

himself will be destroyed." pp. 259-60.

- ^6 The Apostle Peter tells us that the prophets "searched intently and with the greatest care, trying to find out the time and circumstances to which the Spirit of Christ in them was pointing" (1 Pet. 1:10-11).
- ^7 Cf. Dan. 2:35,44; 7:27.
- ^8 This particle occurs 39 times in Daniel 12. In that chapter the NIV renders it as "and" 12 times, as "but" 5 times, as "then" once, as "and then" once, as "so" once, and leaves it untranslated 19 times (but inserts "and" at two places where there is no *w^e* in the Hebrew text). It would be quite proper to render it here as "then" or as "but, and either of these renderings would fit the context far better than "so." This illustrates the fact that everyone who seeks to translate a passage from one language to another has to use a great deal of judgment. Attempts to make a simple word-for-word translation from one language to another are usually misleading, in view of the great differences in language usage.
- ^9 In Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 Christ refers to "the abomination that causes desolation" with reference to events that were then still in the future. Matthew's quotation also includes the words, "spoken through the prophet Daniel". In view of the points mentioned above this fact hardly suffices to prove that Daniel 12:10-12 is a prediction of the time of Antichrist. There is disagreement among New Testament scholars as to whether Jesus was speaking about the Roman war and the destruction of Jerusalem or about the final days of the age. He may have been referring to the difficult prediction in Daniel 9:27 or He may have been using the action of Antiochus as an illustration of something that is still future (see discussion on pp. 208-211). This rather cryptic matter can hardly overturn the strong reasons we have seen for believing that Daniel 12:10-12 points clearly to the crisis caused by Antiochus and not to the crisis discussed in verse 7.
- ^10 The King James Version was the culmination of more than half a century of efforts to find ways to put the thoughts of the Bible into the English language, as spoken by the people of the sixteenth century. Unless there were a similar series of efforts to do the same thing for the twentieth century we can hardly expect as accurate a translation into the language intelligible to the people of our own time. Yet the New International Version, which gathers the thoughts of many minds, is, on the whole, an excellent translation, and is far more useful than a version in a language that no one today can fully understand. The weakest part of the NIV is its translation of the prophetic books. When the editors of the KJV were not sure what