The Role of Synthesis in Exegesis
Frank W. Hardy, PhD
Berrien Springs Symposium
March 9, 2023

Introduction

In this presentation it will seem that I am talking past Dr Li, that I am missing the point. I hope to show that this is not the case. If the goal of exegesis is to draw out of the text what the Holy Spirit has put into it, we will need to draw more than one thing. There will need to be a wide range of data inputs. In what follows I introduce arguments from syntax, the author's choice of terminology, and parallels of various kinds. My purpose in bringing such disparate factors together is to produce a cohesive exegetical synthesis. It is not enough to bring out; we must also bring together, and this is something that cannot happen so long as we are dealing with primarily one factor.

It is not enough to disclaim broader goals.[1] In any given passage, until we know what period of history we are dealing with, it will not be possible to know what the pronouns refer back to. We are in danger of answering later questions before answering earlier ones. We are not ready for a discussion based primarily on the application of anaphoric rules. In what follows I would like to take one test case, discuss it in considerable depth, and show why the above goals cannot be set aside.

The problem is not confined to Dan 11. All four major apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel are saying roughly the same thing, with one empire replacing another through history. Nebuchadnezzar's concept was different from this. In his mind, if the first kingdom was gold (Dan 2), then everything must be gold (Dan 3). But God was showing him that his kingdom would not last. It would be followed by a kingdom different from his, and that one by another, and so on through a series of four kingdoms or empires. If the analysis we propose bypasses these major turning points in the chapter, we have fundamentally misunderstood Dan 11. Daniel's final prophecy begins without Babylon (I), briefly mentions Persia (II), gives a clear reference to Greece (III), and continues on from there in whatever way. That is the question. How does the chapter continue?

At issue is where to place the two transitions that follow Greece. I say two, rather than one, because in each of Daniel's major apocalyptic prophecies the fourth empire comes in two phases, which Seventh-day Adventists have generally identified as secular Rome (IVa) and spiritual Rome (IVb). Li's analysis does not deal with these transitions, and yet these are issues that cannot be avoided. If we don't get these things

---

[1] Li states that, "Since the primary purpose of my translation of Daniel 11 relates to the identity of the participants, that purpose was the guiding principle in the translation. That is, other matters, such as vocabulary, syntax, discourse segmentation, and chronological sequence, were not directly addressed. A full discussion of such matters would require separate studies, and perhaps even separate translations for each issue. Therefore, the translation offered here is not meant as the final word, but only as the basis or starting point for further discussion.

right, we will get them wrong. Only those which affect our understanding of the chapter's transitions will be of interest here.[2] This is different from what Li proposes doing, but we cannot set such matters aside and say meaningful things about the anaphoric references encountered in Dan 11. Here we take one bloc of verses as a test case (vss. 29-39), discuss it in depth, and show that, to be adequate, any translation will have to confront the matter of where one empire ends and another begins.

The verses considered below are 28-40. Doing this will have far-reaching implications for our understanding of what precedes, what follows, some concerns of the atheism caucus, and some technical details put forward in the translation. We begin with the syntax of vss. 28-30.

Syntax

Background

Dan 11:28 mentions two wars. We know these are different wars, because in them the king has different opponents. In the one case North is fighting against South; in the other, North is fighting against the holy covenant. If the king campaigns in the South and then returns home, that war is over. And similarly, if he fights against the holy covenant and returns home, that war is over as well. The first war (against the South) occupies vss. 25-28a. These verses have their own internal chiastic structure, which we will not be able to discuss here. See table 1.

Table 1
War Against the South
Šāb+Noun (Predicate) ESV

D	25d	for **plots** shall be devised against him.	Even **those who eat his food** shall break him.	26a	D'
C	25c	but he shall **not stand**,	His army shall **be swept away**, and many shall fall down slain.	26b	C'
B	25b	And the king of the south shall **wage war** with an exceedingly great and mighty army,	And as for the two kings, their hearts shall be bent on doing evil. They shall **speak lies** at the same table, but to no avail, for the end is yet to be at the time appointed.	27	B'
A	25a	And he shall **stir up** his power and his heart against the king of the south with a great army.	And he shall **return** to his land [*wᵉyāšōb ʾartsô*] with great wealth,	28a	A'

---

[2] For Li "the primary aim [is that] of making the identity of the participants clear to English readers" ("A Color Coded Translation of Daniel 11:2b-12:3," 1).

