

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST  
INTERPRETATION OF TWO TIME PROPHECIES IN THE BOOK OF  
DANIEL - THE 2300 DAYS OF DANIEL 8 AND THE 70 WEEKS OF  
DANIEL 9.**

# **ASSUMPTION 1**

**The two Hebrew words in Dn8-12 translated by the English word “vision” each have specialised and different meanings which support the SDA argument that the 2300 days covers the *entire* vision of Dn8, not just the actions of the little horn.**

By Frank Basten

November, 1990

Copyright F.A.Basten, 1990.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>The Purpose of this Assumption</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Method of this Assumption</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>First Method: The Questions on Doctrine's Approach</b>	<b>7</b>
Preamble	7
Excerpts from Questions on Doctrine:	8
Summary of the Excerpt from Questions on Doctrine.	10
The Problems With the Method Used by Questions on Doctrine	12
Conclusion Regarding the Method Used by Questions on Doctrine.	36
<b>Second Method: Dr. William O'Shea's Approach</b>	<b>37</b>
A. Shea's statement on the meaning of <i>mar'ê</i> in Daniel 10.	38
B. Shea's Argumentation on the Meaning of <i>Mar'ê</i> and <i>Chazôn</i> .	40
C. A Rebuttal to Shea's theory of the meaning of <i>mar'ê</i> from Daniel 10.	42
D. Shea's Evidence of the meaning of <i>mar'ê</i> and <i>chazôn</i> in Daniel 8 and 9.	57
E. Conclusion on Shea's Method.	84
<b>Third Method: Dr. Gerhard Hasel's Approach.</b>	<b>85</b>
A. Excerpt From Hasel's 1979 <i>Ministry</i> Article.	85
Summary of Hasel's arguments	86
The meaning of <i>mar'ê</i>	87
Excerpts from Hasel's 1981 Writings	91
Excerpts from Hasel's 1986 Work:	94
Problems with Dr. Hasel's Method	97
Conclusion on Hasel's Arguments	106

<b>Recent SDA writers.</b>	<b>107</b>
Clifford Goldstein:	108
Donald Earnest Mansell.	109
Gerhard Pfandl	110
<b>Summary of Assumption 1.</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Appendix No.1 My proposal for the use of mar'ê and hazôn in Daniel</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Appendix No.2 The meaning of the phrase “the vision of the evening and the morning.”</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Appendix No.3 The incidence of the word “vision” in the Old Testament.</b>	<b>122</b>
CHESEV.	122
CHAZON	123
CHAZOTH (Hebrew)	126
CHAZUTH	126
CHIZZAYON	127
MACHAZEH	128
MARAH	128
MAREH	130
ROEH	137
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>138</b>

## The Purpose of this Assumption

Biblical Hebrew (BH) and Biblical Aramaic (BA) together use a variety of words for the English word “vision.” The two main words in focus in this paper are the Hebrew words chazôn and mar’eh.<sup>1</sup> The question is whether these words are synonymous and mean the same thing, or whether there are nuances in the word that we need to be cognizant of in order to understand their proper Biblical implication. SDA scholars have argued in the last fifty years that there is indeed a difference in meaning that impacts on the correct interpretation of Daniel chapters 8 and 9. The purpose of this first assumption is to provide a foundation for the arguments regarding the scope of the meaning of the word “vision” in Daniel’s apocalyptic visions of Dn8-12. This assumption is pivotal for the validity of the SDA rationale concerning the relationship between the 2300 days and the 70 weeks. If the meaning of the word refers to a specific part of the revelation in Dn8, then the mere mention of that word would then apply to that specific part of the revelation. To be specific, if the Hebrew word chazôn, means verses 3-12, and mar’ê means verses 13 and 14, then whenever these words occur, we can then say they are referring to those particular verses. This would greatly simplify the task of knowing just what part of the revelation either Daniel or Gabriel was referring to when they used the two different words for “vision.”

With the introduction of this argument based on the proposed meanings of the words by contemporary SDA scholars, a new layer of argumentation was added to the position of the pioneers of SDA historicism. Historicists thought they had an advantage that proved the validity of applying the 2300 days to the *whole vision* of Daniel 8 rather than to the *activities of the little horn* as described in a section of that same vision. We shall examine their methods for this rationale shortly. But before looking at this, I would like to present a table listing all the incidence of these different words for “vision” in the book of Daniel, and the actual text, so that readers can have easy reference to them. I will list them in the order they appear in the text and indicate the word used for “vision” in each case. I also include the Biblical Aramaic, since SDA scholars recognise the correlation between chazôn and chezev. They are colour-coded to indicate the incidence of the same word.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a variety of ways to transliterate these words depending on the software being used, its compatibility of the end use, and the convenience of the typing exercise. I have chosen this particular transliteration for its simplicity and its near accuracy. Other forms are given throughout the paper.

**TABLE 1. THE INCIDENCE OF THE WORD “VISION” IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.**

	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Text in KJV Version.</b>
1	Dn1:17	Chazôn	As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and wisdom: and Daniel had understanding in all <b>visions</b> and dreams.
2	Dn2:19	Chezev	Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night <b>vision</b> . Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven.
3	Dn2:28	Chezev	But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the <b>visions</b> of thy head upon thy bed, are these. <sup>2</sup>
4	Dn4:5	Chezev	I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the <b>visions</b> of my head troubled me.
5	Dn4:9	Chezev	O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the <b>visions</b> of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof.
6	Dn4:10	Chezev	Thus were the <b>visions</b> of mine head in my bed; I saw, and behold, a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great.
7	Dn4:13	Chezev	I saw in the <b>visions</b> of my head upon my bed, and behold, a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven
8	Dn7:1	Chezev	In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and <b>visions</b> of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream and told the sum of the matters.
9	Dn7:2	Chezev	Daniel spake and said, I saw in my <b>vision</b> by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heavens strove upon the great sea.
10	Dn7:7	Chezev	After this I saw in the night <b>visions</b> , and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.
11	Dn7:13	Chezev	I saw in the night <b>visions</b> , and, behold, one like the Son of man came with clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.
12	Dn7:15	Chezev	I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the <b>visions</b> of my head troubled me.

<sup>2</sup> The use of the phrase “latter days” is interesting here because the latter days covered by this vision includes everything from the present time of the Babylonian king to the end of time. So although Daniel says the vision relates to the latter days, it is probably better to translate that concept to a broad statement “the future.” Perhaps it would be fruitful to apply this interpretation to the use of this phrase latter in the book as well, rather than referring to a period beyond the end of the 1260 days. Examine this.

	Ref.	Word	Text in KJV Version.
13	Dn8:1	Chazôn	In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a <b>vision</b> appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.
14	Dn8:2	Chazôn	And I saw in a <b>vision</b> ; and it came to pass when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in vision, and I was by the river of Ulai.
15	Dn8:2	Chazôn	And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in <b>vision</b> , and I was by the river of Ulai.
16	Dn8:13	Chazôn	Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the <b>vision</b> concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot.
17	Dn8:15	Chazôn	And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the <b>vision</b> , and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.
18	Dn8:16	Mar'ê	And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the <b>vision</b> .
19	Dn8:17	Chazôn	So he came near 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; for at the time of the end shall be the <b>vision</b> . <sup>3</sup>
20	Dn8:26	Mar'ê	And the <b>vision</b> of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.
21	Dn8:26	Chazôn	And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the <b>vision</b> ; for it shall be for many days.
22	Dn8:27	Mar'ê / Mar'â	And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.
23	Dn9:21	Chazôn	Yea, whilst I was speaking in prayer even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the <b>vision</b> at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.
24	Dn9:23	Mar'ê	At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the <b>vision</b> .
25	Dn9:24	Chazôn	Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins,

---

<sup>3</sup> This statement is very similar to the one in Dn2, and considering the contents of the vision, it would be a fair translation to render this phrase "time of the end" as "future" as well, since it includes the Persian, Greek and Roman empire up to the destruction of the Roman power.

	Ref.	Word	Text in KJV Version.
			and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the <b>vision</b> and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.
26	Dn10:1	Mar'ê	In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the <b>vision</b> .
27	Dn10:7	Mar'â	And I Daniel alone saw the <b>vision</b> : for the men that were with me saw not the <b>vision</b> ; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves.
28	Dn10:8	Mar'â	Therefore, I was left alone, and saw this great <b>vision</b> , and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned into corruption, and I retained no strength.
29	Dn10:14	Chazôn	Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the <b>vision</b> is for many days.
30	Dn10:16	Mar'â	And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my lord, by the <b>vision</b> my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.
31	Dn11:14	Chazôn	And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the <b>vision</b> , but they shall fall.

This table highlights the presence of the different Hebrew and Aramaic words for what the English has translated as just one word –“vision.” The rest of this paper will deal with the SDA historicists’ explanation of this phenomenon.

## **The Method of this Assumption**

### **First Method: The Questions on Doctrine’s Approach**

#### **Preamble**

The first approach to this argument appeared in SDA denominational print in 1957 in a book entitled Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-Adventist Belief written by a “representative group of [unnamed] Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers and Editors.” (Hereafter the text will be referred to as either Questions on Doctrine or QOD.) This approach looked at the Hebrew word for “vision” and noted that in Dn8 and 9 *two* words, not one, are translated by the English word “vision.” The Danielic usage of these two Hebrew words (chazon, mar'eh) is proposed by QOD to support the SDA synchronisation of the seventy weeks of Dn9:24-27 and the 2300 evenings-mornings of Dn8:14 (cf. Seventh-day Adventists, 1957, pp.270-

272).<sup>4</sup> QOD argues that Dn9:23 has the same word mar'eh as that used in Dn8:13,14 and then proceeds to provide argumentation to support the view that Dn9:24-27 reveals the starting point of Dn8:13,14. They also argue that the usage of a second Hebrew word for "vision" (chazon) in Dn9:21 provides strong support for linking the vision of Dn8 to the revelation in Dn9:24-27. Given that there is this phenomenon of two Hebrew words for the word "vision" in Dn8 and 9, the obvious question raised is, Are these two words saying something different from each other? Does this need to be understood in order to grasp the intention of the writer's statements? QOD was the first publication to start the debate in SDA circles over specific meanings for these two words. Subsequently, SDA's reiterate that this "discovery" substantiate their position on the relationship between the time periods of Dn8 and 9.

### Excerpts from Questions on Doctrine:

The following extracts presents the arguments of QOD:

#### QUESTION 25

***Seventh-day Adventists seek to tie Daniel 9 to Daniel 8. On what basis do you hold (1) that the 2300 days (evenings-mornings) of Daniel begin at the same time as the seventy weeks of years of Daniel 9; and (2) that the seventieth week is already entirely fulfilled? (3) Since you so hold, what then is your interpretation of Daniel 9:27?***

Inasmuch as these questions center chiefly in Daniel 9, let us survey the chapter briefly in order to get the overall picture, and thus have the necessary background for the answers. This prophecy of the seventy weeks of years is one of the most fascinating and vital to be found in the entire prophetic Word. It deals with God's plan for the redemption of man, and foretells the time of the first advent of Christ, as the Messiah, also the time of His death, when He made a complete, vicarious atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world.

The seventy-weeks prophecy has to do with the Jews, the Holy Land, the Holy City, and the sanctuary—the nerve center, truth center, Temple center, and then the rejection center of the Lamb of God by His ancient people. Note the setting: Darius the Mede

.../p.269

was on the throne. Daniel was praying and interceding with God concerning the tragic condition of His backslidden and disobedient people, and the desolation of Jerusalem and the sanctuary (verses 3-19).

1. DANIEL 9 THE KEY THAT UNLOCKS CHAPTER 8.— The prophetic symbols of Daniel 8:2-11 namely, the "ram" as Medo-Persia, the "goat" as Grecia, and the

---

<sup>4</sup> It will be noticed that mar'ê and mar'eh are variants in the first word for "vision," as hazôn and chazon are variants in spelling the transliteration of the second Hebrew word for "vision."



"exceeding great" horn as the terrifying power that would succeed, which was Rome— had all been explained by Gabriel, the celestial messenger, in verses 15 to 26. That is, *all except the symbolic time element involved in the 2300 days, with the events marking their close and the time of their beginning.*

Because of Daniel's sudden illness as the vision of chapter 8 was being explained to him, Gabriel had been unable to explain this remaining time feature— the 2300 days of verses 13, 14, and 26. The dread prospect of the terrible persecution to come upon the people of God evidently caused the aged prophet suddenly to faint and become ill (verse 27). So the explanation broke off precipitately at that point.

This unexplained portion, it will be observed, pertained to the "sanctuary and the host," which were to be "trodden under foot" for 2300 "days" (evenings-mornings), with special events to occur at their close (verses 13, 14, 26). It involved a persecuting power that was to stand up against the Prince of princes and that was to practice and prosper against the people of God, but that would finally be broken without hands.

This revelation profoundly impressed the prophet and, as noted, might well have been the cause of his illness. Chapter 8 closes with certain questions still unanswered.

.../p.270

Later, as Daniel meditated on the vision and its relationship to the condition of his people, he pleaded earnestly with God for the termination of Israel's captivity and their return to Palestine. His prayer brought a speedy answer, for Gabriel was sent to bring him comfort and to unfold the plan of God more fully.

Gabriel had previously explained to Daniel all but the time portion of the symbolic vision of chapter 8. Now he reappears to complete the explanation *in literal terms* (Dan. 9:21, 22) and to clarify this remaining part. The angel uses the arresting words, "Consider *the vision*." This expression provides the key to the explanation, for the term "vision" appears ten times in chapter 8. But it is to be noted that in Daniel 8 and 9 two Hebrew words, *chazon* and *mar'eh*, differing somewhat in meaning, are used in the original Hebrew text. In the English translations only one word, "vision," has been used to express these slightly variant thoughts, and as a result, the exact intent of the original has not always been perceived.

2. TERMS MAY CONNOTE DIFFERENT CONCEPTS.— The Hebrew words for "vision" may be significant. It is possible that when the word *chazon* is used, the reference is to the vision as a whole. On the other hand, where the word *mar'eh* is employed, the reference could be to the particular things seen and heard in the *chazon*. (A footnote is inserted here: "The slight difference in the Hebrew words was indicated in a translation of the Bible in 1764 by Anthony Purver. *Chazon* he rendered "vision," but *mar'eh* he translated as "appearance.") "One feature seen in the overall *chazon* was the "two thousand and three hundred days" of

.../p.271

Daniel 8:14. This special scene is referred to as "the vision [*mar'eh*] of the evening and the morning" (verse 26). When the angel Gabriel, "whom I [Daniel] had seen in

the vision [chazon] at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21), returned to complete his explanation of the vision, he directed Daniel's attention specifically to the vision (mar'eh) when he said, "consider the vision [mar'eh]" (verse 23).

It will be remembered that according to Daniel 8:26, 27, it was the mar'eh "of the evening and the morning" that Daniel did not understand. It was not the vision as a whole, for all but the scene of the evening and the morning had been explained.

There can be no mistake as to this identification of "*the vision*." S. R. Driver, the noted critic (*The Book of Daniel*, 1936, pp. 133), recognised this, and wrote concerning "the vision at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21) that it refers to "viii. 16." The chapter 8 usage and the chapter 9 tie-in appears inescapable, and the identical theme of the two chapters becomes self-evident. *What follows in chapter 9 is therefore not a new and independent vision, but is the continuing literal explanation of the symbolic "vision" of chapter 8.*

We would stress this point, that *in chapter 9 Gabriel was not introducing a new line of prophecy*. He was simply continuing and completing his interrupted explanation, picking up the thread just where he had

Numerous Bible students recognize Daniel 9 to be a continuation of Daniel 8, and when commenting on "whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21), refer back to Daniel 8:17. Among these may be listed Chr. Wordsworth, T. Robinson, Matthew Henry, William Hales, Thomas Scott, F. C. Cook, *The Cambridge Bible*, *The Critical and Exegetical Bible*, etc.

.../p.272

laid it down in his previous appearance to the prophet, recorded in chapter 8. His last words, on the former occasion, had been to the effect that "*the vision*" (mar'eh) of the 2300 evenings-mornings was "true," and that the period involved was to extend over "many days," far into the future.

In the light of these facts, which seem to us to be conclusive, Seventh-day Adventists—along with many scores of scholars of former days—definitely believe that Daniel 9 furnishes the key that unlocks the *time feature* of Daniel 8—the 2300 year-days. To us the two chapters appear to be inseparable, and must be so understood if there is to be any explanation of the time feature of Daniel 8: 14, 26. ([Seventh-day Adventists, 1957](#), pp 268-272)

### **Summary of the Excerpt from Questions on Doctrine.**

In this presentation by QOD the traditional assumptions used by SDA writers are combined with a new lexical argument. The point is made by QOD that "when the word chazon is used the reference is to the vision as a whole. On the other hand, where the word mar'eh is employed the reference could be to the particular things seen and heard in the chazon" (p.270). That is to say, mar'eh is a subpart of a chazon and, presumably, a number of mar'ehs make up the chazon of Dn8.

Two main sources are used to argue that mar'eh is a component of chazon. The first one comes from Dn8:26. "One feature seen in the overall chazon was the '2300 evening-mornings' of Dn8:14. This special scene is referred to as 'the vision [mar'eh]' of the

evening and the morning' (verse 26)" (p.271). This is the first evidence cited. This reference is used to support the view firstly, that chazon is vs.3-14 and secondly, that mar'eh is a subpart of the "overall chazon," since vs.13, 14 are referred to in v26 as mar'eh and presumably vs.13, 14 are also a part of the chazon.

The second source for their evidence distinguishing mar'eh as a component of chazon is the following:

When the angel Gabriel, "whom I [Daniel] had seen in the vision [chazon] at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21), returned to complete his explanation of the vision, he directed Daniel's attention specifically to the vision (mar'eh) when he said, "consider the vision [mar'eh]" (verse 23).

