on the parallelism between the downfall of the hostile power in Dan 2 and the downfall of the hostile power in Dan 11:45, the supernatural cause of which he sees in Dan 12:1. He says: ". . . one cause accounts for both events."¹ He quotes G. M. Price, who says:

It [Dan 11:45] is the same sort of catastrophic end, brought about by direct divine intervention, as marks the termination of all the other lines of prophecy given in this book Daniel. In the second chapter the great image was destroyed by a stone cut out of the mountain "without hands." Verse 45. The beast of the vision of chapter 7 "was slain, and its body destroyed, and it was given to be burned with fire." Verse 11. Of the terrible horn of chapter 8 it is said: "He shall be broken without hand." Verse 25. Here this God-defying power "shall come to his end, and none shall help him." The meaning is that all these powers exist down to the close of all human history, but all are terminated by the supernatural intervention of the powers of heaven at the second coming of Christ.²

Thus, according to Hardy, it seems that "a parallel may be assumed among the oppressors at the end of Dan 2, 7, 8, and 10-12, and among the means by which they are destroyed."³ Hardy concludes that the stone-power in chap. 2 is the same as that represented by Michael in Dan 12, whom he identifies as Christ.

If we accept Hardy's exegesis of Dan 11:22, then the ad eēt in Dan 11:24, the text we are concerned with

¹Ibid., 160.

²Price, 317.

³Hardy, 160.

here, refers to the time of the Romans after Christ;¹ if not, then the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, which is assumed by most commentators, is as good a guess as any other.²

Given this difference between Historicists, on the one hand, and Futurists, Dispensationalists, and Historical-critical scholars, on the other, one can ask, is there an inner-Danielic control which could aid us in a better understanding of Dan 11? I believe there is and I will now attempt to demonstrate it.

Many scholars have recognized that there is a link between Dan 11 and other chapters in the book of Daniel.

¹Price (295) takes the expression "even for a time" as a prophetic time of 360 years and applies it to the time period from 31 B.C. to A.D. 330 (from the battle of Actium to Constantine's move to Constantinople). Price assumes a break between vs. 22 and 23. In vs. 23 he goes back to the time of vs. 16 which for him is about 170 B.C. He says (294), "Now, having told the story of Rome down to the most important event of all ages, the tragic death of the Prince of the covenant, the angel takes us back to a famous event in the history of the Jewish people for a new start in the narration of the history of the world."

²Although commentators in general are convinced that Dan 11 records the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in great detail, several of them are ready to admit that at times they are at a loss to make history fit the prophecy. Young (Daniel, 242), for instance, says concerning the "prince" in 11:22, "I do not know to what the reference is." Baldwin (193) admits, "Historians differ as to the exact events referred to in vs. 23 and vs. 24 is equally difficult to apply exactly." Towner uses phrases like "vague in some details" (154) or "not entirely clear" (158) and Maier (373) quotes E. Bickermann (Der Gott der Makkabäer [Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1937], 169) who said, "Viele Einzelheiten bleiben noch immer dunkel." For a critique of the Maccabean Thesis see A. J. Ferch, "The Book of Daniel and the 'Maccabean Thesis,'" AUSS 21 (1983): 129-141.

Tatford, for example, says, "To a great extent, Dan 11 is a development and fuller explanation of Dan 8."¹ For Leupold Dan 11 ties back into Dan 9,² and several scholars acknowledge that chaps. 2, 7, and 8 are in many ways interrelated.³

Several interpreters have produced tables of comparison of the prophetic chapters of the book of Daniel.⁴ I use the same method in order to discover if Dan 11 can be better understood when it is compared with the rest of the vision chapters in the book of Daniel.

First, we compare Dan 2, 7, and 8 on Chart A,⁵ and then Dan 8, 9, and 10-12 on Chart B.⁶ We shall look for parallel words, phrases, or thoughts and use only the biblical text for explanations.

¹Tatford, Daniel, 181. So also Hartman and Di Lella (276): "This apocalypse is modeled to some extent on the one in chap. 8."; Lacoque, Daniel, 122; H. H. Rowley (Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel [Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959], 128) identifies the king in 11:21 with the Little Horn in Dan 7 and 8.

²Since chapter 9 (in the Vision of the Seventy Heptads) "gave the summary of the course of history in the sequence of all its parts." (Leupold, Daniel, 470).

³Ibid., 331-332. See also Hartman and Di Lella, 142, 230; Baldwin, 154; Driver, Daniel, 94-95; Towner, 93, 118; Franz Dusterwald, Die Weltreiche und das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen des Propheten Daniel (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1890), 100.

⁴Driver, Daniel, 94-95; Ford, Daniel, 286-287; Maxwell, 242, 285.

⁵See page 326.

⁶See page 327.

CHART A

Daniel 2, 7, and 8.

Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8	Explanations
32. head of gold	4. lion		2:28 Babylon
32. breast of silver	5. bear -raised up on one side -devours much flesh	3. ram -one horn higher than the other 4. there was no one that could deliver out of his hands	8:20 Medo-Persia
32. thighs of bronze	6. leopard -dominion given -four heads	5. he-goat 7. he smote the ram 8. four horns	8:21 Greece
33. legs of iron	7. a terrible beast	9. (little horn)	
40. strong as iron -breaks and crushes	-iron teeth -devoured and brake in pieces		
33. feet of iron and clay	8. ten horns		2:41 divided kingdom 7:24 ten kingdoms
	8. little horn	9. little horn	
	21. persecutes saints	10. stamps on the host of heaven	
	25. speaks against the most high	12. magnified itself even to the prince of the host	
	25. three and a half times	14. Two thousand three hundred days	
34. stone cut without hands	26. he shall be consumed	25. he shall be broken without hands	
35. stone became a great mountain	27. kingdom given to the saints = an everlasting kingdom		2:44 kingdom of heaven

CHART B.

Daniel 8, 9, and 10-12.

Dan 8	Dan 9	Dan 10-12
2. at the river Ulai		10:4 at the great river
3. I raised my eyes and saw, and behold		10:5 I lifted up my eyes and looked and behold
8. the great horn was broken -four horns to- wards four winds of heaven		11:4 his kingdom shall be broken -divided toward the four winds of heaven
9. a little horn which grew ex- ceedingly great -toward the glorious land		11:23 he shall be- come strong with a small people 11:16 the glorious land
11. the daily sacrifice was taken away -place of his sanctuary was overthrown -prince of the host	26. sacrifice and offering to cease -shall destroy ... the sanctuary	11:31 shall take away the daily offering
13. the transgress- ion that makes desolate	25. an anointed one a prince	11:22 the prince of the covenant
16. Gabriel make this man under- stand the vision	27. upon the wings of abomination shall come one who makes desolate	11:31 the abomination that makes desolate
17. the vision is for the time of the end	21-23 Gabriel ... I have come to give you understanding	11:35 until the time of the end
19. the later end of the indignation	26. unto the end	11:36 till the in- dignation is accomplished
24. destroy mighty men and the people of the saints	26. shall destroy the city and the sanctuary	
25. he shall even rise up against the Prince of princes	26. an anointed one shall be cut off	11:22 the prince of the covenant shall be broken
25. by no human hand, he shall be broken		11:45 he shall come to his end
26. the vision is true		10:1 the word is true

From Chart A we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The first three empires are clearly defined as Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece by direct text citations.
2. The Little Horn of chap. 7 is basically the same as the Little Horn of chap. 8, even though the Aramaic expression qeren 'aḥ°rî z°cêrâh in Dan 7:8 is not the exact equivalent of the Hebrew qeren 'aḥaṭ miṣṣ°cîrâh in Dan 8:9.¹ The identification of the two horns, says H. H. Rowley, "does not rest on the similarity of the terms, but on the indications of the character and deeds of the person each stands for."² To be exact, the activities of the Little Horn in Dan 7 overlap to a large extent the activities of the Little Horn of Dan 8. Whereas in Dan 7 the Little Horn represents the power that arises after the fourth beast has held center stage, the Little Horn in Dan 8 stands for the power of the beast itself as well as for the Little Horn power of Dan 7. W. H. Shea, after having listed eleven similarities between the two "little horns" observes, "If the prophet had desired to represent different powers in this final position, he could

¹The Aramaic means literally "another small horn" whereas the Hebrew says, "one horn from smallness."

²Rowley, Darius the Mede, 127. He applies both horns to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. See also Lacoque, Daniel, 141, 161; Howie, 119, 125; Porteous, 106, 124; Marti, Daniel, 51, 57; Montgomery, 292, 333.

easily have used different symbols to do so."¹

3. In both chapters the activities of the Little Horn extend through the time of the end (Dan 7:26; 8:17), and in both chapters it is supernaturally destroyed (Dan 7:26; 8:25).
4. The visions in Dan 2 and 7 end with the kingdom of heaven. In Dan 7 the destruction of the Little Horn is connected with the establishment of Christ's kingdom.² Thus, we conclude that the Little Horn in Dan 8, since it overlaps the Little Horn in Dan 7, also perishes (Dan 8:25) at the coming of the everlasting kingdom, although Dan 8 does not expressly mention this kingdom. The parallelism which is shown to exist between Dan 7 and 8 seems to lend support to this.

From Chart B³ we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The striking linguistic parallels show that the same

¹W. H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel," in Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol. 2, ed. F. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 187.

²This is the interpretation of most Historicists and Futurists. See Young, Daniel, 162; Leupold, Daniel, 327; Keil, Daniel, 283; Maier, 297; Walvoord, Daniel, 166; Price, 147-148; Archer, "Daniel," 94; Ford, Daniel, 140.

³In both charts the pivot is chap. 8. In these charts it alone follows the chronological order of the text. One must also bear in mind that chaps. 2, 7, and 8 consist of vision and explanation; this means that details appear in the vision and again in the explanation. Therefore, the corresponding texts, particularly in chaps. 9 and 10-12, are not in the chronological order as they appear in their respective chapters. Furthermore, the descriptions in the chapters do not follow a common sequence.

subject matter is treated in all three passages. This does not mean that the parallel texts always deal with exactly the same historical event, e.g., in Dan 9:26 the reference is to the death of the Messiah, but in the parallel texts in Dan 8:11 and Dan 11:31, it can refer to the cross or to a later spiritual conflict involving Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven (Heb 8:1-2).

2. The "prince" or "anointed one" is Christ¹ in all three passages. He is lord of the covenant (Deut 4:23) and he is also the "prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22).
3. The abomination that makes desolate (Dan 9:27; 11:31)² was cited by Christ in Matt 24:15 as still lying in the future.³ A fulfillment in the second century B.C.,

¹Even the "prince who comes" (Dan 9:26) may be taken to be Christ and not Titus, since it is the people of the prince (the Jews) who caused the downfall of Jerusalem through their rebellion against Rome. (See W. H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," 93, and others before him.)

²In Dan 9:27, 11:31, and 12:11, the Hebrew reads šiqqûš (מ*)šōmēm, in Dan 8:13 happeša^c šōmēm is used. On the grammatical anomalies, see the discussion in Desmond Ford, The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979), 149-150.

³Since, in my view, Dan 12:11 uses Dan 11:31, the two must mean the same. Therefore, when Christ quoted Daniel 11:31 and referred it to the future, he clearly looked upon it as not yet fulfilled. (See G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary and the 'Time of the End': A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," Symposium on Daniel, DARCOM, vol.2, ed. F. Holbrook [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], 442; F. W. Burnett, The Testament of Jesus-Sophia [Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981], 303, n. 1; J. C. Fenton, The Gospel of Matthew [Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963], 387); Ford (The

therefore, does not seem to be within the purview of the citation by Christ.

4. The visions of Dan 8 and 11 both reach to "the time of the end," at which, according to Dan 12:2, the resurrection ushers in the new eon of God's kingdom.
5. The indignation (za^cam) in Dan 8:19 and 11:36 refers to the judgment of God (Isa 10:25; 26:20-21). The context of both texts is "the time of the end" (Dan 8:17; 11:35). Thus, the za^cam in both texts points to the final judgment and destruction of sinners.¹ Others apply both passages to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and see the "time of indignation" as the time in which God used Antiochus as the "rod of wrath" (Isa 5:24-30) for the Jews.² That Dan 8:19 and 11:36 complement each other is also supported by the parallelism of the texts,³ the time to which they

Abomination, 164) believes that Christ viewed the times of Antiochus as prefigurative of what lay ahead.

¹Price, 207-208.

²Prince, 149, 184; Russell, Daniel, 158, 209; Hartman and Di Lella, 237, 301.

³There is an interesting parallel between Dan 8:17 and 11:35. In Dan 8:17 Daniel fell to the ground (npl) and was told to understand (byn), for the vision was to be for the time of the end (°t qš). In Dan 11:35 those of understanding (škl) shall fall (kšl) to make them white, even unto the time of the end (°t qš). It seems that in Dan 8:17 and 11:35 God's dealings with the righteous is mentioned, whereas in Dan 8:19 and 11:36 his judgments on the wicked are referred to. In Dan 8:19 Daniel is shown what shall be at the end of the time of indignation (z^cm), for this time has an appointed end (mw^cd qš). In Dan 11:36 the wicked king shall prosper until the indignation (z^cm)

apply in history, however, is determined by one's overall understanding of these chapters.¹

Summarizing both charts, we can say that Dan 2, 7, 8, and 10-12 are parallel prophecies which cover roughly the same time period. They begin either in the time of the Babylonians or the Persians and reach to the time of the end when the everlasting kingdom breaks into history. The stone in Dan 2, the judgment in Dan 7, and the resurrection in Dan 12, clearly point to the apocalyptic end of history. Hence, we can assume that Dan 8 also reaches that far since there are in it many parallels to the other chapters. The inner unity of the book, which we have attempted to illustrate, makes it difficult to accept any interpretation which restricts all or some of Daniel's prophecies to a period before the establishment of the everlasting kingdom at the end of time.²

The structure of Dan 11, as well as the links and similarities with other chapters of the book of Daniel, gives us ample ground to conclude that it does indeed span the time from the Persian kings to the resurrection and the

is completed.

¹As mentioned above Historical-critical scholars have correctly seen that Dan 8 and 11 parallel each other, but for them the historical events center around Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

²The only exception to the above would be Dan 9 which majors on the events surrounding the cross, and even there it is possible that the phrase "unto the end" reaches to the terminal point of the other prophecies.

final judgment at the end of earth's history. The term °ēṭ in Dan 11:24, therefore, seems to apply to a time after the cross (Dan 11:22). Dan 11:21-24 shows that the contemptible person will have success and achieve what his predecessors could not, yet "only for a time." The phrase "w°ad °ēṭ" seems to indicate that a limit has been set by God to the time the contemptible person can act.¹ The expression "an end will still come at the appointed time (lammô°ēd)" in vs. 27 would confirm this understanding.

Dan 12:1

וּבְעֵת הַהִיא יִשָּׁמַר מִיְכָאֵל הַשָּׂר הַגָּדוֹל
הַעֹמֵד עַל־בְּנֵי עַמּוֹךְ וְהַיְהוּדָה עַתְּ צָרָה
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִהְיֶתָה מִהַיּוֹת גֹּ' עַד הַעַת הַהִיא
וּבְעֵת הַהִיא יִמְלֹט עַמּוֹךְ כָּל־הַנוֹמְצֵא קְתוּב בְּסֵפֶר:

And at that time (ûbā°ēṭ hahî') Michael shall stand up, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble (°ēṭ šārâh), such as never was since there was a nation until that time (°ad hā°ēṭ hahî'). But at that time (ûbā°ēṭ hahî') your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book.

The term °ēṭ appears four times in this verse yet not once is it used in conjunction with qēs.

"At that time" refers us back to "the time of the end" (°ēṭ qēs) in 11:40.² During this "time of the end" Michael will stand up, because there will be such a "time

¹Keil, Daniel, 452; Porteous, 166.

²The article and demonstrative pronoun indicate that there is a preceding point of reference. In this case the time of the events in 11:40-45.

of trouble" within "the time of the end" the like of it the world has never experienced. Yet "at that time," still referring to the "time of the end," God's people will be delivered.¹

The subject of Dan 12:1a is Michael who is further defined by two phrases standing in apposition: "the great prince" (haśśar haggādōl) and "which standeth for the children of thy people" (hā^oōmēd °al b°nē °annekā). The first apposition "haśśar haggādōl"² reminds us of the "prince of the host" (8:11) who is later called the "Prince of princes" (8:25). In Dan 10 we have "the prince of the kingdom of Persia" (vs.13) who opposes the angelus interpres, and Michael³ who is called "one of the chief

¹The outline below indicates the chiasmic structure of the two time periods "the time of the end" and "the time of trouble" within this text:

A - at that time	=	time of the end
B - time of trouble	=	a time within the time of the end
B ¹ - that time	=	a time within the time of the end
A ¹ - at that time	=	the time of the end

²In contrast to nāgīd which is used only three times in Daniel (9:25-26; 11:22) and applies to Christ each time (see page 330 n.1), śar is used quite frequently in Daniel (1:7,8,9,10,11,18; 8:11,25; 9:6,8; 10:13,20,21; 11:5; 12:1) of heavenly and earthly persons.

³Michael, meaning "who is like God?," is in the Jewish literature the highest of the angels, "the angel of Yahweh" frequently mentioned in the OT as a divine being (S. H. Horn, Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1960], 736). In the Talmud (Yoma 37a), we find the three beings, who visit Abraham, described as Michael the teacher and Gabriel and Raphael as his disciples. In Scripture Michael is called the archangel (Jude 9) who fought in heaven with the dragon (Rev 12:7). Some Bible scholars identify Michael with Christ (Ford, Daniel, 250; Price, 268; J. Calvin, Com-

princes" ('aḥad haśśārīm hāri'šōnīm) (Dan 10:13), or "your prince" (Dan 10:21) (śarḱem). All those mentioned are supernatural beings, if we accept the interpretation that the prince of Persia is a demonic angel¹ who resisted God's angel for twenty-one days.

The second phrase hā'ōmēd 'al, literally "to stand over," can mean "to protect, to defend" as in Esth 8:11, ". . . to stand for [over] their life,"² or "to withstand" as in Dan 8:25, ". . . he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes."³ In Dan 12:1 it has the former meaning; Michael stands up to protect "the sons of thy people" and to deliver them.

The next sentence of our verse has the subject 'ēt sārâh, "time of trouble," which is explained by the relative clause, "such as never was since there was a nation, even to that time." This relative clause has two prepositional phrases, "min . . ." and "cad . . ." to indicate the time frame. The first prepositional phrase has the term gôy which stands in contrast to 'am in 12:1a. In the

mentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel, 2 vols., trans. Th. Myers [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948], 2:369).

¹Leupold, Daniel, 457. W. H. Shea ("Wrestling with the Prince of Persia: A Study on Daniel 10," AUSS 21 (1983): 225-250) argues strongly for Calvin's interpretation who identified "the prince of Persia" with Cambyses, the son of Cyrus.

²It has the same sense in Esth 9:16.

³In this sense it is also found in Dan 11:14. See Charles, Daniel, 325.

book of Daniel, the term *gōy* (8:22; 11:23, and 12:1) refers to people, in general,¹ *‘am*, on the other hand, refers specifically to the people of God.²

The *‘ēṭ šārāh* appears eight times in the OT.³ Judges 10:14 refers to the time of oppression through the Philistines which was a "time of trouble" for Israel. In Ps 37 the future of the righteous is contrasted with the fate of the wicked. The "time of trouble" in vs. 39 can refer to any time of tribulation and, therefore, also to the eschatological time of trouble in Dan 12:1.⁴ The "time of trouble" in Isa 33:2 refers to the invasion of the Assyrians in the time of Hezekiah;⁵ the texts in Jeremiah

¹In Dan 8:22 and 11:23 it clearly refers to non-Jews, in Dan 12:1 to people in general: "And then shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation (*gōy*). . ."

²All sixteen occurrences of *‘am* in the book of Daniel refer to God's people (Dan 8:24; 9:6,15,16,19,20, 24,26; 10:14; 11:14,15,32,33; 12:1 (2x),7). Cf. Hasslberger, 231. Hasslberger uses *‘ammekā* in 12:1 in a strictly literal sense as referring to the Jews and then argues that in 11:32-33 *‘am* must also refer to the literal Jews. But if Dan 11:22 is after the cross, *‘am* in Dan 12:1 seems to refer to God's people (cf. Gal 3:28-29).

³Judg 10:14; Neh 9:7; Ps 37:39; Isa 33:2; Jer 14:8; 15:11; 30:7; Dan 12:1.

⁴Some commentators see a reference to the ultimate destiny of the righteous and the wicked in these verses. (See Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1-72*, TOTC [London: InterVarsity Press, 1973], 153; G. Rawlinson, *Psalms*, PC [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950], 289; M. Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, AB [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966], 232.

⁵F. Delitzsch, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2 vols. BCOT, trans. J. Martin (1877; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950-1954), 2:57-58.

(14:8-15:11; 30:7) and Nehemiah (9:7), to the Babylonian exile or the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 586 B.C. Thus, in all OT passages where the exact phrase "time of trouble" is used, the enemy causing the trouble are enemies (foreign nations) of God's people.

In Jer 30 where the phrase "time of Jacob's trouble" is used (vs. 7), the theme is the Babylonian captivity and the restoration of Israel to the promised land. In vs. 7 the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. is understood as the day of Yahweh's judgment upon his people, and the experience of the Jews at that time is compared to the experience of Jacob when he wrestled with the Angel (Gen 32:24-26). Many commentators see Jer 30:7 as having its ultimate fulfillment at the end of time.¹ The "time of Jacob's trouble" is seen as a part of the larger apocalyptic "time of trouble."²

¹H. A. Ironside, Notes on the Prophecy and Lamentations of Jeremiah 3rd ed., (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1943), 148; Arno C. Gaebelein, Gaebelein's Concise Commentary on the Whole Bible, rev. ed. (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1985), 589; Charles L. Feinberg, "Jeremiah," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 6:560; Nichol, ABC, 4:462. Charles, 325, and Jeffery, 541, also see in Jer 30:7 an eschatological time but apply it to the second century B.C.

²"Jacob was threatened by an angry brother ready to kill in revenge for past wrongs. To prepare for the crisis, Jacob tarried to spend the night in prayer. The burden of his heart was that everything should be right with God. As far as he could, Jacob had endeavored to right every wrong that he had committed. By his persistence and faith, Jacob was given the assurance of God's blessing before the night had passed. This same experience of intense soul searching will come to spiritual Israel after the close of probation, just before the Lord's

The ^cēt sārāh of Dan 12:1 is referred to by Jesus Christ in Matt 24:21,¹ "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be," which may indicate again that Jesus Christ considered this portion of the prophecy in Dan 10-12 as still applying to the future.²

As we have seen above,³ the phrase "at that time" (ūbā^cēt hahī') which appears at the beginning and end of Dan 12:1 refers back to Dan 11:40-45. The subject in Dan 12:1c is "your people" qualified by the appositional phrase "everyone who is found written in the book." Thus the "people" are not only belonging to God, they are also recorded in God's book. Many books are mentioned in the

second advent." Nichol, ABC, 4:462.

¹The use of "thlipsis" in Dan 12:1 (LXX) and Matt 24:21, as well as the prepositional phrases beginning with "hoia ou gegonen" and "heōs" in both texts, lead us to this conclusion.

²The phrase "such as was not since . . . nor ever shall be" must not be taken in an absolute chronological sense. In 2 Kgs 18:5 and 23:25 we have a similar phrase, "after him was none like him . . . nor any that were before him" applied to two different kings (Hezekiah and Josiah). Some commentators see a contradiction (J. Robinson, The Second Book of Kings, CBC [Cambridge: University Press, 1976], 167); others try to explain that one was preeminent in faith and the other in works (G. Rawlinson, 2 Kings, PC [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977], 358), but we believe that the phrase was probably proverbial, that is, it was used for emphasis and did not mean more than that these two kings were of singular piety. (See A. Barnes, 1 Sam-Esther, abr. and ed. J. M. Fuller [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953], 280). In Matt 24 we have a similar situation; the tribulation applies to the time of the fall of Jerusalem as well as to a later time.

³See p. 333.

OT,¹ but this one seems to be the "book of life" (Ps 69:28), also called "God's book" (Exod 32:33).² Only those whose names are written in this book will be delivered.

In Dan 12:1 there are three different themes (Michael stands up, a time of trouble, and the deliverance of God's people) welded together by the stereotyped temporal phrase "hā^cēṭ hahī'." The immediate context in Dan 12:2 deals with the resurrection of the dead and to this subject we must now turn our attention.

There is a sizeable body of literature on the topic of the resurrection in the OT.³ According to the scholarly

¹Apart from earthly books like the "book of Moses" (Mark 12:26), we find several heavenly books mentioned: (1) the book of life (Ps 69:28); (2) the book of remembrance (Mal 3:16); (3) the book of lamentation, mourning, and woe (Ezek 2:9,10); (4) the flying scroll (Zech 5:1,2).

²Montgomery, 472. There is a possible link to the books (siprīn) in Dan 7:10. In Rev 20:12-19 the book of life is used in the last judgment. In the judgment in Dan 7 books (plural) are opened which most likely include "the book of life," "the book of remembrance," and any other records required for this judgment.

³The following is a representative but not exhaustive list: Friedrich Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums einschließlich des Volksglaubens im Zeitalter Christi (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1892); Adolphe Lods, La croyance a la vie future et le culte des morts dans l'antiquité israelite (Paris: Fischbacher, 1906); Edwin Albert, Die israelitisch-jüdische Auferstehungshoffnung in ihren Beziehungen zum Parsismus (Königsberg: Buch und Steindruckerei O. Kümmel, 1910); Robert H. Charles, Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. A Critical History (New York: Schocken Books, 1913); Alfred Bertholet, Die israelitische Vorstellung vom Zustande nach dem Tode (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1914); Ernst Sellin, "Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben," NKZ 30 (1919): 232-256; Friedrich Nötscher, Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungs-

glauben (Würzburg, 1926; reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970); Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934); Charles V. Pilcher, The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought (New York: Macmillan, 1940); Aimo T. Nikolainen, Der Auferstehungs-glauben in der Bibel und ihrer Umwelt (n. p.: Druckerei der finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1944); Edmund F. Sutcliffe, The Old Testament and the Future Life (London: Burnes Oates and Washbourne, 1946); H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the OT," ST 3 (1950): 60-78; Leonhard Rost, "Alttestamentliche Wurzeln der ersten Auferstehung," In memoriam E. Lohmeyer, ed. W. Schmauch (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951); Othmar Schilling, Der Jenseitsgedanke im Alten Testament (Mainz: Rheingold, 1951); H. B. Kossen, "De oorsprung van de voorstelling der opstanding vit de doden in Dan 12:2," NTTi 10 (1955): 296-301; Charles R. Smith, The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter (London: Epworth, 1958); B. J. Alfrink, "L'idée de résurrection d'après Dan., XII, 1.2. Biblica 40 (1959): 355-371; Robert Martin-Achard, From Life to Death: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament, trans. J. P. Smith (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960); K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur früh-rabbinischen Zeit," BZ 6 (1962): 177-214; Franz König, Zarathustras Jenseitsvorstellungen und das Alte Testament (Vienna: Herder, 1964); P. Beauchamp, "Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse," Bib 45 (1964): 491-526; R. Mayer, "Der Auferstehungsglaube in der iranischen Religion," Kairos 7 (1965): 194-207; R. K. Taylor, "The Eschatological Meaning of Life and Death in the Book of Wisdom," ETL 42 (1966): 72-137; J. Wijngaards, "Death and Resurrection in Covenantal Context: Hos 6,2," VT 17 (1967): 226-239; Ludwig Wächter, Der Tod im Alten Testament (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967); Nicholas J. Tromp, Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969); George W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, HTS 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); Günther Stemberger, "Das Problem der Auferstehung im Alten Testament," Kairos, N. F. 14 (1972): 273-290; Beda Rigaux, Dieu l'a ressuscité (Gembloux: Ducutot, 1973); H. C. Cavallin, Life After Death, Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974); idem, "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I: Spätjudentum," ANRW II.19.1 (1979): 240-345; Gerhard Hasel, "Resurrection in the Theology of OT Apocalyptic," ZAW 92 (1980): 267-284; L. J.

communis opinio, the physical resurrection of the dead is part of the OT apocalyptic matrix.¹ The two passages which most clearly enunciate it are Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:1-4. Though some scholars see the resurrection in Isa 26 only as a metaphor for the restoration of Israel,² the majority of scholars hold that Isa 26:19 expresses the notion of a physical resurrection.³

As far as Dan 12:2 is concerned, several interpreters see this resurrection simply as a moral and national resurrection of Israel in "the time of the end,"⁴

Greenspoon, "The Origin of the Idea of Resurrection," Traditions in Transformation, ed. Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 247-321; M. S. Moore, "Resurrection and Immortality: Two Motifs Navigating Confluent Theological Streams in the Old Testament (Dan 12,1-4)," TZ 39 (1983): 17-34.

¹Hasel, "Resurrection," 267; see also M. S. Moore, 18; James M. Lindenberger, "Dan 12:1-4" Int 39 (1985): 186.

²Hans Wildberger, Jesaja, 3 vols. BKAT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag 1972-1982), 2:995; Edward J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1941), 1:298; Joseph Jensen, Isaiah 1-39, OTM (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 207. Theodor H. Gaster, "Resurrection" IDB, 4 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 4:40.

³Arthur S. Peake, The Book of Isaiah, ICC, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912), 1:446. George Adam Smith, The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols. (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908), 1:451; A. S. Herbert, Isaiah 1-39, CBC (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 156; J. Ridderbos, Isaiah, BSC, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 213; Delitzsch, Isaiah, 1:452.

⁴Ironside, Daniel, 231; M. R. De Haan, Daniel the Prophet (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947), 307; Keith L. Brooks, The Certain End (Los Angeles: American Prophetic League, 1942), 56; Louis T. Talbot, The Prophecies of Daniel (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1940), 215; Gaebelien, Concise Commentary, 648.

but the majority of interpreters agree that a physical resurrection is in view here.¹

Many scholars see Dan 12:1-4 as part of the true prophecy in Dan 11:40-45, which the writer envisaged but which never came to pass. The resurrection was to come after Antiochus IV Epiphanes had died. Thus, Th. S. Kepler says:

The day of the resurrection is but "a time, two times, and half a time" away; that is, but three and one-half years distant; it is at hand (12:1-4). To reckon the end of the three and one-half year, begin with December 25, 168 B.C., when the Temple was desecrated, and you will work out the resurrection day in 164 B.C.--it is almost here! [Since the resurrection day did not occur in 164 B.C., after 1150 days (three and one-half years), two attempts were made, possibly by editors, to make new predictions: one sights it to occur in 1290 days, another, following the same plan of the Ascension of Isa 14:12, places the resurrection day after 1335 days.]²

The Hebrew text of Dan 12:2a reads as follows: w*rabbîm miyy*šēnē 'admaṭ 'āpār yāqīšû. The copulative conjunction "w" is joined to the subject rabbîm which is further defined by miyy*šēnē 'admaṭ 'āpār. Min here is used in the partitive sense, otherwise, says B. Hasslberger, a

¹Young, Daniel, 256; Leupold, Daniel, 529; Walvoord, Daniel, 284; Archer, "Daniel," 152; Ford, Daniel, 281; Price, 328; Driver, Daniel, 201; Charles, Daniel, 327; Montgomery, 471; Porteous, 170; Marti, Daniel, 90; Bentzen, 85; Howie, 140; J. J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, HSM 16 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 172.

²Thomas S. Kepler, Dreams of the Future, Bible Guides 22 (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), 45. See also Hartman and Di Lella, 306; Jeffery, 544; J. R. Dummelow, ed., A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: McMillan Co., 1940), 544.

construct phrase or a relative clause would have been used.¹ G. F. Hasel points out² that in Esth 8:17, the only other OT passage where we find exactly the same sentence construction,³ *min* has the partitive sense. "Furthermore, the partitive usage is the more common one for *rabbim* followed by *min*. One would have to have compelling reasons," says Hasel, "for departing from normal usage before one could be reasonably sure that a meaning other than the common one should be chosen."⁴ There does not seem to be any compelling reason in this text.

Thus using normal Hebrew grammar and syntax for a reading of Dan 12:2, we find that what is spoken of here is a partial resurrection at which some receive eternal life and others everlasting contempt. Although in Dan 12:2-3 there are no indications as to the time when this will take place, both the preceding and following passages place this resurrection within the context of the eschatological phrase "time of the end."⁵

¹Hasslberger, 294.

²Hasel, "Resurrection," 279.

³*Min* joined to a *nomen regens* which designates a human entity and is in construct with a spatial term: *w^orabbim mē^cammē hā'āreṣ*.

⁴Hasel, "Resurrection," 279. On pp. 277-278 Hasel has an extended discussion on the various uses of *min* which have been proposed for Dan 12:2.

⁵There is no textual or theological justification for considering vs. 2 and 3 as a later interpolation as some interpreters have done. See Nötscher, 164; Hubert Junker, Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische

Summarizing this discussion: Dan 12:1-2 is part of the OT apocalyptic matrix. "At the end of time" when this aeon comes to a close, the cataclysmic events described "as the time of trouble" will be brought to a halt by the inauguration of the new aeon, when there will be a physical resurrection of "many," some to everlasting life and others to everlasting contempt.