In the above structure lines AB:B'A' contain antithetical parallels (set out, return home; wage war, seek to avoid waging war), while lines CD:D'C' contain synonymous parallels (not stand = be swept away; plots devised against him = close associates break him). Adding more verses to this structure would destroy its balance.

Vs. 28b stands alone, because here the king fights, not against the South, but against the holy covenant. And having done so, he returns home. The word translated "return" in both vs. 28a and vs. 28b is *šāb*. See table 2.

Table 2
War Against the Holy Covenant
Šāb+Noun (Predicate) ESV

28b	but his heart shall be set against the holy covenant. And he shall work his will and return to his own land [*wᵉšāb lᵉʾarṣô*].

When *šāb* precedes a noun (N), as in the above examples, it is simply a predicate meaning "return." Thus, *wᵉyāšōb* and *wᵉšāb* both function as predicates meaning, in context, that the king returns home.

Šāb as an adverbial auxiliary

By contrast, when *šāb* immediately precedes a verb (not a noun), it no longer functions as a predicate. Instead, it serves as an auxiliary meaning "again." What gets repeated in such cases is the action of the following verb. This is one of two primary ways in which Hebrew expresses repetition.[3] Vss. 29-30 offer three examples of this. Here I use ESV as a baseline English translation, but ESV misses the adverbial sense of the above construction all three times it occurs. In the following tables I show what ESV does, what in my view it should have done, and how Li handles the same material. See table 3-5.

---

[3] There are many such auxiliaries. When *yāsap* (or *hôsîp*) serves as an auxiliary denoting repetition it points forward and implies that an occurrence of an earlier action is being extended; when *šāb* serves as an auxiliary it points back and implies that the current action is in some way similar to a previous one. In Hebrew the two auxiliaries are not synonymous. There are seven other verbs that can be used as auxiliaries denoting respectively willingness (*ʾābâ*), ability (*yākōl*), inception (*ḥēbēl*), haste (*mihar*), continuity (*halak*), abundance (*hirbâ*), completion (*killâ*), and carrying out or initiating an event (*qām*). Most of these are listed in Jarosław Chrzanowski, in Geoffrey Khan, gen. ed., *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013), s.v. Auxiliaries: Biblical Hebrew, p. 246.

Table 3
Two Wars Beginning
Šāb+VB (Auxiliary) ESV

29	At the time appointed he shall **return and come** [*yashub ubaʾ*] into the south, but it shall not be this time as it was before.
30a	For ships of Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be afraid and withdraw,
30b[i]	and shall **turn back and be enraged** [*wᵉshab wᵉzaʿam*] and take action against the holy covenant.
30b[ii]	He shall **turn back and pay attention** [*wᵉshab wᵉyaben*] to those who forsake the holy covenant.

Table 4
Two Wars Beginning
Šāb+VB (Auxiliary) Modified ESV

29	At the time appointed he shall **again come** [*yāšûb ûbāʾ*] into the south, but it shall not be this time as it was before.
30a	For ships of Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be afraid and withdraw,
30b[i]	and shall **again be enraged** [*wᵉšāb wᵉzāʿam*] and take action against the holy covenant.
30b[ii]	He shall **again pay attention** [*wᵉšāb wᵉyāben*] to those who forsake the holy covenant.

Table 5
Šāb+VB (Auxiliary) Li

29	At the appointed time he will **again come** [*yāšûb ûbāʾ*], but it will not be as at first or the last.
30a	Ships of Kittim will come against him. He will be disheartened and **turn back** [*wᵉšāb*].
30b[i]	He will **be indignant** [*wᵉzāʿam*] against the holy covenant and take action.
30b[ii]	He will **again pay attention** [*wᵉšāb wᵉyābēn*] to those who forsake the holy covenant.