It will be remembered that according to Daniel 8:26, 27, it was the mar'eh "of the evening and the morning" that Daniel did not understand. It was not the vision as a whole, for all but the scene of the evening and the morning had been explained.

There can be no mistake as to this identification of "the vision." S. R. Driver, the noted critic (The Book of Daniel, 1936, pp. 133), recognised this, and wrote concerning "the vision at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21) that it refers to "viii. 16. ([Seventh-day Adventists, 1957](#), p.271)

The line of their argument is

- (1) Dn9:21 refers to the vision of ch8:16. This argument is supported by a credible O.T. scholar, S.R. Driver.
- (2) Dn9:23 refers to a part of the chazon-vision in Dn8 as a mar'eh. This verse calls it "the" mar'eh with the definite article. It will be remembered that the only mar'eh mentioned in Dn8 is the mar'eh of the evening and the morning(v26).
- (3) Thus the concept of chazon as referring to the overall vision and mar'eh referring to a component seems to have support from Dn9:21,23.

In addition to this lexical argument regarding the meanings of chazon and mar'eh, the reader will notice that QOD weaves into its presentation assumptions that have been used right from the inception of the Advent movement, of which the following is a sample:

- (1) "One feature seen in the overall chazon was the 'two thousand and three hundred days' of Daniel 8:14. This special scene is referred to as 'the vision [mar'eh] of the evening and the morning'" (verse 26). (p.270-271)
- (2) "When the angel Gabriel, "whom I [Daniel] had seen in the vision [chazon] at the beginning" (Dan. 9:21), returned to complete his explanation of the vision...."(p.271)
- (3) "It was not the vision as a whole, for all but the scene of the evening and the morning had been explained." (p.271)
- (4) "What follows in chapter 9 is therefore not a new and independent vision,

but is the continuing literal explanation of the symbolic ‘vision’ of chapter 8.” (p.271)

- (5) “It will be remembered that according to Daniel 8:26, 2:7, it was the *mar'eh* ‘of the evening and the morning’ that Daniel did not understand.” (p.271)<sup>5</sup>

## **The Problems With the Method Used by Questions on Doctrine**

### **1. The definition of chazôn.**

The discussion here will be limited to the problem associated with the lexical argument concerning chazon and mar'eh. One feature that needs to be noted in this article by QOD is that there is virtually no discussion regarding chazon. It is just **suggested** that “when the word chazon is used, the reference is to the vision as a whole.” (p.270) This possibility is not then examined, but merely asserted, as though the mere proposal of the idea makes it valid. And at the end of the discussion on these two words, their “suggestion” is then taken to be a “fact,” which seems “conclusive” to the authors of the book. (cf.p.272)

In approaching an appraisal of QOD’s arguments, it is vital that QOD defines chazon as inclusive of vs.2-14. “The symbolic vision of Daniel 8” (p.270) is defined on p.269 as “the prophetic symbols of Dan 8:2-14.” In regard to defining mar'eh as a reference to “particular things seen and heard in the chazon”(p.270), it is unclear whether this means blocks of things “seen and heard,” or whether mar'eh could be reduced to the smallest item “seen and heard,” e.g., a falling star (8:10), or even a word spoken in the vision. Since the “special scene” of the audition in vs. 13,14 is referred to as a mar'eh (p.271), it seems that the use of mar'eh to define blocks of material “seen and heard” is the approach taken by QOD. Their statement confirms this:

It is possible that when the word chazon is used, the reference is to the vision as a whole. On the other hand, where the word *mar'eh* is employed, the reference could be to the particular things seen and heard in the chazon. ([Seventh-day Adventist, 1957](#), p.270)

A structural summary of QOD’s interpretation in Dn8 and 9 may be tabulated as follows:

### **A. CHAZON (vs.2-14)**

---

<sup>5</sup> Within the chapter from which this extract is taken, other assumptions are used that are also addressed later in this paper (for instance, compare QOD, p.269 and Assumptions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; QOD, p.275 with Assumptions 17, 20; QOD, p.286 with Assumption 18). To avoid duplication, a comment on these traditional arguments used by QOD will be reserved until each assumption is dealt with separately. Readers are referred to the comments in those sections of the paper.

- Dn8: 2-4      mar'eh? -of the ram
- Dn8:5-8      mar'eh? -of the goat
- Dn8:9-12      mar'eh?-of the war of the ram and the goat
- Dn8:13,14      mar'eh -of the evening and the morning
- B.**      Dn8:15-26      **Explanation** (neither mar'eh or chazon)
- C.**      Dn9:24-27      **Explanation** (neither mar'eh or chazon)

According to QOD, there is only one vision in Dn8 and 9: that of ch8:2-14. “One feature seen in the overall chazon was the "two thousand and three hundred days" of Daniel 8:14. This special scene is referred to as "the vision [*mar'eh*] of the evening and the morning" (verse 26).”(p.270,271) The purpose of pursuing this line of argument is that the authors want to utilise any links between ch8 and ch9 supporting the SDA argument. That is to say, if what they argue is correct, then the word “vision,” whether occurring in Dn8 or 9, can only refer to the *whole* or *part* of Dn8:2-14, depending on whether chazon or mar'eh is being used. The possibility of either chazon or mar'eh referring to other aspects of Dn8 or 9 is not raised by the authors. The following points are just assumed to be correct:

- 1) mar'eh in ch8:16, 27 refer to the same thing as the mar'eh of ch8:26;
- 2) mar'eh in Dn9:23 refers to a previously given mar'eh;
- 3) chazon in Dn8:13, 15, 17, 26 refers to the same thing as chazon in ch8:1, 2; and ch9:21.

It is argued later in this paper that these three points are dubious.

It should be noticed that a meaning of chazon in Dn8:13 and 15 is assumed by QOD to be identical to the definition that they have given to it. No precise treatment is given to verse 13 and 15 at all. It is simply assumed to refer to verses 2-14. They do not address the significant problem of verse 13 referring to the chazon, which, according to the context, evidently must occur before it is named. And yet QOD have the 2300 evenings-mornings of Dn8:14 included in the chazon, presumably due to the reference to chazon in v15.

## **2. Dn9:21 creates a Problem for Questions on Doctrine.**

The pivotal inconsistency with QOD’s definitions of both mar'eh and chazon centres in its conflict with Dn9:21.

21 Yea, whiles I [Daniel] was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.

The word for “vision” in this verse is chazon. According to QOD, “There can be no

mistake as to this identification of 'the vision.' S. R. Driver, the noted critic (*The Book of Daniel*, 1936, pp. 133), recognised this, and wrote concerning 'the vision at the beginning' (Dan. 9:21) that it refers to 'viii. 16.'" (p.271 ). That point is quite obviously correct. The problem for SDA's however, is that according to their own definitions of "chazon," "mar'eh" and "literal explanation," QOD has not classified Dn8:16 under chazon. Rather, Dn8:16 is a part of the "literal explanation" which, for them, starts from Dn8:15-26 and is completed at Dn9:24-27. Thus, although Dn9:21 says that Gabriel previously appeared in the chazon, QOD would want to say Gabriel only appeared in the "literal explanation," and definitely did not appear in the chazon.

To define Dn8:16 as chazon in just the way Scripture has done, QOD would have to acknowledge that vs.15-26 are a part of the chazon as well, since the block of material between vs.15 and 26 is one natural unit and v16 cannot be isolated from it. The effect of this would be to negate their important dichotomy between "vision" and "interpretation."

In addition to the upset which would occur if Dn8:15-26 were classified as a chazon, the acknowledged similarity between what they call "explanation" in Dn8:15-26 and Dn9:24-27 by QOD coupled together with the acknowledgement that Dn8:15-26 is a part of a "vision," could place them in a position of being forced to acknowledge that Dn9:24-27 could be classified as a "vision" (ch9:23) as well, and that when Gabriel says to Daniel, "Understand the vision" in 9:23, he could in fact, be referring to vs.24-27! The matter of Dn8:15-26 being referred to in Dn9:21 as a chazon, and the possibility of Dn9:24-27 being referred to as a mar'eh would thus virtually destroy the traditional argument linking the 70 weeks with the 2300 days, especially if it is established that chazon and mar'eh are on the whole synonymous and the English translation of both words as "vision" in the extant versions, would be seen to be correct, yet in opposition to QOD (p.270).

There is another point about Dn9:21 which needs to be recognised. Daniel states in v21 that Gabriel who appeared to him in vision a decade or so earlier and had explained the scenes to him, was the same individual who visited him on this occasion also. That is all. There is no statement in this verse that makes the slightest connection between the **subject** of the vision in Dn8 and the reason for this second visit by Gabriel in Dn9.

### 3. What was Gabriel meant to explain to Daniel?

Further considerations concerning the meaning of mar'eh need to be raised as well. When QOD quotes Dn9:21 (p.271), it is merely assumed that the next command (in 9:23) to "consider the vision [mar'eh]" refers to the mar'eh-vision of the "evening and the morning" in Dn8:13-14. But it may equally apply to Dn9:24-27. That is, Dn9:24-27 may be a mar'eh-vision. Yet this possibility is not even canvassed and eliminated, even though it is legitimately possible. Furthermore, mar'eh in Dn8:16,27 may equally apply to vs.2-14. Notice that Gabriel is commanded: "Make this man to understand the vision."(v16) The subsequent explanation as recorded in vs. 17-26 indicates that in obedience to this command Gabriel covered vs. 2-14, not just vs.13-14. If both the man who stood between the Ulai and Gabriel were using chazon and mar'eh in a way proposed by QOD, then why didn't the man use chazon as well as mar'eh in his command if, according to QOD's

definition of these two words, both the chazon and the mar'eh are explained in the “literal explanation” given in Dn8:15-26 and Dn9:24-27?

According to QOD's definition of these two words, ch8:17-26 is an explanation of the chazon, and ch9:24-27 are explanation of the mar'eh. But if Gabriel was aware of this distinction, why does he disobey his charge and explain something that he is not told to explain? If the reply is that Gabriel had to explain the chazon before he could explain the mar'eh then there are two problems that become immediately apparent with this answer.

- Firstly, it is merely an assumption that Gabriel is unable to state an interpretation of the mar'eh without first explaining the chazon.
- Secondly, if the man between the Ulai and Gabriel used chazon and mar'eh in the way that QOD wants them to use it, why didn't the man between the Ulai mention the chazon in his command to Gabriel, since what Gabriel explains is the chazon and not the mar'eh? Why did he not say something like: “Make this man to understand the mar'eh by explaining the chazon first.” Or “Make this man understand the chazon and the mar'eh!” That would have made it clearer.

I wish look closer now at these two problems.

### **3A. Why did Gabriel have to explain the chazôn before the mar'ê?**

With regard to the first problem, if Dn9:24-27 is the supposed explanation of the mar'eh, I cannot see any reason why Dn9:24-27 could not have been given **first** before any explanation of the chazon, since the supposed starting date of the 2300 days - “the going forth of the commandment to rebuild and restore Jerusalem” (Dn9:25) - is clear without any additional information needed from Dn8:17-26. The text would possibly have followed the format set out below had the meaning of mar'eh been what QOD is arguing for, and had Gabriel been obedient in terms of how QOD wishes to read the command of v16. This format would appear as follows:

**[ch.8]**

**16** And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai ,which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision

**17** So he came near 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: for at the time of the end shall be the vision.

**18** Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright

**19** And he said, Behold, I will make thee know when the vision shall be.

**[ch.9:24-27]**



24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

25 Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wad, even in troublous times.

26 And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

It is clear from this simple exercise that if Dn9:24-27 is the explanation of the so-called mar'eh of Dn8:13,14 then there is no reason why Gabriel could not have done what I have just done. Gabriel need not have explained the chazon. He wasn't told to do that, according to QOD's theory. He was told only to explain the mar'eh.

Furthermore, the verb chathak in this quote above translated "determined" (v20) could still be used to argue that the seventy weeks are "cut off" from the 2300 days. This would allow the relationship between these two time periods as proposed by the SDA church to be maintained. There needs to be no more detail than that given above. Thus the way would be clear for the mar'eh to be explained without any reference to the chazon.

A rejoinder to this could be that Daniel would not know in which empire the vision began if no explanation of the visionary symbols was given. Suffice it to say that Daniel was aware that Jerusalem was in ruins! Let us impute some intelligence to the man! It would not be too hard for a man who "understood mysteries" to take the phrase "the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem" just as it reads. He was aware of the statements of the other prophets regarding the rebuilding of Jerusalem. He had just been praying about the very issue having read the writings of Jeremiah not five minutes earlier! Daniel is not prophesying in a vacuum here. He is one voice in chorus with many. So for the purposes of understanding the mar'eh as QOD sees it, Gabriel's explanation in ch8:20-26 is superfluous.

### **3B. Why Did Gabriel Explain what he was not commanded to explain?**

If Gabriel only had to tell Daniel about the starting time for the 2300 days, why did Gabriel continue on with all this extraneous information in verses 24-27, since all except the time period had been explained? Notice what QOD has to say on p.269:

The prophetic symbols of Daniel 8:2-11 namely, the "ram" as Medo-Persia, the



"goat" as Grecia, and the "exceeding great" horn as the terrifying power that would succeed, which was Rome— had all been explained by Gabriel, the celestial messenger, in verses 15 to 26. That is, *all except the symbolic time element involved in the 2300 days, with the events marking their close and the time of their beginning.*

Therefore, all Gabriel should have done to properly finish his commission was to explain "*the events marking their close and the time of their beginning*" It could have gone something like this:

24 The 2300 evening mornings which was told thee, shall commence from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem and after that time the sanctuary shall be restored.

25. And this period is true.

Also superfluous is the bulk of the detail of Dn9:24-27. Consider what QOD says:

What follows in chapter 9 is therefore not a new and independent vision, but is the continuing literal explanation of the symbolic "vision" of chapter 8.

We would stress this point, that *in chapter 9 Gabriel was not introducing a new line of prophecy.* He was simply continuing and completing his interrupted explanation, picking up the thread just where he had laid it down in his previous appearance to the prophet, recorded in chapter 8. (pp.271-272)

It has been noted (see Question 24) that a characteristic feature of *symbolic* prophecy is to give the component time periods, not literally, but in symbolic form. And it has been further demonstrated that Daniel 9:24-27 is a continuation of the literal explanation of the symbolic vision that was begun in Daniel 8:19-26. (p.277)

If Dn9:24-27 is a continuation of the explanation of Dn8, the question needs to be asked, Do the rest of the details in the "explanation" of Dn9 also explain those same aspects or items in Dn8? The following table links various parts of Dn9 with Dn8 to show that Dn9 is indeed an expansion on Dn8, though not in the way endorsed by SDA historicists:

**TABLE 2**

CHAPTER 9	CHAPTER 8	COMMENT
24. 70 weeks for your people and the city to put an end to sin, atone for wickedness, bring in righteousness, and seal up vision and prophecy	23. in the latter time of their kingdom when transgressors are come to the full	The end of the 70 weeks and the activities of the horn would occur toward the end of time.
26. The Anointed One, the ruler will be cut off	11. He magnified himself even to the prince of hosts  25. He shall also stand up against the	The Messianic leader of the Jews would be assassinated.

CHAPTER 9	CHAPTER 8	COMMENT
	Princes of princes	
26. The people of the ruler who will come will destroy the city and the sanctuary.	<p>10. It waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped on them.</p> <p>11...and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down</p> <p>24 he shall destroy wonderfully and shall prosper and practise and shall destroy the mighty and holy people</p>	The coming oppressors would pillage and plunder the holy city, including the temple.
26. The end will come like a flood: war will continue until the end and desolations have been decreed	For 2300 days shall be the transgression of desolation to give both the sanctuary and the and the host to be trodden underfoot; then shall the sanctuary be restored	These desolation will be allowed until the end of all things. After that, oppression will cease (1260 days), worship will resume (1290 days), and the temple will eventually be rebuilt and dedicated (2300days).
27. He will confirm a covenant with many for one week	<p>23. And in the latter time when transgressors are come to the full;</p> <p>25. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart and by peace he will destroy many</p> <p>12 Because of rebellion, the host of the saints and the daily sacrifice was given over to it</p>	If this means alliances between the little horn and other groups, then it refers to deals done during the oppression. If it refers to Christ, it will occur in the latter time of the period when he confirms his covenant with His people.
27. In the midst of the week he will cause the sacrifice and offering to cease	12. he magnified himself even to the prince of the host and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away and the place of his sanctuary was cast down	The little horn power interrupts the temple system of worship.
27. One causing desolations will place abominations in the wing of the temple	12. and an host was given him against the daily sacrifice and by him the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression and it cast truth down to the ground and it practised and prospered	The little horn power will have its day of power in the holy city.

CHAPTER 9	CHAPTER 8	COMMENT
27. He will continue until that which is decreed is poured on the desolator	25. But he will be broken without hand  19. At the appointed time shall be the end	God will bring his purpose to fruition at the right time.

As can be seen from just a cursory look at the parallels between these two chapters, there is a remarkable correlation between the events of the little horn in Dn8 and the details of Dn9, supporting the view that Dn9 adds more details to the revelation of Dn8.<sup>6</sup> But do we apply the statements of QOD rigorously here and say that the events and items in Dn 9 correspond to the same mention of them in Dn 8, since it is claimed Dn 9:24-27 is nothing more than a continuation of the explanation of the vision of Dn8:2-14? Would this then mean that the sanctuary mentioned in Dn8 is the same one mentioned as being rebuilt in Dn9? This would mean that the sanctuary that is destroyed and subsequently restored would be an earthly one. I don't think that the SDA historicists would appreciate us taking this line of reasoning too seriously. The meaning of the daily or the sanctuary in Dn 8, as defined by Dn 9, would not be one that they would readily welcome. Yet QOD is emphatic:

“We would stress this point, that *in chapter 9 Gabriel was not introducing a new line of prophecy*. He was simply continuing and completing his interrupted explanation, picking up the thread just where he had laid it down in his previous appearance to the prophet, recorded in chapter 8. (pp.271-272)

So it seems that arguing for their relationship between the 2300 days and the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem as mentioned in Dn9: 24 brings more baggage with it than what QOD has considered. QOD would not want to say that Dn9 interprets the rest of the details in Dn8, yet that is precisely what they are stressing.