Dan 12:11

וּמֵעַתָּה הַיּוֹמָר הַתָּמִיד וְלִתְּחִלַּת שְׁקִיף שָׁמַיִם יָמִים אָלֶּף
מֵאָתָּים וְתֵשְׁעִים:

And from the time (*umē'ēt*) that the daily is abolished, and the abomination that makes desolate is set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

The adverbial phrase *mē'ēt* followed by the main clause with the subject *tāmid* (daily) and an infinitive clause with the object *šiqqūš* (abomination) marks the terminus a quo for the 1290 days.¹ The connection with Dan 8:13 and 11:31 cannot be missed. Some scholars, therefore, consider vss. 11 and 12 as later glosses "intended to prolong the term of 1150 days announced at 8:14."²

Probleme des Buches Daniel (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), 100; Martinus A. Beek, Das Danielbuch (Leiden: Universiteitsboekhandel en Antiquariaat J. Ginsberg, 1935), 89-90.

¹As well as for the 1335 days in vs. 12. See Keil, Daniel, 498.

²For example, Montgomery, 477.

Accordingly, persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes is seen in all three passages.¹

Other interpreters also recognize the connection with Dan 8:13 and 11:31, but they do not see exclusively Antiochus IV Epiphanes here because in Dan 8 and 11 Antiochus IV Epiphanes, a historical personage, is also a type of the end-time Antichrist. For them in Dan 12:11, the end-time has arrived and thus this text applies only to the Antichrist.² The 1290 days apply to the Great Tribulation "subsequent to the abrogation of the covenant between Antichrist and Israel."³ G. M. Price interprets Dan 12:11 the same way he does 8:11-14, applying both figures (1290 and 1335) to that time of the Christian era in which spiritual Rome dominated the world.⁴

As far as our study of the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ is concerned, the meaning of it remains largely the same whichever interpretation is accepted. The term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ here refers to a chronological point of time from which 1290 days would elapse.

Summary

The term for $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ is found in Phoenician and Punic referring to a time period, e.g., "harvest time," "life

¹Driver, Daniel, 205; Lacoque, Daniel, 250.

²Leupold, Daniel, 545; Walvoord, Daniel, 295; Archer, "Daniel," 156.

³Archer, "Daniel," 156.

⁴Price, 337-338. Ford (Daniel, 283) sees these verses only fulfilled at the time of the end.

time," or "in the time of." In Imperial Aramaic the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ appears quite frequently with the preposition k° to form the adverb "now." The uses of the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ in these cognate languages are of a temporal non-eschatological nature. It appears that $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ is a West Semitic term.

In extra-biblical Hebrew the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ has the meaning of "now," at "this time."

In the OT, the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ can refer to a point or a period of time. The word is used primarily in a qualitative sense (e.g., Gen 24:11; Jer 50:16; Zech 10:1; etc.), but the chronological or quantitative usage appear as well (e.g., Judg 11:26; 1 Kgs 6:1).

In prepositional phrases (e.g., Jer 8:13; 33:15; Joel 3:18 etc.) or in conjunction with words like $\text{p}^{\circ}\text{qudd}\bar{\text{a}}\text{h}$ (Jer 6:15), $\text{'a}\bar{\text{p}}$ (Jer 18:23), or $\text{n}\bar{\text{a}}\text{qam}$ (Jer 51:6), the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ can have eschatological meaning.

In the book of Daniel the term $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ without $\text{q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ is used eleven times and refers primarily to a chronological point or period of time (e.g., Dan 9:21,25; 11:6,13,14,24; 12:11). In Dan 11:24 this time reaches into the apocalyptic end-time of world history.

Because the resurrection is mentioned in the context (Dan 12:2), a definite apocalyptic use of $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ is found in Dan 12:1 where it refers two times to the apocalyptic time of the end and two times to a specific time period "the time of trouble" within this end-time.

The Term qēs

Parallel terms to the Hebrew term qēs can be found in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic. I discuss these in that order.

Akkadian

The Akkadian designation for "end" is qitu (kitu)¹ or qetu² which, on the basis of a consonantal shift, could be the root of qēs.³ It is used for the end of an object, e.g., the extremities (ki-e-ti),⁴ or for the end of a time period like the "end (ketu) of the rule of the king of Amurru."⁵ It is also used in the phrases: "The kindness of the king will overtake them in the end (ki-e-tu)"⁶ and "from the beginning to the end (ki-it)."⁷

The verb qatû (katû) means "to come to an end" or

¹CAD, 13:283; AHW, 2:924; Leroy Waterman, Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. 20 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936), 77.

²Carl Bezold, Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926), 248.

³C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, 2 vols. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), 1:135-136; De Lacy O'Leary, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (London: Paul Keagan, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1923), 89.

⁴Waterman, 17, 511: r 9.

⁵Ibid., 519: r 7.

⁶Ibid., 584: r 5.

⁷R. Campbell Thompson, Late Babylonian Letters (London: Luzac and Co. 1906), 155:17.

"to finish"¹ as in "put an end to your life (na-piṣ-ta-ku-nu liq-ti)."²

A closer etymological relation seems to exist between qēṣ and the Akkadian term qaṣû (kaṣû) which has the basic meaning "to be cool."³ The phrase ki-iṣ umi refers to the "cool of the evening"⁴ which is "the end of the day." In a letter to King Esarhaddon the writer says either of himself or of somebody else, "In the midst of the forest and the cold of the day (ka-ṣu-umu) he prays to Shamash and Bel. . . ."⁵ The verb qaṣaṣu (kaṣaṣu, gaṣaṣu) has the meaning "to cut off, to trim."⁶ It is also listed with the meaning of "ein Ende machen."⁷

Ugaritic

According to J. Aistleitner, Ugaritic has a noun qṣ meaning "Ende, Zipfel" and a verb qṣ meaning "schneiden, schlachten."⁸ In the Ugaritic text 49:II:9-11, we have Anath laying hands on Mot and ordering him to restore her

¹CAD, 13:177; AHW, 2:911; Bezold, 248.

²Donald J. Wiseman, The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon (London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1958), 65, line 487.

³AHW, 1:459.

⁴CAD, 8:445.

⁵Waterman, 18, 958: r 7.

⁶CAD, 5:53.

⁷Bezold, 245.

⁸WUS, 279.

brother Baal. The text says, ". . . tihd . m[t] . bsin . lps . tssq[] bqš . all,"¹ which C. H. Gordon translates: ". . . she seizes Mo[t] in ripping his garments, she closes in on [him], in tearing (his) clothes."² H. L. Ginsberg treats qš as a noun and renders the same passage as follows, "She grabs Mot by the fold (bsin) of his garment, seizes [him] by the hem (qš) of his robe."³

The noun qš which Gordon translates as "slice",⁴ appears frequently in the phrase, "[. . . bhrb m]lht . qš [mri . . .]"⁵ Gordon renders it as "with a keen knife a slice of fatling."⁶ The translation "slice" obviously comes from the thought that a slice is cut off from the end-part of a piece of meat--"end" being the basic meaning of qš. S. Loewenstamm, however, notes that in each case where qš appears in the above mentioned phrase, it stands

¹UT, 168.

²Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugarit and Minoan Crete (New York: W. W. Norton, 1966), 83.

³H. L. Ginsberg, ANET, 140. Similarly, G. C. L. Gibson (Canaanite Myths and Legends [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977], 76) translates: "She seizes Mot by the hem of (his) garment, she constrained [him] by the end of (his) robe."

⁴UT, 479, no. 2259.

⁵Ibid., texts 51:III:42; 51:IV:57; 67:IV:14; cnt 1:8; 2 Aqht VI:4.

⁶Gordon, Ugarit and Minoan Crete, 49, 66, 72, 78, 126.

in parallel to *td*--the word for "breast."¹ Thus he takes *qs* to mean simply "Speise der Götter"² and translates "*šh . lqs . ilm*," which according to him appears in two texts³ with: "Er rief zum Mahle die Götter."⁴ In this case "meal" would be an extended meaning of "a slice of breast."

Aramaic

The Aramaic cognate to the Hebrew term *qēs* is the noun *q*saṭ*.⁵ A. Cowley in his collection of Aramaic papyri from the fifth century B.C. has three texts in which *q*saṭ* appears, twice it is preceded and once it is followed by the preposition *min*.⁶

¹Samuel E. Loewenstamm, "Eine lehrhafte ugaritische Trinkburleske," *UF* 1 (1969): 73.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 72, text RS 24.258, and *UT*, 255, text *°nt X:IV:2*. The text of *°nt X:IV:2* reads "*gm . šh . lq*" and is emended by Gordon to read "*gm . šh . lq[s ilm]*"

⁴Ibid., 73. He is followed by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin, "Der Stichometrische Aufbau von RS 24.258," *UF* 7 (1975): 109. Others have derived *qs* in this context from the root *qys*, "to awake," and have translated, "he shouts to wake up the gods" (Gordon, *UT*, 474). Hans P. Rüger, "Zu RS 24.258," *UF* 1 (1969): 203. Gibson (*Canaanite Myths*, 39) emends the text of *°nt X:IV:2* differently from Gordon. He reads, "*gm . šh . lq[rbm]*," and hence translates, "They did cry aloud to those [near]." This should caution us against placing too much weight on Loewenstamm's argument for the meaning of *qs* as "meal."

⁵*CHAL*, 420.

⁶Cowley, 99, 27:4; 107, 29:3; 130, 35:4. More recent translations of all the Elephantine Aramaic texts are provided by Bezalel Porten in collaboration with Jonas C. Greenfield in *Jews of Elephantine and Arameans of Syene* (Jerusalem: Academ, 1976).

Text no. 27 is a letter from Jews in Elephantine to a high official in Egypt. The Jews complain about certain enemies of theirs and write that "there is a part (qst mn) of the king's stores which is in the fortress of Yeb, (this) they wrecked. . . ."1

Text no. 29 is a contract for a loan from the year 409 B.C. It relates to a debt, part of the price of a house, due from the son of Hosea to Yislah. The text says money was due "from me as a part (mn qst) of the amount of the value of the house of M. . . ."2

Text no. 35 is again a contract for a loan, possibly arising from a divorce settlement. It reads in part, "You have a claim on me for the sum of 2 shekels, that is the sum of 1 stater, being part of (mn qst) the money and goods which are (prescribed) in the deed of your marriage."3

Cowley translates both phrases, mn qst and qst mn, the same way. He takes min as a min explicative and translates the phrase as "a part of" a given totality (money or house). E. Sachau, on the other hand, who has the same two loan-contract texts as Cowley, understands min as a min partitive and explains qst as the total sum. He says, "Das Wort qst nehme ich im Sinne von Ende, Äußerstes, hier =

¹ Ibid., 99-100.

² Ibid., 107.

³ Ibid., 130.

höchster Betrag, Gesamtbetrag."¹ Hence, in texts no. 29 and 35 he translates the phrase as "von der Gesamtsumme des Geldes. . . ." ² In text no. 27, which Sachau does not have and where *min* follows *q^osaṭ*, the meaning of *q^osaṭ* could be "end of." The text would then read, "an (one) end of the king's stores which is in the fortress of Yeb, (this) they wrecked."

In the Aramaic papyri no. 9 (404 B.C.) from the Brooklyn Museum, however, the translation "part" fits the context better. In this document Anani gives his daughter Yehoyishma a part of a house he had originally bought and paid for. The text reads in part, "I have taken thought of thee in my life and I have given to thee part of (*qṣṭ mn*) my house which I bought with silver and whose price I gave."³ Anani then goes on to explain what he gave, ". . . half the court, that is half the lower portion of the empty space (?) and half the stairs."⁴ Thus "part" is the better translation of *qṣṭ* here.

In an Aramaic incantation inscription from the third century B.C. written in cuneiform on a tablet from

¹Sachau, 62. He is supported by A. Ungnad, (Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911], 24) who also translates *qṣṭ* as "Gesamtsumme."

²Ibid., 62, 129.

³Emil G. Kraeling, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), 237, 9:3.

⁴Ibid., 237, 9:4.

Uruk and published by M. Thureau-Dangin in 1922,¹ we find in line 17 the phrase "ia-ti-ir-ta-' ka-sa-ta-' qu-u-mi-ni."² The passage which is a prescription for curing patients afflicted with a certain illness³ is difficult to understand and scholars disagree as to its meaning. G. R. Driver translated the text with "the superfluidity is (at) an end . . ." ⁴ he left the last part untranslated because he said the word qumini "defies interpretation."⁵ C. H. Gordon assumed the root qwm for qumini, interpreted kasata' as "cut off, deficient (f.),"⁶ and translated: "Oh superabundant woman (and) deficient woman, rise!"⁷ B. Landsberger, who said: "der Sinn dieser Verses is mir dunkel

¹Francois Thureau-Dangin, Tablettes d'Uruk, Musee du Louvre, Textes Cuneiformes, vol. 6 (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1922), plate 105, no. 58.

²Cyrus H. Gordon, "The Aramaic Incantation in Cuneiform," AfO 12 (1937-1939): 107.

³Gordon (*Ibid.*, 108) thinks of insanity, deafness, and dumbness, but B. Landsberger ("Zu den aramäischen Beschwörungen in Keilschrift," AfO 12 [1937-1939]: 247), denies this and says, "Niemand, der vorurteilslos an den Text herantritt, wird aus diesen Zeilen die Schilderung epileptischer Zustände oder eines Geisteskranken herauslesen können."

⁴G. R. Driver, "An Aramaic Inscription in the Cuneiform Script," AfO 3 (1926): 48, line 17.

⁵*Ibid.*, 52. P. O. Bostrup, "Aramäische Ritualtexte in Keilschrift," Acta Orientalia 5 (1927): 273, followed Driver's translation and completed the sentence with "der Überfluß ist am Ende, stehe mir bei!"

⁶Gordon, "Aramaic Incantation," 117.

⁷*Ibid.*, 108.

geblieben,"¹ objected to Gordon's translation of *kaṣata'* as "cut off."² He compared *kaṣata'* with the Syriac word "*q̄ṣata'* (something broken off, especially bread)" and translated accordingly: "Rest (und) Brocken, 'stehet (auf)'"³ Gordon, however, maintained his translation⁴ and was supported by A. Dupont-Sommer⁵ who wrote concerning *kaṣata'*:

The context requires an adjective which is used as a noun like *iattīrtā*, *ḥagīrtā*, *ḥassīrtā*. We also assume an adjective of the same root, and the same qatal type as the noun *q̄ṣātā'*: "you, the broken one" (in a physical sense, that which has a broken limb; or in a moral sense, like the Hebrew *nišb̄rê-lēḇ?*).⁶

He translated the whole phrase with "(Toi) l'énorme, (et toi) la brisée (?), levez-vous!"⁷

Qṣṭ in this context then has the meaning of "cut off, incomplete, deficient" rather than "end."

¹Landsberger, 256, n. 47.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 256.

⁴C. H. Gordon, "The Cuneiform Aramaic Incantation," *Orientalia* 9 (1940): 36.

⁵A. Dupont-Sommer, "La Tablette Cunéiforme Araméenne de Warka," *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archeologie Orientale* 39 (1942-44): 48.

⁶Ibid. Le contexte appelle un adj. employé substantivement comme *iattīrtā*, *ḥagīrtā*, *ḥassīrtā*. Aussi conjecturons-nous un adj. de la même racine, et du même type qatal, que le subst. *q̄ṣātā'*: "(toi) la brisée" (au sens physique, celle qui a un membre brisé; ou au sens moral, comme en hébreu *nišb̄rê-leḇ?*).

⁷Ibid., 40.

In the Targumim the common word for "end" in a temporal sense is qissā' (qṣ' or qyṣ').¹

qissā': Gen 6:13 "And the Lord said to Noah, The end (qyṣ') of all flesh has come before me." (TO)²
 Gen 49:1 "And the twelve tribes of Israel gathered themselves together around the golden bed whereon he reclined, and where was revealed to him the Shekina of the Lord, (though) the end (qṣ') for which the king Meshiha is to come had been concealed from him." (PJ)³ "And our father Jacob called his sons, and said to them Gather together, and I will teach you the concealed end (qṣ'), the secret mysteries. . . ." (Y)⁴
 Jer 8:20 ". . . the time has gone, the end (qyṣ') has passed. . . ." (TJ)⁵
 Ezek 7:2 ". . . the end (qṣ') came and the punishment of the end (qṣ'). (TJ)⁶
 Hab 2:3 "For the prophecy is determined for an appointed time, he prepares the end (qṣ') and he will not stop. . . ." (TJ)⁷
 1 Chr 7:21 "The sons of Ephraim erred in their calculation . . . and they came out of Egypt 30 years before the end (qṣ'). . . ." (TK)⁸

In the Targumim, qissā' always refers to the end of

¹M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: Title Publishing Company, 1943), 1404; J. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim (Leipzig, Gustav Engel, 1867), 378.

²Alexander Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, 4 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), 1:10.

³John W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum, 2 vols. (London: Longman 1862; reprint, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968), 1:329.

⁴Ibid., 334.

⁵Sperber, 3:156.

⁶Ibid., 3:275.

⁷Ibid., 3:460.

⁸Ibid., 4:11.

a time period. In Gen 6:13 it is the end of man's life, in Jer 8:20 the end of the harvest-time, in Ezek 7:2 it is the end of the independent state of Judah which is in view, and similarly in Hab 2:3, the end seems to refer to the end of Judah when the Babylonians will come. In 1 Chr 7:21 the end refers to the time Israel was supposed to be in Egypt. All these time periods are within history. The only place where qissā' refers to an eschatological end is in Gen 49:1 in PJ and J. There the reference is to the Messianic time which was expected by all Israel.

The Targumim also use the word q^oṣat, but primarily in the sense of "a part,"¹ except in Num 22:41 where Targum Y has the people of Dan walking at the end (qṣt) of the people of Israel.²

K. Beyer lists three occurrences of q^oṣat in the Aramaic texts from Qumran--all of them with the meaning of "ein Teil"³--and he lists the plural of qṣh as "end" in two documents.⁴ The first of the two texts is Enoch 1:5, "Und alle Enden (qṣwt) [der Erde] werden beben. . . ."⁵

¹In Num 22:41, TO has "he saw from there a part of the people." In Gen 47:2, "And he took a part (some) of this brethren" (Levy, 378).

²Levy, 378.

³Klaus Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984), 684-685. The texts are: H 78:17; M 32:5; and xyMTO.

⁴Ibid., 685. The texts are: H 1:5 and Y 28:24.

⁵Ibid., 232.

The second is the Targum to Enoch 28:24, ". . . die Enden (qšwy) der Erde. . . ." ¹ The immediate context of the second text is lost, but the meaning seems clear, nevertheless. In both cases, qšh clearly has a local meaning.

The Term Qēs in Extra-Biblical Hebrew

In this section we first consider a recently found inscription, written in a Canaanite dialect which is closely related to Hebrew and then look at the Gezer Calendar.

During the excavation of the Dutch Expedition at tell Deir 'Alla, Jordan, in March 1967, fragments of wall plaster with an inscription, initially identified as Ammonite, were found.² The text which was at first attributed to the Persian period was later dated to the early seventh century B.C.³ The inscription reports a prophecy of Balaam which he received from the gods and according to J. A. Hackett it is written in a dialect "related to the South Canaanite dialects of the first half of the first millennium B.C.E."⁴

¹Ibid., 288.

²H. J. Franken, "Texts from the Persian Period from Tell Deir 'Alla," VT 17 (1967): 480-481.

³Frank M. Cross, "Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Sirhan," BASOR 212 (1973): 14; idem, "Ammonite Ostraca from Heshbon," AUSS 13 (1975): 15.

⁴Jo Ann Hackett, The Balaam Text from Deir 'Alla, HSM 31 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 125. This is the first evidence of Balaam's existence outside of the Bible.

On a fragment of the inscription the word *lqsh* appears which J. A. Hackett interprets as *laqiṣṣuh* meaning "to his end."¹ Since the immediate context is missing the translation can only be tentative, but it is a very distinct possibility.

The Gezer calendar which was found by R. A. S. Macalister in 1908² is written in classical Hebrew and was dated by W. F. Albright to the second half of the tenth century B.C.³ It is a list of agricultural occupations arranged according to a rough scheme of month-periods. In the last line it reads, "*yrḥ qṣ*."⁴ M. Lidzbarski took *qṣ* to be the defective form of *qyṣ*, the harvest of the summer-fruit, especially the fig-harvest, and translated the line as "month of the fig-harvest."⁵ G. B. Gray followed Lidzbarski and said *qṣ* "may perhaps be used here as in Amos 8:2, with a pun on *qēṣ*, end,"⁶ but E. J. Pilcher translated *yrḥ qṣ* as "month end."⁷ S. Ronzevalle doubted that

¹Ibid., 26, 28, 30.

²R. A. Stewart Macalister, "Twenty-First Quarterly Report on the Excavation of Gezer," PEFQS 41 (1909): 88.

³W. F. Albright, "The Gezer Calendar," BASOR 92 (1943): 19.

⁴Mark Lidzbarski, "An Old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer," PEFQS 41 (1909): 27.

⁵Ibid., 29.

⁶G. B. Gray, "An Old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer," PEFQS 41 (1909): 31-32.

⁷E. J. Pilcher, "An Old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer," PEFQS 41 (1909): 34.

qys could ever designate the grape-harvest, the last harvest of the agricultural year, he therefore rendered qš as "(a month of) 'interruption', in reference to all the labors, agricultural or not, to which the inscription alludes."¹ Similarly, S. Daiches rejected Lidzbarski's and Gray's interpretation and thought "that qš here really means 'end'. The meaning of yrḥ qš would then be 'month of the end (i.e. of the seed).' This would most probably signify the last harvest."²

Since those early days of the discovery, scholars have ranged on both sides of the issue. Albright accepts Lidzbarski's "summer-fruit."³ J. B. Segal prefers qš as "cut, clip off" (from qšš) rather than as an otherwise unknown verb, "gathering summer fruits."⁴

Whichever translation is chosen, qš as the end of time period is directly or indirectly present, since the harvest of the summer fruit is the last one and thus closes the agricultural year.

¹Seb. Ronzevalle, "The Gezer Hebrew Inscription," PEFQS 41 (1909): 111.

²Samuel Daiches, "Notes on the Gezer Calendar and Some Babylonian Parallels," PEFQS 41 (1909): 116. He rejected Lidzbarski's interpretation for two reasons, "A defective writing of qš for qys is very improbable. Besides we would have expected a word like 'sp or qšr before qš (cf. Micha VII,1)" (ibid).

³Albright, BASOR 92 (1943): 23.

⁴J. B. Segal, "'yrḥ' in the Gezer 'Calendar'," JSS 7 (1962): 220. See also Shermayahu Talmon, "The Gezer Calendar and the Seasonal Cycle of Ancient Canaan," JAOS 83 (1963): 177-187.

The Term **qēs** in the OT outside
of the Book of Daniel

The noun **qēs** appears sixty-seven times in the Old Testament of which fifteen appearances are in the Book of Daniel. It is derived from the root **qšš** and carries the meaning of "end" or "limit."¹ It is used in a spatial sense in 2 Kgs 19:23 and Isa 37:24 where it refers to the "remotest heights" of "parts" of Lebanon, and probably in Jer 50:26 where the phrase **bō'û lāh miqqēs** literally says, "Come against her from (every) end." The NIV translates, "Come against her from afar"; the KJV, "Come against her from the utmost border"; others, ". . . from every quarter" (RSV, Moffat, Smith, and Goodspeed). J. Bright says, "The sense of **miqqēs** is uncertain, but probably 'from end [unto end]', i.e., from all sides (cf. **miqqāseh** in 51:31; Gen 19:4; etc.)."²

In Gen 6:13 **qēs** has the qualitative-quantitative meaning of "extent" or "limit." "The end (**qēs**) of all flesh" does not refer to the end of the antediluvian world, but rather to "the end [extremity] of depravity or corruption, which leads to destruction,"³ unless one accepts

¹HAL, 1044; BDB, 893; KBL, 846.

²John Bright, Jeremiah, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1965), 354.

³Carl F. Keil and F. Delitzsch The Pentateuch, 3 vols., trans. James Martin BCOT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952), 1:142.

the contention that *qēs* should here be translated "time."¹ The end (*qēs*) of all perfection in Ps 119:96 refers to the limit of all earthly perfection, and Job 28:3 explains that because man can light up the interior of the earth, he has put an end (*qēs*) to the darkness.

The predominant use of the term *qēs* is temporal and as such it can refer to the end of a man's life as in Ps 39:4, "Show me O Lord my life's end (*qēs*) . . ."² or with the negation 'ên, to the opposite, i.e., "no end"; e.g., Isa 9:6 (Heb.), "Of the increase of his government and

¹M. Wallenstein, "Some Lexical Material in the Judean Scrolls," *VT* 4 (1954): 212. He says: "'The time of all flesh . . .', namely the time of the destruction of all flesh, would perhaps not be out of tune with that which follows in the same verse: 'And behold, I will destroy them with the earth'." In the literature from Qumran as well as in the other post-biblical Hebrew literature *qēs* is frequently used with the meaning of "time" or "period," however, without completely replacing the meaning "end" (M. Wagner, "קס ges Ende," *THAT*, 2:663). M. Wallenstein (*Hymns from the Judean Scroll* [Manchester: University Press, 1950], 15) translated *qēs hārôn* as "time of fury." Cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), 71. In 1954 N. Wiedner ("The Term קס in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry," *JJS* 5 [1954]: 23) wrote: "It must appear rather remarkable that 'epoch-making' discoveries were needed to direct our attention to this meaning of *qs*, when evidence of this was all along so near at hand: in the liturgical poetry still in use in the synagogue and easily accessible in the Prayer-book for the whole year, the Mahzor for the festivals and the Haggadah for Passover." Wiedner then quotes ten passages (*ibid.*, 24-29) from liturgical texts, in which *qēs* has the meaning of "time" rather than "end." He further lists six eschatological texts in which *qēs* has the same meaning. Cf. A. Mertens *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*, *Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien*, 12 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), 146-148.

²In Job 6:11 it refers to a man's destiny.

peace there will be no end ('ên qēš)." In this sense, it is primarily used in Ecclesiastes where there is no end (qēš) to a man's toil (4:8), to all the people (4:16), and to the making of books (12:2).¹

The phrase miqqēš in the sense of "after, later" or "at the end of" can refer to a specifically named period of time, e.g., "After (miqqēš) 40 days" (Gen 8:6), "After (miqqēš) 430 years" (Exod 12:41), "After (miqqēš) three years" (1 Kgs 2:39),² or to any unspecified time period, e.g., "In the course of time (miqqēš yāmîm)" (Gen 4:3), "From time to time (miqqēš yāmîm layyāmîm)" (2 Sam 14:26), "Some time later (miqqēš yāmîm)" (1 Kgs 17:7).³ L^oqēš šānîm is used in the same way in 2 Chr 18:2, "Some years later," and Neh 13:6, "Some time later."

The demise of a nation or city is indicated by qēš in five prophetic oracles.⁴ Three of these⁵ appear in the

¹So also in Job 16:3 and 22:5.

²This is the most frequent use of miqqēš. The other texts are: Gen 16:3; 41:1; Num 13:25; Deut 9:11; 15:1; 31:10; Judg 11:39; 2 Sam 15:7; Isa 23:15,17; Jer 34:14; 42:7; Ezek 29:13; Esth 2:12; 2 Chr 8:1. Although 2 Chr 21:19 does not use miqqēš, the sense of the difficult Hebrew sentence "ûk^oēt sē't haqqēš l^oyāmîm š^onayim seems to be the same, "at the end of the second year."

³So also in Jer 13:6.

⁴Amos 8:2; Hab 2:3; Jer 51:13; Lam 4:18; Ezek 7:2, 3,6.

⁵Amos 8:2; Lam 4:18; Ezek 7:2,3,6.

larger context of the Day of the Lord¹ and, thus, qēs here acquires an eschatological meaning. The term qēs in this sense connotes the time when a group of evildoers (usually other nations or the people of Israel) will be punished for their deeds.

The prophet Amos had a series of visions in which

¹The origin of the "Day of the Lord" concept is not certain. S. Mowinckel contends it derives from the rituals of the annual New Year's celebration (S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson [New York: Abingdon Press, 1954], 132), G. von Rad holds that the origin is to be found in Israel's historical traditions of holy war (G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2 vols. [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], 123). Whatever the origin, by the time of Amos it was an idea which had taken deep root in the religious thought of Israel. It denoted the time when God was to intervene in human affairs to execute judgment upon evildoers and deliver his people from the hand of the oppressor. The Israelites expected a Theophany which would be a happy day for them, but a day of calamity for their enemies. Amos and the other prophets, however, reversed the hope associated with this day and proclaimed the Day of the Lord not as a day of deliverance, but as a day of judgment and gloom for Israel (Amos 5:18-20). There are 17 texts where the phrase "day of the Lord" or "day of the Lord of hosts" appears (Isa 2:12; 13:6,9; Jer 46:10; Ezek 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15; 2:1,11; 3:4; 4:14; Amos 5:18,20; Obad 15; Zeph 1:7,14; Mal 3:23 [4:6]). Other terms used are: "day of the Lord's anger" (Lam 2:22; Zeph 2:2,3), "the day of the Lord's vengeance" (Isa 34:8; 61:2), "the coming day is of the Lord" (Zech 14:1), "the day of vengeance" (Isa 63:4), "the day of his fierce anger" (Lam 1:12), "the day of destruction" (Job 21:30), "the day of evil" (Prov 16:4), "the day of the wrath of God" (Ezek 7:19), or simply "that day" (Isa 22:8,12; Jer 30:7). These expressions can refer to historical events in the past, e.g., the fall of Jerusalem (Lam 1:12; 2:22); to historical events in the immediate future of the prophet, e.g., the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. (Amos 5:18-20) or the defeat of Egypt in 605 B.C. (Jer 46:10); and they can refer to the eschatological day of the Lord (Isa 2:12; Ezek 13:5; Zech 14:1). Thus the day of the Lord concept was used with considerable freedom to interpret various momentous events in the past or in the future. Cf. Meir Weiss, "The Origin of 'the Day of the Lord'--Reconsidered," HUCA 37 (1966): 29-60.

he was shown Yahweh's judgments on Israel.¹ In Amos 2:6-6:14 Israel is shown why God will bring judgments upon them, and in Amos 8:1-2 God announces that the time for it is ripe. In a play on words, God shows Amos a basket of ripe summer fruit (qāyis) and explains that the end (qēs) has come for Israel. The sight of summer-fruit, well-ripened always meant that the end of the growing season was at hand. The symbol is used here to drive home the lesson that the end of the season of repentance has come for Israel. What follows is a description of what the end will be. The songs will turn into wailing (Amos 8:3) and light will turn into darkness (Amos 8:9). This reminds us of the description of the Day of the Lord in Amos 5:20: "Will not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? Even very dark and no brightness in it?" The "end" which Amos proclaimed was the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C.

Jeremiah's lament over the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., ". . . our end (qēs) had come" (Lam 4:18), and Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the same event, "The end (qēs) is now upon you . . ." (Ezek 7:3; see also vss. 2,6) are both found in the context of the "Day of the Lord" (Lam 1:12; 2:22 and Ezek 7:10-11). Both the destruction and the end that came upon Jerusalem were part of the great "Day of the Lord."

In Hab 2:3 the end (qēs) is connected with the

¹Amos 7:1-9; 8:1-2; 9:1.

"appointed time (mō'ēd)." Habakkuk who complained to God about Judah's moral and spiritual decline was told that God would send the Chaldeans to discipline Judah (Hab 1:1-11). Since this did not seem to be a good solution to Habakkuk he reproached God again (Hab 1:12-2:1) and was told that the Chaldeans would be destroyed after they had been used as a rod to chasten Judah (Hab 2:2-18). In this context the appointed time is the period fixed by God for Babylon and the end is the end of the Babylonian oppression (Hab 2:4-20).¹

In Jer 51:13 Babylon is told, "You who live by many waters and are rich in treasures, your end (qēs) has come, the time for you to be cut off." This was written about 593 B.C. (Jer 51:59). In 539 B.C. Babylon succumbed to Cyrus and the prophecy found its literal fulfillment.

Although the latter two passages are not in a "Day of the Lord" context, there is still an eschatological element present. Babylon as a political power was removed from the stage of history by Cyrus who is also called "God's anointed" (Isa 45:1). For Babylon as a nation, the fall of Babylon in 539 B.C. was the final or eschatological end.

Finally, the b'cēt 'wōn qēs, the time of iniquity of the end, in Ezek 21:30,35 (Engl. 21:25,29) and Ezek 35:5

¹Carl E. Armerding, "Habakkuk," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, 12 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 7:511-512.

is the time when iniquity shall be terminated with punishment, i.e., the destruction of Jerusalem.

The Term *qēs* in the Book of Daniel

In the book of Daniel, the noun *qēs* is used fifteen times--five times with *°ēṭ*¹ and ten times without it.² We first study the ten passages where *qēs* appears without *°ēṭ*.