In Li's proposed translation it is the second clause (*wᵉšāb wᵉzāʿam*) that requires comment. He separates *wᵉšāb* from *wᵉzāʿam*, placing these adjacent words in different clauses (vss. 30a and 30b[i] respectively). Such syntax would normally be subject to an adverbial interpretation, but Li does not consider this obligatory.[4] In the literature

---

[4] "So, in answer to your question, the possibility of a verb functioning adverbially does not force it to do so. Therefore, in the upcoming paper (which updates many details of my previous paper) I treat the three

available to me I do not find support for the above understanding of the syntax. The following quote is from the *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Literature*:

> Biblical Hebrew had two major auxiliary verb constructions: a two-finite-verb construction and, more commonly, an auxiliary+infinitive construction. . . .
> In the two-finite-verb construction, as in וַיָּ֥שָׁב וַיָּ֖לֶן שָׁ֑ם *wayyāšāb wayyālen šām* 'And he again (lit. 'and he returned and') spent the night there' (Judg. 19.7), the auxiliary verb always precedes the lexical verb, and both are finite verbs. Formally, in the surface structure, they look like two coordinate finite verbs, but in the underlying structure they form a syntactic and semantic unity denoting one and the same event. Their surface structure looks like a bi-clausal (or two-clause) structure, but their underlying structure is a mono-clausal (or one-clause) structure.[5]

I emphasize that auxiliary constructions "look like two coordinate finite verbs, but in the underlying structure they form a syntactic and semantic unity denoting one and the same event. Their surface structure looks like a bi-clausal (or two-clause) structure, but their underlying structure is a mono-clausal (or one-clause) structure."[6] This illustrates the concept of syndesis, or connectedness.[7] Thus, it appears that the syntax of constructions such as *wᵉšāb wᵉzāʿam*, having the form *šāb*+VB, should not be separated from each other, but should be interpreted together in an adverbial manner. The two verbs that come together to make up such constructions are separate only in their surface representation. In underlying structure they convey a single idea, which is that a given action is being repeated.[8]

Context

Even if Li's interpretation were optional, that still would not help, because separating the sense of the two verbs from each other would have to be motivated by contextual considerations and in fact the context of this passage solidly supports an adverbial reading. Consider the following points:

---

instances of שׁוּב + verb as possible rather than certain adverbial instances" (personal communication, 02/12/23).

[5] See for example: "שׁוּב as auxiliary verb, modifying another verb, denoting repetition, renewal of action, etc., usu. followed by a finite form of the other verb" (DCH, s.v. שׁוּב, Qal 32); "שָׁב followed by a second verb: to do again, be again" (Joüon, Gramm. §177b; in Akk. the vb. târu, see AHw. 1333b s.v. 6, is used in a correspondingly similar way)" (HAL, s.v. qal 5). See also EHLL, s.v. Auxiliaries: Biblical Hebrew; Waltke & O'Connor, Syntax, 39.3.1.b. I have used a modified form of Chrzanowski's transliteration schema, corresponding to what the reader will find elsewhere in the paper.

[6] Ibid.

[7] See Joüon P. & Muraoka T., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Third Reprint of the Second Edition, with Corrections*; Subsidia Biblica 27 (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), §177b-d, 610-611.

[8] In vs. 10 Li translates, "And again he will fight as far as his fortress" (Translation, 19). But elsewhere he suggests that, "although the verb שׁוּב in an earlier example (11:10) was explained as adverbial in meaning, it is also possible to read it as a regular verb, . . . In this alternative analysis, the verb וישב is understood in the regular meaning of שׁוּב 'to return,' rather than as an adverbial verb 'again'." (idem, 15). There is no need to translate in any way other than adverbially. Earlier in the verse the text says *yitgārû* ("they will fight") and later in the same verse it says *wᵉyāšōb wᵉyitgārû* ("again they will fight"). The againness of this construction is woven into the fabric of the text.