But there is no simple relationship between the explanation in Dn9 and what the SDA interpretation wants to do with the 2300 days in Dn8. There is no consistency between the style of explanation in Dn8:18-26 and the style of explanation in Dn9. Though there are additional features in the explanation of Dn 8:18-26 when compared to the items in the vision, they are woven in amongst instances of clear references to the vision. Such is NOT the case with the details in Dn9. There is no reference in Dn9 to the details in the vision of Dn8, even when talking about time, even though these are referred to in Dn8:18-26 – what may be termed in the SDA historicists' view, the *first* half of the explanation of Dn8. There are no references to any of the animals or the little horn. There is no reference to the 2300 day period.<sup>7</sup> Though I argue for a correlation between the details in Dn9 and there

<sup>6</sup> The reader will notice that the correlation between the details in Dn9 and Dn8 as explained in the table do not match with the SDA historicists' explanation. But notwithstanding their objection, the correlation is still there, and these explanations are still valid as referring to similar incidents.

<sup>7</sup> Shea tries to say that “*ereb-boqer* is referred to as an elided masculine in the “seventy sevens” of Dn9:24, but then pulled that idea a little while later. (See Assumption No. 16)

correspondence with details concerning the little horn power in Dn8, this does not mean that Dn9 is a continued explanation of Dn8: 18-26. *Dn9 is a vision in and of itself*, and it does augment the details of Dn8.

The reference to Gabriel in Dn9:21 is an adjectival clause which merely says “he is the same person who visited me before;” it describes Gabriel. Nothing more. It has neither a link between what he talked about before nor any intimation there was a break in the previous encounter. He would have said something entirely different if he had wanted to say that. He would have said something like: “Gabriel, who had to abort his explanation the first time I saw him....,” or “Gabriel, who could only tell me part of the explanation on an earlier occasion...”

Furthermore, had Gabriel been returning to finish an explanation left incomplete over a decade earlier, one would expect him to indicate as much when he announced the purpose of his visit in ch9. Instead, what is the obvious purpose of his visit? It is to respond to the issues raised in Daniel’s prayer. A comparison between Daniel’s prayer and Dn9:24-27 yields a full correlation, as acknowledged by other scholars’ writings on this topic. For example:

**Tregelles:**

The denomination here is to be taken from the subject of Daniel’s prayer; he prayed about years, he is answered in about periods of seven years, ie., the recurrence of sabbatical years. His prayer had related to the deliverance of Israel from their then captivity, - the reply goes much farther: for it sets out, not from the release of the people, but from the edict to restore and to build Jerusalem; and it reaches through events of varied kinds, until the absolute and established blessing on the ground of righteousness and forgiveness is brought in. (1883, p.98)

Gabriel doesn’t say he has come because he believes that Daniel now has the strength to cope with 45 seconds more of revelation (Surely Gabriel could have strengthened him immediately after the vision of ch.8 as he did in 10:18,19!) It is strangely odd, even absurd, to suggest that Gabriel had to wait over a decade to finish the revelation. In Dn10:12-20 Daniel’s heavenly messenger makes a convoluted explanation as to why he had to delay his message to Daniel for *only three weeks* because of a spiritual conflict which had arisen. How does Gabriel respond to a so-called 9 to 16 year procrastination? He makes *no* apology about any time lag in Dn9. Rather, he returns simply in response to Daniel’s prayer about the 70-year exile as prophesied in Jeremiah. Gabriel gives the undeniable impression there was not any unfinished business to attend to before this prayer arose. Daniel had been “greatly beloved” before he prayed this prayer. He didn’t need to pray this prayer to get heaven to encourage Gabriel to finish his commission. He wasn’t even praying about the 2300 day prophecy. In fact, Daniel did not have the 2300 days on his mind either, despite the fact that early Adventist writers tried to make the texts say that.<sup>8</sup> It was only the 70 years of captivity that was in his mind. And the message of Dn 9 relates only to that.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Assumption No. 12 for a selection of SDA authors who read this into Dn9:1-2.

One would expect if Daniel was keen to find out the starting point of the 2300 days, then he would have prayed like he did in Dn2, Dn9 or Dn 10 for an answer. And we would have a separate chapter on how Daniel was troubled over the matter and how he prayed and how the angel returned to him and said that he would have given it to him on the first visit but that he was too weak to bear it Gabriel would have announced that he has come now to explain the 2300 days. We would have a 13 chapter book of Daniel. But Daniel shows no concern to know the starting point for the 2300 days. If Daniel hadn't been troubled about the 70 years of exile Gabriel wouldn't have visited him then either.

Gabriel shows no concern to tell Daniel about a starting date for the 2300 days. Therefore the starting date was not an issue. Why? Because as Shea has admitted, if the 2300days begins with the activities of the little horn, the time period begins when the desolation of the sanctuary begins. All the elements of Dn8:13 – the abolition of the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that desolates the sanctuary, and the surrender of the sanctuary- all occur with the capture of the sanctuary. The question of v13 does not focus on all of the details in vs.9-11, with the horn power entering the Beautiful Land, killing many of the Jews (probably in battle) and even setting himself up in opposition to the Prince of the Host. It limits itself to only those aspects of the vision mentioned in the question. The beginning point for the 2300 days had a clear marker.

And lastly on this point, with regard to the problem that the persons in the revelation didn't mention the word "chazon" (since this is what Gabriel explains), the burden of proof remains with the authors of QOD to show that the explanation of the chazon (cf. vs.3-14) had to be included in the explanation of the mar'eh, (cf. vs.20-26) even though it wasn't asked for (cf. v16).

Moving from these two problems to other considerations, there are more complications that need to be addressed.

#### **4. Other complications for the explanation by Questions on Doctrine.**

Firstly, if, as QOD would have us believe, the overall chazon contains several mar'ehs, one of which "was the '2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14'"(p.270,271), why did the man between the banks of the Ulai say, "Make this man Gabriel to understand *the* mar'eh"(8:16) when, in QOD's view, Gabriel explained *many* mar'ehs in ch8:20-26? Why did he use the singular when *many* "things seen and heard in the chazon" are explained? Was he meaning only one mar'eh needed to be explained to Daniel? If so, why explain all the other mar'ehs in the chazon as well?

A second query worth consideration is, If these two heavenly beings used mar'eh and chazon as QOD wants us to believe, would not the command be quite ambiguous? The command "Make this man to understand the mar'eh, begs the question: "Which mar'eh do you want me to make him understand?" In QOD's view, the "overall chazon" contains more than one mar'eh. Thus Gabriel would be confused because no indication is given in the command identifying which mar'eh is being referred to. It could refer to any number of "particular things seen and heard in the chazon." QOD infers Gabriel was sent with an

uncertain commission. Taking the inference one step further, we are led to assume therefore, that Gabriel tried to explain many things in the vision, hoping to hit on the one which was troubling Daniel. That is, Gabriel used grapeshot instead of a single bullet. This is a most unlikely scenario.

If it is a fact the mar'eh in Dn8:16 refers specifically to vs.13,14, then why did Gabriel ignore the command, explaining all the other mar'ehs instead and doing what he was not told to do? Notice this statement from SDA pioneer J.N.Andrews:

But the angel has not yet explained the "manner of time," or given it's date to the prophet. If Gabriel never did explain this subject to Daniel, he is a fallen angel; for he was commanded in plain terms thus to do. Dan. viii.16. But he is not a fallen angel as appears from the fact that some hundred years after this, he was sent by Jehovah to Zacharias and to Mary. Luke 1 (Gordon,1983, p.263a or Andrews, 1850, p.263a)

Using Andrews' logic then we can turn this another way. If *not explaining* what Gabriel *was told to explain* qualifies him as a disobedient servant (by not explaining the starting date for the 2300 days), conversely, then *explaining* what he is *not told* to explain (the other mar'ehs instead of vs.13,14) surely also qualifies Gabriel as a disobedient servant. But there is no way, according to QOD's definition of mar'eh, that Gabriel would be able to know from the wording of the command that the man between the Ulai was referring specifically to vs.13,14. The man between the banks of the Ulai would have had to specifically say: "Gabriel, make this man to understand the mar'eh-vision **of the evening and the morning**." This instruction, according to QOD's definition of mar'eh, would have limited the reference of mar'eh to vs.13,14. But we do not find this statement in v16. Thus, there is no way that QOD can conclude merely from the question, or the use of mar'eh in that question, the *exact* intent of the question, using the definition of the words that QOD has chosen.

There is another consideration concerning the relation between 8:15 and vs. 1-26. Few would deny the appearance of Gabriel referred to in Dn9:21 applies specifically to Dn8:15-16 as few would deny.<sup>9</sup> To those who would like to separate the *appearance* of Gabriel in the chazon here at v15, to the *speaking* of the same personage in vs. 17-26, they need to observe that the *seeing* and the *hearing* of the *same* person in the *same* physical position during the *same* interchange cannot be rightly divided into two separate parts of the same revelation. When Daniel is lifted up to stand on his feet (v18), he was able to see Gabriel as Gabriel spoke to him. Gabriel had been close beside him before he fell on his face to the ground and was thus in visual contact with him all the time (v17). The close proximity between them included tactile contact as well as auditory contact.

It is easy to perceive in this case that a mar'eh is both an optical AND an auditory

---

<sup>9</sup> The only exception to this I have discovered is Shea's concept of applying Dn9:21 to chapter 7. He is an absolute historical first as far as I can see who has done this. No other SDA scholar has endorsed this view.



experience as Shea concedes:

The second point about the *mar'ê* is that it "was told" (*ne'émar*, a niphal, or passive, form of the verb "to say"), not seen. Thus Daniel did not see the 2300 evenings mornings; he heard them discussed by the two holy ones in their intravisional explanation during their *mar'ê*, or appearance, to him. A *hazon* (vision) is seen, but a *mar'e* is both seen and heard because the personal being who appears to the prophet in the *mar'ê* also speaks words of information or propositional truth to him. The same point is borne out by Dan 10:8,9, "I was left alone and saw this great *mar'ê* [appearance] [of God]. . . . Then I heard the sound of his [God's] words. . . ." (1980, cf., page 236)

The implication of visual contact as well is hard to deny. Thus, from a holistic viewpoint the *appearance* of Gabriel should not be limited to v15-18, but continued right up until Gabriel finishes his task in v26, even though Daniel doesn't repeatedly say so every time Gabriel says something. Therefore the reference in Dn9:21 to chazon refers at least to Dn8:15-26. The most comprehensive meaning for chazon in Dn9:21 is *the whole vision* of Dn8, that is, vs.2-26.

QOD on the other hand, cannot include Dn8:15-26 in the chazon because the crucial dichotomy between "symbolic" and "literal" would be upset in their argument insisting, as they do, that the year-day principle should be applied to Dn8:14. Why would they be upset? If Dn8:15-26 is acknowledged as being "vision," then they would have to acknowledge that details in a vision can be "literal" as a good many of them are in vs.18-26. This admission would leave them open to acknowledging that the 2300 evenings-mornings could also be literal. They are in a bind because they have committed themselves to saying that the chazon referred to in Dn9:21 is that of ch8, and specifically, Dn8:16, which is the *explanatory* section of Dn8 according to them! One can only conclude then, that the meanings proposed by QOD for mar'eh and chazon are contrived and untenable.

## 5. Mar'ê can be applied to the whole vision of Daniel 8.

I wish to pursue this matter further for a moment and show that mar'eh in Dn8:16 can rightly include vs.2-14, and is synonymous with chazon in Dn8:15. Since there is no objection by Gabriel when he was asked to explain the vision, we can safely assume that Gabriel understood the import of the command from the man between the Ulai and furthermore, what he should explain to Daniel. From his very first words to Daniel, ("Understand O man!" v17), Gabriel begins to acquit himself of that responsibility. It is necessary then to examine the content of Gabriel's explanation to understand what Gabriel, and by inference the man between the Ulai, meant by mar'eh. Since the man between the Ulai did not object to the response by Gabriel, we can rest assured that he was happy with Gabriel's response.

It is only necessary therefore to examine Gabriel's explanation to understand what he perceived by the word mar'eh. The following pages layout the full vision of Dn8:1-14 alongside the interpretation (Dn8:15-27) for a comparison of their contents, and then the following four tables tabulate the contents of both the vision and the interpretation, item by item.

## .6. The Vision and the Interpretation of the Vision.

In this table, the vision of Dn8:1-14 is placed first, and the interpretation in vs.15-26 is placed beside it. In the 1st Column is listed the items in *The Vision*, and those items of the vision that are explicitly referred to in the *interpretation* are placed in “bold” text. Those aspects of the vision which are not explicitly marked in the interpretation for explanation are left in “plain” text. In the 2nd Column is listed *The Interpretation*. Those items of the interpretation that explain some item in the vision are also placed in “bold” text. Those details in the interpretation which do not occur in the vision are left in “plain” text.

TABLE 3

VISION	INTERPRETATION
In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.	15 And it came to pass, when I, even I, Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.
2 And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam	16 And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision
3 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river <b>a ram which had two horns:</b> and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last.	17 So he came near 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: for at the time of the end shall be the vision.
4 I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward, so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand, but he did according to his will, and became great.	18 Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright
5 And as I was considering, behold, an <b>he- goat</b> came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and <b>the goat had a notable horn between his eyes.</b>	19 And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.
6 And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power.	20 <b>The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia.</b>
7 And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand	21 <b>And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king.</b>
8 Therefore the he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, <b>the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones</b> toward the four winds	22 <b>Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation,</b> but not in his power.
	23 And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, <b>a king of fierce countenance,</b> and understanding dark sentences,



<p>of heaven.</p> <p>9 And out of one of them came forth <b>a little horn, which waxed exceeding great</b>, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.</p> <p>10 <b>And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.</b></p> <p>11 <b>Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host</b>, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.</p> <p>12 And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, <b>and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered</b></p> <p>13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot</p> <p>14 <b>And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days;</b> then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.</p>	<p><b>shall stand up.</b></p> <p>24And <b>his power shall be mighty</b>, but not by his own power: <b>and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.</b></p> <p>25 <b>And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart</b>, and by peace shall destroy many: <b>he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes;</b> but he shall be broken without hand.</p> <p>26 <b>And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true:</b> wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days</p> <p>27 And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and I was astonished at the vision, but understood none of it.</p>
---	---

### Initial Conclusions from the Table.

1. The most obvious visual conclusion immediately apparent from this exercise, is that the bold text in the vision clearly shows that *the explanation does not just focus on vs.13-14 as QOD wants us to believe it should, but rather to the "overall chazon of vs.3-14."*
2. The second visually obvious conclusion is how much material in *the vision* is **not** explicitly referred to in the interpretation.
3. The third conclusion is the converse; how much material in *the interpretation* is **not** explicitly related to the vision.

### A. Items in the Vision.

To highlight the facts in this visual presentation above, I wish to summarise these observations by listing, in the first table, the contents of both vision and interpretation by *item* and then in the second column listing the items present in the vision that are *not*

explained in the interpretation. In the second table, I will examine those things that are explained in the interpretation but *not present* in the vision.

In the first column of Table 1 (pp.27, 28), I have numbered each of the items as they appear in the vision. In the second column, I have listed the verse in which they occur. In the third column, I have listed the salient feature of each item. In the fourth column, I indicate if and where they are referred to in the interpretation. For simplicity I have tried as much as possible to limit the contents of each item to a single feature. For instance, in item 8, it refers to “the ram pushed westward, southward, and to the pleasant land.” Although some would want to list “westward,” “southward,” and “to the pleasant land” as separate details, given the paucity of the interpretation anyway, I considered “the ram pushed...” as the salient feature.

Some might question whether a list of such microscopic detail is justified, but the questioner need only consider the detailed interpretation in vs.20-26. Gabriel varies from a most minute detail (“the great horn between his eyes is the first king” v21) to making general statements that could include a multitude of items in the vision (e.g., “through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper.” v25) There may be some variation from scholar to scholar in the listing of the items in the vision, but I have tried to isolate each different item.