Dan 8:19

וַיֹּאמֶר

הִנְנִי טוֹדִיעֶיךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הָיְתָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים כִּי לְמַעַן קֵץ :

And he said: Behold, I will make known to you what shall be³ in the last days of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end (*l°mō°ēd qēs*) shall be.⁴

The words of the angelus interpres, Gabriel, (vs.16) begin with *hin°nī* and the Hiphil participle of *yāda°*. Every time *hin°nī* is used in this chapter, it is a marker for something new that is to catch the attention of Daniel.⁵ The Hiphil participle *mōdīa°* which is the

¹Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9.

²Dan 8:19; 9:26(2x); 11:6,13,27,45; 12:6, 13(2x). The feminine noun *q°sāt* (*BDB*, 892; *HAL*, 1052) is used in Dan 1:5,15,18 to indicate the end of the three years of education the young Hebrews were to have and the end of the ten days of probation during which Daniel and his friends were on a special diet.

³The LXX adds *tois huiois tou laou sou* (what shall happen to the sons of your people).

⁴Theodotion reads *eti gar eis kairou peras hē horasis* (for the vision is yet for an appointed time).

⁵See vss. 3c, 5b, and 15c. *Hinnēh* has the function to draw attention to that which is new in the sequence of events. See Hasslberger, 45. Compare also Karl Oberhuber,

predicate of the subject "I" in *hin^onī* has the suffix of the 2. pers. sg. m. as its indirect object and the relative clause beginning with *'ēṭ* as its direct object. The verb of the relative clause expresses the future (*yihyeh*) which is further defined by the two temporal expressions *b^o'ah^arīṭ hazza^cam* and *l^omō^cēd qēs*.

The fact that *za^cam* has the article has led several interpreters to the conclusion that *b^o'ah^arīṭ hazza^cam* is a *terminus technicus*.¹ The last part of the verse is introduced by *kī* which can be a causal or a consecutive conjunction.² If the former, then vs. 19c explains *hazza^cam*, if the latter, then vs. 19c belongs to *mōdīa^c* in which case the subject "the vision" from vs. 17 is supplied. The sentence then reads: "for the vision belongeth to the appointed time of the end."³

"Zur Syntax des Richterbuches," *VT* 3 (1953): 10. Oberhuber postulates this use of *hinnēh* for the book of Judges.

¹K. Marti, *Das Buch Daniel*, KHC (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901), 61; A. Jeffery, "The Book of Daniel," *IB* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 479; B. Hasslberger, *Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12*, *Münchener Universitätsschriften: Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament*, vol. 4 (St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1977), 61; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 215. But since the expression is a hapax legomenon, it is doubtful whether the whole phrase can be considered a *terminus technicus*. Rather, it seems that *za^cam* by itself had become a *terminus technicus*. See the discussion below.

²Hasslberger, 61.

³C. F. Keil, *The Book of Daniel*, BCOT, trans. M. G. Easton (1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 312; Prince, 150; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel*,

Some take *qēs* to be the subject and *l°mō°ēd* the predicate.¹ Thus Young paraphrases the verse as follows: "I am about to explain to thee that which shall take place during the latter part of the period known as the Wrath, for at an appointed time the end will be."² This is the interpretation I have chosen in my translation of Dan 8:19.³ This verse together with Dan 8:17 and 26 emphasizes the eschatological focus of the visions:

vs. 17 the vision is for the time of the end.
 vs. 19 at the time appointed the end shall be.
 vs. 26 the vision is for many days (i.e., it spans a long time period).

We now look at the two key expressions, *b°'ah°rīt* *hazza°am* and *l°mō°ēd qēs*, the first of which appears only in this verse.⁴

'aharīt is an abstract noun which, depending on the context, can mean "posterity, end, the last" or "the future."⁵ A few times it also carries the meaning of

CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1901), 122; Jeffery, 479. Since *qēs* does not have the article, Keil argues that it belongs to *l°mō°ēd* and *hazōn* is supplied as the subject.

¹Hasslberger, 61; E. J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 177. Hasslberger argues that *qēs* in *°ēt qēs* is also anarthrous and, hence, has no article here.

²Young, Daniel, 177.

³See above.

⁴The second phrase appears also in Dan 11:27.

⁵HAL, 35-36.

"remnant, rest."¹ It is primarily used as an adjective in the sense of "that which comes after."² The noun *za^cam* from the verb *za^cam* "to curse" appears twenty-three times in the OT and means "curse, anger" or "wrath."³ It is used of man's anger only once in Hos 7:16, where the prophet says that the princes of Ephraim have turned apostate through the "insolence (*za^cam*) of their tongue." Otherwise it always appears as a term for the wrath of God,⁴ as the parallelism with 'ap "anger" (Isa 10:5); *hēmāh* "rage" (Ps 38:2 [Heb.]), *‘ebrāh* "fury" (Ezek 21:36 [Heb.]), and *qesep* "wrath" (Jer 10:10) indicates.⁵ Thus, it seems that *za^cam* became a *terminus technicus*⁶ for God's judgments in the time of the prophets; and when Daniel used it with the

¹G. F. Hasel, "'Remnant' as a Meaning of 'Ah^arīt,'" The Archaeology of Jordan and Other Studies, ed. L. T. Geraty and L. G. Herr (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1986), 524.

²See p. 195.

³HAL, 265.

⁴Isa 10:5,25; 13:5; 26:20; 30:27; 66:14; Jer 10:10; 15:17; 50:25; Ezek 21:36; 22:24,31; Nah 1:6; Hab 3:12; Zeph 3:8; Ps 38:4; 69:25; 78:49; 102:11; Lam 2:6; Dan 8:19; 11:36.

⁵B. Wiklander. "צָרַח *za^cam*," TDOT, 4:109. He says: "Usually the verbs associated with *za^cam* have a clear judgment aspect. God pours out *za^cam* (*shaphakh^cal*, Ezek 21:36[31]; 22:31; Zeph 3:8; Ps 69:25[24]) or sends *za^cam* (*shalach b^a*, Ps 78:49). The *za^cam* of God "destroys" (Isa 13:5) or bestrides the earth (in destruction) (Hab 3:12). Twice the verb *male'* is used: Yahweh's lips are full of *za^cam* (Isa 30:27); God has "filled" the prophet with *za^cam* (Jer 15: 17). Two additional passages say that man cannot endure Yahweh's *za^cam* (Jer 10:10, *kūl*; Nah 1:6, *‘amadh*)."

⁶Marti, Daniel, 61.

article (hazza ^cam), it was well understood by his readers. K. Koch is probably right when he says that b^e'ah^arîṭ hazza^cam was understood eschatologically.¹

Mô^cēd is a Hebrew noun appearing 223 times in the OT, of which 145 occurrences alone refer to the 'ōhel mô^cēd, the "tent of meeting."² It can also refer to other meeting places like the "mount of assembly" (har mô^cēd) in Isa 14:13 or the "city of assemblies" (qiryat mô^cādîm) meaning Zion in Isa 33:20. Frequently, the assemblies or feasts are called mô^cēd,³ although it is not always clear whether the local or the temporal aspect of the feast is in view.⁴

Mô^cēd can designate a specific point in time, e.g., the time for the birth of a child (Gen 17:21), the coming of a plague (Exod 9:5), the time of a bird's migration (Jer 8:7), or the time Samuel appointed for Saul (1 Sam 13:8),⁵ as well as an appointed space of time as in Gen 1:14 and Ps 104:19⁶--although not all agree that it can also refer to a

¹K. Koch, "תִּיב מוֹעֵד," TWAT, 4:749.

²Even-Shoshan, 631.

³Lev 23:2; Num 10:10; 15:3; 28:2; 29:39; Isa 1:14; Ezek 36:38; Hos 2:13; 9:5; etc.

⁴Koch, TWAT, 4:747.

⁵Jack P. Lewis, "יָעַד (yā^cad) appoint, betroth, assemble, meet, set," TWOT, 1:388.

⁶HAL, 529; Lewis, TWOT, 1:388. Hartman and Di Lella (231) see a fixed period of time in Dan 8:19.

period of time.¹ A span of time is certainly indicated in Dan 12:7 where, in answer to the question, "How long shall it be . . . ?" the angel swears by him that liveth "that it shall be for a time, times and a half (l^omô^cēd mō^ca^dīm waḥeṣi)." ²

As discussed previously,³ both phrases in Dan 8:19, b^o'ah^arīt hazza^cam and l^omô^cēd qēs, further define yihyeh, "what shall be," i.e., "the future." This future is the apocalyptic time of the end as the larger context of Dan 8 shows.⁴ The parallelism between Dan 2, 7, and 8⁵ indicates that the end of the Little Horn in 8:25 will be at the time when the kingdom of God breaks into history and is given to the saints (7:27). Thus, qēs here is the time when the final events of this aeon will take place.

¹Koch, TWAT, 4:747.

²Koch (TWAT, 4:749) says: "Die Wiedergabe bleibt allerdings fragwürdig, da mō^cēd sonst nie Zeitdauer, sondern eine herausgehobene Phase innerhalb eines Zeitkontinuums meint."

³See p. 367.

⁴B. W. Jones ("Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel" [Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972], 274) refers it to the end of the persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but leaves the possibility of a double meaning open. He says: ". . . if a deliberate double meaning is intended, then conceivably the end of the persecution could also be the end of history."

⁵See p. 326.

Dan 9:26

26 וְאַחֲרֵי הַשְּׁבַעִים שָׁשִׁים וּשְׁנָיִם יִכָּרֵת מֶשֶׁחׁ וְאֵין לוֹ
וְהָעִיר וְהַמִּקְדָּשׁ יִשְׁחָת עִם נְגִיד הַבָּא
וְהָיָה בְשֹׁטֵף וְעַד בֶּן מִלְחָמָה יִתְרָצֵת שְׁמָמוֹת׃

And after sixty-two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, and shall have nothing:¹ and the people of the prince who shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and its end (qēs) shall be with a flood, and until the end (qēs) shall be war² and decreed desolations.

The meaning of qēs in this verse is dependent on the interpretation of the seventy weeks. There exists a variety of interpretations³ and none of them answers all the questions, but exegetically, the most convincing seems to be to me the historical-Messianic view.⁴

¹The LXX reads kai ouk estai (and he shall not be).

²If qēs and milhamāh constitute a construct chain, the last part of vs. 26 would read "until the end of the war shall be decreed desolation."

³See p. 306, n. 4.

⁴In the Historical-critical view, the time elements do not fit the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Furthermore, the Messianic age which vs. 24 prophesies (see Driver, Daniel, 136-137) did not begin after the death of Antiochus. The Dispensational or gap theory rests on two assumptions: (1) that the church is never mentioned in OT prophecy, and (2) the "he" in vs. 27 "he shall make a firm covenant" is the Antichrist rather than the Messiah. The former assumption is disproved by the NT itself, because the Apostles under inspiration did apply OT promises and prophecies to the NT church (Acts 2:17-21; 1 Pet 2:9,11) (B. H. Hall, "The Book of Daniel," WBIC 6 vols. [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969], 3:547). The latter seems inadmissible on contextual grounds. Nowhere in the Bible does the Antichrist make a covenant which he could confirm or "make efficacious" (Young, Daniel, 213) at some future time (see, J. Barton Payne, "The Goal of Daniel's Seventy Weeks," JETS 21 [1978]: 109-110). The antecedent of "he" is the Anointed One of vs. 26 not the "ruler who will

In this view, "the Anointed One" is Christ and "the people of the prince who shall come" are the Romans with Titus¹ or the Jews with Christ as the prince.²

Having suggested an overall understanding of Dan 9:24-27, we can turn to the use of qēs in 9:26b. The first occurrence of qēs in w^oqissō is qēs with the masculine singular suffix "he" or "it." Who or what is referred to? Some interpreters believe it refers to the "ruler who will come" and translate, "and his end will be with the flood," meaning "he will be swept away in the flood of a Divine judgment."³ Similarly, it could refer to the people (°am, masc.) who destroy the city.⁴

come." The subject of the phrase °am nāgīd habbā' is "the people" not "the ruler." "Therefore, the fitting grammatical antecedent of the 'he' (vs. 27) is the 'Messiah' (vs. 26)" (Hasel, "The Seventy Weeks", 10D). The symbolic interpretation also has serious drawbacks: (1) There are no good exegetical reasons for making Jerusalem mean the church or for making the 62 (weeks) and the one (week) into symbolic numbers. (2) If the 7 weeks and the 62 weeks are consecutive periods, then the one week must also follow the 62 weeks and not run concurrently. (For additional problems connected with each of these interpretations, see Hasel, "The Seventy Weeks.").

¹Gurney, 123, and many others.

²See p. 330, n.1.

³Driver, Daniel, 141; Keil, Daniel, 363; A. Lacoque, The Book of Daniel, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 197.

⁴C. G. Ozanne, "Three Textual Problems in Daniel," JTS 16 (1965): 447. Cf. Goldingay, Daniel, 230. He applies all of Dan 9 to the time period of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but believes (Daniel, 268) that there is "a typological relationship between the events and people of the Antiochene crisis and deliverance and those of the Christ event and the End we still await."

Several scholars take the city and the sanctuary as the antecedent and translate: "Its end shall come with a flood."¹ The problem in this case is with the gender of ^cir "city" which is feminine. Furthermore, if it referred to the city and the sanctuary, we would expect the plural masculine suffix hem.² "It" could refer to qōdeš "sanctuary" which is masculine, but can we separate the city from the sanctuary as Auberlen has done?³

A scribal error is, of course, possible,⁴ but it seems better to interpret the suffix as neutral and refer it "not to some particular noun that goes before, but to the whole matter in hand."⁵ The translation would then be: "and it will end in the flood," meaning "The destruction will be of such a nature that it will end in a mighty

¹RSV. Cf. Gurney, 123; Ford, Daniel, 233.

²When there is a double antecedent with a feminine and a masculine noun, the Hebrew uses the masculine plural suffix to refer back to them, e.g., Gen 1:27 ". . . male and female he created them ('ōtām); Gen 32:1 (Heb) ". . . Laban kissed his grandchildren (bānāyw) and his daughters (b^cnōtāyw) and blessed them ('ethem)." Cf. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch, trans. A. E. Cowley, 2nd Eng. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 391.

³Carl A. Auberlen, The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John, trans. Adolph Saphir (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1856), 96.

⁴Keil, Daniel, 363.

⁵E. W. Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, 4 vols., trans. Theodore Meyer and James Martin (1872-78; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1956), 3:139. Hengstenberg cites the use of hū' in Zech 11:11 and Jer 32:6-8 as examples as well as ^calêhem in Ezek 18:26.

overflow."¹ The term flood in the OT is used as a symbol of an invading army (Isa 8:7,8) or as a figure of judgment destroying a city or a country (Nah 1:8). "Both meanings apply here."² If Jerusalem had suffered in the past, the future would hold a time of unparalleled desolation for it; this is the message Gabriel is conveying to Daniel.

The second occurrence of qēš in 9:26b w^cad qēš follows immediately after the first. Does it refer to the same "end" as qışšô, i.e., the end of Jerusalem in A.D. 70? This is assumed by some interpreters.³ Others, however, understand the second qēš in a purely eschatological sense and refer it to the end that comes with the second advent.⁴ Ford says:

This 'end' should not be equated with the 'end' of the city mentioned earlier, for the Hebrew word has neither a suffix nor an article. It means the end generally and corresponds to the end of all things (cf. 7:26; 12:13).⁵

Ford here follows Keil who refers this qēš to "the end of the period in progress,"⁶ and for him the period in progress is the seventy weeks which he believes reach to

¹Young, Daniel, 207. The NIV has "The end will come like a flood."

²Ford, Daniel, 233.

³Tatford, Daniel, 161; Gurney, 123; Young, Daniel, 209; Walvoord, Daniel, 231, and Hengstenberg, 141, understand it in this way.

⁴Keil, Daniel, 364; Maier, 349.

⁵Ford, Daniel, 233.

⁶Keil, Daniel, 364.

the second advent.¹ In other words, the second qēš is "the very last end."²

A study of qēš in the OT shows that qēš by itself without suffix or article used as if it were a proper noun,³ does not always mean the end of all things (see Ezek 21:25,30; 35:5), but at times it can have an eschatological import (e.g., Ezek 7:2,6). Its meaning needs to be primarily determined by the context, and since the immediate context in Dan 9:26 is the end of Jerusalem, there is the distinct likelihood that both qiššô and qēš refer to the same event.

Dan 9:27 is to a certain extent an amplification of vs. 26. The anointed one in vs. 26 confirms the covenant in vs. 27. The people of the prince "who is to come" are those responsible for the desolation in vs. 27. Therefore, the "end" and the "decreed desolations" in vs. 26 should find a parallel in the "decreed end" in vs. 27.

As we have seen in vs. 26, the judgment is upon the city and the sanctuary; in vs. 27, however, the "decreed

¹Ibid., 375 accepts the symbolic interpretation of the 70 weeks and considers the 62 weeks to cover the period from the first advent to sometime in the future when the kingdom of Christ here on earth shall be destroyed.

²Leupold, Daniel, 430. So also G. L. Archer, "Daniel," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, 12 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 7:116.

³Wilch, 113.

end" is poured out on the desolator, the destroyer himself.¹

The Hebrew text of Dan 9:27d reads, "w^cad² kālāh³ w^eneh^erāsāh tittak^k al šōmēm," "even until the end that which was decreed shall be poured out on the desolator." The crucial word is šōmēm.⁴ Does it refer to the place that is desolated or to the person who does the desolating? The participle of šmm appears fifteen times in the OT. Nine times it refers to desolate places⁵ and five times to people who have been made desolate.⁶ There is no text where it is used in an active sense, referring to "a

¹RSV, NIV, NASB, JB, AB. Ford, Daniel, 235; Leupold, Daniel, 435; Maier, 353; Archer, "Daniel," 118-119; Baldwin, 172; Keil, Daniel, 373; Driver, Daniel, 142; Aage Bentzen, Daniel, 2nd ed., HAT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), 69; Zöckler, 205.

²cad here is taken as a conjunction and not as a preposition since "the determined destruction" is the subject of tittak^k (Zöckler, 205).

³The word kālāh comes from the root klh. The basic idea of this root is to bring a process to completion, "zu einem Ende bringen bzw. kommen" (F. J. Helfmeier, "קָלָה kālāh," TWAT, 4:166. See also BDB, 477; KBL, 437). The feminine noun kālāh always has a negative connotation, meaning "consummation, complete destruction, annihilation" (BDB, 478). In conjunction with neh^erāsāh (Niph. part. of ḥrṣ--to settle, determine), which means "what is determined," it is used three times in the OT (Isa 10:23; 28:22; Dan 9:27) and always means "the decreed" or "the determined destruction."

⁴Kal part. of šmm--be deserted, desolated (KBL, 988).

⁵Lam 1:4,13; Isa 49:8,19; 61:4; Ezek 36:4; Dan 8:13; 9:26; 12:11.

⁶Lam 1:16; 3:11; Isa 54:1; Dan 9:18; 2 Sam 13:20.

desolator," for which we have the word מִשְׁמַמִּים,¹ which in fact, does appear in vs. 27. I conclude then that either 9:27 is that one place where שְׁמַמִּים does have the import of "the desolator" or it refers to a desolate place (meaning Jerusalem and Judah) in this text as well.

If the former is correct, the sense of 9:27c would be that the abomination that makes desolate shall continue only until the divinely determined judgment shall be poured out upon the desolator.² The translation of the NIV, "until the end that is decreed is poured out on him" would then be correct. This understanding of 9:27c would lend weight to the argument that the second qēṣ in 9:26 refers to the end of all things,³ and the prophecy would then extend from the destruction of literal Israel's holy city to the continued devastation of God's people through all ages culminating in a time of unparalleled tribulation and subsequent destruction of the Antichrist.⁴

¹Polel participle of שָׁמַם--(1) be appalled, stupefied; (2) destroyer, devastator (KBL, 989; CHAL, 376). מִשְׁמַמִּים appears four times in the OT. In Dan 9:27 and 11:31 it carries the meaning of "destroyer," in Ezra 9:3-4 it has the same import as שְׁמַמִּים--to be appalled.

²Zöckler, 205; J. A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 389.

³Ford, Daniel, 233.

⁴Archer, "Daniel," 116-118; Maier, 349, 353; Leupold, Daniel, 430, 436; Baldwin, 171-172; Keil, Daniel, 364, 373. A parallel to this is seen in Christ's discourse in Matt 24 where he passes from the time of trouble connected with A.D. 70 to the trouble threatening the elect. (Ford, Daniel, 233; Archer, "Daniel," 116.).

If the latter, i.e., a desolate place, is in view, which seems more in harmony with the albeit difficult grammar and syntax, then the meaning of the 9:27c would be that a desolator (𐤎𐤌𐤔𐤌𐤌) would come until the determined destruction has been poured out upon the desolate place, i.e., Jerusalem. In other words, there would be a limit to his activities. We would then translate with the NAB, ". . . until the ruin that is decreed is poured out upon the horror," or with the NEB, ". . . then in the end, what has been decreed concerning the desolation will be poured out."¹

Applying this explanation of 9:27c to the second qēš in 9:26 would make it refer to the same event as qiqšō --the desolation of Jerusalem and Judah.²

Dan 11:6

אִלְקָץ שָׁנִים יִתְחַבְּרוּ וּבֵת מֶלֶךְ-הַיָּגֹב תָּבוֹא אֶל-מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן
 לַעֲשׂוֹת מִישָׁרִים וְלֹא-תִסָּעַר כִּי־חַ הַיָּדוֹעַ וְלֹא יִטְמַר חֲרָשׁ־וּתְנִתָּן
 הִיא וּמְבִיאֶיהָ וְהַיְלָדָהּ וּמְחַוְקָהּ בְּעֵתֵיהֶם:

And at the end of several years (1^oqēš šānīm) they shall make an alliance; for the daughter of the king of the south shall come to the king of the north to make

¹This is the view of Young, Daniel, 219; Hengstenberg, 141, 173; Barnes, Daniel, 2:180, 189.

²Historical-critical scholars also refer the two occurrences of qēš to the same event, but apply it to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Cf. Plöger, Daniel, 141-142; Marti, Daniel, 71; Driver, Daniel, 141.

an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm. . . .¹

The subject "they" of vs. 6a are the king of the South and one of his princes introduced in vs. 5. The king of the South is declared to be mighty, but one of his princes, it is said, will be mightier than he is and rule his own kingdom. After an unspecified time period, the two shall make an alliance, the "prince" of vs. 5 now having become the king of the North.² The temporal expression *l•qēš šānīm* expresses an indefinite time period³ at the end (*l•qēš*) of which the events related in vs. 6 take place.⁴

Dan 11:13

וְיָשָׁב מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן וְהִעֲמִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ רַב מֶלֶךְ
הַרְאֵשׁוֹן וְלִקַּח הַעֲתִים שָׁנִים יָבֹא בֹא בְחֵיל גָּדוֹל וּבְרִכּוֹשׁ רָב:

And the king of the North will return, and raise an army greater than the former, and at the end of times

¹For textual commentary see pp. 310-311.

²Historically the fulfillment of vs. 5 is seen in the story of Ptolemy I and Seleucus Nicator, the founder of the Seleucid empire. Seleucus had originally served under Perdiccas and Antigonus in Babylon, but defected to Ptolemy in 316 B.C. He then gained control of the larger part of Alexander's old domains from the Indus in the east to Syria and Phoenicia in the west. Consequently, his authority far surpassed that of his sponsor Ptolemy (Archer, "Daniel," 130). This is why in vs. 6 he is called the king of the North.

³Also indicated by the use of the plural and the absence of any determination (Hasslberger, 211).

⁴For the historical fulfillment of 11:6, see pp. 311-312 where this text has already been discussed.

of years ($\text{ûl}^\circ\text{qēs ha}^\circ\text{ittîm šānîm}$) he will come with a great army and with much supply.¹

This text has already been discussed.² Qēs here has the same meaning as in 11:6.

Dan 11:27

וַיִּשְׁנִיתָם הַמְּלָכִים לְבָבָם לַמַּרְעַע וְעַל־שֻׁלְחָן אֶחָד בָּנוּ
וַיְדַבְּרוּ וְלֹא תִצְלַח בְּרִעְוֵיהֶם קֶץ לְמוֹעֵד:

And the two kings, their minds set on evil, speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end (qēs) shall be at the time appointed.

This verse begins with a subordinate clause in which the kings' hearts ($l^\circ\text{bāpām}$) are the subject and "do mischief" ($l^\circ\text{mērā}^\circ$) is the predicate.³ The main clause begins with a prepositional phrase indicating the locality, "at one table" ($w^\circ\text{ai šulhān 'ehād}$). The subject "they" refers to the two kings mentioned in vs. 27a. The words "shall speak" is the predicate and "falsehood" ($kāzāb$) is the object.

The two kings refer back to vs. 25 where the king of the North marches against the king of the South, but they are not the same persons as in vs. 25, since in vs. 26a the person of the king of the South is killed, "yea,

¹For textual commentary see pp. 313-314.

²See pp. 313-316.

³"l" denotes the direction, "their hearts go toward wicked deeds" (Keil, Daniel, 453).

they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy (šābar) him."¹ Hasslberger says:

ŠBR in 26a refers only to the person, not to the term *malk ha=nagb*. In 27a the two terms are primarily in view whereby behind *malk ha=šapōn* as a person there is always *nibzā*. For *malk ha=nagb* the person is obviously of lesser importance. This can be seen in the fact that apart from 7a no "succession" parallel to the one by *malk ha=šapōn* is reported. From this one can conclude that for the author *malk ha=nagb* is only important as the opponent of *malk ha=šapōn*. In other words, the latter has the more important rôle. One must not explain the text primarily from history, rather the relationship within the text must first be clarified.²

The text proceeds by indicating that their falsehood shall not prosper (*w^olō' tišlāh*). The reason for it is given in the last part of the verse: "for yet the end shall be at the time appointed" (*kī cōd qēs lammōcēd*).

¹Šābar in Daniel always refers to the end result of "breaking." Those who are broken are destroyed, they do not rise again, e.g., the horns in 8:7,8,22 and 11:4 as well as the king of fierce countenance in 8:25 who is broken "without hands." They all are broken and disappear from the scene. The same happens to "the raiser of taxes" in 11:20 and the people who stand before the vile person in 11:22.

²Hasslberger, 258. ŠBR in 26a bezieht sich nur auf die Person, nicht aber auf die Größe *malk ha=nagb*. In 27a sind denn auch in erster Linie die beiden Größen gemeint, wobei hinter *malk ha=šapōn* als Person immer noch *nibzā* aus 21a steht. Für *malk ha=nagb* spielt die Person offensichtlich eine geringere Rolle. Das zeigt sich allein schon daran, daß außer in 7a keine "Thronfolge" parallel zu der bei *malk ha=šapōn* berichtet wird. Daraus kann man schließen, daß *malk ha=nagb* für den Verfasser nur als Gegenspieler zu *malk ha=šapōn* bedeutsam, letzterer also die wichtigere Größe ist. Man darf also nicht in erster Linie von der Historie her den Text deuten, sondern muß erst textimmanent die Beziehungen klären. Interpreters who see here the history of Antiochus' first expedition into Egypt (170 B.C.) see in the king of the South in vss. 25 and 27 the same person--Ptolemy Philometor. They do not take into account the force of šābar. See Driver, Daniel, 184; Marti, Daniel, 84.

This subordinate clause is introduced by a causal *kī* and has *qēš* as its subject and *lammô^cēd* as the predicate.¹

The question is, what is *qēš* referring to? Some see the end as the complete subjugation of Egypt;² others the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the King of the North³ or the end of his campaign against Egypt.⁴ Keil interprets it eschatologically by equating this *qēš* with *ēṭ qēš* in 11:35,40 and 12:4; and since in 12:4 the resurrection takes place, the *qēš* here is "the end of the present course of the world, with which all the oppression of the people of God cease."⁵

As far as the text itself is concerned, I can only say that from the viewpoint of the two warring kings the appointed end was still future. A few verses later (vs. 35), we are again told that the end is yet future and, finally, in vs. 40 the time of the end has arrived. The textual parallels are quite interesting:

¹The "w" here is the adversative conjunction "but," and the indefinite subject "it" is the fem. form of *šālah* (Hasslberger, 259).

²Driver, *Daniel*, 185; Marti, *Daniel*, 85; Prince, 181.

³Lacoque, *Daniel*, 228, 169; Charles, *Daniel*, 304; Montgomery, 454.

⁴Archer, "Daniel," 138; Tatford, *Daniel*, 192; Hasslberger, 259.

⁵Keil, *Daniel*, 454. The same view is taken by Bentzen, 82; Plöger, *Daniel*, 167; and Jeffery, 529, except that these writers believe that the author believed the end would come soon after Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but that, in fact, it did not come. Cf. Wilch, 112.

vs. 27			kī °ōd qēs	lammō°ēd
vs. 35	°ad °ēṭ	qēs	kī °ōd	lammō°ēd
vs. 40	b°ēṭ	qēs		

From these parallels it seems reasonable to conclude that the appointed end which is still future in vs. 27 becomes the appointed time of the end still future in vs. 35 and then the time of the end in vs. 40. Verse 35 is the link between vs. 27 and vs. 40.¹ And vss. 40-45 belong to the apocalyptic time of the end.²

Dan 11:45

וְיָשַׁע אֶת־הַיְּמִין אֶת־הַיָּם
בֵּין יָמִים לְהַר־צְבִיבֵי־קָדְשׁ וְבָא עַד־קִצּוֹ וְאֵין עֹזֵר לּוֹ:

And he shall pitch his palatial tent³ between the sea⁴ and the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end (qīṣṣō),⁵ and none shall help him.

The subject of vs. 45a and b is the "willful king" of vs. 36 who is called the "king of the North" in vs. 40. He will "at the time of the end" be seemingly successful

¹Many scholars past and present have taken the same view: Ferdinand Hitzig, Das Buch Daniel (Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1850), 211, 214; Barnes, Daniel, 2:233, 240, 246; Driver, Daniel, 185, 193, 198; Montgomery, 466; Bentzen, 82; Jeffery, 537; N. Porteous, Daniel, 2nd rev. ed., OTL (London: SCM Press, 1979), 167, 169, 170. However, they all see °ēṭ qēs connected with the demise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

²See pp. 330-332.

³'appeden is a Persian loan word (KBL, 76; Montgomery, 467).

⁴Lit. "seas" (yammîm) with reference to the Mediterranean Sea.

⁵The LXX reads kai hexei hōra tēs sunteleias autou (the hour [time] of his end shall come).

(vss. 40-43), yet at the height of his success "he shall come to his end (qīṣṣō)," i.e., he shall perish. Qēṣ in this context then means "the end of the King of the North."¹ Most commentators see in the "willful king" and in the King of the North the same figure;² some, however, feel that a third power in addition to the kings of the North and the South is introduced in 11:36.³ For grammatical⁴ and contextual reasons,⁵ I consider the first view to be the more likely and see here the demise of the king of the North. The text does not state how he will perish, but since in the next verse (12:1) the heavenly figure Michael⁶ stands up to deliver God's people, it seems reasonable to suggest that the king of the North, who is destroying many

¹Wilch, 113.

²Keil, Daniel, 470; G. R. King, 232; Maier, 408; Newell, 181; Young, Daniel, 251; Archer, "Daniel," 147; Ford, Daniel, 275; as well as all scholars who interpret Dan 11: 21-45 as referring to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

³Leupold, Daniel, 521; Ironside, Daniel, 215; Talbot, 206; Walvoord, Daniel, 277; R. D. Culver, Daniel and the Latter Days, rev. ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), 180; Roger Liebi, Weltgeschichte im Visier des Propheten Daniel (Berneck: Schwengeler Verlag, 1986), 85.

⁴The suffix of cālāyw in vs. 40 refers to the king of the South immediately preceding it and not to the "willful king" of vs. 36 (Keil, Daniel, 470).

⁵Whenever the kings of the North and the South are mentioned previous to Dan 11:40 they are adversaries. If a new power were introduced in Dan 11:36 the kings of the North and South would be allies in 11:40.

⁶That he is a heavenly figure is clear from Jude 9 where he is called an "archangel," and from Dan 10:13 where the angel tells Daniel that Michael "one of the chief princes" has helped him.

in the preceding verse (vs. 43), comes "to his end" by an act of God.¹

Interpreters who identify the King of the North in 11:45 with Antiochus IV Epiphanes consider this verse as part of a true prophecy (vss. 40-45) which has gone wrong because Antiochus IV Epiphanes actually died in Tabae in Persia² and not in Palestine as the text seems to suggest.³

¹In Dan 8:25 the Little Horn power which, as we see, is the same as the king of the North is broken without hand, i.e., by an act of God. Newell (181) says, "The ultimate end of the wilful king as stated in verse 45 is identical with that set forth in chapter 2:45 and again in chapter 8:25."