1. First, the meaning Li conveys is against the Hebrew accents. The word *wᵉnikʾâ* carries the accent *zaqef qatan*, which distances it from *wᵉšāb*. By contrast *wᵉšāb*, has the weaker accent *tevir*. Thus, the Masoretes saw *wᵉšāb wᵉzāʿam* as a single clause, separate from *wᵉnikʾâ*.
2. The syntax of *yāsûb ûbāʾ, wᵉšāb wᵉzāʿam,* and *wᵉšāb wᵉyāben* is the same in all three cases. There is no purely linguistic reason to treat one clause differently from the others.
3. Thematically, the king opposes those who support the covenant and supports those who oppose the covenant. From this it is clear that the author's intent was to express one thought in two correspondingly opposite ways. The thought is the same both times.
4. Apart from these matters, the rest of the section has nothing to say about a king of the South, so interpreting in such a way as to leave open the possibility of a Southern victory takes us nowhere.

Evangelical readings

There is an Evangelical understanding of vs. 30 that does not correspond closely with the text and that causes translators endless problems. I have already mentioned that ESV misses the sense of repetition in all three clauses (table 3 above), and it translates with four predicates rather than three: according to ESV the king "[1] shall be afraid [2] and withdraw, [3] and shall turn back [4] and be enraged" (vs. 30). Only predicates 1, 3, and 4 in this series have correlates in the Hebrew. The word "withdraw" is entirely gratuitous, although I grant that under other circumstances, i.e., if the syntax were different from what it is, such a reading would be lexically possible.[9] NASB takes a similar approach, combining predicates 1 and 2 from *wᵉnikʾâ* to get "withdraw in fear", but the root meaning is simply "be discouraged."[10] Thus, two English terms derive from one Hebrew word (*wᵉnikʾâ*), and again the concept of withdrawing is simply added.

The reason for such problems has to do with a historical application that many Evangelicals wish to support by applying vs. 30 to Popillius, the Roman legate who came and ordered Antiochus out of Egypt. Peterson captures the idea perfectly by suggesting, "When the Roman ships arrive, he will turn tail [*wᵉnikʾâ*] and go back home [*wᵉšāb*]" (Dan 11:30 MSG).

In Li's proposed translation the word "withdraw" appears, but is not added, because he associates *wᵉšāb* with *wᵉnikʾâ* in the preceding clause instead of with *wᵉzāʿam* which follows. This enables him to translate *wᵉšāb* as "withdraw" without adding a word that is not there (ESV) and without amalgamating two quite different words (*wᵉnikʾâ* and *wᵉšāb*, NASB). See table 6.

---

[9] D.J.A. Clines, ed., *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (*DCH*) sv. שׁוּב, 7a and 7b.
[10] *DCH*, s.v. **kʾh*.

Table 6
Comparison of ESV and Li
Vss. 30a-30b[i]

ESV		Li	
English	Hebrew	Hebrew	English
And he shall be afraid	*wᵉnikʾâ*	*wᵉnikʾâ*	He will be disheartened,
and withdraw,	-	*wᵉšāb*	and turn back.
and shall turn back	*wᵉšāb*	-	
and be enraged	*wᵉzāʿam*	*wᵉzāʿam*	He will be indignant against the holy covenant

In the popular view, if the "ships of Kittim" are Roman they are therefore Northern, which puts Antiochus in the curious role of a king of the South. Perhaps his presence in Egypt is seen as justification for this idea. But if the "ships of Kittim" are Southern, which makes sense in view of the fact that they oppose the king of the North, there is a question who wins. Translating in such a way as to allow for a Southern victory does not account for the fact that the king of the North dominates the rest of the section. There is no further reference to a king of the South until vs. 40.

My point is that there is a clear contrast between *šāb*+N and *šāb*+VB in vs. 28 and vss. 29-30 respectively, and that this contrast must be felt in the translation. See table 7.

Table 7
Summary of Šāb+N and Šāb+VB Constructions
in Dan 11:28-30

			Šāb+N (Predicate = "Return")	
28a	*wᵉyāšōb*	*ʾarṣô*	"return to his land"	South
28b	*wᵉšāb*	*lᵉʾarṣô*	"return to his land"	Holy covenant
			Šāb+VB (Auxiliary = "Do Again")	
29	*yāšûb*	*ûbāʾ*	"again come"	South
30a				
30b[i]	*wᵉšāb*	*wᵉzāʿam*	"again be enraged"	Holy covenant
30b[ii]	*wᵉšāb*	*wᵉyābēn*	"again pay attention"	

Terminology: Word Choices

Choosing terminology is not the same as obeying the rules of syntax. But although two different things are involved, they support each other here. This is what I meant by "synthesis" in the title of the presentation, i.e., that seemingly unrelated things must come together in a unified interpretation.