**TABLE 4**

Item	Verse	ITEM IN THE VISION	Explanatory Verse
	2	Daniel at the palace of Shushan	Nil
	2	The palace was in the province of Ulai	Nil
1	2	Daniel by the river Ulai	Nil
2	3	A ram	v.20
3	3	A ram standing before the river	Nil
4	3	The ram had two horns	Nil
5	3	The ram’s horns were high	v.20
6	3	One ram’s horn was higher than the other	Nil
7	3	The higher horn rose last	Nil
8	4	The ram pushed to the west, north, and south	Nil
9	4	No other animal could resist him or rescue its victims	Nil
10	4	He did according to his will and became great	Nil
11	5	A he-goat appeared	v.21
12	5	The he-goat came from the west	Nil
13	5	The he-goat did not touch the ground as it came from the west	Nil
14	5	The he-goat had a notable horn between its eyes	v.21
15	6	The goat came to the ram	Nil
16	6	The goat charged the ram with all its might	Nil
17	7	The goat charged with all its anger	Nil

Item	Verse	ITEM IN THE VISION	Explanatory Verse
1 8	7	The goat collided with the ram	Nil
1 9	7	The goat broke the ram's two horns	Nil
2 0	7	The ram was defenceless against the goat	Nil
2 1	7	The goat hurled the ram to the ground and trampled on it	Nil
2 2	7	No-one could rescue the ram from the goat's assault	Nil
2 3	8	The goat became very great	Nil
2 4	8	The goat's horn broke when it was at its peak	v.22
2 5	8	Four other horns came up in the place of the great horn	v.22
2 6	8	The four horns came up towards the four winds of heaven	Nil
2 7	9	Out of one of them came a small horn	v.23
2 8	9	This small horn became very great	v.24?
2 9	9	It expanded to the south, east and to the glorious land	Nil
3 0	1 0	It grew up to the stars of heaven	Nil
3 1	1 0	It cast some of the stars to the ground	Nil
3 2	1 0	It trampled on these stars on the ground	v.24
3 3	1 1	The horn magnified itself to the Prince of hosts	v.25
3 4	1 1	The daily sacrifice was abolished by the little horn	Nil
3 5	1 1	The Prince's sanctuary was thrown down by the horn	Nil
3 6	1 2	The host was given to the horn because of transgression	v.24?
3 7	1 2	The horn cast the truth to the ground	V25?
3 8	1 2	The horn practised and prospered	v.24?
3 9	1 3	One holy one was talking to another holy one	Nil
4 0	1 3	The latter said, "How long shall be the vision of the daily, the transgression, and the overthrow of sanctuary and the host?"	v.14
4 1	1 4	The answer was "Until 2300 evening-mornings and then the sanctuary shall be cleansed/restored to its rightful state."	v.26

The conclusions from this first table are:

1. Items that occur in *both* the vision and the interpretation include details from vs.3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and possibly v12. These represent a maximum of 13 out of 41 items (or 31.7%).
2. The mar'eh explained in vs.20-26 is vs.3-14, which is the hazôn, making both mar'eh and hazôn synonymous;
3. 26 out of 41 or 63% of the items in the vision are *not* explained at all in ch8, highlighting quite cogently that QOD is ignorant of the facts when it says that "all except the starting point for the 2300 days had been explained."
4. The interpretation in vs.20-26 has 32% of its content which occurs neither in vs.3-12 nor vs.13,14. This leads us to the conclusion that the interpretation supplied by Gabriel is a revelation in and of its own right, a complete capsule – a conclusion which fits with Dn9:21 calling Dn8:15-26 a hazon-vision.

#### a) Discussion on the Items in the Vision *Not* Explained in vs.15-26

It is worth quoting here the position of QOD on this point:

Gabriel had previously explained to Daniel all but the time portion of the symbolic vision of chapter 8. (p.270)

It will be remembered that according to Daniel 8:26, 2;7, it was the *mar'eh* "of the evening and the morning" that Daniel did not understand. It was not the vision as a whole, for all but the scene of the evening and the morning had been explained. (p.271)

QOD said "all except for the 2300 days had been explained."(p.270) They are wrong. It is clear from Table 2 that QOD is way off the mark in this regard. Is it poor scholarship or political scholarship? Is it a case of scratching for evidence to support a conclusion already decided upon? More than likely, it is just the repetition of a well worn argument without qualifying its veracity.

It is interesting that although in one place (p.271) QOD says Gabriel was told to explain vs.13,14, in the above references it is freely admitted that his explanation of the mar'eh encompassed "the vision;" that is, vs.3-14. Thus QOD inadvertently supports the point that the mar'eh is the hazôn.

The conclusions from this table are:

1. The unexplained items highlight the point that a matter does not have to be explicitly explained to be understood;
2. 63% of the items in the vision are entirely unexplained;
3. The absence of any further comment regarding the 2300 days is strong evidence for this item being understood when first mentioned (8:14)

**TABLE 5**

In this table we highlight those items that occur in the vision that do not occur in the interpretation just for the sake of clarity. This answers the SDA historicists' assertion that everything in the vision had been explained by Gabriel except the starting date for the 2300 days.

Item	Verse	Item in the Vision not Explained in Dn8:15-26
3	3	A ram standing before the river
5	3	The ram's horns were high
6	3	One ram's horn was higher than the other
7	3	The higher of the 2 horns rose last
8	4	The ram pushed northward, westward, and southward
9	4	No other animal could resist or escape him
10	4	The ram did according to his own will and become great
12	5	The he-goat came from the west
13	5	The he-goat did not touch the ground as it came
15	6	The he-goat came to the ram
16	6	The he-goat charged with all his might
17	7	The he-goat charged with anger
18	7	The he-goat collided with the ram
19	7	The he-goat broke the ram's 2 horns
20	7	The ram was defenceless against the he-goat
21	7	The he-goat hurled the ram to the ground and trampled on him
22	7	No victim could be rescued from the he-goat
23	8	The goat became very great
25	8	The four horns came up towards the four winds of heaven
29	9	This small horn expanded to the south, east and the glorious land
30	10	This horn grew up to the stars of heaven
34	11	The daily sacrifice was abolished by the horn
35	11	The prince's sanctuary was thrown down by the horn
39	13	One holy one was talking to another holy one
40	13	The latter said, How long shall the vision of the daily, the transgression, and the overthrow of the sanctuary and the host?
41	14	The answer was 2300 evening-mornings, then the sanctuary will be cleansed/restored

There are some items in this table that need some comment before we look at the next table.

1. Those long familiar with these prophecies would object to some items listed here not appearing in the interpretation, especially in regard to vs.9-14. They are probably under the illusion that vs.20-26 explain these verses but that is not the case. Study vs.20-26 and compare those texts with the list below and see if this is not correct.

**THE VISION (vs.9-11)**

**Is there an EXPLICIT Explanation?**

v9 "out of one of them"

Is not explained at all in ch.8:20-26

v10 "the host of heaven"/ "stars of heaven"

Is not defined at all in ch.8:20-26;

v11 “the daily”	Is not defined at all in ch.8:20-26
v11 “the place of his sanctuary”	Is not defined at all in ch.8:20-26
v12 “host given against the daily / due to transgression.”	Is not explained at all in ch.8:20-26
v13 all the verse	Is not explained at all in ch.8:20-26
v14 “2300 days”	Is not given any explanation,  Just said the matter is “true;”
v.14 “the sanctuary shall be restored”	Is not explained at all in ch.8:20-26

2. The interpretation of the items in this grouping may be given elsewhere in Scripture or may be common knowledge so an interpretation may not need not to be given in Daniel, but that is not the point of this exercise. The original task at hand was to answer the inquiry, Which items in the vision are explicitly explained in vs.20-26? These items are definitely **not** explained.
3. There are also many details recorded concerning the actions of the ram and the he-goat that are likewise untouched by any interpretation in Dan.8. These are not discussed here but instead are in Table 4.
4. The comment in 8:26 about the vision of the evening and the morning being true is not an adequate explanation; it is just an assertion of their veracity. All that Gabriel had to say on this item was not an explanation of the starting point. He was simply urging that Daniel should believe what he heard and saw. This lends weight to the argument that it was all Gabriel needed to say. The events were so incredulous they caused Daniel to question their truth. But Gabriel does not offer corroborative evidence. He simply underlines what has already been said. The weight of that emphasis on Daniel, that is the surety of the occurrence of the prophecy, was enough to send Daniel into a bout of gloomy forebodings for quite awhile. The absence of any more detail on the 2300 days leads us to assume, like so many other matters in Table 2 that were omitted and never explained at a later date, that the starting date was clear to Daniel. Daniel 9 does not mention the 2300 days. Daniel 10 to 12 does not mention the 2300 days. The statement made about the 2300 days in 8:26, merely reaffirming its truthfulness, leads us to conclude that not only was the time period true but that the information provided was adequate. Gabriel had apparently fulfilled his commission.

### **B. Items in the Interpretation.**

The focus of this table is to highlight the implications of the items in the

interpretation and answer the question whether the interpretation just explains the items in the vision, or does it do something different.

The first column numbers the items in the interpretation. The second column indicates in which verse of the interpretation the item is found. The third column gives the details of the item. The fourth column indicates “if” and “where” the item in the interpretation is located in the vision of vs.3-12.

**TABLE 6**

Item	Verse	ITEMS IN THE INTERPRETATION	Location in the vision?
1	1 7	At the time of the end shall be the vision	Nil
2	1 9	The end shall be at the time appointed	nil
3	2 0	The rams 2 horns represent the kings of Media and Persia	v3
4	2 1	The rough goat is the kingdom of Grecia	v5
5	2 1	The great horn between the goat's eyes is the first king	v5
6	2 2	The horn was broken and four replaced it	v8
7	2 2	Four kingdoms shall arise from this nation	v8
8	2 2	Four kingdoms shall not have the power of the great horn	Nil
9	2 3	Toward the end of their reign, transgressors will reach full measure	Nil
1 0	2 3	When transgressors reach full measure, a king shall arise	Nil
1 1	2 3	This king will be fierce and understand dark sentences	Nil
1 2	2 4	This king's power will be mighty	v9
1 3	2 4	This power of the king shall not be of his own origin	Nil
1 4	2 4	He shall cause fearful destruction	Nil
1 5	2 4	He shall succeed in all he does	v9
1 6	2 4	He shall destroy the mighty people	v10
1 7	2 4	He shall destroy the people of the saints	v10
1 8	2 5	By his cunning, he will make deceit prosper in his hand	v12
1 9	2 5	This king shall magnify himself in his mind	v11
2 0	2 5	He will destroy many while they are at ease	Nil
2 1	2 5	He will even oppose the Prince of princes	v11

Item	Verse	ITEMS IN THE INTERPRETATION	Location in the vision?
2 2	2 5	This king will be broken without human hand	Nil
2 3	2 6	The vision of the evening and the morning is true	v14
2 4	2 6	Shut up the vision	Nil
2 5	2 6	The vision pertains to the future	Nil

## Conclusions

1. The first point to consider is the statistics for this table:
  - a. 13 out of 25 items (52%) can be associated with a verse in the hazon: (Items:3,4,5,6,7,12,15,16,17,18,19,21,23)
  - b. 12 out of 25 items (48%) have no direct reference to a verse in the chazon of vs. 3-12: (Items: 1,2,8,9,10,11,13,14,20,24,25);
  - c. 1 out of 25 items (4%) refers to the mar'eh of v13-14:(Item23)
  - d. 14 out of 25 items (52%) are directly associated with the little horn of vs.9-12:(Items: 10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23);
  - e. Only 8 out of 25 items (32%) deal with the vision before the little horn (i.e., vs.3-8). They are Items 3,4,5,6,7,8, and I have included 9,10, even though they have been included as a precursor to the rise of the little horn;
  - f. 15 of the 24 items (42%) deal specifically with the little horn (Items 10-23);
2. The second point to consider is the following inferences from these statistics:
  - a. It cannot be said that Gabriel explains QOD's mar'eh of vs.13,14 if there is only one reference to it in his interpretation, and that reference has no explanatory details in it;
  - b. . The statistics show without a shadow of doubt that:
    - i. Gabriel explains the chazon of vs. 3-14. He refers specifically to vs. 3,5,8,9,10,11,12,14;
    - ii. chazon and mar'eh are synonymous here, contrary to QOD's theory;
  - c. Gabriel's interpretation can be rightly called a hazon in harmony with Dn9:21 since 12 out of the 25 items are new revelations and have no connection with any items in vs.3-14. This is contrary to QOD's position that it cannot be "vision;"
  - d. The only reference to the 2300 days by Gabriel is not an explanation, only a confirmation of its validity;
  - e. 52% of the interpretation is related to some aspect of the little horn. This clearly highlights the point that Gabriel, in answering the question about v14, spends half of his time explaining vs. 9-12, which is clearly not a part of QOD's mar'eh.
    - i. 7 out of the 13 items concerning the little horn are details which occur for the first time (Items: 9,10,11,13,14,20,22) ; that is, they are a part of Gabriel's new revelation.



### a). Discussion on Items in the Interpretation *Not Given* in the Vision

The details given in Table 5 have been discussed in the comments related to Table 4 but the major point of this additional tabulation is to highlight QOD's concept of the interpretation (ch.8:15-26) being nothing more than a revelation of "all but the scene of the evening and the morning." (p.271) The Table shows Gabriel *was indeed* "introducing a new line of prophecy" (QOD, p.272), contrary to the theories of QOD. Table 5 leaves no room for doubt Gabriel is not following the contrived theories of QOD when he explains the mar'eh of "the evening and the morning." He introduces whatever new items he feels is appropriate. He chooses to introduce fifteen new items which are not explicitly mentioned in vs.3-14. His interpretation is a genuine hazon-vision, as true as vs.3-14. Dn9:21 concurs, thus making Dn8:2-26 one entire hazon-vision.

What is important here is that 8 out of 12 items (75%) of Gabriel's *new* items deal with the actions and outcome of the little horn. This clearly demonstrates that in choosing to answer the command to explain the mar'eh of the evenings and mornings of 8:14, Gabriel has focused his attention on vs.9-12, even to the point of adding new revelations to clarify the matter. Furthermore, the addition of the extra items in his interpretation clearly shows that Gabriel went the second mile to fulfil the command to make Daniel understand the mar'eh.

The final evidence that the task had been completed in Gabriel's mind is his final conclusion and command to preserve the revelation, recorded in Dn8:26:

26 And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days

Gabriel's conclusion can be paraphrased, "The revelation is true." This indicates a final general comment is being made and is supported by the next conjunction: "wherefore/therefore" (Hebrew :"w" ). The translation of "w" as "therefore" is quite in order and fits the context appropriately. The Hebrew literally reads "and you, shut the vision because/for it is/shall be for many days." Here is the command that announces the revelation is complete, since the messenger has turned his attention from the message itself to the custodial issues of preservation. It shows that in Gabriel's mind he had fulfilled the task given him in (v. 16) to make Daniel understand the mar'eh-vision.

The first column lists the item number as they appeared in Table 4. The second column lists the verse in which each item occurs. The third column details the item which is not mentioned in ch.8:3-14.

**TABLE 7**

ITEM	VERSE	ITEMS REVEALED IN THE INTERPRETATION BUT NOT GIVEN IN THE VISION OF DN 8
1	17	At the time of the end shall be the vision
2	19	The end shall be at the time appointed
8	22	The four kingdoms shall not have the power of the former king
9	23	In the latter end of their rule, the transgressors will reach their full

		measure.
10	23	When transgressors reach their full measure, a king shall arise
11	23	This king shall be fierce and understanding dark sentences
13	24	The might of this king shall not be of his own origin
14	24	He shall cause fearful destruction
20	25	He will destroy many while they are at ease
22	25	This king will be destroyed without human agency
24	26	Shut up the vision
25	26	The vision pertains to a distant future.
1	17	At the time of the end shall be the vision
2	19	The end shall be at the time appointed

### b). Summary of Analysis of Items in the Interpretation *but not in the Vision*.

In Dn.8:16, Gabriel is told to explain the mar'eh. In doing this, he explicitly includes vs. 3,5,8,9,10,11,12,14-i.e., the chazon. This is definitely not what QOD proposes. When Gabriel is explaining the chazon, so many details are brushed over and never explained, even up to the end of Dn12. Therefore the belief that an item has to be explicitly explained before Daniel can understand is false.

A question that this analysis raises is, If Gabriel was commanded to explain the full vision (vs. 3-14), why are so many details omitted? The most obvious answer to come to mind is that Gabriel knew the extent of Daniel's expertise in "visions and dreams" (Dn2:17). Therefore Gabriel only had to give him the key details, leaving the rest for Daniel to interpret. But the revelation was not given to Daniel alone. He is commanded on more than one occasion to preserve this revelation for posterity (8:26; 12:9). Therefore, the explanation had to be sufficient for a multitude of minds. The Danielic revelations do assume a certain level of familiarity with the symbols employed. A close study of the symbols in the vision and a comparison with their use elsewhere in other revelations given to Daniel, both before and after this one, reveals a plan of heaven to use a common set of symbols that were relevant to the worldview of numerous readers.

Thus the argument presented above concerning Gabriel's use of Daniel's understanding to guide the detail of his explanation is not the full picture. Yet at the same time, when Gabriel is told, "Make *this man* to understand the vision," can we rightly assume he is also giving the explanation to anyone who is familiar with visionary symbols, at least up to the level of Daniel's understanding? One has to be versed in visionary symbols, as was Daniel, to understand.

The obvious conclusion from this is that even the interpretation is a revelation, since the provision of new details are provided, in addition to explanations about previous details. This would be consistent with the view that Dn8:2-26 is all one chazon, one mar'eh. QOD has inadvertently admitted that Dn9:21 rightly defines Dn8:16 (p.272), and this can therefore be extrapolated to also mean that vs. 17-26 are a chazon in addition to vs.3-14. I argue that the response of Gabriel to explain the mar'eh in 8:18-26 shows that he understood the mar'eh to include vs.2-14 (or more correctly, vs.3-14). Therefore the statement of Daniel in 9:21, which considers the whole experience in Dn8 as a hazon-

vision, is in fact correct in every sense of the word. It also aligns with his statement in Dn8:1,2 where he says only a hazon appeared to him that year. There is no mention of a “mar’eh” or an “explanation,” just the hazon. This stands in stark contrast to the position of QOD which says what follows Dn8:14 is not “vision.”

## 7. Question on Doctrine’s Distinction between “symbolic” and “literal.”

Another important consideration concerning the distinction by QOD regarding “vision” and “interpretation” is their differentiation between “symbolic” and “literal” items in these two categories of vision and interpretation. Notice these statements from QOD:

The prophetic symbols of Daniel 8:2-11 namely, the "ram" as Medo-Persia, the "goat" as Grecia, and the "exceeding great" horn as the terrifying power that would succeed, which was Rome—had all been explained by Gabriel, the celestial messenger, in verses 15 to 26. That is, *all except the symbolic time element involved in the 2300 days, with the events marking their close and the time of their beginning.* (p.269)

Gabriel had previously explained to Daniel all but the time portion of the symbolic vision of chapter 8. (p.270)

It will be remembered that according to Daniel 8:26, 2;7, it was the *mar'eh* "of the evening and the morning" that Daniel did not understand. It was not the vision as a whole, for all but the scene of the evening and the morning had been explained.(p.271)

What follows in chapter 9 is therefore not a new and independent vision, but is the continuing literal explanation of the symbolic "vision" of chapter 8.