²Accounts of Antiochus' death differ. According to 2 Macc 1:16, Antiochus was killed by the priests of the temple of Nanaea as he tried to rob it: "They hacked them to pieces, decapitated them, and threw their heads to those who were waiting on the outside." But in 2 Macc 9:5, God struck him down with an incurable and invisible plague as he was leaving Persia for Jerusalem to "make Jerusalem a charnel city of the Jews" (2 Macc 9:4). Cf. Solomon Zeitlin, The Second Book of Maccabees, trans. Sydney Tedesche (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), 105, 181-182. Polybius (The Histories 31.9 [trans. W. R. Paton, LCL, 6:177]) states: "In Syria King Antiochus wishing to provide himself with money, decided to make an expedition against the sanctuary of Artemis in Elymais. On reaching the spot he was foiled in his hopes, as the barbarian tribes who dwelt in the neighbourhood would not permit the outrage, and on his retreat he died at Tabae in Persia, smitten with madness, as some people say, owing to certain manifestations of divine displeasure when he was attempting this outrage on the above sanctuary." According to E. Bickerman, ("The Seleucid Period," in E. Yarshater, ed., The Cambridge History of Iran III:1, The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods [Cambridge: Cambridge University 1983], 32-3) as Tabae is in western Anatolia, the word should be emended to Gabae, a suburb of modern Isfahan. He cites for the last days of Antiochus IV the commentary of M. Holleaux, Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques 6 vols. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1942), 3:264-267.

³Porteous, 169-170; Driver, Daniel, 197; W. S. Towner, Daniel, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press,

Others see in vss. 36-45 a prophecy of the end-time Antichrist and his demise.¹ The events described in these verses are taken to parallel the descriptions of God's judgment on the Antichrist in other texts which are mostly given in the context of the Holy Land.²

We have noted previously³ that Dan 7 and 8 and Dan 11-12, i.e., all three visions, reach to the time of the end. Thus the events described in Dan 11:40-12:3 are also apocalyptic in nature. The term *qēs*, although referring only to the end of the king of the North, is here part of the apocalyptic drama in the book of Daniel.

Dan 12:6

וַיֹּאמֶר לְאִישׁ לְבוּשׁ
הַבְּדִים אֲשֶׁר מִמֶּעַל לְטִיט הַיָּאֵר עַד-קֵץ קֶץ הַפְּלֹאֹת:

And one said to the man clothed in linen, who was upon the waters of the river, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?"

The subject of vs. 6a is the indefinite pronoun "one" which refers back to one of the two beings introduced in vs. 5. The predicate of this main clause is "said," and its object is the "man clothed in linen." The relative

1984), 165; Hammer, 114; Bentzen, 83; Montgomery, 465; Plöger, Daniel, 167; Marti, Daniel, 89.

¹Leupold, Daniel, . 524; Maier, 408; Young, Daniel, 253; Archer, "Daniel," 148; Newell, 181; Keil, Daniel, 474; G. R. King, 232; Talbot, 209; Walvoord, Daniel, 280.

²Ezek 38 and 39; Joel 3:2; Zech 12 and 14; Rev 16: 12-16; 20:7-10.

³See p. 332.

clause beginning with 'ašer indicates the location of "the man clothed in linen." In vs. 6b we have a question introduced by °ad māṭay, a preposition-adverb phrase which appears twenty-nine times in the OT.¹ The phrase "until when"² always asks for the end of a time period, the conclusion of a time span, e.g., "How long wilt thou refuse to humble yourself?" (Exod 10:3); "How long wilt thou be angry. . . ?" (Ps 80:4); "How long will ye judge unjustly?" (Ps 82:2). In each case, the questioner is not interested in a given time span; his question is really: "When will you stop doing what you are doing?"

In Dan 8:13, "Until when the vision?" the focus is again upon what takes place at the end of the 2300 evening-mornings. Hasel says:

The emphasis is not *duration* (how long) but *termination* (until when) and what follows. This exegetical insight finds contextual support in the temporal "until" (°ad) in the answer of verse 14a which in turn is followed by "then" (waw after temporal information) in the last part of verse 14.³

The context of Dan 8 clearly shows that the focus of this chapter is on the end-time. In Dan 8:17 the

¹Exod 10:3,7; Num 14:27; 1 Sam 1:14; 16:1; 2 Sam 2:26; 1 Kgs 18:21; Isa 6:11; Jer 4:14,21; 12:4; 23:26; 31:22; 47:5; Hos 8:5; Hab 2:6; Zech 1:12; Ps 6:3; 74:10; 80:4; 82:2; 90:13; 94:3(2x); Prov 1:22; 6:9; Dan 8:13; 12:6; Neh 2:6 (Even-Shoshan, 727).

²KBL (680), "Bis wann?"; HAL, 618; BDB, 607. See also Hartmann and Di Lella (226) who state: "Literally, 'Until when the vision?'"

³Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 427-430.

angelus interpres informs Daniel that "the vision concerns the time of the end"; in Dan 8:19 it "concerns the appointed time of the end"; (NIV) and in Dan 8:26 the vision "concerns the distant future" (NIV).

In the case of Dan 12:6b, the end in view is the qēš happ^olā'ōt, "the end of these wonders," which J. R. Wilch equates with "the End."¹ Contrary to Keil who thinks the duration of this end is asked for,² Hasslberger observes, "Es wird gefragt nach dem Ende von ha=p^olā'ōt, nicht aber nach der Dauer dieses Endes."³ This question is similar to the one asked in Dan 8:13, °ad mātay heḥāzôn where the end of the vision is the focal point.

What does p^olā'ōt⁴ refer to? The noun pele' is used thirteen times in the OT.⁵ Except for Lam 1:9, where it describes Jerusalem's fall as "wonderful," and Isa 29:14, where God's punishment of Israel is called "a marvelous work and wonder," pele' describes God's acts of salvation (Exod 15:11; Isa 25:1; etc.), his name (Isa 9:6), and his testimony (Ps 119:129).

The answer to the question in vs. 6b is given in

¹Wilch, 112.

²Keil, Daniel, 489. See also Young, Daniel, 259.

³Hasslberger, 363.

⁴p^olā'ōt is the fem. pl. of pele' which means "wonder," "something extraordinary" (BDB, 810; KBL, 760).

⁵Exod 15:11; Isa 9:6; 25:1; 29:14; Ps 77:11,15; 78:12; 88:10,12; 89:5; 119:129; Lam 1:9; Dan 12:6 (Even-Shoshan, 944).

vs. 7 where the man clothed in linen says "that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished," but no indication is given which "wonders" are meant.

Some commentators apply *pele'* to specific parts of chaps. 11 and 12,¹ but it seems preferable to refer *p^olā'ôt* to the entire series of events preceding the question² rather than just a part of it.

I stated earlier that *pele'* refers primarily to the salvific acts of God. The only salvific acts in the whole series of events preceding Dan 12:6 are in Dan 11:34 (they shall be helped with a little help) and Dan 12:1-2 (Michael stands up and God's people are delivered). Nevertheless, history itself is controlled by God, as is pointed out in Dan 11:27 and 35. God is the one who appoints times and seasons. It seems that *pele'* in Dan 12: 6 includes both, the acts of God as well as the "marvelous things"³ and actions of the kings of the South and the North.

¹Driver (Daniel, 203), Marti (Daniel, 91), and Jeffery (545), apply it to 11:31-36 and 12:1; Baldwin (207) and Maier (417), refer it to 11:31-12:3; and Hasslberger (363) to 11:21-12:1. Lacoque (Daniel, 248) and Hartman and Di Lella (274) apply it specifically to the wicked deeds of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

²Leupold, Daniel, 538; Barnes, Daniel, 2:265.

³In Dan 11:36 the word *nīplā'ôt*, a Niphal participle fem. pl. of *pl'*, is used. It has the same meaning as *pele'* and refers primarily to the works of God. It is also used in 8:24, "and he shall destroy wonderfully" for the works of the Little Horn.

In short, the "wonders" mentioned in Dan 12:6 reach to the end of the three and a half times of vs. 7, at which time the ^cēṭ qēs, "the time of the end" of vs. 4, will begin and the events of Dan 11:40-12:3 will take place.

Dan 12:13

וַיֹּאמֶר לְךָ לִקְוֹת וְתֵנוּחַ וְתִשְׁמַד לְגִרְלָךְ לִקְוֹת יְמֵיָי:

But you go on to the end (qēs) and you shall rest,¹ and stand in your allotted place at the end of the days.

This, the last verse of the book of Daniel, is largely a repetition of Dan 12:9. Both verses are direct addresses to Daniel, both begin with lēḵ "go thou," and both point Daniel to the qēs.

The imperative lēḵ at the beginning is followed by two verbal clauses in the future tense in which Daniel is both times the subject.

The first verb nūah has the basic meaning of "being settled" or "resting."² In the physical sense, the ark "rested" on the mountains of Ararat (Gen 8:4), and the locusts "rested" on Egypt (Gen 10:14). L. J. Coppes distinguishes four theological uses of nūah.³ The psychological-spiritual rest (the absence of trouble) is

¹LXX and Theodotion add eti gar eisin hēmerai kai hōrai eis anaplērosin sunteleias (for there are yet days and seasons to the fulfillment of the end).

²BDB, 628; HAL, 641-642.

³L. J. Coppes, "נָח (nūah) rest, settle down," TWOT, 2:562. See also H. D. Preuß, "נָח nūah," TWAT, 5:297-307.

referred to in Ps 116:7 where it says that the only true place of spiritual rest is found in God. The martial use concerns the promise of God to defeat the enemy of Israel and to give them rest (security) in the land (Deut 12:10; Josh 21:44). The soteriological use is based on the fact that God rested (nūah) on the sabbath day (Exod 20:11). "Hence, man is not only to cease from his worldly pursuits (Exod 31:12-17; cf. Isa 58:13-14) but he is to enter into a state of victory/ salvation rest (Josh 1:13; Deut 25:19)."¹ Finally, nūah as "resting in death" is found in Job 3:13 and 17 where Job bemoans his existence and wishes he had been a stillborn or had died after his birth, and in Isa 57:2 where the righteous rest in their beds (graves).²

It is this last meaning which also seems to be the sense of nūah in Dan 12:13. Some commentators apply the same meaning to the word qēs³ preceding nūah. Thus qēs here would be the end of Daniel's life,⁴ but others interpret it eschatologically as in Dan 12:4.⁵ Hasslberger

¹ Ibid.

² Delitzsch, The Prophecies of Isaiah, 369; Ridderbos, Isaiah, 514.

³ The fact that this qēs is missing in the LXX and Theodotion has led to the assumption that lqs has been inadvertently copied in after lk from the similar combination just below (Montgomery, 477; Bentzen, 86).

⁴ Keil, Daniel, 505; Prince, 193; Young, Daniel, 264; Porteous, 173.

⁵ Barnes, Daniel, 2:271; Marti, Daniel, 92; Driver, Daniel, 206; Leupold, Daniel, 548; Jeffery, 549.

points out that if *qēš* here were to refer to the end of Daniel's life, we would expect a personal pronoun as in 11:45b *qiššō*.¹ Nevertheless, I believe that since in Dan 12:13a *qēš* is followed by *w^olānūah* and then by *w^olā^cmōd²* and *l^oqēš hayyāmīn*, it seems better and more in harmony with the flow of the sentence to understand the whole verse as an enumeration of stages in Daniel's future: first, you will go your way until you die (*qēš*) and rest in the grave, then (at the resurrection), you will rise and receive your lot³ at the end of the days, i.e., at the end of the apocalyptic time of the end. Thus, the first *qēš* refers to his death, the second one to the resurrection at the end of time.

¹Hasslberger, 369.

²In Hebrew *cāmād* has the basic meaning of "to stand" (*BDB*, 763; *KBL*, 712), e.g., Gen 24:31 where Laban says to Eliezer, "Why do you stand outside?" or Exod 33:9, "the cloudy pillar stood at the door of the tabernacle." Taken figuratively it can mean "to stand over somebody," i.e., to be a leader as in Num 7:2. One who was a priest or a prophet "stood before the Yahweh" (Deut 10:8; 1 Kgs 17:1), and a servant stood before his master (Deut 1:38), meaning "served him" (S. Amsler, "72Y c^omd stehēn," *THAT*, 2:331). In Aramaic the word *qūm* means "to rise, stand up" as well as "to stand" (*CHAL*, 419); and it seems that *cāmād* in Neh 8:5, "all the people stood up (*c^omd*)," and Dan 12:13 was influenced by the meaning of the Aramaic *qūm*. Thus *cāmād* in Dan 12:13 has the same import as the Hebrew or Aramaic word *qūm*. (See Montgomery, 478; Keil, *Daniel*, 505; Marti, *Daniel*, 92; Leupold, *Daniel*, 549). The influence of Aramaic can also be seen in the spelling of *yāmīn* for *yāmīm*.

³The Hebrew *gōrāl* literally means "lot, allotted portion" (*HAL*, 178). It is here employed in a spiritual sense for "reward" as in Jer 13:25; Mic 2:5; and Ps 125:3 (Montgomery, 478).

Summary

The Akkadian term *kitu* can mean "end" in a temporal and local sense. The verb *kaṣu* "to be cool" has the meaning of "end" in the phrase *ki-iṣ ūmi* "cool of the day" which refers to the "end of day." Finally, the term *kaṣaṣu* "to cut off" can also mean "to make an end."

The Ugaritic expression *qṣ* as a verb means "to tear" and as a noun it refers to the end-part of something, e.g., a slice of meat, or the hem of a garment. An extended meaning of "slice" would be "food" or "meal."

In Aramaic the word *qṣt* is mostly translated as "part," although "end" is sometimes possible, but never in a temporal sense.

In the Targumim the word *qiṣṣa'* always refers to the end of a time period. In Gen 49:1, where in some Targumim it refers to the Messianic time, it has an eschatological meaning.

In Aramaic texts from Qumran, *qṣt* means "part" and *qṣh* is used twice to refer to the ends of the earth.

In the Tell Deir 'Alla inscription *qēṣ* refers to the end of a man's life and in the Gezer calendar, to the end of the agricultural year.

In the OT *qēṣ* appears sixty-seven times. In passages outside the book of Daniel it has a local meaning in some texts, but the predominant use of it is temporal. As such it can refer to the end of a specific (e.g., Gen 8:6; Exod 12:41) or unspecified time period (e.g., 1 Kgs

17:7; 2 Chr 18:2; Neh 13:6). Qēš is used in the same sense in Dan 11:6 and 13 where the end of a certain time period in the history of the Diadochi is referred to.

There are three texts (Amos 8:2; Lam 4:18; and Ezek 7:2-6) where qēš is used in the context of the Day of the Lord and thus has eschatological meaning. The same holds true for Dan 9:26, where the end of Jerusalem is predicted. In Dan 12:13a, qēš refers to the end of Daniel's life.

In Dan 8:19; 11:27,45; 12:6,13b; qēš is the time when apocalyptic events take place, the kingdom of God breaks into history, the saints receive the kingdom of heaven, and the new aeon of the Messianic rule begins.

The Phrase °ēt qeš in the Book of Daniel

Our study thus far has shown that °ēt qēš or a cognate equivalent does not appear anywhere in ancient Semitic literature aside from the OT. In the OT the phrase is a purely Danielic expression, since all five OT occurrences of it appear in the second half of the book.¹

The Five Occurrences in Daniel

Daniel 8:17

Chapter 8 of Daniel contains the first vision report in Hebrew and can be divided as follows:

¹Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9.

1. Introduction	1-2a
2. Vision	2b-14
Vision Proper	2b-12
Ram	3-4
Goat	5-8
Little Horn	9-13
Audition Proper	13-14
3. Interpretation	15-26
Appearance of Interpreter	15-19
Message of Interpreter	20-26
4. Conclusion	27

In vss. 3-8 the two kingdoms of Persia and Greece are symbolized by the ram and the goat.¹ The ram charging westward, northward, and southward, with nobody able to stop him, is an apt symbol of Persia's territorial expansion under Cyrus and his successors. The unexpected appearance of Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.) and the swiftness of his remarkable conquest are well represented by the he-goat with the notable horn, which comes from the west without touching the ground. Vss. 6 and 7 record the defeat of the Persian ram and in vs. 8 the history of Greece is briefly touched. The notable horn power, representing the Alexandrian empire, came to an end in 301 B.C. when, after the battle of Ipsus, the empire was divided among the four Diadochi: Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy.

In vs. 9 a Little Horn appears which is widely understood to come out of one of the four horns and to

¹In Dan 8:20 and 21 the angelus interpres is clearly identifying two symbols.

represent Antiochus IV Epiphanes.¹ However, not all commentators agree on this and a number of other identifications have been put forward. During the last century when the Mohammedan power was still a force to be reckoned with, a number of interpreters identified the Little Horn with Islam² or Turkey.³ Joseph Tyso identified it with the future Antichrist,⁴ and a number of exegetes saw Rome as

¹ Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, trans. G. L. Archer Jr. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), 85; Calvin, Daniel, 2:96; Heinrich A. C. Hävernich, Commentar über das Buch Daniel (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1832), 266; Keil, Daniel, 295; Marti, Daniel, 58; Montgomery, 333; Lacoque, Daniel, 161; Young, Daniel, 170; Leupold, Daniel, 345; Walvoord, Daniel, 185; Archer, "Daniel," 98; Goldingay, Daniel, 209.

² George S. Faber, The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy: Or a Dissertation on the Prophecies, which Treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (London: W. E. Painter, 1844), 2:120; James Hatley Frere, Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Ezra and St. John, Shewing That All the Prophetic Writings Are Formed upon One Plan (London: John Hatchard and Son, 1850), 247; John W. Birchmore, Prophecy Interpreted by History (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1871), 40; Robert Nevin, Studies in Prophecy (Londonderry: James Montgomery, 1890), 82; Joseph Tanner, Daniel and the Revelation (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), 509.

³ E. B. Elliott, Horae Apocalypticae, 4 vols., 5th ed. (London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday, 1862), 3:438.

⁴ Joseph Tyso, An Elucidation of the Prophecies (London: Jackson and Walford, 1838), 24. Similarly, S. P. Tregelles (Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel, 8th ed. [1847; reprint, Chelmsford: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony, n.d.], 91) sees a king in the future who will fulfill this prophecy.

the Little Horn,¹ a view which is still held today by several of expositors.²

Dan 8:10-12 describes further activities of the Little Horn. It became great (tigdal as in vs. 9) and destroyed some of the host of heaven (š'pā' haššāmāyīn), which may be taken to be God's people on earth.³

In vs. 11 the verbal forms in Hebrew change from feminine (vss. 9-10, except yāsā' at the beginning of vs. 9) to masculine, indicating a change of some sort. T. Kliefoth thinks this shift indicates a change from vision to prediction.⁴ H. Junkers feels that vss. 11 and 12

¹Thomas Newton, Dissertations on the Prophecies (1782; reprint, London: J. F. Dove, 1839), 248; Adam Clarke, The Holy Bible, 6 vols. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), 4:597; W. R. A. Boyle, The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel (London: Rivingtons, 1863), 300; William C. Thurman, The Sealed Book of Daniel Opened: Or a Book of Reference for Those Who Wish to Examine the Sure Word of Prophecy (Boston, MA: Office of the "World's Crisis," 1867), 285; Uriah Smith, The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation (Review and Herald, 1885; reprint, rev. ed. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1944), 97.

²Nichol, ABC, 4:841; Price, 169; Maxwell, 1:160; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," 190; Shea, "Unity of Daniel," 189-190; Jaques B. Doukhan, The Vision of the End: Daniel (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), 28.

³In ordinary speech the "host of heaven" refers to the stars (Deut 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:16; 21:3; 23:4), but here we are dealing with symbolism. In Exod 7:4, God calls the people of Israel "my host" and in Dan 8:24, the parallel text to 8:10 the Little Horn is said to destroy "mighty ones and the people of the saints." Thus the host of heaven in this context is a symbol for God's people on earth. See Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," 397-398.

⁴Th. F. Kliefoth, Das Buch Daniel (Schwerin: A. W. Sandmeyer, 1868), 268-269.

describe reality and not vision,¹ and Hasslberger claims that vss. 11 and 12 give an interpretation of vss. 9 and 10.² J. A. Montgomery believes that the writer's autograph here contains errors,³ and R. H. Charles simply emends the text and changes the masculine verbs and suffixes into feminine ones to make them conform with the preceding passage.⁴

Hasel sees this change in gender similar to Junker, but adds that it may further reflect a change "in the phases of the two entities which the metaphor-symbol represents."⁵ Thus, he sees vss. 9-10 as one phase of Rome, and vss. 11-12 as another phase.⁶

With vs. 13 we come to the audition about the sanctuary which is important for determining the time of *ʿēṭ qēṣ*. In vs. 13 one heavenly being asks a second one, "*ʿad māṭay heḥāzōn?*" The phrase *ʿad māṭay* consisting of the temporal preposition *ʿad* and the temporal interrogative

¹Junker, 67-68. The same view is taken by Lacoque, Daniel, 159, and Bentzen, 56.

²Hasslberger, 18.

³Montgomery, 335.

⁴Charles, Daniel, 206, 208.

⁵Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," 401.

⁶Ibid. Historicists usually find a parallel fulfillment for each specification in 8:9-12 in the two phases of political-pagan and ecclesiastical-papal Rome (cf. Price, 170, 173, 176-177; Nichol, ABC, 4:841-843). In contrast to this dual fulfillment, Hasel sees a sequential fulfillment.

adverb *mātay* is generally translated as "how long . . . ?" or "for how long shall be the vision . . . ?" in all English Bibles.¹ The only exception I found is Young's literal translation of the Bible which has, "Till when is the vision . . . ?"²

The translation "until when" for *ʿad mātay* is also given by some leading lexicographers³ and is used by several ancient and modern Bible translations. The Greek translation of Theodotion,⁴ for instance, has *heōs pote* (until when), the Zürcher Bibel says, "Bis wann gilt das Gesicht?" and several French translations render the phrase with "Jusques á quand durera la vision . . . ?"⁵

The emphasis in *ʿad mātay*, which appears twenty-

¹E.g. KJV, NIV, JB, NASB. Susan Niditch (The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition, HSM 30 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983], 232), who also translates "how long . . .," believes that the author of Daniel modeled Dan 8:13 on Zechariah 1:12, the only other place in the OT where a similar conversation between two heavenly beings is overheard by the seer.

²Robert Young, The Holy Bible (London: Pickering and Inglis, 1937).

³BDB, 607; KBL, 680; HAL, 618.

⁴Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta, 2 vols. (Stuttgart Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), 2:918.

⁵Version d'Ostervald, David Martin, Bible de Jerusalem. The translation by Louis Segond uses the phrase, "Pendant combien de temps . . ." similar to most English translations. The more literal translation is also used by Hartman and Di Lella (226) who translate, "Until when the vision?" Leupold (Daniel, 351) says, "The problem centers on the point: "How far does the vision reach?" He, therefore, renders *ʿad mātay* with "unto how long?"

seven times in the OT,¹ is on the end of the time span in view, not on its duration. In Exod 10:7 we read, "And Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us?" The point is that there is no interest in the time span during which Moses would be a snare to the Egyptians, rather they wanted to know when Pharaoh would let the Israelites go. The thrust of the expression is on the terminal point of the time period, not on the entire time span.²

It is commonly believed that the question, "How long . . . ?" refers to the "transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot." G. L. Archer, for instance, says that the angel posed the question concerning "the terrible period during which the temple and altar of the Lord would be desecrated, as suggested by the words of vs. 11."³ However, this is too limited an understanding. The question does not deal with one portion of the vision only. It concerns the whole period of the vision which started with the Persian empire

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

²Only in Dan 12:6 and Neh 2:6 is the answer given in terms of a time period, but even there the emphasis is on what happens when the time period is finished.

³Archer, "Daniel," 102. So also Young, Daniel, 173; Leupold, Daniel, 351; Marti, Daniel, 59; Bentzen, 70-71; Porteous, 126.

symbolized by the ram,¹ and it specifically emphasizes the terminal point of the vision as is made clear by the answer in vs. 14. The "until when" (ʿad māṭay) of vs. 13 is followed by the "then" (waw after temporal information) of vs. 14,² thus indicating the emphasis intended.

The question asked is, "Until when is this vision?" not "How long shall the sanctuary be trodden under foot?" although the latter is, of course, part of the vision. The subject of ʿad māṭay, "until when" is heḥāzōn, "the vision." The rest of the sentence, the tāmīd, the pešaʿ, etc., stand in apposition to ḥāzōn.³ They describe the last part of the vision. The term for "vision," as already stated, is ḥāzōn. This term designates the entire "vision" from vs. 3-12, because this term is employed first as a designation of the vision in vss. 1-2, where it appears three times. Thus, this term is the terminological frame of the entire vision from vss. 3-12. The appositional expressions in vs. 13 make the point that the "vision" climaxes in the items mentioned last, but the vision is not restricted to them. There is a type of A-B-A pattern in the sense that we have A = the designation "vision" (vss.

¹Dan 8:3,20.

²Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 429, 430.

³Driver, Daniel, 119; Leupold, Daniel, 351; Hasslberger, 106.

1-2), B = the vision proper (vss. 3-12), and A = the angelic question about the vision's reach (vs. 13).

We noted previously that Dan 2, 7, and 8 contain complementary parallel visions. However, they do not simply go over the same ground with different symbols, each vision enlarges and amplifies on the previous one. This enlargement is not in breadth but in depth. It is as though we were always looking at the same object but from a different perspective in each chapter. In chap. 2 we have the general outline of world history from the time of Babylon to the end of history with a particular emphasis on the fourth empire. In chap. 7 we cover briefly the same four empires, but then focus on the activities of the Little Horn which grows out of the fourth empire. Seven of the twenty-eight verses of chap. 7 deal with the Little Horn, indicating the emphasis of the chapter.¹ In chap. 8 the prophecy begins with Persia instead of Babylon, since the time span of vs. 14 reaches back to Persia, but the focus is again on the Little Horn. Seven out of twenty-seven verses deal with it here.² In chap. 7 it is the political power of the Little Horn which is in the foreground--he subdues three kings (vs. 24), he persecutes the saints and changes laws (vs. 25). In chap. 8 it is the religious power which is emphasized--he took away the daily

¹Dan 7:8,11,20,21,24-26.

²Dan 8:9-12, 23-25.

sacrifice and cast the sanctuary and the truth to the ground.¹ Thus the visions are complementary, each giving a particular viewpoint of the topic. In this way we receive the total picture of the battle going on between God and the Little Horn.

The answer to the question, "For how long is this vision that culminates in the terrible work of the Little Horn?"² is given in a precise sentence in vs. 14, "And he said to me, Until 2300 evening(s) (and) morning(s) then shall the sanctuary be vindicated."

Many explanations have been attempted to make the 2300 days coincide with the history of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Most modern scholars have adopted the interpretation (first set forth by Ephraim of Syria³) which considers the phrase *ereb-bōqer* (evening and morning) as a reference to the daily evening and morning sacrifices.⁴ Hence, they divide the 2300 days in half and arrive at 1150 days, which are thought to correspond to the three years

¹There is one important difference between chaps. 7 and 8. In chap. 7 the Little Horn is part of the fourth beast. In chap. 8 the Little Horn stands in place of the fourth beast. It is possible that the Little Horn here is a synecdoche reminding the reader of the fourth beast in chap. 7.

²Ford, Daniel, 188.

³Young, Daniel, 173.

⁴Marti, Daniel, 60; Driver, Daniel, 119; Montgomery, 343; Bentzen, 71; Heaton, 195; Plöger, Daniel, 127; Lacoque, Daniel, 164; Porteous, 126-127; Towner, 122; Baldwin, 158; Hartman and Di Lella, 227; Archer, "Daniel," 103; etc.

during which the temple was profaned by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.¹ However, whether one reckons 365 or 360 days for a year, the three years fall at least 55 to 70 days short of the 1150 days. It is at best an approximation.

S. J. Schwantes has given four cogent reasons which militate against this interpretation:

1. There is no linguistic evidence for linking the "2300 evening-morning" expression to the daily sacrifices. It must be assumed that "evening-morning" refers to the *tāmīd* sacrifice.
2. The morning and evening sacrifices, called the *ʿōlat tāmīd* ("continual burnt offering") were considered a unit and apparently viewed as a single sacrifice, although it came in two parts. Thus even if the expression "evening-morning" referred to the daily sacrifices, it would be incorrect to halve the 2300 figure.
3. The evening-morning sequence is not part of the sanctuary language. When the morning and evening sacrifices are mentioned in the OT, *bōqer* always precedes *ʿereḇ*.²

¹The desecration of the sanctuary according to the first ten chapters of First Maccabees (1 Macc 1:54; 4:52-53) lasted exactly three years (25th of Kislev 167 B.C.--25th Kislev 164 B.C.) or three years and ten days (on the 15th of Kislev 167 B.C. altars were erected in Jewish cities. Some see this as the setting up of the abomination).

²Exod 29:39; Lev 6:12-13; Num 28:4; 2 Kgs 16:15; 1 Chr 16:40; 23:30; 2 Chr 2:4; 13:11; 31:3; Ezra 3:3.

4. The LXX and Theodotion have understood the expression to denote "days," and translate, "Until evening and morning days two thousand and three hundred."¹

I might add that the only other place in the OT where an expression similar to ^cereḅ-bōqer in Dan 8:14,26 is found is Gen 1² where the phrase "and it was evening and it was morning" refers to a twenty-four-hour day.³

Other scholars, too, have recognized that the reference is to 2300 whole days. C. F. Keil, for instance, says:

A Hebrew reader could not possibly understand the period of time 2300 evening-mornings of 2300 half days or 1150 whole days, because evening and morning at the creation constituted not the half but the whole day . . . We must therefore take the words as they are, i.e. understand them of 2300 whole days.⁴

H. C. Leupold cites the Greek word *nuchthēmeron* meaning "a night and a day" (2 Cor 11:25) in the sense of a period of twenty-four hours as a parallel to ^cereḅ bōqer

¹Siegfried J. Schwantes, "^cEreḅ Bōqer of Dan 8:14 Re-examined," *AUSS* 16 (1978): 375-85.

²The expression *me^cereḅ ^cad-bōqer* is used in Lev 24:3, but there it refers to the lamps in the sanctuary and simply says that they should burn from evening till morning, i.e., not during the day (*ibid.*, 381). No daily sacrifice idea is present.

³See Exod 20:8-11; 31:15-17. For the biblical evidence that the day was reckoned beginning with the evening, see H. R. Stroes, "Does the Day Begin in the Evening or in the Morning?" *VT* 16 (1966): 460-75.

⁴Keil, *Daniel*, 304.

and says, "This is the simplest and most feasible interpretation."¹

If the text speaks of 2300 evening(s) (and) morning(s), what is covered by this period of time? Many expositors who accept the figure 2300 try to fit the 2300 days or six years and about four months into the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. They begin this time period with the alleged murder of Onias III in 171 B.C., which to them symbolizes the laying waste of the sanctuary. The termination is seen in 164 B.C. with the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who died during a military campaign in Media at which time the temple in Jerusalem was rededicated and Jewish worship restored.²

However, K. Bringmann has shown that according to the newest chronological reckonings Onias III was murdered in 170 B.C.,³ not in 171 B.C. as usually suggested, and the rededication of the temple took place in Dec 165 B.C., one year before the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴ Thus the

¹Leupold, Daniel, 354. Cf. Young, Daniel, 174; Walvoord, Daniel, 189; B. E. Thiering, "The Three and a Half Years of Elijah," NovT 23 (1981): 49.

²Young, Daniel, 174; Walvoord, Daniel, 190. But the words of Ch. H. H. Wright (186-187) are still valid today. He said: "All efforts, however, to harmonize the period whether expounded as 2300 or as 1150 days, with any precise historical epoch mentioned in the Books of Maccabees or in Josephus have proven futile."

³K. Bringmann, Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983), 124-125.

⁴Ibid., 26.

problem of time becomes more intense, because the period from 170 B.C. to 165 B.C. falls far short of six years and four months.

Several commentators believe that the number 2300 possesses a symbolic meaning.¹ Keil, who believes that God's judgments were so often measured by the number seven² and that this number came to symbolize judgment and who recognizes that 2300 days fall short of seven full years, says:

Thus the answer of the angel has this meaning: The time of the predicted oppression of Israel and of the desolation of the sanctuary by Antiochus, the little horn, shall not reach the full duration of a period of divine judgment, shall not last so long as the severe oppression of Israel by the Midianites, Judg. vi. 1, or as the famine which fell upon Israel in the time of Elisha, and shall not reach to a tenth part of the time of trial and of sorrow endured by the exiles, and under the weight of which Israel then mourned.³

Keil's interpretation is certainly one way out of the impasse in which those find themselves who try to squeeze the 2300 days to a specific time period in the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Historicist interpreters have generally understood the 2300 days to be prophetic days (each day representing one literal year).⁴ They have done this on the basis that

¹Keil, Daniel, 306; Leupold, Daniel, 357; Goldingay, Daniel, 213.

²See Judg 6:1; 2 Sam 24:13; 2 Kgs 8:1.

³Keil, Daniel, 307.