LaRondelle

LaRondelle was not thinking of syntax when he made the following observation. He was merely pointing out that, when Dan 11 moves forward into the period after the cross, we would expect to see things become more spiritual.

> The critical question is: where in the outline series of Dan 11 does the prophetic portrayal pass the first advent of Christ and also enter into the time of the end? The series of Dan 11 may be believed to enter the time after the cross of Christ from verse 31 onward, because verse 31 speaks about the setting up of 'the abomination that makes desolate' (RSV) , profanation of the temple. the taking away of the 'continual' (burnt offering) or 'daily' (mediation service).[11]

Here LaRondelle is understating his case. See table 8.

Table 8
Terms of Spiritual Significance in Dan 11

Ref.	Hebrew	English (ESV)
Dan 11:2-15 (x1)		
11:14	*hekhazon*	The vision
Dan 11:16-28 (x3)		
11:16	*ʾerets-hatstsebi*	The glorious land
11:17	*bat hannashim*	The daughter of women
11:22	*negid berit*	The prince of the covenant
Dan 11:29-12:3 (x29)		
11:30	*berit qodesh*	The holy covenant
11:31	*hammiqdash hammaʿoz*	The temple and fortress (lit. the temple fortress)
11:31	*tamid*	The regular burnt offering (lit. the regular)
11:31	*shiqquts meshomem*	The abomination that makes desolate
11:32	*berit*	The covenant
11:32	*ʾelohayw*	Their God
11:33	*maśkile ʿam*	The wise among the people
11:35	*maśkilim*	The wise
11:35	*litsrop, lebarer, lalben*	Refined, purified, and made white
11:36	*kol-ʾel*	Every god
11:36	*ʾel ʾelim*	The God of gods

---

[11] "Interpretation of Prophetic and Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 243.

11:37	ʾelohe ʾabotayw	The gods of his fathers
11:37	khemdat nashim	The one beloved by women
11:37	ʿal-kol-ʾeloah	Any other god
11:38	ʾeloah maʿuzim	The god of fortresses
11:38	ʾeloah ʾasher loʾ-yedaʿuhu	A god whom his fathers did not know
11:39	ʾeloah nekar	A foreign god
11:41	ʾerets hatstsebi	The glorious land
11:41	ʾedom umoʾab wereʾshit bene ʿammon	Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites
11:42	mitsrayim	Egypt
11:43	mitsrayim	Egypt
11:43	lubim wekushim	The Libyans and the Cushites
11:45	har-tsebi-qodesh	The glorious holy mountain
12:1	mikaʾel haśśar haggadol	Michael, the great prince
12:2	yaqitsu	Shall awake
12:2	khayye ʿolam	Everlasting life
12:2	kharapot ledirʾon ʿolam	Shame and everlasting contempt
12:3	maśkilim	Those who are wise
12:3	matsdiqe harabbim	Those who turn many to righteousness

In the above table 1/33 = 3.0% of all spiritually relevant terms in Dan 11 occur in the first third of the chapter, and 3/33 = 9.1% occur in the second third. We don't start getting a heavy concentration of spiritual terms until the last third, where we find 29/33 = 87.9%.[12]

If someone were to object that "Egypt" is not a spiritual term in vss. 42 and 43, I grant that it is unspiritual, but its lack of spirituality is significant when contrasted with other similar ethnic and geographical things like "Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" (vs. 41), "the Libyans and the Cushites" (vs. 43), "the glorious land" (vs. 41), and "the glorious holy mountain" (vs. 45). If these form a set, the word "holy" cannot mean that in the final verses "the glorious holy mountain" is the only term that has spiritual significance. Saying so would break the obvious connection between "the glorious holy mountain" and "the glorious land," where the word "holy" is not used. I suggest that in vss. 42 and 43 "Egypt" has just as much spiritual significance as any of the corresponding terms. But let us say I am wrong. Remove the two references. In this case instead of 87.9% in the third section we would have 87.1%. So what have we accomplished by adjusting the list? A change occurs at the beginning of the third section, and is overwhelmingly supported by the data shown above.