We would stress this point, that *in chapter 9 Gabriel was not introducing a new line of prophecy.* He was simply continuing and completing his interrupted explanation, picking up the thread just where he had laid it down in his previous appearance to the prophet, recorded in chapter 8. (pp.271-272)

It has been noted (see Question 24) that a characteristic feature of *symbolic* prophecy is to give the component time periods, not literally, but in symbolic form. And it has been further demonstrated that Daniel 9:24-27 is a continuation of the literal explanation of the symbolic vision that was begun in Daniel 8:19-26. Now, inasmuch as Daniel 9:24-27 is a portion of the *literal explanation* of the symbolic vision, we would logically expect the time elements likewise to be given in literal terms. Such is the case if *shabua'* is here given the obvious meaning of "seven years." (p.277)

QOD defines chazôn as symbolic, and explanation as literal. Dn9, it maintains, is a continuation of the literal interpretation of ch8. However, by their own admission “vision” (chazôn) includes both the vision of vs.2-14 *and* the interpretation of vs.15-26 (using their stated explanation of Dn9:21), and that the given interpretation not only *defines* the chazôn (cf., ch8:16 as illustrated by vs.18-26 referring to items in vs.2-14), but in addition *it is an integral part of the chazôn* itself (cf., Dn8:26 in QOD terms). This indeed brings into question their dichotomy between what is symbolic/figurative and what is literal (I’m assuming here that symbolic and figurative are interchangeable). Furthermore, it could be then argued that an item occurring in a “vision”, whether it be a mar’ê-vision or a chazôn-

vision, as well as an explanation, could be either literal or figurative. The decision would have to be assessed, not on the basis of whether it occurs in a vision or an interpretation, but on the basis of the item itself.

Another question to consider is how much of Dn9:24-27 is literal and how much is figurative? Both Shea (1982, pp.74, 77) and I support the argument that shabua' is indeed a symbolic unit which is intimately linked with Dn9:1,2 and the sabbatical year (see Assumption 16), and yet it occurs in what QOD calls "literal explanation." There are other items in Dn9:24-27 that are symbolic/figurative, just as there are literal items in ch8:2-14. For instance, in Dn9:24-27, "the end shall be with a flood", "overspreading of abominations" (v27), are not literal phrases. And in the vision, although it is predominantly symbolic imagery, we encounter phrases such as "the palace of Shushan, which is in the province of Elam"(v2); "the river Ulai"(v2); "the banks of the river Ulai"(v16); and the four points of the compass (vs. 4,5,8,9). Other phrases that could be seen as literal could include "the daily," and "the sanctuary." (vs. 11,12,13)

So apart from the problem that QOD faces in regard to its definition of chazon versus mar'eh, as well as its definition of "vision" versus "literal interpretation," it also faces problems with its dichotomy between "symbolic/figurative" and "literal" in Dn8 and 9. Therefore, the time periods in Dn8:14 and Dn9:24-27 cannot necessarily be judged as literal or figurative merely from their location in the revelation.

### **Conclusion Regarding the Method Used by Questions on Doctrine.**

To conclude the discussion on QOD's argument linking Dn9:23 with the 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14, the evidence fails to stand up under close scrutiny for the following reasons:

- (1) QOD defines chazôn as Dn8:2-14, whereas Scripture (Dn9:21) has defined Dn8:16 also as chazôn, the latter being acknowledged also by QOD;
- (2) Dn8:15-26 is one natural unit since Gabriel is present with Daniel to explain the mar'ê through to when he finishes his communication at v26
- (3) Verse 16 cannot be separated from v15-26 and be referred to by Dn9:21 as a chazon in and of itself. Thus, the entire passage, Dn8:15-26, is a part of the chazon referred to in Dn9:21.
- (4) **Therefore, Dn9:21 refers to Dn8:15-26 as a chazon .**
- (5) QOD correctly acknowledges that the passage Dn8:2-14 is chazon, **thus making Dn8:2-26 one whole chazon.**
- (6) A close examination of the contents of vs.20-26 indicates:
  - a. the mar'eh which was explained, explicitly included vs.3-14, that is, the chazon mentioned in v14. This equates mar'eh with chazon.
  - b. Neither the man between the Ulai nor Gabriel understood the QOD dichotomy between mar'eh and chazon, since, in explaining the mar'eh he explains the chazon.

Thus “vision” and “interpretation” can both be called mar’eh and chazon in Dn8 since *interpretation* (8:16-26) is called chazon in Dn9:21) and vision is called mar’eh by the material in 8:18-26;

- (7) The use of mar’eh in Dn8:27 does not specifically refer to the mar’eh of the evening and the morning. It could indeed refer to Dn8:2-14.
- (8) It is simply not true that everything in the vision of Dn8:3-12 had been explained in vs.20-26, excepting the starting date for the 2300 days. Only approximately 33% of the ideas given in the vision are referred to in the interpretation. The fact that an item is not explained in vs.20-26 does not mean that Daniel did not understand it. It may well be Gabriel already understood what points Daniel did and did not understand and he therefore chose only those items about which Daniel needed explanation. In fact, there were many things still unexplained from Dn8, even by the end of Dn12. Even if Dn9:24-27 is an explanatory appendix to Dn8, this too, leaves some elements unexplained. The absence of any explicit explanation for a starting date is as strong a case for Daniel’s understanding of it as it is for his non-understanding of it.
- (9) There is no need for Gabriel to explain vs.3-12 in vs.20-26 if all he was commanded to explain was Dn8:13,14. This explanation of the starting date for the 2300 days (or allegedly Dn9:24-27) could easily have been given without the explanation of the vision of vs.3-12, and Daniel would still have understood the starting date if that is all he needed to know to understand the mar’ê.
- (10) In the statement of Dn9:22, 23, regarding Gabriel’s purpose for visiting Daniel, there is no hint Gabriel has come to address the matter of the 2300 days. There is no hint at all in Dn9:2-19 that Daniel is considering the 2300 days or that the 2300 days is related to the issues in Daniel’s prayer. The purpose of Gabriel’s visit in ch9 is solely and explicitly related to the subject matter immediately in context, i.e., Daniel’s prayer of ch.9:4-19.

On these grounds, the lexical argument proposed by the book Questions on Doctrine regarding the meaning of chazôn and mar’ê in Dn 8 and 9 is refuted. This only leaves as the basis for the argument which links the 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14 with the seventy weeks of Dn9:24-27, the traditional SDA method –of making outright assumptions. These dubious assumptions provide poor foundation stones for interpretations that SDA historicists build around Daniel’s symbols.

## Second Method: Dr. William O’Shea’s Approach

A similar approach to the link between Dn9:23 and Dn8:13,14 was presented in 1981 in a work entitled “The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical and Theological” and edited by Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner. There were two papers in this volume that related directly to the subject of the meaning of the word “vision” in Dn8:13 and the starting date for the 2300 day prophecy. One paper was entitled, “The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9,” by William H. O’Shea. The second paper, by Gerhard F. Hasel, was entitled, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Saints and the

Sanctuary in Daniel 8.” These two papers will be examined extensively in this paper.

Turning then to Shea’s work first, Shea was writing on this topic before publication of the post-Glacier View volumes by the Biblical Research Institute. In 1980 he wrote a paper for the Glacier View Committee called “Daniel and the Judgment.” This covered the bulk of his ideas that he was to later amplify in articles in the Daniel and Revelation Committee Series (DARCOM). His 1981 paper, “*The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9*, in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, by Wallenkampf and Leshner, was the first *published* article to express his theory concerning the meaning of the two Hebrew words for “vision.” This was followed in 1982, by Volume 1 of the DARCOM series entitled “*Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*” written solely by Shea covering this and related topics more extensively. My initial focus is on Shea’s 1981 article in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*. This is where he first promulgates his novel theory. His article is not easy to follow on the first reading. He tends to jump around the book of Daniel in an unsequential manner. To illustrate, he begins his thesis in Dn10 in order to prove his particular meaning of the two words for “vision.” Then he goes back to Dn8 and applies what he has extrapolated from Dn10 to Dn8. He then discusses the problem text in Dn9 and finds a solution for it in Dn7.

Following a quotation of Shea’s arguments on the use of “vision” in Dn10, I will examine Shea’s arguments under three headings:

1. Shea’s Argumentation on the Meaning of *Mar’ê* and *Chazôn* in Dn10.
2. My rebuttal to Shea’s theory of the meaning of *mar’ê* in Dn10;
3. Shea’s evidence of the meaning of *mar’ê* and *chazôn* in Daniel 8 and 9.

I will then finish with a concluding summary on Shea’s method.

#### **A. Shea’s statement on the meaning of *mar’ê* in Daniel 10.**

The following extract from Shea’s paper outlines his argument for the meaning of *hazôn* and *mar’ê* from Dn10:

The "vision" referred to above from Dan 9:23 and 10:14 brings up a discussion of the technical terminology applied by Daniel SOMETHING MISSING HERE. to the different aspects of the revelatory experiences he had. When Gabriel said to Daniel, "The vision is for days yet to come," as recorded in Dan 10:14, this is the fifth occurrence of the English word vision in the translation of ch 10, but it is only the first occurrence of the Hebrew word *hazôn*. The Hebrew word used in the preceding four instances is *mar’ê*. *Mar’ê* comes from the root ra’â which is the common verb used 1,140 times in the OT for the idea of seeing. *Hazôn* comes from *hâzâ*, which appears much less frequently in the OT and which generally refers (although not exclusively) to the more specific act of seeing in prophetic vision. As a noun *hazôn* is used only of prophetic visions, where *mar’ê* commonly used in contexts not connected with prophecy. *Mar’ê* refers to that which can be seen with the natural eye, be it spots on the skin (Lev 13:3), the attractiveness (Is 2:9) or unattractiveness (Is 53:2) of what is seen, what a person looks like, including his stature (1 Sa 16:7; Song 5:15), or everything that can be seen by the eyes (Lev 13:12). Generally, it should be noted in this connection that *mar’ê* refers to some aspect of the appearance of individuals, or personal beings. With this information in hand we may turn to the



use of these words in Dan 10. Daniel introduces this passage by stating (v1) that he "understood the word and had understanding of the *mar'ê* [appearance]." Daniel does not at this time state that he received a *hazôn* (vision) but that he saw a *mar'ê* (appearance). From what follows in the chapter it is obvious that the "appearance" to which he referred was the appearance of God, as recorded in vs. 5-7. After recording the splendor of God that he saw, Daniel states, "And I, Daniel, alone saw the *mar'ê* [appearance], for the men who were with me did not see the *mar'ê* [appearance], but a great trembling fell upon them, and they fled to hide themselves. So I was left alone and saw this great *mar'ê* [appearance], and no strength was left in me" (vs. 7-8). When Gabriel subsequently came to Daniel he explained to Gabriel, "O my lord, by reason of the *mar'ê* [appearance] pains have come upon me" (v 16). *Mar'ê* is used not only for the appearance of God as a whole, but it is used also in v 6 to describe His face in particular, which had the "appearance" of lightning. *Mar'ê* is also used once for Gabriel in this chapter in comparing his appearance to that of a man (v 18). Note also in this connection that *mar'ê* is used for the appearance of God and His heavenly escort in Eze 1 and 10 (cf 1:1; 8:4; 43:3).

From the description of Daniel's experiences on this occasion it is evident that in six of the seven instances where *mar'ê* is used in this chapter he referred thereby to the appearance of God, which he saw, as recorded in vs. 5-7. He does not use the word *hazôn* anywhere in this chapter to refer to that appearance. Thus a sharp distinction is drawn here between the use of *mar'ê*, which refers to the appearance of God as seen by Daniel on that occasion, and the use of *hazôn* for the vision in v 14, which Gabriel said would be for many days. This distinction indicates that *hazôn* must refer to some other vision than the appearance of God described in ch 10. Thus the *hazôn* mentioned here logically points back to the preceding vision of Dan 8, just as the similar reference in Dan 9:23 does.<sup>10</sup> In Dan 8:17 Gabriel told Daniel that the *hazôn* (vision) was for "the time of the end" just as he told him in 10:14 it would be for "days yet to come."

Further emphasis might be placed at this point on the distinction between *mar'ê* and *hazôn* elucidated in Dan 10. *Mar'ê* appears to refer more specifically to the appearance of a personal being in vision, as was the case with God here, whereas *hazôn* here refers back to the prophet's earlier view of the beasts and their activities, which represent the rise and fall of nations and their relations with God's people and His agencies. The distinction drawn here can now be applied to the occurrences of these two words in chs 8 and 9, where their distribution and function are somewhat more complex. (pp.232-234)

Shea's arguments in this selection can be summarised thus:

- (1) In the final chapters of Daniel's book hazôn only occurs in Dn10:14;
- (2) Daniel does not use hazôn anywhere in ch10 to refer to the vision of Dn10:5-7 ;
- (3) In harmony with usage of these two words elsewhere in Scripture, mar'ê is used in Dn10, to refer to the physical act of seeing whereas hazôn is used virtually exclusively "to the more specific act of seeing in prophetic vision;"

<sup>10</sup> It is interesting here that Shea says Dn9:23 refers to Dn8, whereas in other places, he says it refers to chapter 7. Is Dn9 the third time that Gabriel has visited Daniel?

- (4) Mar'ê refers generally “to some aspect of the appearance of individuals, or personal beings;”
- (5) Mar'ê alone is used in Dn10 to refer to the vision of God in vs.5-7;
- (6) Therefore mar'ê and hazôn are in sharp contrast to each other in Dn10;
- (7) The reference to the hazôn of “many days” points “to some other vision than the appearance of God described in Dn10;”
- (8) The last previous vision occurs in ch8 and a reference in Dn9:23 (should be 9:21 if Shea is discussing hazôn, not the verse 23 that he quotes) also refers back to ch8;
- (9) Both the reference in Dn8:17 and 10:14 refer to a hazôn at the end time or “the days yet to come.” This is further evidence that hazôn in Dn10:14 “logically” refers back to Dn8;
- (10) Shea goes even further in his “clarification” of the meaning of these two words by pointing out that the use of mar'ê in Dn10 applies to “the appearance of a personal being in vision,” “whereas hazôn here refers back to the prophet’s earlier view of the beasts and their activities, which represent the rise and fall of nations and their relations with the people of God and His agencies.”

This then comprises Shea’s evidence from Dn10. Using this “evidence,” he then applies it to the occurrences of these words in Dn8 and 9.

#### **B. Shea’s Argumentation on the Meaning of Mar'ê and Chazôn.**

Firstly, Shea basically supported the major thesis of QOD, that hazôn and mar'ê are technical Danielic terms, tying Dn9:21-27 to Dn8:13,14 in a very definite way. Shea took a slightly different line of argument from that pursued by QOD. Shea firstly argued for a more refined meaning for both mar'ê and hazôn compared to that of QOD. Whereas QOD saw chazôn as applying to Dn8:2-14, Shea limits hazôn to Dn8:3-12. Similarly, whereas QOD defines mar'ê as “the particular things seen or heard in the chazôn”(p.270), Shea limits the meaning of mar'ê in Dn8 and 9 to Dn8:13,14 – “the intravisional appearance and explanation of the two holy ones.” (p.237).

Secondly, Shea attempts to gain his basic “proof” of the different meanings of both mar'ê and hazôn from Dn10. After establishing his “evidence” in this chapter, he reverts back to Dn8 and 9 to see if his thesis supports the SDA theory regarding the links between the two chapters. He finds that it does, with the exception of one text: Dn9:21. He candidly admits the pivotal nature of the problem and then proposes that Dn9:21 is referring to Dn7 (pp.238f)!! He then summarises his findings in favour of his thesis.

In the rest of his paper, Shea briefly discusses the ten-year delay between Dn8 and Dn9 (pp.239-240); the implications of nehtak (“cut off,” “determined”) in Dn9:24 (pp.249-250) and concludes his paper with a discussion on when the prophecies of Dn8 and Dn9 were to begin (p.250). Expressed tabularly, Shea’s proposal for the outline of Dn8 to 12 would follow something like the following:



## DANIEL 8

**Dn8:1-2**-Introductory Comment (p.229?)

**Dn8:2-12**-hazôn -lengthy vision (p.229)“of the beasts and the little horn”(p.237)

**Dn8:13,14**-mar'ê-“the intravisional appearance and explanation of the two holy ones cf.,Dn8:16,26,27;9:23” (p.237,229,?)

**Dn8:15-26**- “ the extravisional appearance and explanation of Gabriel: could be included in the mar'ê of Dn8:26 and 9:23 but does not have to be. Cannot be included in the mar'ê of Dn8:16, which refers to what Gabriel was to explain.” (p.237)

## DANIEL 9.

**Dn9:1-20**- “Daniel’s lengthy prayer” (p.239)

**Dn9:21-27**- “Extravisional explanation”(p.229)

**Dn9:24-27**-“Didactic prophecy”(p.240); neither mar'ê or hazôn but rather explanation only(p.230)

## DANIEL 11-12

“Didactic prophecy”(p.240); neither mar'ê or hazôn but rather explanation (p.230)

**Note for Dn9,11-12:** “...both these didactic prophecies explain both of the earlier visionary prophecies.”(p.240,229)

Shea limits the meaning of mar'ê “to the appearance of personal beings, in this case, the holy ones in the scenes Daniel saw at the end of this vision” (p.235). According to this definition, nothing in Dn8:3-12 should be classified as mar'ê. As for Dn8:15-26, Shea says:

Dan 8:15-26 the extravisional appearance and explanation of Gabriel: could be included in the mar'ê of 8: 26 and 9:23 but does not have to be. Cannot be included in the mar'ê of Dan 8:16, which refers to what Gabriel was to explain. This explanatory function of Dan 8:15-26 makes the primary application of all three of these occurrences of mar'ê refer to Dan 8:13-14 regardless of how one relates Dan 8:15-26 to them (p.237).