⁴William Whitla, Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse (London: John Murray, 1922), 221; Thomas Newton,

the angelic question in Dan 8:13 embraces the entire vision from vs. 3-12¹ as well as on the basis of the direct references that the vision reaches to "the time of the end" (vs. 17) and shall be for "many days" (vs. 26). The *termini a quo* and *ad quem* have been variously computed,² but the *terminus a quo* most often used is 457 B.C.³

259; Richard Beere, A Dissertation on the 13th and 14th Verses of the 8th Chapter of Daniel (London: Printed for the author, 1790), 17-25. William C. Davis, The Millennium, or a Short Sketch on the Rise and Fall of Antichrist (Salisbury, NC: Coupee and Crader, 1811), 12; Elliott, Horae Apocalypticae, 3:434; Thomas R. Birks, First Elements of Sacred Prophecy: Including an Examination of Several Recent Expositions, and of the Year-Day Theory (London: William Edward Painter, 1843), 360. William Ramsey, An Exposition of the Book of Daniel: With Practical Observations (Edinburgh: Thomas Grant, 1853), 210; U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 187; Tanner, 514; Price, 187; William H. Shea, Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation, DARCOM, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), 56. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 435.

¹In Dan 8 two words are used which can both be translated as "vision." The first word "ḥāzōn" appears seven times (8:1, 2(2x), 13,15,17,26), the second word "mar'eh" appears three times (8:16,26,27). The fact that the angelic questioner in vs. 13 uses ḥāzōn, the word used three times at the beginning of chap. 8, indicates that the question concerns the whole vision and is not limited to the "Little Horn" period.

²Johann Ph. Petri (Aufschluß der Zahlen Daniels und der Offenbarung Johannis [n.p., 1768], 8-9) had 453 B.C. as his *terminus a quo*; Sir Isaac Newton (Whitla, Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse, 126) took 70 A.D., and Th. Newton (Dissertations on the Prophecies, 259), 334 B.C. Alexander Keith (The Signs of the Times, as Denoted by the Fulfillment of Historical Predictions, 2 vols. [New York: Jonathan Leavit, 1832], 2:635) and Elliott (3:446) reckoned the 2300 years from 480 B.C. to A.D. 1820; Faber (2:124) counted them from 784 B.C. to A.D. 1517; and Nevin, (100) from 330 B.C. to A.D. 1970.

³Archibald Mason, Two Essays on Daniel's Prophetic Number of Two Thousand Three Hundred Days: And on the

This date, taken from Dan 9:25,¹ is seen as the terminus a quo of the seventy weeks as well as of the 2300 days. First, because in the interpretation given by the angelus interpres in Dan 8, the exact starting point for the 2300 days is not provided, except as the "vision" begins with the ram, the symbol for Media and Persia (vs. 20). Thus, the beginning must lie in the Persian period since the "vision" has its terminus a quo in that period. The exact time in that period is sought in Dan 9 which has definite links with Dan 8.² Second, the verb nehtak in

Christian's Duty to Inquire into the Church's Deliverance (Glasgow: Young, Gallie, and Co., 1820), 23; M. Habershon, A Dissertation (London: James Nisbet, 1834), 293; David Cambell, Illustrations of Prophecy (Boston: Published by the author, 1840), 82-83; Edward Bickersteth, A Practical Guide to the Prophecies, with Reference to Their Interpretation and Fulfillment, and to Personal Edification (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1852), 181; Birks, First Elements, 360; Ramsey, Book of Daniel, 212; John N. Andrews, The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days, 2nd ed. (1853; reprint, Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1863), 27; Uriah Smith, The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII.14 (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1877), 100-101; Henry Grattan Guinness, Light for the Last Days (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888), 192; Price, 187; Ford, Daniel, 189; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 438.

¹The commandment "to restore and build Jerusalem" was the decree issued by Artaxerxes I in his seventh year (Ezra 7:7,8), i.e., 457 B.C. See Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," 50-51.

²On page 327 we noted the verbal parallels between Dan 8 and 9 which are most significant. Hasel ("The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 437-438) lists five areas where links exist between Dan 8 and 9: (1) Similar terminology, (2) cultic perspective, (3) common angel-interpreter, (4) auditory revelation, and (5) conceptual link. See also W. Shea, "The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9," 228-250.

9:24¹ (a hapax legomenon) commonly translated as "determined"² or "decreed"³ can mean either "cut off" or "decided, determined, decreed."⁴ Both meanings are found in Mishnaic Hebrew.⁵ Because "it is a recognized principle of Semitic philology that the extended meanings of Semitic verbs develop from concrete meanings in the direction of abstract concepts,"⁶ the basic meaning of "to cut off" is the more likely one for Dan 9:24, since we cannot even be sure that the extended meaning "to determine" was in use in Daniel's time (600 B.C.).

Supposing "cut off" as the correct translation of *neḥtaḳ* in Dan 9:24, the seventy weeks or 490 years can only be cut off from the longer 2300 evenings-mornings period in Dan 8 which covers centuries. This is, in fact, what has been done by Historicist interpreters who have taken 457 B.C. as the terminus a quo for the seventy weeks and the

¹Niphal, third person singular masculine from the root *ḥātaḳ*.

²KJV.

³RSV, NASB, NIV.

⁴HAL, 349.

⁵In Mishnaic sources, *ḥātaḳ* is used more often as "to cut" than "to decree" or "to determine." It is used in reference to cutting off parts of animals according to the dietary laws, cutting a lamp wick, and cutting out ore (W. Shea, "Relationship between Prophecies", 242).

⁶Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," 107. Shea also points out that the only significant linguistic comparative material for *ḥātaḳ* comes from Ugarit and that there, too, the word has the meaning "to cut off" rather than "to determine" (ibid.).

2300 evenings-mornings.¹ In this way they arrive at 1843/4 as the terminus ad quem for the 2300 evenings-mornings.²

At the end of the period of 2300 evenings-mornings, the prophecy says "the sanctuary will be restored" (vs. 14).³ That which the Little Horn has "taken away and cast down" (vs. 11) will be restored. The word for "restored"

¹See p. 306, n. 4.

²A number of Historicists in the nineteenth century understood Dan 8:14 to refer to the end of the Turkish power and the beginning of the restoration of the Jews (e.g., Habershon, 36-37; D. Campbell, 81; Bickersteth, 181; Guinness, 191-192). Some believed that in 1843/44 Christ would come and cleanse the earth from sin (e.g., W. Miller, Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years (Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833), 49; S. S. Snow, Midnight Cry, May 2, 1844, 335), others, after Oct. 1844, understood the prophecy to refer to a new phase of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, a work of judgment corresponding to the OT Yom Kippur, beginning in 1844 (e.g., U. Smith, The Sanctuary, 256-261; Andrews, 66; E. G. White, The Great Controversy [1888, reprint, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911], 486). In the present century it is the third view which is usually held by Historicists (e.g., Price, 196-199; Nichol, ABC, 4:844-845; Maxwell, 1:181-188; Doukhan, Daniel, 35-41). The necessity for a pre-advent judgment has also been recognized by other scholars. For example, F. Düsterwald (177) says, concerning Dan 7:9-14: "Ohne alle Frage wird hier beim Propheten Daniel das Gericht Gottes über die ihm feindlichen Weltreiche geschildert. Das Gericht endigt mit der endgültigen Verwerfung der Weltreiche und dem Triumph der Sache Gottes. Es ist jedoch nicht, wie viele ältere Ausleger (Theodoret u.a.) annahmen, das allgemeine Weltgericht, welches hier geschildert wird, nicht ein Gericht Gottes auf Erden, sondern der Schauplatz des Gerichtes ist der Himmel, und aus dem ganzen Zusammenhange geht hervor, dass es gewissermassen ein Vorgericht ist, welches dann in dem allgemeinen Weltgerichte seine Bestätigung findet."

³RSV, NASB.

--nišdaq¹ is a Niphal form which is used only here in the OT and which has traditionally been rendered as "cleansed."² Many modern translations prefer the more literal meaning of šādaq which is "to be justified," "to be declared right,"³ which is also the more likely translation of the Peshitta.⁴ The latest Jewish translation, however, again has "shall be cleansed,"⁵ and the Anchor Bible reads, "will be purified."⁶ Whatever the total ramifications of the term nišdaq, we can with certainty say that the work of the Little Horn is undone and the sanctuary is brought back to its original state.

¹Niphal affirmative, 3rd person singular, masculine from the root šdq, to be justified.

²LXX, Vulgate, KJV, ASV. Both the Septuagint and Theodotion read katharisthēsetai, "shall be cleansed" (Rahlfs, 2:918). The Vulgate reads mundabitur, "cleansed" (Robertus Weber, Biblia Sacra, 2 vols. [Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969], 2:1361).

³RSV, JB, NASB, Young's Bible, Berkeley, Smith, and Goodspeed.

⁴The Peshitta uses nzk' from the root zk' which can mean "to be free from guilt . . . to be declared blameless . . . to justify oneself or others" (J. Payne Smith, ed., A Compendious Syriac Dictionary [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957], 115). Though Carl Brockelmann, (Lexicon Syriacum [Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966], 196) also lists purus (adj. "clean") and purgavit for the Pael.

⁵The Writings (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1982), 442.

⁶Hartman and Di Lella, 222. Hartman argues that "will be justified" can hardly be said of the sanctuary. He, therefore, believes that "the underlying Aramaic was surely yidke, "will be cleansed, purified," which was corrupted into or misread by the translator as yizke, "will be victorious, justified."

In Dan 8:14 the vision proper ends. In vs. 15 Daniel searches for understanding and is visited by Gabriel who in vs. 16 is told to make Daniel understand the vision. Thus we come to vs. 17, where we encounter the phrase $\text{c}\bar{\text{e}}\text{t}$ $\text{q}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}$ for the first time.

וַיָּבֹא אֶצֶל עֲמֹדִי וּבִבְלֹאֵי נִבְשָׁתִי וְאָפְלָה
עַל־פָּנַי וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי הִבֵּן בְּרִאדָם כִּי לְשֵׁת־קֶץ הַחַזוֹן:

And he came near¹ to where I stood, and when he came, I was afraid and fell upon my face. But he said unto me, "Understand, O Son of man, that the vision extends to the time of the end."²

Verse 17a consists of four verbal clauses in which the subjects alternate between "he" and "I." They describe Gabriel's approach and Daniel's reaction. Verse 17b is introduced by a verbal clause which begins with the adversative conjunction "but," and in which "he" is the subject and "me" the object. The sentence continues with a direct speech beginning with an imperative³ followed by a vocative⁴ and a verbal clause which is the object of the imperative "understand." "The vision" is the subject of

¹Literally "beside me".

²I take the preposition l^{e} in a temporal sense as in Deut 16:4 and 1 Sam 13:8 similar to the NEB, ". . . the vision points to the time of the end." Most translations see it expressing belonging or possession (RSV, NIV, NASB, ASV, AB, TW).

³Hiphil imperative of b^{yn} .

⁴Daniel is here called "Son of man" as was Ezekiel (Ezek 3:1; 33:11).

this clause, "extends to" is the implied predicate, and "the end of time" is a prepositional phrase expressing the conclusion of a period of time.

The crucial part of the verse is the last part of the speech of Gabriel, ". . . the vision extends to the time of the end." The beginning of the "vision" (ḥāzōn) is given in Dan 8:3. The ram symbol is explained to be the Medo-Persian empire (vs. 20). The vision reaches to the "time of the end" (°ēṭ qēs), or "the final situation."¹

One view among scholars generally considers °ēṭ qēs to be an eschatological term to be applied to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. According to this position, Dan 8 expected the Messianic age straight after the demise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.² Thus, °ēṭ qēs is equated with b°'aḥ°rīt hayyāmīm (the latter days), 'aḥ°rīt hazza°am (the

¹Wilch, 112. He considers this to be the absolute end of world history.

²Caesar von Lengerke, Das Buch Daniel (Königsberg: Verlag Bornträger, 1835), 394-395; Hitzig, 139, 224; George H. A. von Ewald, Prophets of the Old Testament, 5 vols., trans. J. F. Smith (London: Williams and Norgate, 1881), 5:264, 303; Prince, 149, 187; Marti, Daniel, 61, 88; Driver, Daniel, 121; Charles, Daniel, 215; Jeffery, 478; Goldingay, Daniel, 216. Jones (274) says it was impossible for him to determine whether the time would continue after the qēs of 8:17,19; 11:27,35,40; 12:4,9. He refers it to the end of the persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but admits that the end of the persecution could also be the end of history.

latter indignation), and $m\bar{o}^c\bar{e}d\ q\bar{e}s$ (the appointed time of the end).¹

A variation of this interpretation is E. J. Young's view who equates $^c\bar{e}t\ q\bar{e}s$ with $'ah^a\bar{r}i\bar{t}\ hazza^c\bar{a}m$ and applies both to "the end of time when afflictions or indignation are to be permitted upon Israel. It is the end of the OT period and the ushering in of the New."²

A second view takes Dan 8 as having a dual fulfillment, i.e., "that a prophecy fulfilled in part in the past is a foreshadowing of a future event which will completely fulfill the passage."³ Some take the entire chapter as having a dual fulfillment,⁴ others take the vision proper as historically fulfilled but see in the interpretation of the vision a dual fulfillment.⁵ Thus, expositors of this view generally apply $^c\bar{e}t\ q\bar{e}s$ to the time before Christ's

¹Marti, Daniel, 76; Charles, Daniel, 394; Jeffery, 479.

²Young, Daniel, 176.

³Walvoord, Daniel, 194.

⁴Joseph A. Seiss, Voices from Babylon (Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1879), 219-221; William Kelly, Lectures on the Book of Daniel, 2nd ed. (London: G. Morish, 1881), 132; Nathaniel West, Daniel's Great Prophecy: The Eastern Question: The Kingdom (New York: Hope of Israel Movement, 1898), 101-103; Tatford, 133; J. Dwight Pentecost, Prophecy for Today (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961), 82-83; Walvoord, Daniel, 196; Gerhard Maier, Der Prophet Daniel, WS (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982), 307; Ford, Daniel, 172, 191; Leupold, Daniel, 361.

⁵Ironside, Daniel, 147-149; Talbot, 143; NSRB, 911.

second advent¹ although some apply it also to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²

A similar view is taken by J. G. Baldwin who, in accordance with her idealistic method of interpretation, sees chap. 8 portraying "a recurring historical phenomenon: the clever but ruthless world dictator, who stops at nothing in order to achieve his ambitions."³

A third view rejects the Antiochus IV Epiphanes interpretation and applies the Little Horn in Dan 8 either to the Roman Empire,⁴ its successor--papal Rome,⁵ the

¹Seiss, 220; Tatford, Daniel, 133; Ironside, Daniel, 149. Leupold (Daniel, 361) says: ". . . aside from the obvious relation that the vision has to the events that lie in the near future, namely, in the time of the Persian and the Greek Empires, this whole vision also serves as a type of what shall transpire at the time of the end of the present world order. So the "end" referred to the absolute end."

²West, 100; Maier, 312. Maier says: "v. 19ff zeigen, daß Medopersian und Griechenland bereits in die 'Zeit des Endes' eingeordnet werden. Es kann sich also nicht um die 'Endzeit' im engsten Sinne, d.h. um die Zeit vor der Wiederkunft Jesu handeln!" On p. 313 he adds: "ist Antiochus IV Epiphanes wirklich ein Modell des Antichrist, wie wir oben angenommen haben, dann gibt es--durch die prophetische Perspektive ineinandergeschoben--noch eine zweite Erfüllung, eine zweite 'Zeit des Endes.' Nämlich diejenigen des Antichrist, den Dan 7,7ff. 19ff und Offb 13 ankündigen."

³Baldwin, 162.

⁴For example, Boyle, 300; Clarke, 4:597.

⁵For example, Robert Reid, The Seven Last Plagues: or Vials of the Wrath of God (Pittsburgh: D. and M. Mclean, 1828), 48; J. N. Andrews, 11-14; W. Miller, 13-14; David N. Lord, The Coming and Reign of Christ (New York: Frankling Night, 1858), 390; U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 144; Nichol, ABC, 4:841; Price, 169; Maxwell, 160; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8,"

Mohammedans,¹ or a future Antichrist.² All expositors of this view see "the time of the end" as the time preceding and culminating in the second advent of Christ, i.e., the end of world history.³ A. E. Bloomfield, for instance, says:

The time of the end, like "the day of the Lord" or "that day," is a reference to the events that lead up to the coming of Christ. This "time" is the focal point of all history.⁴

J. R. Wilch in his study on עֵת has correctly pointed out that the five instances of עֵת קֵץ in Dan 8-12 all refer to "the absolute eschatological 'End'."⁵ Yet this absolute end is not a point in time, but the final period of history. Wilch calls it the "final 'act': the

190; Shea, "Unity of Daniel," 189-190.

¹For example, Faber, 2:107; Birchmore, 40; Nevin, 82; Tanner, 509; H. N. Sargent, The Marvels of Bible Prophecy (London: Covenant Publishing, 1938), 167; E. Filmer, Daniel's Predictions (London: Regency Press, 1979), 92.

²Tyso, 24; Tregelles, 80-83; G. H. Pember, The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895), 289-290; C. Larkin, The Book of Daniel (Philadelphia: C. Larkin, 1929), 140. A. E. Bloomfield, The End of the Days (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1981), 164.

³Faber, 2:119; Birchmore, 46; Nevin, 79; Tanner, 524; Thurman, 231; Tyso, 24-25; U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 171; Larkin, 141; Price, 206; Nichol, ABC, 4: 845; Bloomfield, 171; Shea, Selected Studies, 60; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 457.

⁴Bloomfield, 171.

⁵Wilch, 111.

'situation of the End'.¹ Thus, in Dan 8:17 he sees the absolute end of the course of history with "the time of the end" being "the final situation."²

We have seen that all interpreters consider ^{עַתָּה} ^{קֵץ} to be an eschatological term. Yet they do not agree as to its application. Does it apply to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes or to the end of the world?

On page 326 we noted that there exist several terminological and conceptual parallels between Dan 7 and 8. We find the same world powers, the same Little Horn, the same activities of the Little Horn, and in both chapters the Little Horn is supernaturally destroyed at "the time of the end" (8:17), when the saints receive the kingdom (7:28). It is not surprising, therefore, that scholars have called chap. 8 an elucidation of chap. 7³ and have drawn attention to the "numerous specific parallels."⁴

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., 112. Goldingay, (Daniel, 216) arguing against Wilch contends that in Dan 8:17 "Daniel is not thinking of 'the absolute eschatological "End"'. . . when human history comes to a close." He refers the text to the end of the Antiochene era ('aḥ^arīṭ hayyāmīm), the closing scene of the history of Israel and the nations (2:28)" (ibid). Goldingay has to go outside of Daniel to the idea of wrath in Zech 1 and 1 Macc to make his point.

³Marti, Daniel, 55; Bentzen, 58; Shea, Selected Studies, 31.

⁴Lacoeque, Daniel, 156. See also Plöger, Daniel, 130; Rowley, Darius the Mede, 127; John J. Collins, Daniel, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, vol. 20 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984), 80; A. Feuillet, "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," RB 60 (1953): 197-198. Hasel ("The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly

Accepting this parallelism, only two options remain. Either both chapters refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes under the symbol of the Little Horn or both chapters span the time from Babylon to the second coming of Christ. I believe B. Jones is correct when he says that the prophets saw the end of an era--the Golden Age here on earth, whereas the apocalyptists saw the end of the world and the beginning of eternity.¹ Each symbolic vision in Daniel ends with the judgment and the setting up of the kingdom of God.² In Dan 2 the stone is explained as the kingdom of God (Dan 2:44). In Dan 7 the everlasting kingdom that is given to the saints of the Most High also comes at the end of world history, not in history

Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," 460) says: "The Daniel 8:13-14 passage is an expansion, supplementation, and enlargement of the end-time investigative preadvent judgment scene of 7:9-10, 13-14, 21-22, 25-27. It is presupposed by the executive activities of Prince Michael who rescues 'everyone who is . . . written in the book' (12:1, NASB) and raises the faithful to everlasting life."

¹Jones, 30-31.

²Plöger, 130. He sees the judgment of Dan 7 also in Dan 2 and 8. He says the importance of chap. 8 is "daß das in Kap. 2 bereits angedeutete, Kap. 7 beherrschende Thema eines abschließenden Gerichtes über die geschichtlichen Mächte mit Nachdruck aufgegriffen, aber keineswegs zu Ende geführt wird." I agree that in chap. 8 the judgment of the Little Horn is not as clearly shown as in chap. 7, although to be "broken without hands" does indicate divine destruction. Certainly in 7:26 the judgment of the Little Horn is clearly its eternal destruction. It should be pointed out at this stage that nowhere in Scripture is there a hint that a heavenly judgment was held before Christ came to this earth the first time.

(Dan 7:14).¹ Furthermore, at the end of Dan 11 and in Dan 12: 1-4 where the term "ēṭ qēṣ appears more often than anywhere else in the book of Daniel, the resurrection of the dead is mentioned which also points at the end of time and not only to an end of an era.² Thus, I believe in Dan

¹Several texts in Dan 7 are quoted or alluded to in the NT, and the way the NT authors use them shows that for the NT writers some of the events portrayed in Dan 7 were still future:

Daniel	Revelation
7:7 beast with 10 horns	12:3 dragon with 10 horns 13:1 beast with 10 horns
7:25 little horn of the beast rules for 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ times	12:6,14 woman flees from dragon for 1260 days or 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ times 13:5 the beast rules 42 months
7:8 little horn speaks great things	13:5 the beast speaks great things and blasphemies
7:10 judgment sits and books are open	20:12 judgment is held and books are opened
7:11 the fourth beast is burned	9:20 the beast is burned
7:13 Son of man with the clouds of heaven	Matt 24:30 they shall see the the Son of man coming in the clouds 26:64 you shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven

It is the cumulative weight of these parallels that shows that Dan 7 was not considered past history in NT times since Rev 1:1 says that John was shown "what must shortly come to pass." Thus, if chap. 8 parallels chap. 7, the same must apply to it.

²Against Goldingay, Daniel, 215.

8 we have the same pattern, "the time of the end" in Dan 8:17 refers to the end of time, the end of history.

The angel's words to Daniel in 8:19 have been discussed on pp. 366-370. I was led to conclude that both phrases, "the last end of the indignation" and "the appointed time of the end," are eschatological expressions referring to the final events of history.

Summarizing our discussion of Dan 8:17, I come to the following conclusions:

1. Dan 8 covers the span of time of major empires and their aftermath as in Dan 2 and 7. It is not an abbreviated vision.
2. The question in vs. 13 concerns the extent or span of the total vision, not just the extent or span of the desolation of the sanctuary.
3. The 2300 evening(s) (and) morning(s) span the total vision from its beginning with the ram symbol to "the time of the end."
4. The term ^cēṭ qēs is considered to be an eschatological term by all schools of interpretation. However, in harmony with the apocalyptic nature of the book of Daniel as a whole, it should be part of the apocalyptic scenario, pointing to an absolute end.
5. ^cēṭ qēs in Dan 8:17 belongs to apocalyptic and refers to the time prior to Christ's second coming.
6. The NT citations and allusions to Dan 7 show that in NT times Dan 7:7-14 was not considered to be past history;

thus, Dan 8 must also refer to a time after Christ's first advent.

Dan 11:35

וּמִן־הַמְּשֻׁבָּלִים³⁵

יִפְּלוּ לְצַרְוֹת בָּהֶם וְלִבְרָר וְלִלְבָן עַד־עֵת קֵץ כִּי־עוֹד לְמַעַר :

And some of those who are wise¹ shall fall, to refine and to purge them, and to make them white,² until the time of the end, for it is yet for the appointed time.

Dan 11:35 is part of a series of verses describing the activities of the "maškilîm" (vss. 32b-35) in the face of the invasion of the king of the North (vs. 29). The subject of vs. 35a are the maškilîm, "those who are wise." It is followed by the predicate kâšal, "fall," and three infinitives indicating the purpose of the fall: to refine, cleanse, and make white. At the same time, vs. 35b also gives the reason for the events in vs. 33b.

Who is to be purged through the fall of the maškilîm? They themselves,³ the "people" (c_m) in vs. 33,⁴

¹Hiph. pt. masc. pl. of sākal, "be prudent," "have insight" (BDB, 968; KBL, 922). These "prudent ones" are mentioned four times in this last vision in Daniel (11:33, 35; 12:3,10). In Dan 1:4 the maškilîm are those Nebuchadnezzar has chosen to be educated in Babylon.

²The three infinitives are metaphors indicating the purging process. Šārap "refine" (BDB, 864) refers to the smelting of metals (Zech 13:9); bārar "purge" (BDB, 140) has reference to the sifting of wheat (Amos 9:9); and lāban "make white" (BDB, 526) is used in Joel 1:7 where branches are made white when their bark is taken off. In an ethical sense, lāban is used in Ps 51:9 and Isa 1:18. In later Hebrew it was also used for cleansing and polishing vessels (Montgomery, 459).

³Marti, Daniel, 87; Bentzen, 84.

or the "many" (rbyṃ) in vs. 34.¹ To whom does the bāhem refer? Montgomery thinks that through the martyrdom of the "learned," the mass of the people are tested and purified. He says, this verse "is the earliest expression of the thought that 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church'."² Whichever group is referred to, the thought is clear that this "falling" will go on until the time of the end which will come at the appointed time (vs. 35b).

In our survey of literature, it was noted that for Historical-critical and Preterist scholars, in general, 'ēṭ qēs in Dan 11 and 12 always refers to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes or to the times immediately following.³ All other scholars take a non-Antiochus interpretation. They see this as a statement of apocalyptic eschatology, referring to the final time in history before the absolute End. Thus all schools of interpretation consider 'ēṭ qēs in Dan 11 and 12 at least eschatological, some within

⁴Keil, Daniel, 460; Montgomery, 459.

¹Jeffery, 533; Hasslberger, 271.

²Montgomery, 459. G. von Rad (Old Testament Theology, 2:31) similarly says: ". . . their very death has a purifying and cleansing effect, reminding one of the atoning function of the Servant (Is.LIII.II)."

³See pp. 106-113. For example, Driver, Daniel, 193; Marti, Daniel, 87; Montgomery, 459; Bentzen, 83; Porteous, 168; Hartman and Di Lella, 300; Towner, 162; M. Stuart, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1850), 350; Thomson, 319-322; Zöckler, 251; J. Goettsberger, Das Buch Daniel, Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1928), 86; Gurney, 144.

history at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and others apocalyptic, referring to a final, absolute End.

The passage following Dan 11:35 describes the activities of the willful king (vss. 36-39) and in vs. 40, °ēṭ qēs is mentioned again. In the latter, "the time of the end," which was seen as future in vs. 35, has now arrived. In the concluding part of the vision (Dan 12:1-4) we read at the beginning: "At that time Michael shall arise . . ." and in connection with this event the resurrection of the dead takes place. This is a literal resurrection according to most scholars.¹ Thus, those who consider °ēṭ qēs as an apocalyptic expression referring to the absolute end-time of world history seem to be correct.

Dan 11:40

וּבְעֵת קֵץ יִתְנַגַּח עִמּוֹ מֶלֶךְ הַיָּבֵב וְיִשְׁתַּעֲרַר עָלָיו מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן
בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים וּבְאֵנִיּוֹת רַבּוֹת וּבָא בְּאֲרָצוֹת וְשָׂטַף וְעָבַר:

And at the time of the end (°ēṭ qēs) the king of the South² will thrust³ against him; but the king of the North will storm upon him with chariots and horsemen and many ships. And he will enter countries overrun⁴ (them) and pass on.

¹See p. 342.

²In the LXX the king of South is identified as ho basileus Aiguptou (the king of Egypt).

³The Hithpael of ngh "thrust" (BDB, 618; HAL, 630) is used here only. In Dan 8:4 the Piel of ngh indicates the activities of the ram.

⁴Stp, "rinse," "overflow" (BDB, 1009; KBL, 946) is here used figuratively as in vs. 10; Isa 8:8; 30:28; Jer 47:2.

Dan 11:40 begins a new episode in the struggle between the king of the North and the king of the South. The subject of vs. 40a is the king of the South. The object *‘immō* "against him" connects this verse with the previous one, since it refers to the king of the North mentioned in vs. 39. Supposing a two-power struggle,¹ vs. 40 reverses the situation, the subject is now the king of the North and the object the king of the South, thus producing a short chiasm. The predicates in both sentences are action verbs: "to thrust against," "to storm upon," reflecting the fierce battle that is raging between these two opponents. The victor is obviously the King of the North who overruns countries (vs. 40c) and passes on "into the glorious land" (vs. 41). The verses following describe his success until, in vs. 45, he meets his end.

What is said above concerning "the time of the end" in vs. 35 applies also to this verse. In view of the larger context that leads into Dan 12:1-3, the *‘ēt qēs* in Dan 11:40 has reference to the final end-time of history.

Dan 12:4

וְאַתָּה דָּנִיֵּאל סַתֵּם הַדְּבָרִים וְחָתַם הַסֵּפֶר עֲרֵצֵת בְּזָוִי וּשְׁמַטּוּ
רָבִים וְחִרְבָּה הָעִיר:

But you Daniel shut up² these words and seal³ the book

¹Concerning the possibility of a third power being introduced here, see page 385.

²Imp. of *sātam* "shut up" "hide" (BDB, 711; HAL, 728). Water holes are "blocked" (2 Kgs 3:19,25) and gaps

until the time of the end. Many shall (then) go back and forth¹ and knowledge shall increase.

At the end of the section of Dan 11:2-12:4 there is again a direct address as we found at the beginning (Dan 11:2); thus they serve as the introduction and conclusion. Dan 12:4 is considered to be one of the most difficult in the whole book of Daniel. There are two basic difficulties: (1) What does the shutting up and sealing of the vision mean? Is Daniel bidden to keep the book hidden or closed until the time of the end?² Or is he merely asked to

in walls are "filled" (Neh 4:1). Figuratively the words of prophecy are "shut up" (Dan. 8:26; 12:4,9).

³Imp. of *hātam* "seal," "seal up" (BDB, 367; HAL, 350). The word is used for the sealing of letters (1 Kgs 21:8) and documents (Jer 32:10). Isa 8:16 uses it metaphorically, "seal the instruction in the heart of my disciples." In our text it is probably used in the literal sense.

¹The term *šwt*, literally "rove about" (BDB, 1002; KBL, 955), is used thirteen times in the OT (Even-Shoshan, 1124) and describes Satan "roaming" the earth (Job 1:7; 2:2), the children of Israel "going round" gathering manna (Num 11:8), and the Lord's eyes "going to and fro" through all the land (Zech 4:10). Theodotion reads *heōs didachthōsi polloi* (until many are taught).

²Commentators who take this view generally understand by it that the vision was only to be understood in "the time of the end" for which it was primarily written. See, for example, U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 286; Driver, Daniel, 125; Prince, 190; Marti, Daniel, 90; Montgomery, 352; Price, 330; Nichol, ABC, 4: 879; Newell, 188; Walvoord, Daniel, 291; Bloomfield, 257; Baldwin, 206; Goldingay, Daniel, 309. Some interpreters who believe that the book originated in the second century B.C. regard this command as a literary device of the author to explain why no one had ever heard of it till the days of Antiochus (e.g., Driver, Daniel, 125; Towner, 125).

preserve and take care of it?¹ (2) How are we to understand the running back and forth and the increase in knowledge? Does it refer to the increase in mobility and general knowledge?² Or does it refer to the searching of Scripture and the increase in the understanding of God's prophecies?³

Concerning the first question, it is to be noted that both imperatives "to shut up" and "seal" recall Dan 8:26 where Daniel was also told to "seal" the vision. This may first of all answer the subsidiary question regarding the content of the word "book" in Dan 12:4 as to whether it concerns the whole book⁴ of Daniel or only the last vision in Dan 10-12.⁵ If in Dan 8:26 Daniel was already told to seal the vision, Dan 12:4 would hardly refer a second time to the previous visions.

¹Keil, Daniel, 319; H. Bultema, Commentary on Daniel (1918; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1988), 348; Young, Daniel, 257; Leupold, Daniel, 390. These scholars emphasize that the primary intent of the command is to preserve or protect the book for the future, not to keep it secret because it would not be understood until the time of the end, though some admit that this may well be true (Bultema, 348; Leupold, Daniel, 534).

²Ironside, Daniel, 233; U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 287; Price, 331. The latter two interpreters include the increase in the understanding of the book of Daniel.

³Driver, Daniel, 203; Marti, Daniel, 90; Leupold, Daniel, 534; Newell, 189; Bloomfield, 257; Gurney, 167.

⁴Prince, 190; Keil, Daniel, 484; Montgomery, 473; Price, 330; Young, Daniel, 257; Goldingay, Daniel, 309.

⁵Stuart, 367; Zöckler, 263; U. Smith, Daniel and Revelation, 286; Leupold, Daniel, 534; Nichol, ABC, 4:879.

Second, the reason given in Dan 8:26 "for it is for many days," can be related to "the time of the end" which is given as the terminus, down to which the present revelation reaches (Dan 11:35,40). If Daniel was merely told to preserve, guard, or protect¹ the vision until "the time of the end," he himself could have done it for only a few years. Young, therefore, takes up the suggestion by T. Kliefoth that Daniel placed the original copy in some archives while copies of it remained in public use.² Whether or not this hypothesis holds, Dan 12:4 seems to suggest that a true understanding of these visions would come in the time of the end.³

The expression °ēṭ qēṣ in Dan 12:4 seems to refer back to "the time of the end" in Dan 11:35,40. We have seen that in view of the larger context "the time of the end" refers there to the time preceding the resurrection of the dead in Dan 12:2 which will happen at the final end of all things.⁴ This seems to be also the meaning here. Just prior to the end of history, people will search out the Danielic visions just as Daniel himself searched out the seventy-year prophecy of Jeremiah (Dan 9:2).