In my view the above change involves not just terminology but a transition between empires. This occurs, not at vs. 31 (as LaRondelle suggests), or vs. 30 (as we might draw from the above list), but at vs. 29. The wars we find there are similar because the parties prosecuting them are similar. Here the first phase of Roman power gives way to the next. The transition between the two involves introducing a flood of spiritual terminology because spiritual Rome is, well, spiritual. Some change of this sort must occur in Dan 11 to maintain the parallels with earlier chapters and in my view it

---

[12] 81.8% if we exclude the two references to "Egypt," and it is true that "Egypt" is unspiritual, but this fact in itself has spiritual significance in the final verses.

happens here. We now seek to confirm the above hypothesis with material drawn from various types of parallels.

Parallels

In this section of the paper we examine parallels back to Dan 7 (25ab, 25c, 25d); within Dan 11 (29/35, 35/40); and forward to Dan 12 (11:35-36/12:6-7). Altogether there are six sets different of parallels, all converge on one point, i.e., that Dan 11:29-39, although bipartite, is still internally cohesive, that it occurs in the same timeframe as both 7:25c and 12:6-7, and that it leads up to and immediately adjoins the "time of the end" in vs. 40a.

Part 1: Dan 7:25ab

The transition which occurs in vss. 29-30 has its counterpart in Dan 7:23-25. After the terrible fourth beast with its ten horns, there is a little horn which "shall be different from the former ones" (see above). Immediately after this statement we come to Dan 7:25. Consider especially the first two clauses:

25a   He shall speak words against the Most High,
25b   and shall wear out the saints of the Most High,
25c   and shall think to change the times and the law;
25d   and they shall be given into his hand for a time, times, and half a time.

Notice that in 7:25ab pride is followed by violence, whereas in 11:29-35/36-39 violence is followed by pride. The only difference here is in the sequence of narration, and that is chiastic (AB:B'A').

Part 2: Dan 7:25c

Dan 7:25c mentions "the times and the law," while in Dan 11:29-35/36-39 the corresponding term is "covenant." I suggest that "the covenant" (or "holy covenant") in these verses includes the ten commandments within its scope, where God's creatorship is shown to be the basis for all His dealings with us, and all our dealings with Him.

Part 3: Dan 7:25d

The timeframe for the "time, times, and half a time" of 7:25d, and for what follows, is the same in both chapters. The same events are the same, the same issues are dealt with, and all of this takes place within the same timeframe.

Part 4: Dan 11:29/35

We now move on to parallels internal to Dan 11. The first Hebrew word of vs. 29 and the last of vs. 35 is *lammôʿēd*. Coming as these do at the beginning and the end of their half section, these paired occurrences of *lammôʿēd* provide a frame around the intervening verses. We note that this frame has to do only with vss. 29-35, and does not include vss. 36-39.[13] The same word (*lammôʿēd*) occurs earlier in the chapter (vs. 27), but its appearance there is not relevant to this discussion. The two references to an "appointed time" in vss. 29 and 35 are appointed moments marking the beginning and end of an appointed period, as noted from the parallel with 7:25d.

Part 5: Dan 11:35/40

With respect to vss. 36-39, just before 36 and just after 39 (i.e., 35 and 40) we find matching references to "the time of the end." The one reference says, "until the time of the end" (vs. 35), while the other says, "At the time of the end" (vs. 40). The important element in these phrases might seem to be "the time of the end," but our focus here will be on the words "until" and "at." These words must be interpreted together, as a pair. In English if we say, "Wait until 6:00 o'clock, then at 6:00 give me a call," the expectation is not that "at 6:00" means "at any time after 6:00." "Until" looks forward to a specific moment of time. That moment occurs when the period leading up to it stops.