Based on his interpretation of the usage of mar'ê in Dn10, Shea takes a more narrow view of the meaning of mar'ê than that of QOD. According to Shea, there is no hint at all that Scripture refers to “the particular things seen or heard” in vs.3-12 as mar'ê as proposed by QOD. Shea thereby shows his dismissal of QOD’s position. The only attested usage which Shea says can be classified as a clarification of mar'ê is Dn8:26: “the vision (mar'ê)

of the evening and the morning,” which refers us quite clearly, in his view, to Dn8:13-14. Given then his more precise definition of mar'ê, it is much easier for Shea to relate the seventy weeks of Dn9:24-27 to the 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14, since, when Gabriel says in Dn9:23 “Consider the mar'ê,” he is referring specifically to Dn8:13,14! Notice how he concludes:

We may now summarize this brief study of the technical terminology used for different aspects of the prophecies in Daniel. When Gabriel used the word *mar'ê* in Dan 9:23 to refer to the part of the prophecy of ch 8 that he had come to explain, he referred just to that vision in general but more specifically to the *mar'ê* or "appearance," of the two holy ones as recorded in Dan 8:13-14. Because the primary point of information told in that appearance as one relating to time (the 2300 evenings-mornings during which he sanctuary and its services were cast down), and because Gabriel's new explanation directed to that *mar'ê* begins with an additional element of time (the 70 weeks), the reference to the *mar'ê* in Dan9:23 relates the 70 weeks to the 2300 evenings-mornings ever more directly, along with the connections already observed in the preceding sections of this study (pp.238f).

Haven given a brief outline of Shea's thesis and his line of argument, I wish to address his arguments more specifically and examine their validity. His connection between mar'ê in Dn9:23 and Dn8:13,14 is entirely dependent upon his definition of mar'ê. This should be the logical place to begin examining his thesis.

### C. A Rebuttal to Shea's theory of the meaning of mar'ê from Daniel 10.

Before I examine the 10 points listed above, I wish to address a much more basic issue related to Shea's use of Dn10 as the platform to establish his 'unequivocally unambiguous evidence.'

The issue is the question as to whether the word mar'ê occurs in Dn 10 as often as is reported. In R.Kittel's Biblica Hebraica (1909) (referred hereafter as BHK), the instances of mr' in Dn10:7a,7b,8,16 are all pointed mar'â. Dn10:7b has an accompanying metheg (accent), meaning that there is a possibility that either 'â or 'ê could occur there, though from the context of the BHK, 'â would be the obvious choice. But even discounting this text, there is an issue that has to be addressed here. In the apparatus criticus of BHK, no mention is given of possible variants to this pointing.

However, in Elliger's and Rudolf's Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia (1984)( referred to as BHS), they have the following interesting comments. At Dn8:27 they note that manuscripts read *mar'ah* instead of *mar'eh*. In the occurrence at Dn10:7 they have this comment:

TYPE THIS IN RATHER THAN AN IMAGE.

The Gothic “T” is for Targums; “ut” –is for “as, so that;” “I” is for lege/legendum-“read, to be read,” “id” is for idem “same as.” Putting it all together, it says that the Targums have *mar'eh* here. :The next phrase says to treat this verse as Dn8:27. The last phrase says that verse 8 and verse 16 are to be treated likewise. The suggestion of BHS is that we could choose *mar'eh* here instead of *mar'ah* if we follow the lead of the Targums.

Clearly the issue is not clear-cut for either choice in Dn 10.

### Brown, Driver and Biggs (1986)

The BDB edition of Gesenius classifies *mar'ah* in Dn10:7,8 16 as a separate word, although it gives the same meaning to it as to *mar'eh*:

1759 †I. מְרָאָה n.f. vision, as means of revelation: מ' abs. Nu 12<sup>6</sup> (E), 1 S 3<sup>15</sup> Dn 10<sup>16</sup>, as acc. cogn. v<sup>7.7.8</sup>; appar. pl. abs. מְרָאוֹת Ez 43<sup>3</sup>, but rd. מְרָאָה הָרֶכֶב & Co Berthol Siegf Krae, or del. Toy Krae (as altern.); estr. מְרָאוֹת הַלַּיְלָה Gn 46<sup>2</sup> (E), מְרָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים Ez 1<sup>1</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 40<sup>2</sup>.

### Tregelles (1952)

מְרָאָה const. מְרָאָה with suff. מְרָאִי Cant. 2:14; מְרָאָה Lev. 13:34; מְרָאָה Lev. 13:35; but more often with forms of the suffix, which appear to be pl., of which however the Yod is radical (see מְרָאָה, מְרָאָה and Gramm. § 90, 9), like מְרָאִי Cant. 2:14; מְרָאִי Job 41:1; and מְרָאִיָּה (which are found construed with a sing. Gen. 41:21; Lev. 14:37; Dan. 1:15), plur. const. מְרָאִי Eccles. 11:9 נוֹיֵב (קרי מְרָאָה) m. (from the root מְרָאָה).

(1) *appearance, look, aspect*, Gen. 41:21; Cant. 2:14 [and often Arab. مَرَاة]; Lev. 13:12, לְכָל מְרָאָה עֵינַי, "according to all the looking of the priest," i.e. as to what the priest sees in him. Deut. 28:34, מְרָאָה עֵינַי "what thine eyes behold;" verse 67; Isa. 11:3; Eze. 23:16.

(2) *vision, sight*, Exod. 3:3; Eze. 8:4; 11:24; 43:3; Dan. 8:16.

(3) *form, appearance*, Exod. 24:17; Eze. 1:16, 28. It is placed after in the genitive, יִפֶּת מְרָאָה Gen. 12:11; מְרָאָה טוֹבָה Gen. 24:16; 26:7, fair of form; and with ל prefixed, לְמְרָאָה beautiful of form, Gen. 2:9. In the prophetic style the appearance of anything, is *what is like such a thing*; comp. דְּמוּת No. 3. Dan. 10:18, וַיַּעֲבִי בְּמְרָאָה אָדָם "there touched me as the appearance of a man;" Eze. 8:2; also 1:26, דְּמוּת בְּמְרָאָה.

מְרָאָה f. of the preceding.—(1) *vision*, i. q. חֲזוֹן Dan. 10:7, 8, 16, מְרָאוֹת הַלַּיְלָה visions of the night, Gen. 46:2. מְרָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים visions sent by God, Eze. 8:3; 40:2.

(2) *a looking-glass, a mirror*, Ex. 38:8. (Arab. مِرْآة id.) compare מְרָאָה.

50

Tregelles version of Gesenius' Lexicon sees Dn10:7,8 and 16 as incidences of *mar'ah* rather than *mar'eh*, although he says that the meaning of *mar'ah* is equivalent to *chazôn*.

## Koehler and Baumgartner (1994)

מַרְאֵה: מַרְאֵה, Bauer-L. *Heb.* 492p: MHeb., Tigr. (Littmann-H. *Wb.* 116a) *merāyat*: pl. cs. מַרְאֵה (SamP, M<sup>192</sup> *mārā'ot*): —1. **apparition, vision** (= מַרְאֵה 3) Nu 12<sub>6</sub> 1S 3<sub>15</sub> (reve-

lation of a divine word !) Da 10<sub>7f-16</sub>; pl. with מַרְאֵה Gn 46<sub>2</sub> (Sept. Pesh. sg.), with מַרְאֵה Ezk 1<sub>1</sub> 8<sub>3</sub> 40<sub>2</sub>; 43<sub>3</sub> rd. מַרְאֵה; Sir 41<sub>2</sub> margin מַרְאֵה, M<sup>1112</sup> מַרְאֵה; —2. **mirror**, MHeb., IQM 5<sub>5</sub> מַרְאֵה פְּנִים, Arb. *mir'āt*; = מַרְאֵה MHeb. JArm. EgArm.; BRL 493; Yadin *BarKokhba* 1:125ff; Reicke-R. *Hw.* 1831: Ex 38<sub>8</sub>. †

KBL treats the occurrences of *mar'ah* as a separate word in Dn10, even though it says that the meaning is equivalent to meaning No.3 under *mar'eh*.

As can be seen from the above details, the use of Dn10 as a platform for a definition of mar'ê and hazôn is not as uncomplicated as Shea supposes. Is mar'â a different word to mar'ê? This is the consensus of lexicographers. Thus, in their view, the occurrence of mar'â cannot be used for mar'ê. In other occurrences of mar'ê in Daniel, the pointing is not questioned. So the use of these texts in Dn10 to establish definitions for these words must be seen as a questionable exercise at best. Be that as it may, I wish to turn to Shea's arguments listed above and expose their weaknesses.

In the following section I will argue:

- (1) That mar'ê occurs in a significant number of occasions in prophecy;
- (2) That mar'ê in Dn10:1 refers to Dn10:4 to 12:13;
- (3) That mar'ê in Dn10:1 synonymous with dábár/d'barîm;
- (4) That mar'ê is synonymous in Dn10:1 and Dn10:14 with hazôn;
- (5) Can a Mar'ê include what is Spoken as well as what is Seen?

### 1. Mar'ê used in contexts not connected with prophecy.

One of the more fundamental points raised by Shea is the usage of the word across the broad range of Biblical literature. How is it used elsewhere outside the book of Daniel? Is the same as the usage in the book of Daniel? In what context is it normally found? Is there any features about the incidence of this word that we need to be cognizant of? The following is a statement by Shea on this feature of the word:

*Mar'ê* comes from the root ra'â which is the common verb used 1,140 times in the OT for the idea of seeing. *Hazôn* comes from *hâzâ*, which appears much less

frequently in the OT and which generally refers (although not exclusively) to the more specific act of seeing in prophetic vision. As a noun *hazôn* is used only of prophetic visions, where *mar'ê* commonly used in contexts not connected with prophecy. *Mar'ê* refers to that which can be seen with the natural eye, be it spots on the skin (Lev 13:3), the attractiveness (Is 2:9) or unattractiveness (Is 53:2) of what is seen, what a person looks like, including his stature (1 Sa 16:7; Song 5:15), or everything that can be seen by the eyes (Lev 13:12). Generally, it should be noted in this connection that *mar'ê* refers to some aspect of the appearance of individuals, or personal beings. With this information in hand we may turn to the use of these words in Dan 10. Daniel introduces this passage by stating (v1) that he "understood the word and had understanding of the *mar'ê* [appearance]." Daniel does not at this time state that he received a *hazôn* (vision) but that he saw a *mar'ê* (appearance). From what follows in the chapter it is obvious that the "appearance" to which he referred was the appearance of God, as recorded in vs. 5-7. After recording the splendor of God that he saw, Daniel states, "And I, Daniel, alone saw the *mar'ê* [appearance], for the men who were with me did not see the *mar'ê* [appearance], but a great trembling fell upon them, and they fled to hide themselves. So I was left alone and saw this great *mar'ê* [appearance], and no strength was left in me" (vs. 7-8). When Gabriel subsequently came to Daniel he explained to Gabriel, "'O my lord, by reason of the *mar'ê* [appearance] pains have come upon me'" (v 16). *Mar'ê* is used not only for the appearance of God as a whole, but it is used also in v 6 to describe His face in particular, which had the "appearance" of lightning. *Mar'ê* is also used once for Gabriel in this chapter in comparing his appearance to that of a man (v 18). Note also in this connection that *mar'ê* is used for the appearance of God and His heavenly escort in Eze 1 and 10 (cf 1:1; 8:4; 43:3). (1981a, pp.232-234)

One of Shea's first failings is that he contradicts a mass of Scriptures in his own definition of the meaning of *mar'ê*. He says that *mar'ê* refers to visions that "can be seen with the natural eye," whereas we are led to believe *hazôn* refers to visions that cannot be seen with the natural eye, but "the more specific act of seeing in prophetic vision." But then Shea states further down that "*Mar'ê* is used not only for the appearance of God as a whole, but it is used also in v 6 to describe His face in particular, which had the 'appearance' of lightning." Does this mean that not only "the appearance of God as a whole," but also "His face in particular" can be seen with the natural eye? This would be problematic considering the wealth of statements in the Bible stating that divine aid is needed to do what Shea says can be done with the natural eye. If he agrees that no man can see God and live, he must agree also that natural man needs divine support to endure any revelation given to him /her in order to survive the event. It might be more advantageous here to assume that Shea is saying, a *mar'ê* is seen with the natural eye (and with divine support to endure the revelation), whereas a *hazôn* is seen in the mind.

Unfortunately, in Shea's comments regarding the meaning of *mar'ê*, he only includes material that corresponds with the conclusions that he wishes to establish. He says that "*mar'ê* is commonly used in contexts not connected with prophecy" (p.232). This statement itself is vague and in need of clarification. Does "prophecy" here mean a prophetic book, or a prophecy regardless of whether it is in a prophetic book or not? And what is Shea's concept of a prophecy? Does it include "classical" prophecies, or only apocalyptic visions?

If one takes "prophecy" as the Hebrews understand it, meaning the prophetic books, then in the prophetic section of the Hebrew Bible *mar'ê* occurs 46 times. In the "later



prophets,” mar'ê occurs 38 times; and if we include Daniel from “the writings,” the frequency increases to around 50. Now, when it is considered that the total occurrence of mar'ê is around 100 (excluding instances in Dn10:7,7,8 where mar'ê occurs as a marginal reading, though probably a correct one at that), a frequency of up to 50% in the prophetic literature is a significantly common usage.

If Shea means the use of mar'ê as meaning “vision” of a supernatural variety, the frequency is 27 times in Ezekiel, 7-10 times in Daniel, twice in Joel and once in Nahum, giving a total of 37 occurrences. This is still a significant representation that Shea has to account for. As can be seen from this thumbnail sketch of the incidence of mar'ê in Scripture, the word does occur *very frequently* in prophetic texts, contrary to Shea’s assertion. It does occur with reference to supernatural vision, and as well as being used to refer to the sight (whether natural or supernatural), of individuals or personal beings, it is also used to describe Moses’ burning bush (Ex3:3), the vision of the sanctuary given to Moses (Num8:4), or Ezekiel (Eze41:21;42:11), or even the throne of God (Eze10:1,9,10). To paraphrase Shea “*mar'ê*” is *commonly* “used in contexts connected with prophecy.” (1981a, p.232)

In fairness to Shea however, it should be said that regardless of whether natural or supernatural vision is being referred to, regardless of whether the object of the vision is man, angel or God, regardless of whether it is the actual appearance of the person or only the sight of a part of their body (e.g., a sore (Lev 13,14)), around 50-60 occurrences do indeed “refer to some aspect of individuals, or personal beings” (p.232). But even in acknowledging this, it needs to be pointed out that Shea has made the mistake of not making enough allowance for the use of mar'ê in regard to supernatural visions, nor for its occurrence in prophetic visions. This must bring into question any conclusion that Shea makes since he has incorrectly established the parameters for his proposals concerning the distinction between these two words. But there is more!!!

## 2. That mar'ê in Dn10:1 refers to Dn10:4 to 12:13.

In Shea’s very next paragraph the next error occurs:

With this information in hand we may turn to the use of these words in Dan 10. Daniel introduces this passage by stating (v 1) that he “understood the word and had understanding of the *mar'ê* [appearance].” Daniel does not at this time state that he received a *hazôn* (vision) but that he saw a *mar'ê* (appearance). From what follows in the chapter it is obvious that the “appearance” to which he referred was the appearance of God, as recorded in vs. 5-7, 9 (1981a, p.233)

There is a convenient twist of the text in verse 1 here by Shea from Daniel having “understanding of the mar'ê,” to Daniel “seeing the mar'ê,” which has important bearings on the outcome of the definition of mar'ê in Dn10. In terms of Shea’s definition of mar'ê – that it “refers to that which can be seen with the natural eye,”- the statement of Daniel in v1, not of “seeing” the mar'ê, but “understanding” the vision is difficult for him to accommodate. So what does he do? He changes the verse to suit his theory! The act of “understanding” is not an optical response to a stimuli; it is a cognitive response. This distinction becomes significant when we consider Daniel’s response to the vision of

ch10:5-7, compared to his duty and his response to the revelation of Dn11:13 to Dn 12:13.

I will assume for the purposes of this discussion that mr' in Dn10:6,7,7,8,16 are all pointed as mar'ê, and refer to vs. 5-7 as Shea proposes, and that the instance in Dn10:18 refers to the appearance of the man as recorded in vs. 5-7. It may be asked as to what was Daniel's response to this appearance of the man clothed in linen? What response did either the man clothed in linen (vs. 5-7) or the humanlike messenger expect from Daniel in respect of the appearance of the supernatural being? Daniel's response is recorded in vs. 8,9,16,17:

8 Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength.

9 Yet heard I the voice of his words: and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground.

16 And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me O my lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.

17 For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is there breath left in me.

Daniel mentions loss of strength, loss of consciousness, sorrows that upset him (pains came unto him RSV), and loss of breath. These are Daniel's automatic responses to the revelation. Is there any expectations placed upon Daniel in the chapter in respect to the revelation of vs.5-7? The expectations that are placed on Daniel are implicated in vs.11, 14,19-21:

11 And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling.

14 Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days.

19 And said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong. And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak; for thou hast strengthened me.

20 Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee ? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.

21 But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.



It will be noticed in these verses that in respect of the revelation of the man clothed in linen recorded in vs. 5-7, Daniel is expected to respond without fear and without a sense of corruptness, with peace of mind, and with strength (cf., vs.17-19). In short, Daniel is expected to respond in the exact opposite way as he in fact did respond. But nowhere is there any command to “understand” the revelation of the man in vs. 5-7. The references in v11, 14 and 21 to “understanding” and “knowing” is in regard to what the messenger “will shew Daniel” (v21).

Notice that even at v21, this communiqué which Daniel was to understand had not yet been conveyed to Daniel. So it is evident that Daniel’s exercise of understanding had not commenced by v21! In ch11:2 we read “and now I will shew thee the truth....” What Daniel had been commanded to understand in ch10:11-14,20-21, begins at ch11:2 and finishes at 12:3 (with an epilogue in 12:5-13). Thus, it is clear from these details that in regard to the vision of the man clothed in linen recorded in Dn10:5-7, Daniel is only expected to “see” and not to be scared by what he sees. It is also just as clear that in regard to “the words” that were to be spoken to Daniel; words that are given in response to his three weeks vigil (v12,cf.,vs.2-4); that these words are given in ch11:2 and continue through to the end of the book. These are the words Daniel was told to “understand.” And when Daniel came to committing it to writing, he summarised this whole experience as recorded in verse 1 of ch10:

In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision.