¹Young, Daniel, 257.

²Ibid.

³See also 12:9.

⁴Wilch, 111.

Dan 12:9

וַיֹּאמֶר לְדָן דְּנִיָּאל קְרִיטְתֵימִים וְחֲתֻמִּים הִרְבְּרִים קְרִיטְתָּ קֶץ:

And he said: Go Daniel for the words are shut up and sealed until the time of the end.¹

In this epilogue (Dan 12:5-13) a new scene is introduced. Two other beings appear and converse with the man clothed in linen whom Daniel had seen at the beginning of the vision (Dan 10:4-5). He hears what they say but does not understand it and asks, in vs. 8, "My Lord, what shall be the outcome² of these things?"

The response refers to "the time of the end" (vs. 9b), which is the time when these things will be understood (vs. 10). It is the same time as the one referred to in vs. 4. The unsealing of the vision and the increase of knowledge will come when the power of the willful king is broken (Dan 11:45). It appears that this must be prior to the resurrection of the dead (Dan 12:1-2).

Summary

1. The expression *°ēṭ qēṣ* in Dan 8:17 seems to belong to apocalyptic eschatology and refers to the time prior to the absolute End.
2. The four passages in Dan 11-12 (11:35,40; 12:4,9), where *°ēṭ qēṣ* appears, belong to the final revelation

¹This verse is largely parallel to Dan 12:4. For individual word studies see above.

²The word *'ah^a rîṭ* here refers to the end or outcome of things as in Isa 46:10; 47:7; etc. Cf. p. 196.

in the book. Two of the references precede (11:35,40) and two follow (12:4,9) the climax of the vision, i.e., the resurrection at the final eschaton (12:2). For contextual reasons, therefore, the expression "עַל־קֶשֶׁת" in the book of Daniel seems to be a *terminus technicus* of the final period of human history leading up to the final eschaton when the old aeon gives way to the new one when God's Kingdom will be established "without human hands."¹

¹Cf. Dan 2:34.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation endeavored to investigate the meanings of the explicit end-time expressions "the latter days" and "the time of the end" in the book of Daniel. Since both expressions are important for the understanding of history and eschatology in the book of Daniel, I have attempted a linguistic and contextual investigation of those phrases and their component parts in the ancient Near Eastern literature and in the OT as a whole in order to ascertain their respective meanings. Thus, it was anticipated that this study may contribute to a better understanding of the eschatology of the book of Daniel as an apocalyptic document of great importance.

Summary

The first chapter of this investigation provided the necessary background for my research in providing a review of literature of the interpretation of the pertinent chapters in the book of Daniel where the phrases "the latter days" (Dan 2 and 10) and "the time of the end" (Dan 8, 11, and 12) appear. We noted first of all that by the late 1880s four major schools of interpretation of the book of Daniel are in existence and continue to the present.

Consequently, there exists a great variety of interpretations not only in regard to such chapters as Dan 2 and 7-12, but also in regard to the temporal expressions under investigation. As indicated above, the four schools of interpretation are as follows:

1. The Historical-critical School considers most of Daniel's "prophecies" as vaticinia ex eventu and sees their intended fulfillment in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C. Scholars of this interpretational school generally equate "the time of the end" and "the latter days" and apply them to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and its aftermath in the second century B.C. Thus, both expressions are considered to have eschatological import within history but not as pointing to the final end of history.
2. The Preterist School considers Daniel's prophecies as true prophecies. Their fulfillment is seen primarily one and a half centuries before Christ, in Christ, and immediately following Christ. Preterists usually apply "the latter days" to the Messianic kingdom which Christ inaugurated. "The time of the end," in their view, can refer to the age of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the demise of the Grecian Empire, the latter days of the Roman Empire, and, for a few Preterists, even to the second advent of Christ. Accordingly, "the latter days" are primarily non-eschatological in the Preterist view

while "the time of the end" can be eschatological, for a few even apocalyptic.

3. The Futurist-dispensationalist School is divided in regard to the understanding of the two temporal expressions under consideration. Futurists interpret the stone in Dan 2 as the first coming of Christ and the latter days as the Messianic age. Dispensationalists consider the stone to refer to the Second Advent, hence "the latter days" are the time prior to it. "The latter days" in Dan 10:14 are variously interpreted by both groups. Some apply them to the Messianic age, others equate them with "the time of the end" and apply them to the end-time. A third group believes that since Daniel's days we have been and are living in "the latter days." "The time of the end," for Futurist-dispensationalist interpreters, can refer to the end of a time period in history, e.g., the end of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, as well as to the final end of history at the eschaton. Hence, both expressions can have eschatological and/or apocalyptic meanings.
4. The Historicist School, the oldest one of the four schools of interpretation, generally equates "the latter days" and "the time of the end" in the book of Daniel and applies both of them to the time just prior to the final eschaton. Thus, both expressions are seen to have apocalyptic meaning, referring to the absolute

End. However, there are some Historicists who see the stone in Dan 2 to refer to Christ's first advent and thus apply "the latter days" in Dan 2:28 to the time prior to that event. Again there are some who identify the Little Horn in Dan 8 with Antiochus IV Epiphanes and, accordingly, "the time of the end" in Dan 8:17 refers to his time. Because of the resurrection in Dan 12:2, "the time of the end" in Dan 12 is seen by the latter to have a dual application--the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the time prior to the Second Advent.¹

Our literature survey had indicated that there is no communis opinio with regard to the meaning of either b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm or cēt qēs and that there is a real need for a linguistic, contextual re-evaluation of both temporal phrases in the book of Daniel.

Our second chapter has been devoted to the phrase "the latter days" (Dan 2:28). We turned our attention to the root 'ḥr and its derivatives as well as the expression b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm in ancient Near Eastern literary texts. Next, we studied the same terms in the OT and we

¹A fifth school of interpretation--the Idealistic School--found only in one commentary, sees in every age a fulfillment of Daniel's prophecies. Thus "the latter days" are considered to be a general expression for the future, and "the time of the end" is primarily applied to the end of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who is a type of a recurring historical phenomenon.

investigated the expression "the latter days in Dan 2:28 and 10:14.

The results of the investigation of Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic literary records show that in Akkadian and Aramaic the primary reference of the words derived from the root 'hr in these languages applies to a general future. It can be an immediate or a remote future. The scanty evidence from Ugaritic texts seems to indicate that the word 'uḥry has the local meaning of "last one."

Akkadian texts contain some equivalent phrases to b* 'aḥ^ariṭ hayyāmim. The Akkadian expressions ana aḥrat ūmē and ana arkāt ūmē refer both to the future, in general, or to a specific point of time in the future when certain events will take place. These phrases, frequent in historical and legal texts, do not appear in any religious texts. In legal texts the phrase ana arkāt ūmē can be considered a legal terminus technicus indicating the temporal frame of reference of a will or document. There is no eschatological import in any of these texts.

The study of 'aḥ^ariṭ in the OT has shown that it can refer to the future in general (Deut 8:16; Job 42:12; Prov 25:8), to the end or the result of an action in a man's experience (Amos 8:10; Prov 14:12), as well as to the future life of the righteous man (Prov 23:17,18; 24:14). In Dan 8:19, where it is parallel to cēt qēs, it possibly has an apocalyptic meaning.

The phrase 'aḥ^ariṭ hayyāmim "the latter days,"

which appears twelve times in the OT outside of the book of Daniel, can refer to a specific future period in the history of Israel, e.g., the time of the Judges (Deut 31:29), the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 23:20; 30:24), the time of the Babylonian exile (Deut 4:30), or the time of the Persian restoration (Jer 48:47; 49:37). In Gen 49:1, *b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm* has reference to the whole time span from the conquest to the Messianic kingdom. In other texts (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5), only the Messianic kingdom is in view. In Num 24:14, "the latter days" refer first of all to the time of David in which this prophecy found an initial fulfillment. Yet David was only a type of that greater star, the Messiah who was to come long after David's time. Finally, in Ezek 38:16, *b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm* points primarily to the time after the exile when this prophecy could have found a fulfillment, but did not.

Thus "the latter days" (*b' 'ah^a rîṭ hayyāmîm*), in some texts, have an implied (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14) or explicit (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5) eschatological meaning. In other texts, this expression simply refers to a future period within the history of Israel without eschatological intent (Deut 31:29; Jer 48:47; 49:37). The fall of Jerusalem (Jer 23:20; 30:24) and the Babylonian exile (Deut 4:30) belong to the field of national eschatology within history, whereas Ezek 38:16 in its final application belongs to the apocalyptic scenario at the end of history.

The investigation of the expressions *b^o'ah^arîṭ yōmayyā'* and *b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* in the book of Daniel (2:28; 10:14) has shown that they are cognate phrases. Both phrases refer to the future which began in the time of Daniel and reaches down to the Messianic kingdom. Thus, while both phrases have eschatological significance, yet they do not seem to be eschatological *termini technici*.

The third chapter concerned itself with the phrase *°ēṭ qēṣ* which appears only in Dan 8:17; 11:35,40; and 12:4 and 9. As in chap. 2, we first studied the words *°ēṭ* and *qēṣ* in the ancient Near Eastern literary texts. Next, we traced their use in Hebrew in and outside of the OT in order to establish their meanings. Finally, we considered each text in the book of Daniel where *°ēṭ* and *qēṣ* or the phrase *°ēṭ qēṣ* appears.

The study of the noun *°ēṭ* in such cognate languages as Phoenician, Punic, and Aramaic, as well as in extra-biblical Hebrew literary texts, indicated that all occurrences are of a temporal non-eschatological nature.

The OT usage of *°ēṭ* outside of the book of Daniel indicated that it can refer to events of a qualitative and recurring nature, e.g., the time of rain (Ezra 10:13), and the migratory time of birds (Jer 8:7), as well as to nonrecurring events, e.g., the time of birth and death (Eccl 3:2). A chronological or qualitative use of *°ēṭ* is found in Judg 11:26 and 1 Kgs 6:1. In a number of texts *°ēṭ* refers to the eschatological judgment on national

Israel (e.g., Jer 8:1-3; 18:23; 51:6). In other texts, reference is to the eschatological future which God wanted to bring in after the return from exile (Jer 3:17; 33:15; Zeph 3:19,20).

In the book of Daniel, ^oēṭ appears without qēṣ eleven times and refers primarily to a chronological point or period of time (e.g., Dan 9:21,25; 11:6,13,14,24; 12:11). In Dan 12:1 it refers to apocalyptic events in the end of time, which is supported by the context which leads to final deliverance and the resurrection of the dead (12:1-2).

The meaning of the noun qēṣ, "end," in such cognate languages as Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic is local as well as temporal. Thus it can refer to the end part of an object, e.g., the hem of a robe in Ugaritic, and to the end of a time period, e.g., the Akkadian "cool of the evening" refers to the end of a day. In the Targumim, qīṣṣā' always refers to the end of a time period (e.g., Gen 6:13; 49:1; Jer 8:20; Ezek 7:2; Hab 2:3; 1 Chr 7:21). In Gen 49:1 where the Targum makes reference to the Messianic time, qīṣṣā' has eschatological import.

In extra-biblical Hebrew as well as in the OT, the predominant use of qēṣ is temporal. As such, it can refer to the end of a specific (e.g., Gen 8:6; Ex 12:41) or unspecified time period (1 Kgs 17:7; 2 Chr 18:2; Neh 13:6). In three texts (Amos 8:2; Lam 4:18; Ezek 7:2,3,6), qēṣ is used in the context of the Day of the Lord and thus has

eschatological meaning. The same intent is present in Hab 2:3; Jer 51:13; and Ezek 21:30,35; 35:5.

In the book of Daniel, *qēs* is used with the general temporal meaning of "end" in 11:6,13. In Dan 9:26 and 12:13a, it has eschatological significance and in Dan 8:19; 11:27,45, and 12:6,13b, *qēs* refers to the apocalyptic time of the end.

The phrase *ēṭ qēs* is purely Danielic and is an apocalyptic terminus technicus. It appears five times in the latter half of the book (8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9) and always refers to the apocalyptic end of world history, the final period of time leading up to the absolute End.

Conclusions

It has long been recognized that the historiography of Israel differs radically from the cyclical view of history commonly found in ancient Near Eastern literature.¹ The cyclic concept, which is as old as the Babylonian and Egyptian civilization, is that of unending repetition in history similar to what man could observe in nature. The linear view, given to Israel through divine revelation, perceives history as "progress toward a definite end--a theodicy."²

¹See W. Eichrodt, "Offenbarung und Geschichte im Alten Testament," *TZ* 4 (1948): 322, 329; G. v. Rad, "Theologische Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament," *TZ* 4 (1948): 161.

²George E. Shankel, God and Man in History (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1967), 33. Cf.

The OT awareness of history as a movement toward a divine goal grew out of God's covenant promises, his guidance of the patriarchs and Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage. God delivered Israel for a purpose and that purpose became clear at Mount Sinai. There Israel as no other nation became a people with a mission to proclaim God's mighty acts in history. Thus, the Old Testament reveals history as a continuous outworking of a divine plan.¹

In the prophetic writings this divine plan culminates in the eschatological² renewal³ within history. It is the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel. Now it is true that on the Day of the Lord Israel will be judged

Hartmut Gese, "Geschichtliches Denken im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament," ZTK 55 (1958): 141.

¹G. v. Rad (Old Testament Theology, 2 vols., trans. D. M. G. Stalker [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], 1:106) wrote: "The Old Testament writers confine themselves to representing Yahweh's relationship to Israel and the world in one aspect only, namely, as continuing divine activity in history. This implies that in principle Israel's faith is grounded in a theology of history."

²In this study "eschatology" has been used in a wider sense referring to a completely new order of circumstances within history. Cf. Th. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology," VT, Sup 1 (1953): 223-224.

³Th. C. Vriezen (*ibid.*, 222) correctly observes that "for Isaiah the renewal is by no means simply "historical" in our sense of the word (this term can be as misleading as the word "eschatological"): it is historical and at the same time supra-historical, it takes place within the framework of history but is caused by forces that transcend history, so that what is coming is a new order of things in which the glory and the Spirit of God (Is.xi) reveals itself."

(Amos 5:18-20) but a remnant will survive (Amos 5:15; Isa 6:13; 10:20-23) and enter the golden era in which nations will beat their swords into plowshares (Mic 4:3) and "all flesh" shall come to worship the Lord on Zion (Isa 66:18-21).¹

This study has shown that the expression "the latter days" (b^e'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm) in some texts clearly refers to this eschatological renewal in the history of Israel (see Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5).² Yet it is not an eschatological terminus technicus as some have claimed.³ The expression "the latter days" is at times simply an idiom for "the future" (Deut 3:29; Jer 48:47; 49:37), at other times it refers to specific periods in the history of Israel, e.g., the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 23:20) or the Babylonian exile (Deut 4:30) which are eschatological in the broadest sense of the word. In Dan 2:28 and 10:14 "the

¹See J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Eschatology in the Old Testament," The Witness of Tradition, OTS, vol. 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 94.

²Bruce W. Jones ("Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel" [Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972], 225) referring to Isa 2 and Mic 4 says: "The world will be unlike the present world to the extent that wars will cease and all the nations will acknowledge the God of Jacob, but life will be lived on this earth rather than in heaven so we may characterize it as historical, even though a decisive change will have taken place." Cf. J. R. Wilch, Time and Event (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 70.

³For example, John H. Bennetch, "The Prophecy of Jacob," BSac 95 (1938): 419; Carl Armerding, "The Last Words of Jacob: Gen 49," BSac 112 (1955): 323; J. D. Pentecost, Things to Come (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958), 351.

latter days" embrace the whole sweep of human history from Daniel's time until the final eschaton. Each text where *b'e'aharit hayyamim* appears has to be treated on its own terms. This phrase does not a priori give the text in which it appears an eschatological intent. Thus, neither those scholars who consider "the latter days" always eschatological¹ nor those interpreters who regard "the latter days" always as a synonym for "future"² are wholly correct. In each case, the context has to decide what the meaning of "the latter days" is.

The locus classicus for an OT theology of history is the book of Daniel. In contrast to the Greek poet Hesiod in the eighth century B.C. who outlined five cycles, or stages, of history,³ Daniel's sequence of empires is not a type of recurring cycles, rather it is an example of the outworking of Heilsgeschichte, which has its goal in the kingdom of God beyond history.

Since in the book of Daniel specific references to the history of Israel and the saving acts of God are lacking, G. von Rad has called the book "fundamentally

¹Ibid.

²For example, J. T. Willis, "The Expression *be'acharith hayyamin* [sic] in the Old Testament," RestQ 22 (1979): 69; G. W. Buchanan, "Eschatology and the 'End of Days'," JNES 20 (1961): 189; H. Kosmala, "At the End of the Days," ASTI 2 (1963): 28-30.

³Shankel, 33. Cf. G. F. Hasel, "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 Against Its Near Eastern Environment," JSOT 12 (1979):20.

unhistorical"¹ in its outlook. Salvation in Daniel is confined to "the time of the end." The salvific acts of God in the history of Israel are not mentioned. Thus, "von Rad sees an irreconcilable difference between prophecy and apocalyptic in their respective attitudes to concrete historical events."² But this is not necessarily so.

Certainly the book of Daniel does not show much interest in the history of Israel (except for chap 9), but as K. Koch has pointed out: "the book of Daniel is the first 'world-history' in the history of humanity."³ Yet the history of Israel is not forgotten, it is presupposed, it becomes part of Daniel's universal history.⁴

The book of Daniel reveals the historical relationship between the world-empires as the work of God who "removes kings and establishes kings" (Dan 2:21), and who "at the time of the end" will judge these world powers and establish his everlasting kingdom.⁵

The question I have attempted to address in this study is the nature and the historical application of "the

¹Rad, OT Theology, 2:321.

²John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, HSM 16 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 155.

³K. Koch, "Die Weltreiche im Danielbuch," TLZ 85 (1960): 830.

⁴Idem, "Spätisraelitisches Geschichtsdenken am Beispiel des Buches Daniel," HZ 193 (1961): 28.

⁵Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Die Deutung der Weltgeschichte im Alten Testament," ZTK 56 (1959): 137.

time of the end (עֵת קֵץ).” Does this expression refer to the end of an era in history or to the end of history? And which period of history is in view, the Maccabean era or a time period still future?

Scholars generally agree that עֵת קֵץ is eschatological and many of them also believe that the end of history is in view.¹ They differ, however, in regard to the historical application of it. A number of interpreters apply "the time of the end" to the Maccabean era,² others refer it to a future time prior to the second advent of Christ.³

On the basis of my research presented in this study, I have come to the conclusion that "the time of the end" is an apocalyptic terminus technicus of Danielic

¹For example, S. R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, CBSC (Cambridge: University Press, 1901), 121; J. J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, 157; R. Bultmann, History and Eschatology (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), 30; Otto Zöckler, The Book of the Prophet Daniel, LC, trans. J. Strong (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 181; A. Clarke, The Holy Bible, 6 vols. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), 4:618; G. M. Price, The Greatest of the Prophets (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955), 206; Wilch, 111.

²For example, W. Zimmerli, Old Testament Theology in Outline, trans. D. E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), 236; Driver, Daniel, 121; Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, 160-161; P. R. Davis, "Eschatology in the Book of Daniel," JSOT 17 (1980): 43-44; idem, Daniel (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 115.

³For example, Price, 206; F. D. Nichol, ed. The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-57), 4:845; H. C. Leupold, Daniel (Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), 361; J. F. Walvoord, Daniel (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), 199.

origin which always applies to the last period of Heilsgeschichte prior to the second advent of Christ when the everlasting kingdom will bring to an end and replace world history. Thus *ἡ ἔσχατος* does not have a double or multiple fulfillment as some have claimed.¹

I further conclude that the two expressions, "the latter days" and "the time of the end," are not equivalent and that they bear no direct relationship to each other. Both are eschatological expressions, but only "the time of the end" refers to the final eschatological or apocalyptic event.

Whereas the time period beginning with the cross can be called "the latter days," the term "time of the end" cannot be applied to it. It has reference to the closing events on the prophetic calendar, to the end-time of world history. In other words, "the time of the end" is the closing period of the NT "last days" (Acts 2:17; Heb 1:2; Jas 5:3; 2 Pet 3:3).

¹See p. 416. On the question of dual or multiple fulfillment G. F. Hasel ("Fulfillments of Prophecy," 70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy, DARCOM, vol. 3; edited by Frank B. Holbrook [Washington: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], 290) correctly says: "Apocalyptic prophecies have neither dual nor multiple fulfillments. On the contrary each symbol has but one fulfillment. For example, in the book of Daniel each metal and beast has only one fulfillment. The ten horns and the one in Daniel 7, the one and the four and the one in Daniel 8, have only one fulfillment. Dual, or twofold, fulfillments may be present in some general/classical prophetic predictions where contextual scriptural indications make this clear and the details of the specifications are met in each instance. But apocalyptic prophecy, as found in the books of Daniel and Revelation, has but one fulfillment for each symbol."

With some exceptions I have endeavored to deal with the biblical and extra-biblical material down to the closing period of the OT (fifth century B.C.). Further study needs to be given to the use of these words and phrases in the intertestamental and NT period. The Qumran material, in particular, deserves close attention, for it is there that the phrase b^o'ah^arîṭ hayyāmîm appears more than a dozen times, and the word qēṣ is used frequently.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalders, G. Ch. Genesis. 2 vols. Bible Students' Commentary. Translated by William Heynen. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the NT. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937.
- Abos-Padilla, Ricardo. Plädoyer für Antiochus IV. Epiphanes. 47 1/2 Thesen über das Buch Daniel. Frankfurt am Main: Pan Text Verlag, 1983.
- Aistleitner, Joseph. Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1965.
- _____. Die Mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1964.
- Albert, Edwin. Die israelitisch-jüdische Auferstehungshoffnung in ihren Beziehungen zum Parsismus. Königsberg: Buch und Steindruckerei O. Kümmel, 1910.
- Albright, W. F. "The Gezer Calendar." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 92 (1943): 16-26.
- _____. "Gog and Magog." Journal of Biblical Literature 43 (1924): 378-385.
- _____. "The 'Natural Force' of Moses in the Light of Ugaritic." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 94 (1944): 32-35.
- _____. "Palestinian Inscriptions." Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Third edition with supplement. Edited by J. B. Pritchard, Princeton University Press, 1969. 320-322.
- Alexander, Joseph A. Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. 2 vols. 1846; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1953.

- Alexander, W. L. Deuteronomy. Pulpit Commentary. London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1897.
- Alford, Henry. The Book of Genesis. 1872; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1979.
- Alfrink, B. J. "L'idée de résurrection d'après Dan., XII, 1.2." Biblica 40 (1959): 355-371.
- Allegro, J. M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." Journal of Biblical Literature 75 (1956): 174-187.
- _____. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim." Journal of Biblical Literature 77 (1958): 350-354.
- Allen, Leslie C. The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah. New International Commentary on the OT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.
- Allen, Ronald B. "עָנָן (*cānān*) cloud, cloudy." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris; G. L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:684-685.
- Allis, Oswald T. Prophecy and the Church. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1945.
- Alt, Albrecht. "Die Deutung der Weltgeschichte im Alten Testament." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 56 (1959): 129-137.
- Amiet, Pierre. Elam. Auvers-sur-Oise: Archée Editeur, 1966.
- Amsler, S. "עָמַד *c̄md* stehen." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 2 vols. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976. 2:328-332.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David N. Freedman. Hosea. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1980.
- Anderson, Robert. The Coming Prince. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1957.
- Andrews, H. T. "Daniel." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1919.
- Andrews, J. N. The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days. 2nd ed. 1853; reprint, Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1863.

- Aphraates Select Demonstrations. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. 13:345-412.
- Archer, Gleason L. "Daniel." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- _____. "Isaiah." The Biblical Expositor. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Co., 1960.
- Armerding, Carl E. "Habakkuk." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- _____. "The Last Words of Jacob: Gen 49." Bibliotheca Sacra 112 (1955): 320-329.
- Artzy, Michal. "Pomegranate Scepters and Incense Stand with Pomegranates Found in Priest's Grave." Biblical Archaeologist Review 16.1 (1990): 48-51.
- Auberlen, Carl A. The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John. Translated by Adolph Saphir. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1856.
- Augustine Tractate 4 on the Gospel of John. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First series. 7:25-31.
- Avigad, Naham, and Yigael Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1956.
- Baillet, M., J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, eds. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955-1982.
- Ball, Bryan W. The English Connection. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981.
- _____. A Great Expectation. Studies in the History of Christian Thought. Vol. 12. Edited by H. A. Oberman. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. Daniel. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978.
- Barndollar, W. W. The Validity of Dispensationalism. Des Plaines, IL: Regular Baptist Press, 1964.
- Barnes, Albert. Daniel. 2 vols. 1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.
- _____. The Prophet Isaiah. 2 vols. New York: R. Worthington, 1881.

- _____. 1 Sam-Esther. Abridged and edited by J. M. Fuller. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Barr, James. Biblical Words for Time. 2nd ed. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1969.
- _____. "Daniel." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley. Sunbury-on-Thames, Middlesex: Th. Nelson, 1962.
- _____. "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 53 (1985): 201-233.
- Barthelemy, D., and J. T. Milik. Qumran Cave I in Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Barton, George A. "The Composition of the Book of Daniel." Journal of Biblical Literature 17 (1898): 62-86.
- Baskin, J. R. "Origen on Balaam: The Dilemma of the Unworthy Prophet." Vigiliae Christianae 37 (1983): 22-35.
- Battenfield, J. A., and P. Y. Pendleton. The Great Demonstration. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1914.
- Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Baumgartner, Walter. Das Buch Daniel. Aus der Welt der Religion. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1926.
- _____. "Eine Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung." Theologische Rundschau 11 (1939): 59-83, 125-144, 201-228.
- _____. "Zu den vier Reichen von Dan 2." Theologische Zeitschrift 1 (1945): 17-22.
- Baumgartner, W., B. Hartmann and E. Y. Kutscher. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament. 3rd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967-.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. "Ezekiel." The New Bible Commentary Revised. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.
- _____. "The Interpretation of Dan 7." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 45 (1983): 44-58.

- Beauchamp, P. "Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse." Biblica 45 (1964): 491-526.
- Becher, M. "Visio de quattuor regnis." Verbum Domini 4 (1924): 206-210.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation." Revue de Qumran 10 (1981): 521-542.
- _____. "The Earliest Enoch Literature and Its Calendar: Marks of their Origin, Date and Motivation." Revue de Qumran 10 (1981): 365-403.
- _____. "The Modern Attempt to Reconcile the Qumran Calendar with the True Solar Year." Revue de Qumran 7 (1970): 379-396.
- _____. "The Qumran Calendar and the Sacrifices of the Essenes." Revue de Qumran 7 (1971): 587-591.
- _____. "The significance of the calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology." Revue de Qumran 10 (1980): 167-202.
- Bede, The Venerable. The Explanation of the Apocalypse by Venerable Beda. Translated by E. Marshall. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1878.
- Beek, Martinus A. Das Danielbuch. Leiden: Universiteits-boekhandel en Antiquariaat J. Ginsberg, 1935.
- Beere, Richard. A Dissertation on the 13th and 14th Verses of the 8th Chapter of Daniel. London: Printed for the author, 1790.
- Bennetch, John H. "The Prophecy of Jacob." Bibliotheca Sacra 95 (1938): 417-435.
- Bennett, D. "The Stone Kingdom of Daniel 2." Symposium on Daniel. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series. Vol. 2. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Bennett, D. Miles. Hosea: Prophet of God's Love. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Benoit, P., J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux. Les Grottes de Murabba'at. Discoveries in the Judean Desert. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

- Bentzen, Aage. Daniel. 2nd ed. Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952.
- Bergmann, J. "אָנאַפּ" Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Vol. 1. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974. 348-350.
- Berkhof, L. Principles of Biblical Inspiration. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.
- Berthold, Leonhard. Daniel aus dem Hebräisch-Aramäischen neu übersetzt und erklärt mit einer vollständigen Einleitung und einigen historischen und exegetischen Excursen. Erlangen: Johann Jacob Palm, 1806-1808.
- Bertholet, Alfred. Hesekiel. Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1936.
- _____. Die israelitische Vorstellung vom Zustande nach dem Tode. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1914.
- Bevan, A. A. A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Cambridge: University Press, 1892.
- Beyer, Klaus. Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984.
- Bezold, Carl. Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Bickerman, Elias. Four Strange Books of the Bible. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.
- _____. Der Gott der Makkabäer. Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1937.
- _____. "The Seleucid Period." The Cambridge History of Iran. III:1, The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods. Edited by E. Yarshater. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983.
- Bickersteth, Edward. A Practical Guide to the Prophecies, with Reference to Their Interpretation and Fulfillment, and to Personal Edification. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1852.
- Birchmore, John W. Prophecy Interpreted by History. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1871.
- Birkeland, H. "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the OT." Studia Theologica 3 (1950): 60-78.

- Birks, Thomas R. Commentary on the Book of Isaiah. London: Rivingtons, 1871.
- _____. First Elements of Sacred Prophecy: Including an Examination of Several Recent Expositions, and of the Year-Day Theory. London: William Edward Painter, 1843.
- _____. The Four Prophetic Empires, and the Kingdom of Messiah: Being an Exposition of the First Two Visions of Daniel. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1845.
- _____. The Two Later Visions of Daniel: Historically Explained. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1846.
- Bittner, Stephan. Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea. Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975.
- Blackwood, A. W. Commentary on Jeremiah. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977.
- Bloch, Joshua. On the Apocalyptic in Judaism. Jewish Quarterly Review. Monograph Series, no. 2. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952.
- Bloomfield, Arthur E. The End of the Days. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1981.
- Boehmer, J. "Zorn." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 44 (1926): 320-322.
- Boettner, Loraine. The Millennium. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958.
- Boman, Thorleif. Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek. New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1960.
- Borger, Riekele. Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien, Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 9. 1956; reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1967.
- Bosanquet, James W. Messiah the Prince or the Inspiration of the Prophecies of Daniel. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1869.
- Bostrup, P. O. "Aramäische Ritualtexte in Keilschrift." Acta Orientalia 5 (1927): 257-301.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. vols. 1- Translated by John T. Willis and David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974-.

- _____. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 7 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970-.
- Bousset, W., and H. Gressmann. Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Die Offenbarung Johannis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1906.
- Boutflower, Charles. In and Around the Book of Daniel. 1923; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963.
- Box, G. H. The Book of Isaiah. London: Pitman and Sons, 1908.
- Boyle, W. R. A. The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel. London: Rivingtons, 1863.
- Bright, John. Jeremiah. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1965.
- Bringmann, Klaus. Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Juda. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983.
- Brockelmann, Carl. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.
- _____. Lexicon Syriacum. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W., ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979-87.
- Brooks, Keith L. The Certain End. Los Angeles: American Prophetic League, 1942.
- Broughton, H. Daniel His Chaldie Visions and His Hebrew: Both Translated. London: Richard Field, 1596.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Brunner, Robert. Ezechiel. 2 vols. Zürcher Bibel. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1969.
- Buchanan, George W. "Eschatology and the End of Days." Journal of Near Eastern Studies 20 (1961): 188-193.

- Budde, Karl. "Zu Jesaja 1-5." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1931): 16-40.
- Budge, Ernest A. Wallis, and Leonard W. King. Annals of the Kings of Assyria. Vol. 1. London: British Museum, 1902.
- Bultema, Harry. Commentary on Daniel. 1918; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1988.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. History and Eschatology. Edinburgh: University Press, 1957.
- Bunn, John T. "Ezekiel." The Broadman Bible Commentary. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1971.
- Burgh, William. Lectures on the Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ. 2nd ed., enl. Dublin: William Curry, Jr., and Co., 1835.
- Burgmann, Hans. "Die vier Endzeitermine im Danielbuch," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 86 (1974): 543-50
- Burnett, F. W. The Testament of Jesus-Sophia. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.
- Bush, George. Notes, Critical, and Practical on the Book of Numbers. New York: Ivison and Phinney, 1858.
- Buttrick, George A., ed. Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Buzy, Denis. "Les Symboles de Daniel." Revue Biblique, n.s. 15 (1918): 403-431.
- Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel. 2 vols. Translated by Th. Myers. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948.
- _____. Commentaries on the "Twelve Minor Prophets." 2 vols. Translated by John Owen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950.
- _____. Genesis. 2 vols. Translated by John King. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948.
- Cambell, David. Illustrations of Prophecy. Boston: Published by the Author, 1840.
- Campbell, Donald K. Daniel: Decoder of Dreams. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1977.