But of course the verses in question were not written in English; they were written in Hebrew, and in Hebrew the preposition *bᵉ*- has a range of meanings.[14] Thus, the word "at" could be translated "in," "during," and in a variety of other ways, i.e., it could be translated quite flexibly if it were not for the parallel passage in vs. 35. The argument for a more general understanding of *bᵉ*- in vs. 40 will be successful if, and to the degree that, we set vs. 35 aside when interpreting vs. 40. But isolating the two verses from each other does not help us achieve a better understanding of either passage.

Because there is a clear link between *ʿēt qēṣ* and *ʿēt qēṣ*, and because this link creates a second one between *ʿad* and *bᵉ*-, no separation is possible. A majority of English translations get this right. English "at" refers to a moment of history because in context Hebrew *bᵉ*- refers to a moment of history, because this preposition links back to an earlier one, as discussed. There is a direct connection between waiting for something and the time when the period of waiting ends. What refers to a period of history in vs. 40 is *ʿēt qēṣ* ("the time of the end"), not *bᵉ*- ("at").

Summary: Parts 4 and 5

In both cases a section is framed by a matching pair of relevant expressions. The first pair, which demarcates vss. 29-35 in 29 and 35, could be called an inner frame

---

[13] This fact provides supporting evidence that vss. 29-30a and 30b-35 belong together in the same half-section.

[14] For example: "in, inside, within, among, inside, into, on, onto, upon, through, by, at, during, throughout," or, with infinitive construct, "when, whenever" (*DCH*, s.v. ־בְּ, of place/time.

because it resides within its section; while the second pair, which demarcates vss. 36-39 in 35 and 40, could be called an outer frame because it surrounds a section rather than occurring within it.

It is important that we keep the parts of the first frame together, (*lammôʿēd/lammôʿēd*), that we keep the parts of the second frame together (ʿ*ad/b*e- = "until"/"at"), and that we study the two frames together. All of these correspondences represent parts of what the Holy Spirit has put into the text for our instruction, and all must be drawn out and analyzed together. Notice the sequence: "and some of the wise shall stumble, so that they may be refined, purified, and made white, until **the time of the end** [ʿad ʿet-qets = outer frame = B], for it still awaits **the appointed time** [lammoʿed = inner frame = A]." The first phrase "the time of the end" pertains to the second frame (B), while the second phrase "the appointed time" pertains to the first frame (A). The sequence of narration is not AB; it is BA. The two frames do not merely cooccur in vs. 35; they interlock.

Part 6: Dan 12:6-7

There is another connection to notice. Much has been said about the thematic parallels between the "time, times, and half a time" in 7:25d, but there is also a set of verbal parallels linking 11:35-36 to 12:6-7. These come in five pairs. See table 9.

Table 9
Verbal and Thematic Parallels between Dan
11:35-36 and 12:6-7

11:35 (A)	11:36 (B)	12:6 (C)	12:7 (D)
until the time of the end		How long shall it be till the end	
the appointed time			for a time, times, and half a time
	niplaʾot ashtonishing things	*happelaʾot* of these wonders	
	till the [indignation] is accomplished		and when [the shattering of the power of the holy people] comes to an end *tiklena [kol-ʾelleh]* [all these things] would be finished

In the above table I have not reordered the clauses. This is the sequence in which they are narrated. There is an almost mathematical quality about the relationships shown here. If we use letters to designate the various columns, what we have is: row 1 = AC, row 2 = AD; row 3 = BC, and row 4 = BD. The parallels are laid out like a truth table (AC, AD; BC, BD), systematically showing all available combinations. The important thing, however, is to realize that vs. 35 is an integral part of 29-35, that vs. 36 is an integral part of 36-39, and that the timeframe for 7:25; 11:29-39; and 12:6-7 is the same.