This summary statement shows that Daniel understood the revelation of Dn11:2 to 12:13 to be a dábár and a mar’ê. Clearly then from the above evidence, there is a strong case for arguing that the clause “and had understanding of the vision (mar’ê ),” is Daniel’s response to the command given to him in as recorded ch10:11. That is to say, during the revelation, Daniel is told to understand the words that were to be given to him in answer to his prayers. And when Daniel comes to commit the experience to writing, he summarises by saying that he understood what he was told to understand.

The implication of this point is that rather than referring to vs.5-7, the occurrence of mar’ê in ch10:1 refers to ch11:2 to 12:13 at least, and should properly include 10:4 to 12:13 – that is, not only the *vision* of the man clothed in linen and the messengers as they appear in ch10-12, but also the *message* that the man conveys to Daniel. In regard to Shea’s approach to mar’ê in Dn10:1 where he glibly asserts: “From what follows in the chapter it is obvious that the ‘appearance’ to which he referred was the appearance of God, as recorded in vs. 5-7,” we can see that he has ignored the difficulty of looking carefully at verse 1. It is NOT obvious that mar’ê in 10:1 refers just to vs.5-7 and I challenge Shea to bring forward any explicit, unambiguous evidence that removes any possibility of mar’ê in 10:1 referring to anything except vs.5-7!

As has been shown again, Shea’s thesis lacks any credibility since mar’ê in 10:1 could refer not only to the appearance of personal beings, but also “to the rise and fall of nations and their relation with God’s people and His agencies” (p.233) as recorded in 11:2 to 12:13, material which Shea wishes to be reserved solely for the meaning of hazôn (though, in his

view, 11:2 to 12:13 is not hazôn but dábár/debarîm, or didactic prophecy (p.240), which is neither mar'ê nor hazôn ). Thus Shea is in all kinds of trouble if the very chapter that he proposes to use to establish his definitions for these two words actually supports those definitions that he wants so much to argue against!

### 3. That mar'ê in Dn10:1 synonymous with dábár/d'barîm;

I wish now to consider mar'ê in relation to dábár/debarîm, (“word”: 10:1,1,1; “words”: 10:11;12:4,9), hazôn in 10:14, ‘met (“true, truth”:10:1;11:2) and ‘eth harasûm biktav ‘met (“that which is written in the scripture of truth”10:21). I intend to argue that dábár /debarîm, mar'ê, and hazôn in chs10-12 all refer to different aspects of the same revelation that Daniel documented in these chapters.

How is dábár /debarîm used in the book of Daniel? Let us examine its usage and derive some conclusions to help us understand its relationship to mar'ê. Dábár occurs in the singular four times in ch 10: three times in verse 1, and once in v11. The instance in v11 refers specifically to the words spoken to him in that same verse by the man who touched him:

And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling.

It will be noticed that dábár, translated “word” here, effectively means “message” since there is more than one word spoken to Daniel. The text of Dn10:1 says:

IN the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision.

It is clear that the revelation revealed to Daniel in the third year is the information recorded in Dn11-12. It is this revelation that is called both “a thing,” and “the vision.” Therefore, the revelation in Dn11-12 is “the thing” (dábár) and “the vision” (mar'eh). It will also be noticed that whereas the use of dábár in 10:1 refers to the whole experience as a dábár, whereas the instance of dábár in v11 refers only to a small statement in one verse. For the purposes of this study then, the only applicable instances of dábár that need to be considered in relation to mar'ê are the three instances in 10:1.

Notice these four phrases occurring in 10:1:

A word ( dábár ) was revealed to Daniel

And the word ( dábár ) was true and (it was) a great war (NIV) (tsáb'á)

And he understood the word ( dábár )

And understanding (was) to him in/by/means of/because of the mar'ê-vision.

Given the validity of the arguments presented before showing that Daniel's desire for understanding during his three week vigil is answered in the communiqué conveyed by the messenger in ch11:2 to 12:13, the case is strong for arguing firstly, that Daniel was given one experience of "understanding" at that time (thus both the dábár and the mar'ê are the means by which he was given this understanding), and secondly, that dábár and the mar'ê contain identical information, and are thus synonymous.

I have translated the dative/genitive preposition "*b<sup>e</sup>*" with the words "in/by/by means of/because of" to try and convey the options available in this context, which, in this case, the vision is the *instrument* or means "by which" understanding was imparted (cf., vs. 12-14 and Brown, Driver and Briggs (1983), article "*b<sup>e</sup>*" III.2,(p.89b). Also cf., NEB, LXX θ) The use of the simple English genitive to express "*b<sup>e</sup>*" here (e.g., "understanding *of* the vision" NASB, RSV, AB, RV, ASV) doesn't express the preposition as accurately as the instrumental sense. The fact that "*b<sup>e</sup>*" with mar'ê in verse 1 denotes a sense of instrument, does not detract from the virtual synonymy of dábár and mar'ê. That is to say, because the mar'ê provides the understanding, it does not follow that it is only a subpart of the dábár. Dábár refers to the "message," "the word," or as some translate it, "oracle," and mar'ê is used to qualify dábár by indicating through what means the dábár was given. To give an example in English, if dábár is translated as "revelation" (cf.,NIV) and mar'ê is translated as "vision," we have Dn10:1 as saying:

A revelation was revealed/disclosed to Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, and the revelation was true and it concerned a great conflict, and he understood the revelation, and understanding was/came to him through /by means of a vision.

Here "revelation" is the general term and "vision" is the specific term (as differing from say, "a dream"), yet vision is the revelation since there was only one means of revelation - "the vision." Thus "revelation" and "vision" are virtually synonymous in this context and refer to the same thing. This idea is supported by Keil (1978) who says:

Dábár is the following revelation, which was communicated to the prophet not by a vision (hazôn ), but by a manifestation of God (mar'ê ), and was given in the form of a simple human discourse (1978, p.406).

Notice also these comments by R.H. Charles (1929):

**The commandment went forth.** The text here should be rendered 'a word went forth,' ie., the divine declaration contained in vs24-27. The same expression (dábár) recurs at the close of the verse where again the R.V. 'consider the matter' is to be corrected into 'consider the word'...

The two expression 'word' and 'vision' mean practically the same thing, denoting its twofold relation in regard to God and in regard to man.(pp.103,104)

The plural of dábár, d<sup>e</sup>barîm occurs 9 times in this last section of the book of Daniel (10:6,9,9,11,12,12,15;12:4). Those instances of the word in 10:6,9,9 refer to words spoken by the man clothed in linen that are not recorded by Daniel. The instance in v12 of d<sup>e</sup>barîm

refers to Daniel's prayers, and the occurrence in v15 refers to the messenger's words recorded in vs.12-14. This leaves three instances of d<sup>e</sup>barîm in 10:11 and 12:4,9. All three instances refer to the communiqué of 11:2 to 12:4 (and probably also include the information conveyed in 12:5,11-13 as well).

Taking the instance of d<sup>e</sup>barîm of 10:11 first, the text says: "understand the words that I speak unto thee." This is followed by Daniel's request in v19 where he says, "Let my lord speak," and the messenger says in 11:2, "And now I will show thee the truth." Thus the d<sup>e</sup>barîm of Dn10:11 are clearly the "truth" which is recorded from 11:2ff. It is also clear from this that d<sup>e</sup>barîm is also "that which is noted in the scripture of truth" (10:21), since those things which are noted in books are "words" - d<sup>e</sup>barîm. Furthermore, "that which is noted in the scripture of truth" is also called "the truth" in 11:2. And so what is called dábár and mar'ê in 10:1, is also called d<sup>e</sup>barîm and e<sup>e</sup>met. Furthermore in 12:4, where he is told to shut up the d<sup>e</sup>barîm which he had been given, this occurrence of d<sup>e</sup>barîm refers clearly to 11:2 to 12:4.

The occurrence of d<sup>e</sup>barîm in 12:9 needs to be observed before leaving this matter:

And he said, Go, Daniel, because closed and sealed are d<sup>e</sup>barîm until the time of the end.

Although there is room to argue that d<sup>e</sup>barîm here refers to the same words as the d<sup>e</sup>barîm of v4, I think there is a better sense of d<sup>e</sup>barîm here. In ch12:8, Daniel inquires as to the 'ah<sup>a</sup>rît' of the things he had heard. 'ah<sup>a</sup>rît' here is variously translated "end," (Knox, JB), "issue," (RSV,ASV,NEB,RV), "outcome" (NASB,JB), "issue and final end (AB), "last phase" (Moffat), "latter end" (ASV, margin), and "what shall come after these things" (Lamsa).

What this word seems to convey is that Daniel understood "these things" or "these words" which were conveyed to him in ch11:2 to 12:4 (and this is confirmed by ch10:1), but what he didn't understand was the 'ah<sup>a</sup>rît', the outcome of these things beyond the events portrayed. Daniel wanted more detail of the good things to come after Michael would stand up and deliver His people. His appetite had been whetted. His ear had caught the news of the good things beyond the "great conflict." But what were they? Yes, they were everlasting, but that only tells you about the duration, not the content of what will occur. The actual final events and the introduction of the everlasting kingdom is not spelled out for him in the current revelation before him as recorded in chs.11-12.

The messenger's answer is that the d<sup>e</sup>barîm Daniel wishes to hear about are written in the Scripture of truth, to which only Michael and the messenger have access. But they are sealed in that book; yet they are only sealed there until the "time of the end," when they will be unsealed and "the wise shall understand"(v10). How the wise shall understand, Daniel is not told, but if the book of Joel would have any meaning for those who would live at the end-time, then ch2:28,29 would be of special significance:

And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions (hizzâyôn). Even upon my menservants and maidservants in those days I will pour out my Spirit.

This text seems to imply that the wise shall understand in exactly the same way as Daniel came to understand what he knew -through dreams and visions. What was sealed in the scripture of truth, inaccessible to Daniel, and perhaps even to the messenger would be unsealed in the time of the end and conveyed to “the wise” through the same means as the messenger had used previously -dreams and visions.

There is a good case, therefore, for d<sup>e</sup>barîm in Dn12:9 referring to something different from d<sup>e</sup>barîm in Dn12:4. I see d<sup>e</sup>barîm as referring to an undisclosed revelation. But whichever way d<sup>e</sup>barîm in 12:9 is interpreted, the evidence is clear that d<sup>e</sup>barîm in Dn10:11;12:4 and possibly v5 is identical to dábâr in ch10:1, mar'ê in ch10:1, 'eth harasûm biktab 'e<sup>e</sup>met in10:21 and 'e<sup>e</sup>met in 11:2.

#### 4.The Relationship between mar'ê and hazôn in Dn10.

Looking now at the relationship between hazôn and the other words, it should be noticed that Shea has built his definition for his entire thesis upon the occurrence of this word in this chapter. Here firstly is the occurrence of hazôn in ch10:

14 Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days:  
for yet the vision is for many days.

Here is Shea's comment about it:

From the description of Daniel's experiences on this occasion it is evident that in six of the seven instances where mar'ê is used in this chapter he referred thereby to the appearance of God, which he saw, as recorded in vs. 5-7. He does not use the word hazôn anywhere in this chapter to refer to that appearance. Thus a sharp distinction is drawn here between the use of mar'ê, which refers to the appearance of God as seen by Daniel on that occasion, and the use of hazôn for the vision in v 14, which Gabriel said would be for many days. This distinction indicates that hazôn must refer to some other vision than the appearance of God described in ch 10. Thus the hazôn mentioned here logically points back to the preceding vision of Dan 8, just as the similar reference in Dan 9:23 does. In Dan 8:17 Gabriel told Daniel that the hazôn (vision) was for "the time of the end" just as he told him in 10:14 it would be for "days yet to come."

Further emphasis might be placed at this point on the distinction between mar'ê and hazôn elucidated in Dan 10. Mar'ê appears to refer more specifically to the appearance of a personal being in vision, as was the case with God here, whereas hazôn here refers back to the prophet's earlier view of the beasts and their activities, which represent the rise and rise and fall of nations and their relations with God's people and His agencies. The distinction drawn here can now be applied to the occurrences of these two words in chs 8 and 9, where their distribution and function are somewhat more complex (pp.232-234)

Though I agree that hazôn here refers to something else beside 10:5-7, the possibility exists for it to refer to the things the messenger was going to reveal regarding what would “befall thy people.” Shea says it “logically” points back to ch8, without explaining the logic that is so obvious to him. Surely he would have to discount all other possibilities before coming up with such a remote meaning for the word? How can he establish a meaning without carefully examining the immediate context and ruling out other options? Rather

than looking closely at the text, Shea has shuffled off to Dn9:23 to try and produce his evidence! The problem here is twofold. In the first place, if Shea is trying to establish a meaning for hazôn in ch10 so that he can then apply it to chs8 and 9, it seems a highly inconsistent exercise to refer back to ch9 to supply the evidence for the meaning that cannot be got from ch10 so that he can prove that this meaning then applies to chs 8 and 9! That is just circular thinking. In the second place, if Shea is referring to hazôn in ch9, then he must be referring to v21, not v23 which he has quoted. And the only reason that hazôn in 9:21 refers back to an earlier vision is because the temporal adverb batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ (“before/earlier/lit. at the first”) accompanied the word! There is no such adverb in ch10:14 nor any indication that one has been ellided. So there is no precedent with hazôn in Dn9 that leads us to conclude that hazôn in 10:14 has to refer to a previous hazôn.

Shea says that the phrase layyamîn (lit., “for the days,” “for days yet to come” (RSV), “to the days yet future” (NASB) also occurs in 8:27 with hazôn. Therefore the fact that both hazôns relate to the future is enough for Shea to say that 10:14 refers to the hazôn in ch8. The possibility that most, if not all, of this type of apocalyptic vision given to the prophets refer to the future as standard procedure, is a fundamental principle that seems to have eluded Shea’s thinking. Notice the statement in Dn2:28 along the same lines:

But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these.

Are we going to say that Dn 10:14 refers us to Dn2? We must, if we follow Shea’s logic, since this is the first instance of a hazôn! Here we see another example of Shea’s lack of scholarly objectivity in handling this material. He seems to only to consider those points that have the vaguest notion of accord with his own theories and completely ignores everything else. The very text under consideration in ch10 answers very clearly how we should read hazôn in that verse. Here is the text again:

14 Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days.

The most superficial reading of this verse in chapter 10 would yield the conclusion that the phrase—“for yet the vision is for many days”—is a comment which qualifies and emphasises the previous clauses in the verse. In this verse the messenger says that the communiqué he has brought for Daniel is “that which shall befall your people in the latter days.” Previously, in 10:11, the messenger called his present communiqué to Daniel d<sup>e</sup>barîm, “words”, a term that occurs again in 12:4. This term clearly refers to the d<sup>e</sup>barîm contained in 11:2 to 12:4. Therefore the links are very strong for proving that the efforts of the messenger to make Daniel “understand what shall befall” his “people in the latter days” are actually contained in 11:2 to 12:4.

It is clear that the end was not imminent, because the messenger then adds that the details about the latter are “for many days,” or a long way off in the future. The details that are a long way off into the future, are the hazôn, the d<sup>e</sup>barîm, the dábár – since they are one and the same thing. There is nothing disjointed by applying the last part of this verse as a qualifying statement concerning the place in time of those things at the end-time mentioned



in the first part of the verse. They fit perfectly. A similar pair of temporal statements that qualify each other is found in Dn8. In Dn8:17 we read:

17 So he came near 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: for at the time of the end shall be the vision.

Daniel here says that the revelation that he is being given deals with events that reach to the time of the end. And in verse 26 we read:

26 And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut  
thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.

In this verse Daniel is clearly told that the time of the end is not imminent; rather, it is “many days” away. Thus these two phrases that we met in Dn10 occur here in Dn8, and both sets of clauses say the same thing: that though the revelation may deal with the events associated with the “time of the end,” that time is in the distant future. In Dn8:17 the revelation is called the mar’ê, and in v26 the revelation is called the mar’ê of the evening and the morning. Here we have the same word for the revelation used each time. In Dn10 however, we have, in the first instance, a clause describing the revelation that: “shall befall thy people in the latter days” (v14), and in the second instance, we have a noun used to describe the revelation: “hazôn.” Since the thing that is “for many days” is the “time of the end,” or “the latter days,” it is absolutely obvious that the hazôn is a revelation that deals with the events at the time of the end. And following on from this, the hazôn deals with the things “what shall befall thy people in the latter days” (v14). And these are documented in Dn11:2 to 12:4.

There is further proof of the links making “what shall befall” his “people in the latter days” mean the information contained in Dn11:2 to 12:4. One of the things mentioned in verse 14 is that the angel had “now come to make” Daniel “understand.” So if we look at the things the messenger brought for his understanding we find them in ch11:2 to 12:4. There is nothing of substance in Dn10 to warrant including that chapter in this statement of purpose.

Therefore according to the construction of Dn10:14, the hazôn is the dábár given to Daniel in Dn11:2 to 12:4 (and probably also including up to v13). It is becoming quite clear that Shea’s evidence for his meaning of hazôn in 10:14 is turning out to be a chimera.

## 5. Can a Mar’ê include what is Spoken as well as what is Seen?

The last argument of Shea’s to address in this point is his statement that a mar’ê usually refers to the appearance of a person or something spoken, whereas a hazôn is something seen:

*Mar’ê* appears to refer more specifically to the appearance of a personal being in vision, as was the case with God here, whereas *hazôn* here refers back to the prophet’s earlier view of the beasts and their activities, which represent the rise and fall of nations and their relations with God’s people and His agencies. (p.233).