- Campbell, Roderick. Israel and the New Covenant. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1954.
- Candlish, Robert S. Studies in Genesis. 1868; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1979.
- Capp, E. S. The Fifth Monarchy Men. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.
- Carley, Keith W. Ezekiel. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1974.
- Carmignac, Jean. "La notion d'eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân." Revue de Qumran 7 (1969): 17-31.
- Carroll, Robert P. The Book of Jeremiah. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Caspari, C. P. Zur Einführung in das Buch Daniel. Leipzig: Dörffling und Francken, 1869.
- Cauley, F., and A. R. Millard. "Jeremiah." New Bible Commentary Revised. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.
- Cavallin, H. C. "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I: Spätjudentum." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.19.1 (1979): 240-345.
- _____. Life After Death, Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974.
- Cazelles, Henri. "Qui aurait visé, à l'origine, Isaïe 2:2-5?" Vetus Testamentum 30 (1980): 409-420.
- Cerny, Ladislav. The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems. Prague: University Karlovy, 1948.
- Charles, Robert H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- _____. Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. A Critical History. New York: Schocken Books, 1913.
- _____. The Revelation of St. John. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.

- Chase, Irah. Remarks on the Book of Daniel. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1844.
- Cheyne, T. K. Hosea, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1889.
- _____. Jeremiah. Pulpit Commentary. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913.
- _____. The Prophecies of Isaiah. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890.
- Chrysostom, S. John. Adversus Judaeos. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 48:839-942.
- _____. Interpretatio in Danielelem Prophetam. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 56:193-246.
- Clark, Jerome L. 1844. 3 vols. Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1968.
- Clarke, Adam. The Holy Bible. 6 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.
- Clay, Albert T. A. Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform. Yale Oriental Series. Vol. 5, pt. 3. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.
- Clement of Alexandria. The Stromata. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 2:29-567.
- Clifford, Richard J. "History and Myth in Daniel 10-12," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 220 (1975): 23-26.
- Coats, George W. "The Way of Obedience." Semeia 24 (1982): 53-79.
- Cody, Aelred. Ezekiel. Old Testament Message. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- Cohen, A. The Soncino Chumash. Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino Press, 1947.
- Cohen, Gary. " שָׁבָא (shābā) take captive." Theological Word-book of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris; G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:895-896.

- Collins, Anthony. The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered: In a View of the Controversy Occasion'd by a Late Book Entitled, A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion. London: T. J., 1727.
- Collins, John J. "Apocalyptic." The New Dictionary of Theology. Edited by Joseph A. Komonchak, Mary Collins, and Dermot A. Lane. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987.
- _____. "Apocalyptic Genre and Mythic Allusions in Daniel," Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 21 (1981): 83-100.
- _____. The Apocalyptic Imagination. New York: Crossroads, 1984.
- _____. The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Vol. 16. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- _____. Daniel. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature. Vol. 20. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____. Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees. Old Testament Message. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981.
- _____. "Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 220 (1975): 27-36.
- _____. ed. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." Semeia 14 (1979): 1-221.
- Conradi, L. R. The Impelling Force of Prophetic Truth. London: Thynne and Co., 1935.
- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 7:391-505.
- Coogan, Michael D., ed. Stories from Ancient Canaan. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Cook, F. C., ed. Exodus-Ruth. The Bible Commentary. Abridged and edited by J. M. Fuller. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Cooke, G. E. A. The Book of Ezekiel. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951.

- _____. A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Coppens, J. "La Benediction de Jacob." Vetus Testamentum supplement 4 (1956): 97-115.
- Coppes, L. J. "נָחַ (nūah) rest, settle down." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. L. Harris, L. Archer, Jr., B. K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:562-563.
- _____. "et. Time, space of time, appointed time, proper time." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris, G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:680-681.
- Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. 5 parts. Paris: Reipublicae Typographeo, 1881-1950.
- Cowles, Henry. Ezekiel and Daniel. New York: Appleton and Co., 1868.
- Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Craigie, Peter C. The Book of Deuteronomy. The New International Commentary on the OT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.
- Craven, Toni. Ezekiel, Daniel. Collegeville Bible Commentary. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986.
- Crinsoz, Theodore. Essai sur l'Apocalypse avec les éclaircissemens sur les propheties de Daniel quie regardent les derniers tem[pls]. N. p., 1729.
- Cross, Frank M. "Ammonite Ostraca from Heshbon." Andrews University Seminary Studies 13 (1975): 1-20.
- _____. "Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Sirhan." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 212 (1973): 12-15.
- Culver, Robert Duncan. Daniel and the Latter Days. Rev. ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1977.
- Cumming, J. Prophetic Studies: Or Lectures on the Book of Daniel. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co., 1850.
- Cyril, S. The Catechetical Lectures. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. 7:1-157.

- Cyprian Treatise. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:421-557.
- Dahood, M. Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963.
- _____. Psalms 1-50. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- _____. "Ugaritic Hebrew Parallel Pairs." Ras Shamra Parallels. Vol. 1. Edited by Loren R. Fisher. Der Alte Orient. Vol. 49. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1972.
- _____. "Ugaritic Hebrew Parallel Pairs Supplement." Ras Shamra Parallels. Vol. 3. Edited by Stan Rummel. Der Alte Orient. Vol. 51. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1981.
- Daiches, Samuel. "Notes on the Gezer Calendar and Some Babylonian Parallels." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 116.
- Darby, John. Studies on the Book of Daniel: A Course of Lectures. London: J. B. Bateman, 1864.
- Davidson, Robert. Genesis 12-50. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Davies, Philip R. Daniel. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- _____. "Daniel Chapter Two." Journal of Theological Studies 27 (1976): 392-401.
- _____. "Eschatology in the Book of Daniel." Journal for the Study of Old Testament 17 (1980): 33-53.
- Davis, William C. The Millennium, or a Short Sketch on the Rise and Fall of Antichrist. Salisbury, NC: Coupee and Crader, 1811.
- Dearman, Andrew, ed. Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- De Haan, M. R. Daniel the Prophet. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947.
- Delcor, M. Le Livre de Daniel. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1971.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1975.

- _____. The Prophecies of Isaiah. 2 vols. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin. 1877; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950-1954.
- _____. Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum AT. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886.
- D'Envieu, J. Fabre. Le livre du Prophete Daniel. Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1891.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand. Das Buch Daniel und seine Probleme. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien. Vol. 36. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk Stuttgart, 1969.
- Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. "°DB und °DB im Ugaritischen." Ugaritische Forschungen 17 (1986): 105-116.
- Dietrich, M., O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin. "Der Stichometrische Aufbau von RS 24.258." Ugaritische Forschungen 7 (1975): 109-114.
- Dijkstra, Meindert, and Johannes C. de Moor. "Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhatu." Ugaritische Forschungen 7 (1975): 171-215.
- Dillmann, August. Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1886.
- _____. Die Genesis. 2 vols. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1875.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Doukhan, Jaques B. "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study," Andrews University Seminary Studies 17 (1979): 1-22.
- _____. The Vision of the End: Daniel. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987.
- Driver, G. R. Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- _____. "An Aramaic Inscription in the Cuneiform Script." Archiv für Orientforschung 3 (1926): 47-53.
- _____. Canaanite Myths and Legends. Oudtestamentische Studien. Vol. 3. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.

- Driver, G. R., and John C. Miles. The Assyrian Laws. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.
- _____. The Babylonian Laws. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Daniel. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1901.
- _____. Deuteronomy. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- Duhm, Bernhard. Das Buch Jesaja. 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922.
- Dummelow, J. R., ed. A Commentary on the Holy Bible. New York: McMillan Co., 1940.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. "Azitawadda, Roi des Danouniens." Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archeologie Orientale 42 (1948): 161-188.
- _____. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by G. Vermes. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973.
- _____. "La Tablette Cunéiforme Araméenne de Warka." Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archeologie Orientale 39 (1942-44): 35-62.
- Dürr, Lorenz. Die Stellung des Propheten Ezechiel in der israelitischen-jüdischen Apokalyptic. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen. Münster i. W.: Aschendorfsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.
- Düsterwald, Franz. Die Weltreiche und das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen des Propheten Daniel. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1890.
- Ebeling, Erich. "Eine neue Tafel des akkadischen Zû-Mythos." Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale 46 (1952): 25-41.
- Ebeling, Erich, Brunc Meissner, and Ernst F. Weidner. Die Inschriften der altassyrischen Könige. Altorientalische Bibliothek. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1926.
- Eerdmans, B. D. The Religion of Israel. Leiden: University Press Leiden, 1947.

- Efird, James M. Daniel and Revelation. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1978.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B. Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. 7 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968.
- Eichhorn, J. G. Einleitung ins Alte Testament. 3 vols., 2nd ed. Reutlingen: J. Grözinger, 1790.
- _____. Einleitung ins Alte Testament. 3 vols., 3rd ed. Leipzig: Weidmännische Buchhandlung, 1803.
- Eichrodt, Walter. "Offenbarung und Geschichte im Alten Testament." Theologische Zeitschrift 4 (1948): 321-331.
- _____. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Old Testament Library. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1967-77.
- Elliott, E. B. Horae Apocalypticæ. 4 vols. 5th ed. London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday, 1862.
- Ellison, H. L. Ezekiel: The Man and His Message. Exeter, Devon: Paternoster Press, 1967.
- _____. "The Message of Hosea in the Light of His Marriage." Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969): 3-9.
- Emmerson, Grace I. Hosea an Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective, Journal for the Study of OT. Supplement Series, vol. 28. Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1984.
- Eph^{ca}l, I. The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent 9th-5th Centuries B.C. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Epstein, I., ed. The Babylonian Talmud. 6 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935-48.
- Erlandsson, S. "708 'acher." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by J. G. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 6 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH., 1970-72. 1:201-203.
- _____. "The Wrath of YHWH." Tyndale Bulletin 23 (1972): 111-116.

- Etheridge, J. W. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum. 2 vols. London: Longman, 1862; reprint, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968.
- Eusebius Demonstrationis Evangelicae: Fragmentum Libri XV. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 22:791-794.
- _____. The Ecclesiastical History. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. Loeb Classical Library.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. A New Concordance of the Bible. Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer" Publishing House, 1983.
- Evetts, B. T. A. "On Five Unpublished Cylinders of Sennacherib." Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 3 (1888): 311-331.
- Ewald, Georg H. A. von. Prophets of the Old Testament. 5 vols. Translated by J. F. Smith. London: Williams and Norgate, 1881.
- Faber, George S. The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy: Or a Dissertation on the Prophecies, Which Treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times. 2nd ed., 3 vols. London: W. E. Painter, 1844.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. Ezekiel. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1876.
- Farrar, F. W. The Book of Daniel. Expositor's Bible. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Feinberg, Charles L. "Jeremiah." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- _____. The Minor Prophets. Chicago: Moody Press, 1977.
- Fensham, F. C. "The Marriage Metaphor in Hosea for the Covenant Relationship between the Lord and His People (Hos 1:2-9)." Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages 12 (1984): 71-78.
- Fenton, J. C. The Gospel of Matthew. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Ferch, Arthur J. Daniel on Solid Ground. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1988.
- _____. "The Book of Daniel and the 'Maccabean Thesis.'" Andrews University Seminary Studies 21 (1983): 129-141.

- Feuillet, A. "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique." Revue Biblique 60 (1953): 170-202, 321-346.
- Filmer, Edmund. Daniel's Predictions. London: Regency Press, 1979.
- Fishbane, Michael. "Varia Deuteronomica." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 84 (1972): 349-352.
- Fisch, S. Ezekiel. Soncino Books of the Bible (Series). London: Soncino Press, 1950.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1. Biblica et Orientalia. Vol. 18. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- Floris, Joachim of. Concordia Novi ac Veteris Testamenti. Venedig, 1519; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva G. M. B. H., 1964.
- Flusser, David. "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel." Israel Oriental Studies 2 (1972): 148-175.
- _____. "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2. Sam 7." Israel Exploration Journal 9 (1959): 99-109.
- Fohrer, G. "Die Struktur der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie." Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. 99 (1967): 32-58.
- Folsom, Nathaniel S. Critical and Historical Interpretation of the Prophecies of Daniel. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1842.
- Ford, Desmond. The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979.
- _____. Daniel. Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1978.
- Forman, A. P. Prophecy. St. Louis: Presbyterian Publishing Company, 1878.
- Franken, H. J. "Texts from the Persian Period from Tell Deir 'Alla." Vetus Testamentum 17 (1967): 480-481.
- Freedman, H. Jeremiah. Soncino Books of the Bible. London: Soncino Press, 1949.

- Freehof, Solomon B. Book of Jeremiah. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1977.
- Freer, K. O. "A Study of Vision Reports in Biblical Literature." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1975.
- Frere, James Hatley. A Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Esdras, and St. John, Shewing That All the Prophetic Writings Are Formed upon One Plan. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1850.
- Fritsch, Ch. T. The Book of Genesis. Layman's Bible Commentary. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Froom, L. E. The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1950.
- Frost, S. B. "Eschatology and Myth," Vetus Testamentum 2 (1952): 70.
- Frye, R. "Qumran and Iran." Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. 4 vols. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975. 3:167-73.
- Fuhs, H. F. "אֱלֹהִים 'ālāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 7 vols. Edited by J. G. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970-. 6:84-105.
- Fürst, Julius. A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Translated by S. Davidson. London: Williams and Norgate, 1867.
- Gaebelein, Arno C. Gaebelein's Concise Commentary on the Whole Bible. Rev. ed. Neptune, NJ: Loiseaux Brothers, 1985.
- _____. The Prophet Daniel. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1955.
- Gaide, Gilles. Le Livre de Daniel. Tours: Maison Mame, 1969.
- Gall, August Freiherr von. Basilea Tou Theou: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur vorkirchlichen Eschatologie. Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek. Vol. 7. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Galling, Kurt. "Das Rätsel der Zeit im Urteil Kohelets (Koh 3,1-15)." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 58 (1961): 1-15.

- _____, ed. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 7 vols. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-65.
- Gammie, John G. Daniel. Knox Preaching Guides. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.
- _____. "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel." Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976): 191-204.
- _____. "On the Intention and Sources of Daniel I-IV." Vetus Testamentum 31 (1981): 282-292.
- _____. "A Journey Through Danielic Spaces." Interpretation 39 (1985): 144-156.
- Gaster, Theodor H. "Resurrection." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Gaustad, Edwin S., ed. The Rise of Adventism. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Gehman, Henry S. "The Ruler of the Universe." Interpretation 11 (1957): 269-281.
- Gese, Hartmut. "Die Bedeutung der Krise unter Antiochus IV Epiphanes für die Apokalyptik des Danielbuches." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 80 (1983): 373-388.
- _____. "Geschichtliches Denken im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 55 (1958): 127-145.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1905.
- Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. Revised by A. E. Cowley. 2nd Eng. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Gibson, John C. L. Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977.
- _____. Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Ginsberg, H. Louis. "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 98 (1945): 15-23.

- _____. Studies in Daniel. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Vol. 14. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948.
- _____. "Ugaritic Myths, Epics and Legends." Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Third ed. with supplement. Edited by J. B. Pritchard, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. 129-155.
- Goettsberger, Johannes. Das Buch Daniel. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1928.
- Goldingay, John E. "The Book of Daniel: Three Issues." Themelios 2.2 (1977): 45-49.
- _____. Daniel. Word Bible Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989.
- Goldstein, J. A. I Maccabees. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1976.
- Goldwurm, Hersh. Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary. Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources. Art Scroll Tanach Series. New York: Mesorah Pub., 1980.
- Good, Edwin M. "The 'Blessing' on Judah, Gen 49:8-12." Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963): 427-432.
- Gooding, D. W. "The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and Its Implications," Tyndale Bulletin 32 (1981): 43-80.
- Goodwin, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D. 12 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1866.
- Gordis, R. "Hosea's Marriage and Message." Hebrew Union College Annual 25 (1954): 9-35.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "The Aramaic Incantation in Cuneiform." Archiv für Orientforschung 12 (1937-1939): 105-117.
- _____. "The Cuneiform Aramaic Incantation." Orientalia 9 (1940): 29-38.
- _____. Forgotten Scripts. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- _____. "Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit," Berytus 25 (1977): 5-133.

- _____. Ugarit and Minoan Crete. New York: W. W. Norton, 1966.
- _____. Ugaritic Literature. Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1949.
- _____. Ugaritic Textbook. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Gray, George B. The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- _____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- _____. "An Old Hebrew-Calendar Inscription from Gezer." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 30-33.
- Gray, John. I and II Kings. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- _____. "The Legacy of Canaan." Vetus Testamentum supplements. Vol. 5. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- _____. "The Masoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 86 (1974): 331-350.
- Grayson, A. K. "The Creation Epic." Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Third ed. with supplement. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. 501-503.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and S. Shaked. "Three Iranian Words in the Targum of Job from Qumran." Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 122 (1972): 37-45.
- Greenspoon, L. J. "The Origin of the Idea of Resurrection." Traditions in Transformation. Edited by Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981.
- Grelot, Pierre. De la mort a la vie eternelle. Paris: Les editions du cerf, 1971.
- Gressmann, Hugo. Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1926.

- _____. Der Messias. Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929.
- _____. Der Ursprung der israelitischen-jüdischen Eschatologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905.
- Grönbaek, Jacob H. "Zur Frage der Eschatologie in der Verkündigung der Gerichtspropheten." Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok 24 (1959): 5-21.
- Gross, Walter. Bileam. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Vol. 38. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1974.
- Grotius, H. Annotationes in Vetus et Novum Testamentum. London: 1727.
- Gruen, E. "Rome and the Seleucids in the Aftermath of Pydna," Chiron 6 (1976): 73-95.
- Gruenthaner, Michael J. "The Four Empires of Daniel." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 18 (1956): 364-379.
- Guinness, Henry Grattan. Light for the Last Days. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.
- Gunkel, Hermann. Genesis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1901.
- Gurney, Robert M. God in Control. Worthing, West Sussex: H. E. Walter, 1980.
- Guthrie, H. H., Jr. "The Book of Numbers." Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Habershon, M. A Dissertation. London: James Nisbet, 1834.
- Hackett, Jo Ann. The Balaam Text from Deir 'Alla. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Vol. 31. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Hailey, Homer. A Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972.
- Hales, William. A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy. 4 vols. London: C. J. G. and F. Rivington, 1830.
- Hall, Bert H. "The Book of Daniel." The Wesleyan Bible Commentary. 6 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. 3:501-559.

- Hallo, W. W. "Akkadian Apocalypses." Israel Exploration Journal. 16 (1966): 231-42.
- Hamilton, Victor P. "שׁוּב (shūb) (re)turn." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris; G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:909-910.
- Hammer, Raymond. The Book of Daniel. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Haney, Herbert M. The Wrath of God in the Former Prophets. New York: Vantage Press, 1960.
- Hanhart, Robert. "Kriterien geschichtlicher Wahrheit in der Makkabäerzeit." Theologische Existenz Heute. N. F. 140 (1967): 7-22.
- Hanson, A. T. The Wrath of the Lamb. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Hanson, Paul D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- _____, ed. Visionaries and Their Apocalypses. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "The Wrath of God." Expository Times 58 (1946-47): 216-218.
- Hardy, Frank W. "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11." M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983.
- Harkavy, Alexander. Student's Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1941.
- Harper, William R. Amos and Hosea. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905.
- Harris, R. Laird. "The Last Days in the Bible and Qumran." In Jesus of Nazareth, Savior and Lord. Edited by C. F. H. Henry. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1966.
- _____. "אָהַר ('āhar) tarry, delay, defer." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris; G. L. Archer, Jr., and B. K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 1:33-34
- Harrison, R. K. "Deuteronomy." The New Bible Commentary Revised. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.

- _____. Jeremiah and Lamentations. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1973.
- Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. Di Lella. The Book of Daniel. Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1978.
- Hartman, Louis F. "Daniel." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Harton, G. M. "An Interpretation of Daniel 11:36-45." Grace Theological Journal 4 (1983): 205-231.
- Hasel, G. F. "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 Against its Near Eastern Environment." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 12 (1979): 17-30.
- _____. "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks." The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series. Vol. 3. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- _____. "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary, and 'the Time of the End': A Study of Daniel 8:9-14." Symposium on Daniel. Daniel and Revelation Committee. Vol. 2. Edited by F. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- _____. "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8." The Sanctuary and the Atonement. Edited by A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshar. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.
- _____. "תָּנַי nāgīd." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:203-219.
- _____. "The Origin and Early History of the Remnant Motif in Ancient Israel." Ph.D. dissertation. Vanderbilt University, 1970.
- _____. The Remnant. Andrews University Monographs (Studies in Religion). Vol. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972.
- _____. "'Remnant' as a Meaning of 'Ahārīt.'" The Archaeology of Jordan and Other Studies. Edited by L. T. Geraty and L. G. Herr. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1986.

- _____. "Resurrection in the Theology of OT Apocalyptic." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 92 (1980): 267-284.
- _____. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27." Ministry 49 (1976): 1D-21D.
- Haskell, Stephen N. The Story of Daniel the Prophet. South Lancaster, MA: Bible Training School, 1908.
- Hasslberger, Bernhard. Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12. Münchner Universitätsschriften: Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament. Vol. 4. St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1977.
- Hävernich, Heinrich A. C. Commentar über das Buch Daniel. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1832.
- Heaton, Eric W. The Book of Daniel. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Heidel, Alexander. The Babylonian Genesis. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Helfmeier, F. J. "כָּלָה kālāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984. 4:166-174.
- Henderson, Ebenezer. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1857.
- Hengstenberg, Ernst W. Christology of the Old Testament. 4 vols. Translated by Theodor Meyer and James Martin. 1872-1878; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1956.
- Henry, Matthew. An Exposition of the Old and New Testament. 6 vols. Philadelphia: Ed. Barrington and Geo. D. Haswell, n.d.
- Herbert, A. S. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- _____. Isaiah 1-39. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- Heermann, A. "Ehe und Kinder des Propheten Hosea." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 40 (1922): 287-312.

- Herntrich, Volkmar. Der Prophet Jesaja 1-12. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.
- Heschel, Abraham J. The Prophets. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Hewitt, Clarence H. The Seer of Babylon. Boston, MA: Advent Christian Herald, 1948.
- Hinke, W. J. A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I. The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series D: Research and Treatises. Edited by H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia, 1907.
- Hinz, W. The Lost World of Elam. New York: New York University, 1972.
- Hippolytus Fragments from Commentaries: On Daniel. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:177-185.
- _____. Scholia on Daniel. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:185-191.
- _____. Treatise on Christ and Antichrist. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:204-219.
- Hitzig, Ferdinand. Das Buch Daniel. Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1850.
- Hoehner, Harold W. Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977.
- Hofmann, Johann C. K. Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und im Neuen Testament. Nordlingen: E. S. Bed'sche Buchhandlung, 1841/44.
- Holbrook, F. B., ed. Symposium on Daniel. Daniel and Revelation Committee. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971.
- _____. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 1-25. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Holleaux, M. Etudes d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques. 6 vols. Paris: 1942. 3:264-267.

- Hölscher, Gustav. Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie. Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1925.
- Hoonacker, A. van. "The Four Empires of the Book of Daniel." Expository Times 13 (1902): 420-423.
- Horn, Siegfried H. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1960.
- Howie, Carl G. The Book of Ezekiel. The Book of Daniel. Layman's Bible Commentary. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1961.
- Hyatt, J. P. "Jeremiah." The Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 5:775-1142.
- Indicopleustes, Cosmas. Topographiae Christianae. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 88:51-475.
- _____. "Topographiae Christianae." Sources chrétiennes. Vol. 141. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- Irenaeus Against Heresies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1:422-555.
- Ironside, H. A. Lectures on Daniel the Prophet. 2nd ed. Neptune: NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1920.
- _____. The Prophet Isaiah. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1952.
- _____. Notes on the Prophecies and Lamentations of Jeremiah. 3rd ed. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1943.
- Jacob, B. The First Book of the Bible, Genesis. Translated by E. I. Jacob and W. Jacob. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.
- Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments. 6 vols. 1866; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1945.
- Janowski, B. "Sündenvergebung 'um Hiobs willen'. Fürbitte und Vergebung in 11 Qtg Job 38:2f. und Hi 42:9f. LXX." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 73 (1982): 251-280.
- Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. New York: Title Publishing Company, 1943.

- Jean, Charles F., and Jacob Hoftijzer. Dictionnaire des inscriptions semitiques de l'ouest. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Jeffery, Arthur. "The Book of Daniel." Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Jenni, Ernst. "דָּנָה 'hr danach." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT. 2 vols. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76. 1: 110-118.
- _____. "Eschatology of the OT." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. 2:126-133.
- _____. "דָּן jōm Tag." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT. 2 vols. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76. 1:707-726.
- _____. "דָּן cēt Zeit." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT. 2 vols. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76. 2:370-385.
- Jenour, Alfred. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. London: R. B. Seeley and Sons, 1830.
- Jensen, Irving L. Jeremiah, Prophet of Judgment. Chicago: Moody Press, 1966.
- Jensen, Joseph. Isaiah 1-39. Old Testament Message. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- Jensen, P. "Inschriften Agum-kakrimi's, d.i. Agum's des Jüngeren." Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten. Vol. 3a. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. Edited by E. Schrader. Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892.
- Jerdan, C. Hosea. Pulpit Commentary. 1913; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Jeremias, Jörg. Der Prophet Hosea. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Vol. 24/I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983.
- Jerome's Commentary on Daniel. Translated by G. L. Archer, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Johnson, E. "דָּנָה 'ānaph." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Vol. 1. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974, 350-360.

- Johnson, Philip C. The Book of Daniel. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.
- Jones, Bruce W. "Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel." Ph.D. dissertation. Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972.
- Jongeling, B. "Contributions of the Qumran Job Targum to the Aramaic Vocabulary." Journal of Semitic Studies 17 (1972): 191-197.
- Jongeling, B., C. J. Labuschagne, and A. S. van der Woude. Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations I. Semitic Studies Series. Vol. 4. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Josephus, Flavius. Jewish Antiquities. 9 vols. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Allen Wikgren, Ralph Marcus, and Louis Feldman. Loeb Classical Library.
- Joye, George. The exposition of Daniel the Prophete gathered oute of Philip Melancton, Johan Ecolampadius, Chonrade Pellicane, and out of Johan Draconite. Geneva: n.p., 1545.
- Junker, Hubert. Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische Probleme des Buches Daniel. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.
- Kaiser, Otto. Isaiah 1-12. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S. "Eschatologie in the Book of Micah." Vetus Testamentum 11 (1961): 392-405.
- Katzenstein, H. Jacob. "Phoenicia, Phoenicians." Encyclopaedia Judaica. 16 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1971. 13:471-481.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Job Targum from Qumran." Journal of the American Oriental Society 93 (1973): 317-327.
- Kautz, J. R. III. "Moab." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 4 vols. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979-1988. 3:389-396.
- Keil, Carl, F. The Book of Daniel. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by M. G. Easton. 1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949.
- _____. The Book of Kings. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872.

- _____. The Minor Prophets. 2 vols. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 1868.
- _____. The Prophecies of Ezekiel. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1876.
- _____. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. 2 vols. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by David Patrick. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. The Pentateuch. 3 vols. Bible Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952.
- Keith, Alexander. The Signs of the Times, as Denoted by the Fulfillment of Historical Predictions. 2 vols. New York: Jonathan Leavit, 1832.
- Kelly, William. An Exposition of the Book of Isaiah. 1871; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1979.
- _____. Lectures on the Book of Daniel. 2nd ed. London: G. Morish, 1881.
- _____. Notes on the Book of Daniel. 1858; reprint, New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, 1902.
- Kenrick, Francis P. The Book of Job and the Prophets. Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian, and Piet, 1859.
- Kepler, Th. S. Dreams of the Future. Bible Guides. Vol. 22. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.
- Kidner, Derek. Genesis. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1967.
- _____. Love to the Loveless, The Message of Hosea. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1981.
- _____. Psalms 1-72. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973.
- Kilpatrick, G. G. D. "The Book of Isaiah." Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 5:149-773.
- King, Geoffrey R. Daniel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans 1966.

- King, L. W. Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial Tablets in the British Museum. London: British Museum, 1912.
- _____. The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, about B.C. 2200. 3 vols. London: Luzac and Co., 1900.
- Kinne, Aaron. An Explanation of the Principal Types, the Prophecies of Daniel and Hosea, the Revelation, and Other Symbolical Passages of the Holy Scriptures. Boston: Samuel T. Armstrong, 1814.
- Kissane, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1941.
- Kittel, Gerhard. " λογος ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by F. G. Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964-81.
- Kliefoth, Th. F. Das Buch Daniel. Schwerin: A. W. Sandmeyer, 1868.
- Knabenbauer, J. Commentarius in Daniele prophetam. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1891.
- Knight, G. A. F. A Christian Theology of the Old Testament. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959.
- _____. "The Book of Daniel." The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Koch, Klaus. Das Buch Daniel. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- _____. "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" Interpretation 39 (1985): 117-130.
- _____. " דָּנִיֵּאל מֹעֵד ." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984. 4:744-750.
- _____. Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1970.
- _____. "Spätisraelitisches Geschichtsdenken am Beispiel des Buches Daniel." Historische Zeitschrift 193 (1961): 1-32.
- _____. "Die Weltreicht im Danielbuch." Theologische Literaturzeitung 85 (1960): 830-831.

- Koch, K., and J. M. Schmidt, eds. Apokalyptik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- König, Eduard. Das Buch Jesaja. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1926.
- _____. Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936.
- _____. Die messianischen Weissagungen des AT. Stuttgart: Chr. Belser, 1925.
- König, Franz. Zarathustras Jenseitsvorstellungen und das Alte Testament. Vienna: Herder Verlag, 1964.
- Kosmala, Hans. "At the End of the Days." Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 2 (1963): 27-37.
- Kossen, H. B. "De oorsprung van de voorstelling der opstanding vit de doden in Dan 12:2." Nederlands(ch)e Theologisch Tijdschrift 10 (1955-56): 296-301.
- Kraeling, Emil G. The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Kraus, Hans Joachim. Psalmen. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- _____. Worship in Israel. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Kuhn, Karl G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960.
- Kutscher, E. Y. "Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon." Journal of Biblical Literature 76 (1957): 288-292.
- Lacocque, André. The Book of Daniel. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- _____. "Naissance de l'apocalyptique." Lumière et Vie 31 (1982): 4-12.
- Ladd, G. E. "Apocalyptic." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984. Pp.62-65.
- Laetsch, Theo. Bible Commentary: Jeremiah. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1965.

- Lagrange, M. J. "Les Prophetes Messianiques." Revue Biblique, n.s. 1 (1904): 491-520.
- Lambert, W. G. "Akkadian Prophecies." Journal of Cuneiform Studies 18 (1964): 7-30.
- _____. "Three Literary Prayers of the Babylonians." Archiv für Orientforschung 19 (1959-60): 47-66.
- Lambert, W. G., and A. R. Millard. Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Lamparter, Helmut. Prophet wider Willen. Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1964.
- Lamson, Justus G. The Eleventh of Daniel. Minneapolis, MN: J. G. Lamson, 1909.
- Landes, G. M. "Ammon." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. 1:108-114.
- Landsberger, B., and J. V. Kinnier Wilson. "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma elish." Journal of Near Eastern Studies 20 (1961): 154-179.
- Landsberger, B. "Zu den aramäischen Beschwörungen in Keilschrift." Archiv für Orientforschung 12 (1937-1939): 247-257.
- Lang, G. H. The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1940.
- Langdon, Stephen H. The Babylonian Epic of Creation. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- _____. Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek. Vol. 4. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912.
- Lange, John P. Genesis. Lange's Commentary. Translated and enlarged by Tayler Lewis and R. A. Gosman. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- _____. Numbers. Lange's Commentary. Translated and enlarged by Samuel T. Lowrie and R. A. Gosman. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Larkin, Clarence. The Book of Daniel. Philadelphia: C. Larkin, 1929.

- LaRondelle, Hans K. The Israel of God in Prophecy. Andrews University Monographs (Studies in Religion). Vol. 13. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.
- Lattey, C. The Book of Daniel. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1948.
- Lebram, Jürgen-Christian. Das Buch Daniel. Zürcher Bibel. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984.
- _____. "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel." Vetus Testamentum 25 (1975): 722-736.
- _____. "Die Weltreiche in der Jüdischen Apocalyptik." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 76 (1964): 328-331.
- _____. "Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Daniel-forschung," Journal for the Study of Judaism 5 (1974): 1-33.
- Lee, Samuel. An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy. Cambridge: University Press, 1849.
- Lefevre, André. "L'expression 'en ce jour-là' dans le livre d'Isaie." Melanges Bibliques. Travaux de L'institut Catholique de Paris 4 (Paris: Blond and Gay, 1957), 174-179.
- Lemaire, André. "Probable Head of Priestly Scepter from Solomon's Temple Surfaces in Jerusalem." Biblical Archaeologist Review 10.1 (1984): 24-29.
- Lengerke, Caesar von. Das Buch Daniel. Königsberg: Verlag Bornträger, 1835.
- Leslie, Elmer A. Jeremiah. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Daniel. Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969.
- _____. Exposition of Isaiah. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.
- _____. Genesis. Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942.
- Levy, J. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim. Leipzig: Gustav Engel, 1867.