Summary

In the course of this presentation I have drawn attention to various facts, which may be summarized as follows:

a. That 11:28 and 29-30 are syntactically distinct from each other;
b. That 11:29-35 is thematically parallel to 7:25b, and 11:36-39 to 7:25a;
c. That the "covenant" (or "holy covenant") of vss. 30b and 32 is thematically parallel to "the times and the law" in 7:25c;
d. That 7:25d supplies the timeframe for 7:25ab, and therefore the timeframe for 11:29-35/36-39, which is thematically parallel;
e. That a set of ten verbal parallels (5 & 5) links 11:35-36 to 12:6-7;
f. That vs. 35 does not represent a different period of history from the rest of vss. 29-35.
g. That vs. 36 does not occur in a different period of history from the rest of vss. 36-39.

h. That the parallels between 11:35-36 and 12:6-7 apply equally to all of vss. 29-35 and 36-39.
i. That 7:25d and 12:7 both describe the same prophetic period, i.e., the "time, times, and half a time" or 1260 days/years;
j. That the "appointed time" in 11:35 marks the end of the 1260 days;
k. That "until the time of the end" looks from vs. 35 to the "time of the end" in vs. 40;
l. That the "time of the end" begins at a specific moment of history;
m. That the "time, times, and half a time" and the "time of the end" adjoin each other chronologically. There is no space between them.

If the 1260 days end in 1798, as a majority of Seventh-day Adventists believe, and if the above relationships have been accurately represented, it follows that "At the time of the end" is a reference to 1798. Thus, the events of that year should have a strong influence on our understanding of vs. 40.

Verse 40

History

Nick Miller discusses the events of 1798 from a legal rather than military point of view, with special reference to the Justinian Code. He notes that, as regards the papacy, the religiously oriented Code of Justinian was made officially null and void in the city of Rome on February 15, 1798. This happened when "General Berthier declared Rome an independent republic and 'in consequence, every other temporal authority emanating from the old government of the Pope, is suppressed, and it shall no more exercise any function."[15] This pronouncement, made as part of Berthier's Bill No. 8, has no relation to any corresponding events in Paris that would promulgate the new Napoleonic Code more widely. Thus, the 1260 years of the papal Middle Ages coincides with the validity of the Justinian Code, as that Code relates to the papacy.

The same code had been made binding for the papacy, by Belisarius, in Rome, in March of AD 538. Belisarius could not have implemented this Code in 538 in the absence of an army; nor could Berthier have abolished it in 1798 in the absence of an army. Multiple factors are involved at both ends of the 1260 years.

And there are other factors besides these. Engel Yoder has done some interesting research on the Third Council of Orleans, which convened sometime during 538. Canon 28 of this Council forbade ordinary field labor on Sunday. This Canon is interesting because it is a Sunday law, but also because of the way violators were to be

---

[15] "Calculating the 1260-Year Prophecy," in Brasil de Souza, A. Rahel Wells, Laszlo Gallusz, and Denis Kaiser, edd., *Eschatology lfrom an Adventist Perspective: Proceedings of the Fourth International Bible Conference, Rome, June 11-20, 2018* (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2021), 559-572. See also LeRoy E. Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. 2: *Pre-Reformation and Reformation; Restoration, and Second Departure* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1948), 756-757.

punished: "If any one be found doing the works forbidden above, let him be punished, not as the civil authorities may direct, but as the ecclesiastical powers may determine."[16] The above Canon should be seen as a practical application of the more general grant of authority made available to the papacy by Belisarius in the early spring of that same year.

Conclusion

The concept of synthesis is meaningless if there is only one thing to synthesize. There must be multiple data inputs. Ironically, the more we multiply and diversify these inputs, the more cohesive our exegesis becomes. This much has to do with specific points of exegesis.

Having said all of the above, Li specifically asserts that, "since the primary purpose of my translation of Daniel 11 relates to the identity of the participants, that purpose was the guiding principle in the translation. That is, other matters, such as vocabulary, syntax, discourse segmentation, and chronological sequence, were not directly addressed." But until they have been, we will not know whether our anaphoric references are to a Greek or a Roman. If we don't know what empire we are dealing with, it will be difficult to know which individuals are being referenced. There must be some prior level of analysis. We must first be clear on where the points of transition are between one empire and another.

---

[16] A.H. Lewis, A Critical History of Sunday Legislation from 321 to 1888 A.D., 64.