- Lewis, Jack P. " אָד (*yā^cad*) *appoint, betrothe, assemble, meet, set.*" Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer, Jr., and B. K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 1:387-389.
- Lidzbarski, Mark. "An Old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 26-29.
- Liebi, Roger. Weltgeschichte im Visier des Propheten Daniel. Berneck: Schwengeler Verlag, 1986.
- Lindblom, Joh. "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?" Studia Theologica 6 (1952): 79-114.
- Lindenberger, James M. "Ahiqar." The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1985.
- _____. "Dan 12:1-4." Interpretation 39 (1985): 181-186.
- Lindsay, Gordon. The Prophecies of Daniel. Dallas: Christ for the Nations, 1982.
- Lipinski, E. "אֲחִיקָר בְּתוֹכָם בְּפָנֵי מֶלֶךְ בְּאֶרֶץ אֲשׁוּרִים" dans les textes pre-exiliques." Vetus Testamentum 20 (1970): 445-450.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Lods, Adolphe. La croyance a la vie future et le culte des morts dans l'antiquité israelite. Paris: Fischbacher, 1906.
- Loewenstamm, Samuel E. "Eine lehrhafte ugaritische Trinkburleske." Ugaritische Forschungen 1 (1969): 71-77.
- Lohse, Eduard. Die Texte aus Qumran. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.
- Lord, David N. The Coming and Reign of Christ. New York: Frankling Night, 1858.
- Lowth, William. A Commentary upon the Prophecy of Daniel and the Twelve Minor Prophets. London: W. Mears, 1726.
- Luckenbill, Daniel D. The Annals of Sennacherib. Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924.

- Ludwigson, R. A Survey of Bible Prophecy. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973.
- Lust, J. "'Gathering and Return' in Jeremiah and Ezekiel." Le livre de Jeremie. Bibliothika Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: University Press, 1981.
- Luther, Martin. Auslegung des Alten Testaments. Dr. Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften. 23 vols. Edited by J. G. Walch. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1881-1904.
- _____. "Luthers Vorrede über den Propheten Daniel." D. Martin Luthers Deutsche Bibel. Martin Luthers Werke. Weimar ed. Vol. 11 Weimar: Hermann Böhlans Nachfolger, 1960.
- _____. D. Martin Luthers Werke. Weimar ed. Vol. 7. Weimar: Hermann Böhlans Nachfolger, 1897.
- Lyon, D. G. Keilschrifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1883.
- Macalister, R. A. Stewart. "Twenty-First Quarterly Report on the Excavation of Gezer." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 87-105.
- Maher, Michael. Genesis. Old Testament Message. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982.
- Maier, Gerhard. Der Prophet Daniel. Wuppertaler Studienbibel. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982.
- Maitland, Samuel R. An Attempt to Elucidate the Prophecies Concerning Antichrist: With Remarks on Some Works of J. H. Frere. London: Francis and John Rivington, 1853.
- _____. An Enquiry into the Grounds on Which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John Has Been Supposed to Consist of 1260 Years. 2nd ed. London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1837.
- Maly, E. H. "Genesis." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Margalit, Baruch. "Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part II:KTU 1.19)." Ugaritische Forschungen 16 (1984): 119-179.
- Marsh, John. The Fullness of Time. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

- Marti, Karl. Das Buch Daniel. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.
- _____. Das Buch Jesaja. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.
- Martin-Achard, Robert. From Life to Death. A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament. Translated by J. P. Smith. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- Martin, Alfred, and John A. Martin. Isaiah: the Glory of the Messiah. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Martyr, Justin. Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew. Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1:236-252.
- Mason, Archibald. Two Essays on Daniel's Prophetic Number of Two Thousand Three Hundred Days: And on the Christian's Duty to Inquire into the Church's Deliverance. Glasgow: Young, Gallie, and Co., 1820.
- Matthews, Isaac G. Ezekiel. An American Commentary on the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1939.
- Maurer, Franz J. Commentarius Grammaticus Criticus in Vetus Testamentum. Leipzig: F. F. Volckmar, 1838.
- Mauro, Philip. The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation. Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, 1944.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. God Cares. Vol. 1. Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981.
- Mayer, R. "Der Auferstehungsglaube in der iranischen Religion." Kairos 7 (1965): 194-207.
- Mayes, A. D. H. Deuteronomy. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1979.
- Mays, James L. Hosea. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- McGinn, B. Apocalyptic Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- McKenzie, John L. "Vengeance Is Mine." Scripture 12 (1960): 33-39.
- M'clintock, J., and J. Strong. Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature. 12 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, Pub., 1888.

- McNamara, M. "Seventy Weeks of Years." New Catholic Encyclopedia. 17 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Mede, Joseph. "The Apostasy of the Latter Times." The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede. London: Roger Norton, 1677.
- _____. "Discourses on Divers Texts of Scripture." The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede. London: Roger Norton, 1677.
- _____. "His Epistles." The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede. London: Roger Norton, 1677.
- Melanchthon, Philip. Philippi Melanthonis [sic] Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia in Corpus Reformatorum. 28 vols. Edited by Carolus G. Bretschneider. Halis Saxonum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1834-60; reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1963.
- Merrill, E. H. "Fixed Dates in Patriarchal Chronology." Bibliotheca Sacra 137 (1980): 241-251.
- Mertens, A. Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer. Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien, no. 12. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971.
- Meyer, Eduard. Ursprünge und Anfänge des Christentums. 2 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1921.
- Meyer, L. de, H. Gasche, and F. Vallat, eds., Fragmenta Historiae Aelamicae. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1986.
- Meyer, Rudolf. Hebräische Grammatik. Sammlung Göschen. 3 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1969.
- Michaelis, Joham D. "Daniel secundum septuaginta, ex tetraplis Origenis," Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek 4 (1773): 1-44.
- Michelson, A. B. Daniel and Revelation. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1984.
- Miles, Charles P. Lectures, Expository and Practical, on the Book of the Prophet Daniel. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1841.
- Milik, J. T. The Books of Enoch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

- Millard, A. R. "Daniel." The International Bible Commentary. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Miller, P. D. "Moabite Stone." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 4 vols. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979-1988. 3:396-398.
- Miller, William. Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A.D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years. Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833.
- Milligan, E. M. Is the Kingdom Age at Hand? New York: George H. Doran, 1924.
- Mitchell, H. G. Isaiah. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1897.
- Möller, W. Andreas Osiander. Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965.
- Montgomery, James A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927.
- Moore, George F. Judaism. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.
- Moore, Michael S. The Balaam Traditions. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- _____. "Resurrection and Immortality: Two Motifs Navigating Confluent Theological Streams in the Old Testament (Dan 12, 1-4)." Theologische Zeitschrift 39 (1983): 17-34.
- More, Henry. An Illustration of Those Two Abstruse Books in Scripture, the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John. London: Flesher, 1685.
- Morgenstern, Julian. The Book of Genesis. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.
- Moriarity, F. L. "Numbers." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Morkholm, Otto. Antiochus IV of Syria Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1966.
- Morris, Leon. Apocalyptic. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972.

- _____. "The Wrath of God." Expository Times 63 (1951-52): 142-145.
- Morrow, Francis J. "11 Q Targum Job and the Massoretic Text." Revue de Qumran 8 (1973): 253-256.
- Mounce, Robert H. The Book of Revelation. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Muilenburg, James. "The Biblical View of Time." Harvard Theological Review 54 (1961): 225-252.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Notizen zu althebräischen Inschriften I." Ugaritische Forschungen 2 (1970): 229-242.
- _____. Ursprünge und Strukturen alttestamentlicher Eschatologie. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, no. 109. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1969.
- Munch, Peter A. The Expression bajjôm hahu'. Is it an Eschatological terminus technicus? Avhandling utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1936.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI." Journal of Jewish Studies 25 (1974): 425-443.
- _____. "Notes on the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI." Revue de Qumran 9 (1975): 117-125.
- Murphy, J. G. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Genesis. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1866.
- Myres, J. D. "Gog and the Danger from the North in Ezekiel." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 64 (1932): 213-219.
- Nägelsbach, Carl W. E. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Lange's Commentary. Translated by S. S. Asbury. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- _____. The Prophet Isaiah. Lange's Commentary. Translated by Samuel T. Lowrie and Dunlop Moore. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Nelson, Richard D. First and Second Kings. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987.

- Nevin, Robert. Studies in Prophecy. Londonderry: James Montgomery, 1890.
- Newell, Philip R. Daniel: The Man Greatly Beloved and His Prophecies. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962.
- Newman, John Henry. "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist." The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review 28 (1840): 391-440.
- Newton, Benjamin W. First Series of Aids to Prophetic Enquiry. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1850.
- Newton, Thomas. Dissertations on the Prophecies. 1782; reprint, London: J. F. Dove, 1839.
- Nichol, Francis D. The Midnight Cry. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1944.
- _____, ed. The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-57.
- Nicholson, E. W. Jeremiah 1-25. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- _____. Jeremiah 26-52. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1975.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Harvard Theological Studies. Vol. 26. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson. Numeri. Expositor's Bible. New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908.
- Niditch, Susan. The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition. Harvard Semitic Monographs 30. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Nikel, Johannes. Grundriß der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.
- Nikolainen, Aimo T. Der Auferstehungsglauben in der Bibel und ihrer Umwelt. N. p.: Druckerei der finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1944.
- Noordtzijs, A. Numbers. Bible Students Commentary. Translated by Ed van der Maas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

- Noth, M. Gesammelte Studien zum AT. Theologische Bücher. Vol. 6. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957.
- _____. Numeri. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben. Würzburg, 1926; reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.
- Nougayrol, Jean. "Une version ancienne du 'just souffrant'." Revue Biblique 59 (1952): 239-250.
- Nunez, Samuel. "The Vision of Dan 8: Interpretations from 1700-1900." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1987.
- Oberhuber, Karl. "Zur Syntax des Richterbuches." Vetus Testamentum 3 (1953): 2-45.
- O'Leary, De Lacy. Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1923.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo, et al., eds. The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago: Oriental Insititute, 1956-.
- Orelli, Conrad von. Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit genetisch und sprachvergleichend dargestellt. Leipzig: Lorentz, 1871.
- Origen Against Celsus. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 4:573-610.
- _____. Commentariorum in Genesim. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 12:45-146.
- Osbon, A. M. Daniel Verified in History and Chronologie. New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1856.
- Osswald, Eva. "Zum Problem der vaticinia ex eventu." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 75 (1963): 27-44.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit. Theologische Existenz Heute. No. 157. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1969.
- Oswalt, J. "The Golden Calves and the Egyptian Concept of Deity." Evangelical Quarterly 45 (1973): 13-20.

- Owens, John J. Daniel. Broadman Bible Commentary. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1971.
- Ozanne, C. G. The Fourth Gentile Kingdom. Worthing, West Sussex: H. E. Walter, 1982.
- _____. "Three Textual Problems in Daniel." Journal of Theological Studies 16 (1965): 445-448.
- Parker, Thomas. The Visions and Prophecies of Daniel Expounded: Wherein the Mistakes of Former Interpreters are Modestly Discovered. London: Edmund Paxton, 1646.
- Patrick, Symon, et al. "Daniel." A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament. 4 vols. Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846.
- Patterson, R. D. "שָׁלוֹם (šūp) come to an end, cease." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris; G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 2:620.
- Payne, J. Barton. Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- _____. "The Goal of Daniel's Seventy Weeks." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 21 (1978): 97-115.
- Peake, Arthur S. The Book of Isaiah. International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures. 2 vols. Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 1912.
- _____. "Genesis." A Commentary on the Bible. London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1919.
- Pehlke, Helmuth. "An Exegetical and Theological Study of Genesis 49:1-28." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Peiser, Felix E. Texte juristischen und geschäftlichen Inhalts. Sammlung assyrischer und babylonischer Texte in Umschrift und Übersetzung. Vol. 4. Edited by E. Schrader. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1896.
- Pember, George H. The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. Prophecy for Today. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961.

- _____. Things to Come. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958.
- Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary: Numbers. Translated by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silberman. London: Shapiro, Valentine and Co., 1946.
- Petrie, Arthur. The Message of Daniel. Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1947.
- Petri, Johann Ph. Aufschluß der Zahlen Daniels und der Offenbarung Johannis. N.p., 1768.
- Pettingill, William L. Simple Studies in Daniel. 3rd ed. Harrisburg, PA: Fred Kelker. 1914.
- Pfeiffer, Ch. F., H. F. Vos, and J. Rea. Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1975.
- Phillips, Anthony. Deuteronomy. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- Pilcher, Charles V. The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought. New York: Macmillan, 1940.
- Pilcher, E. J. "An Old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 33-34.
- Piper, O. A. "Johannesapokalypse," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 3rd ed. 7 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. 3:826.
- Plaut, W. Gunther. The Torah. New York: Union of Hebrew Congregations, 1981.
- Ploeg, J. P. M. van der. "Eschatology in the Old Testament." The Witness of Tradition. Oudtestamentische Studien. Vol. 17. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Ploeg, J. P. M. van der, and A. S. van der Woude. Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumran. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971. Pp. 89-99.
- Plöger, Otto. Das Buch Daniel. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.
- _____. Theokratie und Eschatologie. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 2. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1962.
- Polybius The Histories. 6 vols. Translated by W. R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann, 1954.

- Polychronius In Daniele in Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio e vaticanis codicibus edita. Edited by Angelus Maius. 10 vols. Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1825-1831.
- Porten, Bezalel and Jonas C. Greenfield, Jews of Elephantine and Arameans of Syene. Jerusalem: Academon, 1976.
- Porteous, Norman. Daniel. 2nd rev. ed. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1979.
- Preuß, Horst D., ed. Eschatologie im Alten Testament. Wege der Forschung. Vol. 480. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.
- _____. Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 87. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968.
- _____. " נְבִיא נִיחָה." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:297-307.
- Price, George McCready. The Greatest of the Prophets. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955.
- Price, Walter K. In the Final Days. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- Prince, J. Dyneley. A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Procksch, Otto. Jesaja I. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1930.
- Prophezie und Eschatologie. Bibelkonferenz Marienhöhe. Darmstadt: n. p. 1982.
- Pusey, Edward B. Daniel the Prophet. New York: Funk and Wagnells, 1885.
- _____. The Minor Prophets. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.

- Rabinowitz, Jacob J. "The Meaning of the Phrase נמר אי יום אחרון in the Aramaic Papyri." Journal of Near Eastern Studies 14 (1955): 59-60.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Das erste Buch Mose. 4 vols. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.
- _____. " אֱלֹהִים ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
- _____. "Theologische Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament." Theologische Zeitschrift 4 (1948): 161-174.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Ramm, B. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1956.
- Ramsey, William. An Exposition of the Book of Daniel: With Practical Observations. Edinburgh: Thomas Grant, 1853.
- Rawlinson, George. Isaiah. 2 vols. Pulpit Commentary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913.
- _____. 2 Kings. Pulpit Commentary. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.
- _____. Psalms. 3 vols. Pulpit Commentary. London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1897.
- Rehm, Martin. Der königliche Messias. Eichstätter Studien. N. F., no. 1. Kevelaer, Rheinland: Butzon und Bercker, 1968.
- Reid, Robert. The Seven Last Plagues: or Vials of the Wrath of God. Pittsburgh: D. and M. Maclean, 1828.
- Reider, Joseph. Deuteronomy. The Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1937.
- Renckens, H. The Prophet of the Nearness of God--Isaiah. Translated by James M. Boumans. De Pere, WI: St. Norbert Abbey Press, 1969.

- Reventlow, Henning Graf. The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Ridderbos, J. Deuteronomy. Bible Students Commentary. Translated by Ed M. van der Maas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub., 1984.
- _____. Isaiah. Bible Students Commentary. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- Rigaux, Beda. Dieu l'a ressuscité. Gembloux: Ducutot, 1973.
- Riggans, Walter. Numbers. Daily Study Bible Series. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns," Tradition und Situation. Schilderungen zur AT Prophetie. Festschrift für A. Weiser. Edited by E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.
- _____. The Faith of Qumran. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.
- Roberts, Lawrence G. A. Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. London: Covenant Pub. Co., 1931.
- Robertson Nicoll, W. Numeri. Expositors Bible. New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908.
- Robinson, J. The Second Book of Kings. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1976.
- Rohling, A. Das Buch des Propheten Daniel. Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1876.
- Ronzevalle, S. "The Gezer Hebrew Inscription." Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 41 (1909): 107-112.
- Rosenmüller, Ernst F. C. "Daniel." Scholia in Vetus Testamentum. Part 10. Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1832.
- Rosenthal, Franz. "Canaanite and Aramaic Inscriptions." Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Third ed. with supplement. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 1969. 501-503.
- _____. A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Porta linguarum orientalium. Vol. 5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

- Rost, Leonhard. "Alttestamentliche Wurzeln der ersten Auferstehung." In memoriam E. Lohmeyer. Edited by W. Schmauch. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951.
- Rowland, Christopher, The Open Heaven. New York: Crossroads, 1982.
- Rowley, H. H. Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959.
- _____. "The Marriage of Hosea." Men of God. Studies in OT History and Prophecy. London: Thomas Nelson, 1963.
- _____. "The 'Prince of the Covenant' in Daniel 11:22." The Expository Times 55 (1943-44): 24-27.
- _____. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- _____. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Rudolph, W. Hosea. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1966.
- _____. Jeremiah. Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947.
- Rüger, Hans P. "Zu RS 24.258." Ugaritische Forschungen 1 (1969): 203-206.
- Rule, William H. An Historical Exposition of the Book of Daniel the Prophet. London: Seeley, Jackson and Halliday, 1869.
- Russell, D. S. Daniel. Daily Study Bible Series. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- _____. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. OTL Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Ryan, D. "Hosea." A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1969.
- Sachau, Eduard. Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.
- Saebø, M. "דָּרְיָאֵשׁ." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 7 vols. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1982. 3:566-570.

- Sahlin, Harald. "Antiochus IV und Judas Makkabäus." Studia Theologica 23 (1969):41-68.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. The Origins of Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- "Sanhedrin." The Babylonian Talmud. 2 vols. Translated by H. Freedman. London: Soncino Press, 1935.
- Sargent, H. N. The Marvels of Bible Prophecy. London: Covenant Publishing, 1938.
- Sawyer, John F. A. Isaiah. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- Saydon, P. P. "Daniel." A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. London: Th. Nelson and Sons, 1953.
- Schebo, W. A. Gog and Magog. St. Paul: W. A. Schebo, n.d.
- Scheil, V. "Fragments de la legende du dieu zû." Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale 35 (1938): 14-25.
- Schilling, Othmar. Der Jenseitsgedanke im Alten Testament. Mainz: Rheingold, 1951.
- Schlatter, D. A. "Die B^onê parisîm bei Daniel: 11,14." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 14 (1894): 145-151.
- Schmidt, H. "Die Ehe des Hosea." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 42 (1924): 245-272.
- Schmidt, Joh. M. Die jüdische Apokalyptik. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Schmithals, Walter. Die Apokalyptik. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973.
- Schott, Albert. "Die Vergleiche in den akkadischen Königsinschriften." Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft 30 (1926): 1-255.
- Schrader, Eberhard, ed. Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten. 5 vols. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889-96.
- Schreiner, Josef. Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1969.

- _____. "Hoseas Ehe, ein Zeichen des Gerichts." Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 163-183.
- Schroeder, Wilhelm, Julius. Das Deuteronomium. Lange's Bibelwerk. Bielefeld: Verlag von Velhagen und Klasing, 1866.
- Schubert, K. "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur früh-rabbinischen Zeit." Biblische Zeitschrift 6 (1962): 177-214.
- Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973. 1:151-152.
- Schwally, Friedrich. Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums einschließlich des Volksglaubens im Zeitalter Christi. Giessen: J. Ricker, 1892.
- Schwantes, Siegfried, J. "Ereb Böger of Dan 8:14 Re-examined." Andrews University Seminary Studies 16 (1978): 375-85.
- Seebass, Horst. "אָרִיחַ 'ach^arīth." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1974. 1:207-212.
- _____. "אָרִיחַ 'ach^arīth." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 7 vols. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1973. 1:224-228.
- Segal, J. B. "'yrh' in the Gezer 'Calendar'." Journal of Semitic Studies 7 (1962): 212-221.
- Seiss, Joseph A. Voices from Babylon. Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1879.
- Sellin, Ernst. "Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben." Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift 30 (1919): 232-256.
- _____. Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912.
- Seybold, Klaus. "Das Herrscherbild des Bileamorakels Num. 24,15-19." Theologische Zeitschrift 29 (1973): 1-19.
- Shankel, George E. God and Man in History. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1967.

- Shea, William H. "Early Development of the Antiochus Epiphanes Interpretation." Symposium on Daniel. Daniel and Revelation Committee. Vol. 2. Edited by F. B. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- _____. "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Dan 9:25." Andrews University Seminary Studies 18 (1980): 59-63.
- _____. "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27." The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee. Vol. 3. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- _____. "The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9." The Sanctuary and the Atonement. Edited by A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshar. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.
- _____. Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series. Vol. 1. Washington D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982.
- _____. "Unity of Daniel." Symposium on Daniel. Daniel and Revelation Committee. Vol. 2. Edited by F. B. Holbrook. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- _____. "Wrestling with the Prince of Persia: A Study on Daniel 10." Andrews University Seminary Studies. 21 (1983): 225-250.
- Siegman, Edward F. "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 18 (1956): 364-379.
- Skinner, John. The Book of Ezekiel. The Expositor's Bible. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908.
- _____. Genesis. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910.
- Slotki, I. W. Isaiah. Soncino Books of the Bible (Series). London: Soncino Press, 1949.
- Smith, Charles R. The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter. London: Epworth, 1958.
- Smith, F. G. Prophetic Lectures on Daniel and Revelation. Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, 1941.

- Smith, George Adam. The Book of Deuteronomy. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.
- _____. The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908.
- Smith, J. Payne, ed. A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Smith, Samuel Alden. Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals, Königs von Assyrien (668-626 v. Chr.). 3 vols. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1887-1889.
- Smith, Uriah. The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Review and Herald, 1885; reprint, rev. ed. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1944.
- _____. The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII.14. Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1877.
- Smith, William, and Henry Wace, eds. A Dictionary of Christian Biography. 4 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877.
- Smyth, Kevin. "The Prophecy Concerning Judah: Gen 49:8-12." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 7 (1945): 290-305.
- Snow, S. S. Midnight Cry, May 2, 1844.
- Soden, Wolfram von. Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965-72.
- _____. "Neue Bruchstücke zur sechsten und siebenten Tafel des Weltschöpfungsepos Enuma eliš." Zeitschrift für Assyriologie. N. F. 13 (1942): 1-26.
- Sokoloff, Michael. The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University, 1974.
- Sparkes, Samuel. A Historical Commentary on the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel. Extending from the Days of Cyrus to the Crimean War. Binghamton: Adam and Lawyer Printers, 1858.
- Speiser, A. "Akkadian Myths and Epics." Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Third ed. with supplement. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. 60-119.

- _____. Genesis. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1964.
- Sperber, Alexander. The Bible in Aramaic. 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.
- Staerk, W. "Der Gebrauch der Wendung בְּאַרְמֵי־הַשָּׁמַיִם im at. Kanon." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 11 (1891): 247-253.
- Stemberger, Günter. "Das Problem der Auferstehung im Alten Testament." Kairos. N.F. 14 (1972): 273-290.
- Stevens, William C. The Book of Daniel. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1915.
- Strassmaier, J. N. "Inscriben von Nabopalassar und Smerdis." Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 4 (1889): 106-152.
- Strauss, Lehman. The Prophecies of Daniel. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1969.
- Streane, A. W. Jeremiah and Lamentations. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. London: C. J. Clay, 1891.
- Streck, Maximilian. Assurbanipal und die letzten Assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Niniveh's. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek. Vol. 7/1-3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916.
- Stroes, H. R. "Does the Day Begin in the Evening or in the Morning?" Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966): 460-475.
- Stuart, Moses. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1850.
- Sturdy, John. Numbers. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. The Old Testament and the Future Life. London: Burnes Oates and Washbourne, 1946.
- Syrus, Ephraem. In Daniele Prophetam in Opera Omnia Quae Extant Graece, Syriace, Latine. 6 vols. Rome: Typographia Pontificia Vaticana, 1737-1743.
- Talbot, Louis T. The Prophecies of Daniel. Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1940.
- Tanner, Joseph. Daniel and the Revelation. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898.

- Tarver, Samuel. Course and Culmination of Empire According to Prophecy. Louisville, KY: John P. Morton, 1866.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Biblical Doctrines of the Wrath of God. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.
- Tatford, Frederick A. Daniel and His Prophecy. London: Oliphants, 1953; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock, 1980.
- _____. The Minor Prophets. 1974; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publisher 1982.
- Taylor, John B. "Apocalyptic Literature." The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- _____. Ezekiel. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969.
- Taylor, R. K. "The Eschatological Meaning of Life and Death in the Book of Wisdom." Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses 42 (1966): 72-137.
- Taylor, William M. Daniel the Beloved. 1878; reprint, New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1919.
- Tertullian An Answer to the Jews. Ante-Nicene Fathers. 3: 154-172.
- Theodoret Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophete. Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857. 81:1255-1546.
- Thiering, B. E. "The Three and a Half Years of Elijah." Novum Testamentum 23 (1981): 41-55.
- Thompson, R. Campbell. Late Babylonian Letters. London: Luzac and Co., 1906.
- Thompson, R. Campbell, and Hamilton, R. W. "The British Museum Excavations on the Temple of Ishtar at Niniveh, 1930-31." Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology 19 (1932): 55-116.
- _____. The Epic of Gilgamesh. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Thompson, John A. The Book of Jeremiah. New International Commentary of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980.

- _____. Deuteronomy. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974.
- _____. "Moab, Moabites." Illustrated Bible Dictionary. 3 vols. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.
- Thomson, J. E. H. . Daniel. Pulpit Commentary. London: Paul Kegan, Trench, Trübner, 1898.
- Thureau-Dangin, Francois. Tablettes d'Uruk. Musee du Louvre, Textes Cuneiformes. Vol. 6. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1922.
- _____. "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra." Syria 18 (1937): 252.
- Thurman, William C. The Sealed Book of Daniel Opened: Or a Book of Reference for Those Who Wish to Examine the Sure Word of Prophecy. Boston, MA: Office of the "World's Crisis," 1867.
- Tkacik, Arnold J. "Ezekiel." Jerome Bible Commentary. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- Todd, James H. Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist in the Writings of Daniel and St. Paul. Dublin: The University Press, 1840.
- Toon, Peter, ed. Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1970.
- Torczyner, Harry. Lachish I: The Lachish Letters. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Towner, W. Sibley. Daniel. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.
- Tregelles, Samuel P. Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel. 8th ed. 1847; reprint, Chelmsford: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony, n.d.
- Tromp, Nicholas J. Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Tyso, Joseph. An Elucidation of the Prophecies. London: Jackson and Walford, 1838.
- Ullendorff, E. "Ugaritic Marginalia II." Journal of Semitic Studies 7 (1962): 339-351.

- Unger, Merrill F. Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.
- Ungnad, A. Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.
- Vallat, F. Suse et L'Elam. Paris: A.D.P.F., 1980.
- Vaulx, J. de. Les Nombres. Sources Biblique. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1972.
- Vawter, Bruce. Amos, Hosea, Micah. Old Testament Message. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981.
- _____. "The Canaanite Background of Genesis 49." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (1955): 1-18.
- _____. "Intimations of Immortality and the OT." Journal of Biblical Literature 91 (1972): 158-171.
- Vermeulen, J. Du prophete Isaie a l'apocalyptique. 2 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1977.
- vetter, Dieter. Seherspruch und Segensschilderung. Calwer Theologische Monographien. Reihe A: Bibelwissenschaft. Vol. 4. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974.
- Victorinus Commentary on the Apocalypse. Ante-Nicene Fathers. 7:344-360.
- Vincent, Thomas. "The Popish Doctrine, Which Forbiddeth to Marry, Is a Devilish and Wicked Doctrine." Puritan Sermons. 6 vols. Wheaton, IL: Richard Owen Roberts, 1981.
- Vine, W. E. Isaiah. London: Oliphant, 1946.
- Volz, D. Paul. Das Dämonische in Jahwe. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1924.
- _____. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.
- _____. Jesaja II. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.
- _____. Studien zum Text des Jeremiah. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1920.
- Vries, Simon J. de. Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Time and History in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975.

- Vriezen, Th. C. "Prophecy and Eschatology." Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 1 (1953): 199-229.
- Wächter, Ludwig. Der Tod im Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967.
- Wagner, M. "ךָ עֵשׂוֹת עֵדֵי." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT. 2 vols. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76. 2:661-663.
- Wallace, Ronald S. The Lord Is King. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979.
- Wallenstein, M. Hymns from the Judean Scroll. Manchester: University Press, 1950.
- _____. "Some Lexical Material in the Judean Scroll." Vetus Testamentum 4 (1954): 211-214.
- Walton, John H. "The Four Kingdoms of Daniel." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 29 (1986): 25-36.
- Walvoord, John F. Daniel. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.
- _____. Israel in Prophecy. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962.
- _____. The Revelation of Jesus Christ. Chicago: Moody Press, 1966.
- Ward, J. S. Hosea. A Theological Commentary. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Waterman, Leroy. Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire. University of Michigan Studies. Humanistic Series. Vol. 1-. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936.
- Weber, Robertus. Biblia Sacra. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.
- Weidner, Ernst. Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I. und seiner Nachfolger. Archiv für Orientforschung. Beiheft 12. 1959; reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- Weingreen, J. A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Weiss, Meir. "The Origin of 'the Day of the Lord'-- Reconsidered." Hebrew Union College Annual 37 (1966): 29-60.

- Weiss, R. "Further Notes on the Qumran Targum to Job." Journal of Semitic Studies 19 (1974): 13-18.
- Wellhausen, J. Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. 6th ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907.
- Wenham, Gordon. Numbers. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981.
- West, Nathaniel. Daniel's Great Prophecy. The Eastern Question. The Kingdom. New York: Hope of Israel Movement, 1898.
- Westermann, Claus. Genesis. 2 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.
- Whitaker, Richard E. A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Whitcomb, John C. Daniel. Everyman's Bible Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- White, E. G. The Great Controversy. 1888; reprint, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911.
- _____. Prophets and Kings. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1917.
- Whitelaw, Thomas. Genesis. Pulpit Commentary. London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1913.
- Whitla, William. Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse. London: John Murray, 1922.
- Whitley, C. F. "Kohleth and Ugaritic Parallels." Ugaritische Forschungen 11 (1979): 811-824.
- Widengren, Geo. Religionsphänomenologie. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1969.
- Wiedner, N. "The Term in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry." Journal of Jewish Studies 5 (1954): 22-31.
- Wijngaards, J. "Death and Resurrection in Covenantal Context: Hos 6,2." Vetus Testamentum 17 (1967): 226-239.

- Wiklander, Bertil. "דָּבַר זָמָם." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1977. 4:106-111.
- _____. Prophecy as Literature. Coniectanea Biblica. OT Series. Vol. 22. Malmö: Liber Förlag, 1984.
- Wilch, John R. Time and Event. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Wildberger, Hans. Jesaja. 3 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972-1982.
- _____. "Jesajas Verständnis der Geschichte." Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 9 (1963): 83-117.
- Williams, R. J. Hebrew Syntax: An Outline. 2nd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Willis, John T. "The Expression *be'acharith hayyamin* [sic] in the Old Testament." Restoration Quarterly 22 (1979): 54-71.
- Willison, John. A Prophecy of the French Revolution, and the Downfall of the Antichrist: Being Two Sermons Preached Many Years ago. Reprint. London: J. Forbes, 1793.
- Winterbotham, R. Numbers. Pulpit Commentary. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913.
- Wiseman, Donald J. Chronicles of Chaldean Kings. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1956.
- _____. The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon. London: The British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1958.
- Wolf, Herbert. "דָּבַר (zāmam) purpose, devise, consider." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris, G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 1:244-245.
- Wolff, Hans W. Dodekapropheten 1. Hosea. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. 2nd ed. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
- _____. Hosea. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Wood, Leon J. A Commentary on Daniel. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973.

- _____. " הָרָא (*hārā*) *burn, be kindled.*" Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edited by R. Laird Harris, G. L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 1:322.
- Wordsworth, Christopher. "Daniel." The Holy Bible. Vol. 6. London: Rivingtons, 1872.
- _____. "The Five Books of Moses." The Holy Bible. London: Rivingtons, 1869.
- Woude, A. S. van der. "Das Hiobtargum aus Qumran Höhle XI." Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 9 (1963): 322-331.
- Wright, Charles H. H. Daniel and His Prophecies. London: Williams and Norgate, 1906.
- The Writings. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1982.
- Würthwein, E. Der Text des Alten Testaments. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1973.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. Foes from the Northern Frontier. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982.
- _____. "Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 23 (1980): 13-21.
- York, Anthony D. "11 Qtg Job XXI, 4-5 (Job 32,13)." Revue de Qumran 9 (1975): 127-129.
- Young, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah. 3 vols. New International Commentary of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965.
- _____. The Prophecy of Daniel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949.
- Young, Robert. The Holy Bible. London: Pickering and Inglis, 1937.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. The Second Book of Maccabees. Translated by Sydney Tedesche. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Zimmerli, W. Ezekiel. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Translated by J. D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979-1983.
- _____. Old Testament Theology in Outline. Translated by D. E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.

Zöckler, Otto. The Book of the Prophet Daniel. Lange's Commentary. Translated by J. Strong. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Zwingli, der Staatsmann in Zwingli, Hauptschriften. Vol. 7. Edited by F. Blanke, O. Farner, and R. Pfister. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1942.

Zyl, A. H. van. The Moabites. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.