Though I agree that mar'ê in ch10:6,7,8,18 refers “more specifically to the appearance of a personal being in vision,” why would it exclude that which is spoken by that personal being? The answer is of course that Shea does not want to include ch 11:2 to 12:13 in the mar'ê, as it would throw his theories out. Yet at the same time, he wishes to say that the mar'ê of ch8, which he says refers to vs.13,14 includes that which was spoken between the two holy ones, that is, the information about the 2300 evening-mornings. It doesn't take too much intelligence to see that a mar'ê is both an optical AND an auditory experience as Shea concedes on page 236:

The second point about the *mar'ê* is that it "was told" (*ne'émar*, a niph'al, or passive, form of the verb "to say"), not seen. Thus Daniel did not see the 2300 evenings mornings; he heard them discussed by the two holy ones in their intravisional explanation during their *mar'ê*, or appearance, to him. A *hazon* (vision) is seen, but a *mar'e* is both seen and heard because the personal being who appears to the prophet in the *mar'ê* also speaks words of information or propositional truth to him. The same point is borne out by Dan 10:8,9, "I was left alone and saw this great *mar'ê* [appearance] [of God]. . . . Then I heard the sound of his [God's] words. . . ." <sup>11</sup>

Thus, according to Shea's own admission concerning the presence of auditory material in the mar'ê, the mar'ê of Dn10:1 can quite legitimately include the *description* of “the rise and fall of nations and their relations with God's people and His agencies” we find in ch11:2 to 12:4 (or v13). (This position of Shea's also concords with the assertion that Dn8: 15-26 can rightly be called a mar'ê because the revelation is both seen and heard in those texts. Added to this, Dn9:21 calls Dn8:15-26 as a hazôn)

### 3. Conclusion on Shea's Theory of the Meaning of Mar'ê in Dn10?

Daniel chapter 10 is used by Shea as the basis for his meanings of the two words for “vision.” His arguments were as follows:

- (1) In the final chapters of Daniel's book hazôn only occurs in Dn10:14.
- (2) Daniel does not use hazôn anywhere in ch10 to refer to the vision of Dn10:5-7.
- (3) In harmony with usage of these two words elsewhere in Scripture, mar'ê is used in Dn10, to refer to the physical act of seeing whereas hazôn is used virtually exclusively “to the more specific act of seeing in prophetic vision;”
- (4) Since Mar'ê refers generally “to some aspect of the appearance of individuals, or personal beings;”
- (5) And mar'ê alone is used in Dn10 to refer to the vision of God in vs.5-7;

---

<sup>11</sup> On that basis then, we could argue that the phrase “mar'ê of the morning and the evening” refers to the whole chapter since both things that are heard and seen cover the whole chapter, and the mar'ê of the Daniel-in-the-vision covers the whole chapter. At the same time, a hazôn covers the whole chapter, since hazôn in verse 15 refers to vs 3-12 or vs.3-14, and Dn9:21 refers to vs.15-26 as hazôn, making the whole chapter one hazôn, as it is called in vs. 1, 2.

- (6) Therefore mar'ê and hazôn are in sharp contrast to each other in Dn10;
- (7) And the reference to the hazôn of “many days” points “to some other vision than the appearance of God described in Dn10.”
- (8) Since the last previous vision occurs in ch8 and a reference in Dn9:23 also refers back to ch8, this reference in Dn10:14 must refer to ch8;
- (9) And both instances of hazôn in Dn8:17 and 10:14 refer to a hazôn at the end time or “the days yet to come,” providing further evidence that hazôn in Dn10:14 “logically” refers back to Dn8;
- (10) Shea goes even further in his “clarification” of the meaning of these two words by pointing out that the use of mar'ê in Dn10 applies to “the appearance of a personal being in vision,” “whereas hazôn here refers back to the prophet’s earlier view of the beasts and their activities, which represent the rise and fall of nations and their relations with the people of God and His agencies.”

In answering this argument, I showed that

- approximately half of the one hundred occurrences of mar'ê occur in a prophetic context, disproving Shea’s initial assertion that it commonly occurs in contexts not connected with prophecy. (Is half a glass of water half-full or half-empty?) It does indeed commonly occur in prophetic contexts.
- In regard to the second argument, that mar'ê in Dn10:1 refers only to ch10:5-7, 9, I showed this to be incorrect and proved that the reference in Dn10:1 refers to the entire revelation up to Dn12:3.
- With his third argument, I show that Shea has used circular logic here because he says that he “derives” his definition for these words from their usage in Dn10. What in fact he has done here, is to explain their usage from Dn8 and 9 and use this to prove his definition in Dn10 so that he can then use his definition in Dn10 to argue that his definition fits the incidents of the words in Dn8 and 9. This is crooked thinking. If he was going to use Dn10 to prove the usage of these two words in the book of Daniel, one would expect him to extract *all* his arguments from the evidence in Dn10. He cannot do that. He has had to use the conclusion he is heading toward, and argue with it from Dn9 and 8, to then prove his point in Dn10. It is a classical circular argument and is invalid, undermining everything else he writes on this topic.
- In regard to points 4, 5, and 6, mar'ê was shown to cover the full revelation including not only the appearance of God in Dn10, but the information conveyed in Dn11-Dn12:3 as well.
- Point 7 to 9 were shown to be incorrect because other assumptions concerning the meaning of hazôn outside of Dn10 are used to arrive at this decision rather than evidence from Dn10 itself. In addition, the phrases “many days” or “in the latter day,” aptly applies to the information conveyed in Dn11-12 since that information carries right up to when the resurrection and the judgment occurs

(Dn12:1-3).

In conclusion, there is not a shred of evidence of any “further” distinction in regard to hazôn in 10:14 referring explicitly to Dn8:3-12 with its beasts and their activities. Where is the evidence that hazôn *has* to refer to Dn8? Why cannot the use of this word in Dn10:14 refer to Dn11:2–12:4? He hasn’t argued against this at all, yet this is the way that the text augurs. There is no evidence that even links it with Dn8. I challenge Shea to produce this further evidence showing hazôn in ch10 refers explicitly and specifically to Dn8! Shea has *assumed* that hazôn in 10:14 refers to Dn8:3-12 and he offers *his assumption* as the evidence which confirms his thesis. This is hardly the type of unambiguous material upon which to base a lexical distinction between two words that have so much weight of argument resting on the evidence in Dn10. If one ignores the arguments presented earlier, which examined the contextual evidence of the first and second half of Dn10:14 arguing in favour of hazôn in 10:14 referring to the vision in 11:2 to 12:4, then at the very least, hazôn is unqualified and remains ambiguous, thus ruling out any leeway at all for Shea to establish a definition for hazôn from Dn10. Shea says his meaning for these words “were derived” from ch10. (1981a, p.233) He is wrong.

Anyone who uses Dn10 on its own to establish a meaning for these two words would have to conclude, as I have done, that the hazôn referred to in verse 14 dealing with end-time matters, is the revelation in ch11-12:3, which is an integral part of this ongoing interaction between Daniel and the heavenly beings. The reference in this verse (10:14) is a proleptic reference to the impending revelation. Similarly, for the meaning of the mar’ê. This mar’ê which needed “understanding” (v.1) and not just “viewing” (Shea’s view), refers to the same revelation, including not only Dn10 but also the information conveyed by the heavenly being as detailed in Dn11-12. It is the information conveyed in Dn11-12 that invokes Daniel’s understanding, not the vision of vs.5-7, as Shea proposes.

#### **D. Shea’s Evidence of the meaning of mar’ê and chazôn in Daniel 8 and 9.**

Having examined Shea’s “evidence” in Dn10 for his proposed meanings of mar’ê and hazôn, I wish to examine his discussion regarding the usage of these words in Dn8 and 9. In examining this part of his paper, I shall endeavour to ignore my arguments concerning his treatment of Dn10 and just assess his arguments for different meanings in Dn8 and 9 on their own merits.

##### **1. Extract of Shea’s Material.**

The following extract from Shea’s paper illustrates his argument regarding the use of hazôn and mar’ê in Dn8 and 9. (I have numbered the paragraphs and pages for easy referencing).

.../p.233

1. The distinction drawn here can now be applied to the occurrences of these two words in chs 8 and 9, where their distribution and function

.../p.234

are somewhat more complex. The word *hazôn*, or "vision," occurs in two main contexts in these two chapters, both of which satisfactorily fit the definition derived for this word here.

2. In the first case *hazôn* has to do with the vision of ch 8, generally. This chapter begins with two references to the *hazôn* that Daniel saw (vs.1-2), which clearly include his view of the beasts and their activities that follow. In v 13 two holy ones were seen and heard discussing the scenes Daniel had witnessed, and one asked the other, "How long [or until when] shall be the *hazôn* . . ." According to the details enumerated in the question asked by this holy one, obviously he referred to selected elements seen especially in the latter part of the overall *hazôn*, which covered, up to that point, what is described in vs. 3 to 12. On this basis it can be said that all of what is described as seen through v 12 clearly classifies as a *hazôn*. In v 15 Daniel referred again to the *hazôn* he had seen, which, from the evidence just discussed, certainly includes vs. 3-12 regardless of how vs. 13-14 are related to the *hazôn* described there.

3. In the second instance *hazôn* appears in the particular context of a theme recurring from this point on to the end of the book. That theme has to do with the instruction that the prophecies given to Daniel were for many days hence, for the time of the end, and consequently they were to be shut up or sealed until that time.

4. We first meet this theme in 8:17, where Gabriel instructed Daniel, "Understand O son of man, that the *hazôn* [vision] is for the time of the end." At the end of this interlude of instruction (v 26) Gabriel returned to this theme--"*S<sup>e</sup>thom* [shut up] *hazôn* [vision] . . . 'for it pertains to many days hence.'" Dan 9:24 also refers to *hatôm* (sealing up) the *hazôn* (the vision), we have already cited 10:14, where Daniel was told that the *hazôn* (vision) was for days yet to come.

5. The last two passages in which this theme is elaborated occur in ch 12. In v 4 Daniel was told to *s<sup>e</sup>thom* (shut up) the *d<sup>e</sup>barîm* (words) and *h<sup>a</sup>thom* (seal up) the *sépher* (book) until the time the end when knowledge concerning the prophecies would increase. In v 9 of the same chapter Daniel was told that the words were shut up and sealed up until the time of the end.

6. Thus this theme occurs as an envelope around Gabriel's instruction to Daniel in ch 8, in vs. 17 and 26, and again around his instruction to Daniel in chs 10-12, in 10:14 and 12:4, 9, it occurs at the beginning of the prophetic message he gave to Daniel in ch 9 (v 24).

.../p.235

7. The similarity between the roots of the two verbs used in these passages relates them according to the type of activity they describe, and the time factor referred to in these verses is similar, for many days or to the time of the end. The "words" that were to be shut up, or sealed up, refer to the didactic or explanatory words of instruction that Gabriel brought to Daniel, is clearly explained in Dan 9:22-23. Thus this word should be carefully noted as the third of the three terms employed by Daniel for the prophetic information he received, along with *hazôn*, or vision," and *mar'ê*, or "appearance." The reference to the book, or scroll, in 12:4 appears to signal that Daniel's prophetic ministry had come to an end and that all the information revealed to him through these three avenues was to be compiled.

8. From these two main examples of the use of *hazôn* in chs 8 and 9 we may turn to the occurrences and use of *mar'ê* in the same chapters. As a response to Daniel's

desire expressed in 8:15 for further understanding of the *hazôn* (vision), the voice of God is recorded in v 16 as instructing Gabriel, "Make this man understand the *mar'ê* [appearance]." The thesis proposed here is that the two words used here, *hazôn* and *mar'ê* are not used as synonyms but that they are used as technical terms to refer to different aspects of is prophecy and that God used the word *mar'ê* to call the attention of Gabriel and Daniel to a particular part of this prophecy.

9. Although Daniel's reference to the *hazôn* (vision) in v 15 could be all inclusive on the basis of analogy with the use of these words in ch 10, it is proposed here that the reference to the *mar'ê* (appearance) in 8:16 refers more specifically to the appearance of personal beings, in this case the holy ones, in the scenes Daniel saw at the end of this vision. Thus it is suggested that the *mar'ê* referred to in v 16 should be applied more specifically to the intravisional discussion and explanation carried only the two holy ones in their appearance to Daniel.

10. This point receives some support from the next reference to the *mar'ê* in ch 8, which occurs in v 26, "the *mar'ê* [appearance] of the *evenings and mornings* which was told is true, but seal up the *hazôn* [vision] for it pertains to many days hence." The first point to note about the *mar'ê* here is that it is the *mar'ê* of the evenings-mornings. Where do the evenings-mornings occur earlier in the chapter? They occur in the intravisional converse held between the two personal beings, the holy ones, in which one told the other that it was to be 2300 evenings-mornings until the sanctuary would be cleansed, or restored. Because this *mar'ê* is specifically labeled as the *mar'ê* of the evenings-mornings, it should be related directly to the *mar'ê*, or appearance, of the two beings who discussed the evenings-mornings earlier.

.../p.236

11. The second point about the *mar'ê* is that it "was told" (*ne"mar*, a niphal, or passive, form of the verb "to say"), not seen. Thus Daniel did not see the 2300 evenings-mornings; he heard them discussed by the two holy ones in their intravisional explanation during their *mar'ê*, or appearance, to him. A *hazôn* (vision) is seen, but a *mar'ê* is both seen and heard because the personal being who appears to the prophet in the *mar'ê* also speaks words of information or propositional truth to him. The same point is borne out by Dan 10:8-9, "I was left alone and saw this great *mar'ê* [appearance] [of God]. . . . Then I heard the sound of his [God's] words. . . ."

12. According to Dan 8:16, Gabriel was instructed to cause Daniel to understand the *mar'ê* (appearance). At the end of Gabriel's explanation, however, Daniel still did not understand it (v 27). As a result, God subsequently sent Gabriel a second time to explain the *mar'ê*. Thus, when Gabriel appeared to Daniel, as recorded in 9:21, he did not refer him to the *hazôn* (vision) in general, but more specifically he referred him to the *mar'ê*, which Daniel did not understand. Perhaps the particular part of the instruction from the *mar'ê* that Daniel did not understand and that shocked him so much was how the little horn power could trample down God's host, His sanctuary, and its sacrifice under foot for so long a period of time as the 2300 evenings-mornings mentioned in this connection. Thus there is a direct connection between the prophet of Dan 8 and of Dan 9 insofar as the prophetic terminology involved is concerned, and that terminology is applied here to a specific aspect of the prophecy of Dan 8, that which stemmed from the intravisional *mar'ê*, or appearance, of the two holy ones to Daniel.

13. Because *mar'ê* is also applied to Gabriel on one occasion (Dan 10:18), one might consider the possibility that the reference to the *mar'ê* in Dan 8:26 and 9:23 could include the explanatory information given to Daniel both on the occasions of the intravisional appearance of the two holy ones in Dan 8:13-14 and the extravisional

appearance of Gabriel in Dan 8:15-26. However one relates these two appearances, it is clear that the *mar'ê* in Dan 8:16 could only refer to the appearance of the two holy ones in Dan 8:13-14 because of the position of this reference in the chapter. The important distinction to be made here is that vs. 3-12, which describe the activities of the beasts and the little horn should be defined as a *hazôn* (vision), whereas these appearances of the two holy ones and Gabriel (either the first appearance or both appearances) should be defined by way of contrast with the word *mar'ê*. The application of these words proposed here may be outlined as follows:

14. Dan 8:3-12--the vision of the beasts and the little horn: *hazôn*

.../p.237

Dan 8:13-14--the intravisional appearance and explanation of the two holy ones: the *mar'ê* of Dan 8:16, 26, and 9:23

Dan 8:15-26--the extravisional appearance and explanation of Gabriel: could be included in the *mar'ê* of 8: 26 and 9:23 but does not have to be. Cannot be included in the *mar'ê* of Dan 8:16, which refers to what Gabriel was to explain. This explanatory function of Dan 8:15-26 makes the primary application of all three of these occurrences of *mar'ê* refer to Dan 8:13-14 regardless of how one relates Dan 8:15-26 to them. ( 1981. pp.:233-237)

## 2. Summary of Shea's Extract.

Before examining the validity of Shea's arguments, I would like to summarise the above extract: His thesis is that "hazôn and mar'ê are not used as synonyms but that they are used as technical terms to refer to different aspects of this prophecy." (par.8) That is, hazôn applies to Dn8:3-12 (par.2), whereas mar'ê applies to Dn8:13,14 (par.9). The arguments he uses to build up this thesis are the following:

- (1) In regard to hazôn, Shea categorises the occurrences of this word into two contexts, a general context and a "envelope" context:
  - a. The first concerns just a general reference to the vision of Dn8:3-12, as in the case of hazôn in Dn8:1,2,2,13 and 15 (though hazôn may here include v13,14 as well) (par.1,2,9);
  - b. In par.3-7, Shea discusses what he sees as a second context of hazôn. This refers to the instances of hazôn in Dn8:17,26;9:24 and 10:14 (Dn9:21 gets a separate treatment later). This second context is what he calls an "envelope," in the sense that in each of the sections containing this word, there is a command to "close" or "seal" something. This occurs in Dn8:26, Dn9:24 and Dn12:4, 9. He sees this command as a recurring theme "enveloping" the text connected to this word. He then discusses three themes he finds related to this topic:
    - I. The first theme (occurring in 8:17,26; 9:24) involves the instruction to seal (h'etom) or to shut up (s'etom) the hazôn. This instruction to either "seal" or "close" the vision or book occurs as a recurring theme until the end of the book.
    - II. The second theme (occurring in 8:17,26;10:14) involves the declaration



of the period to which the hazôn would apply (i.e., unsealed or opened), that is, “the latter days,” “many days hence” etc.

- III. With the third theme, Shea looks at the use of d<sup>e</sup>barîm (“words”), and concludes that mar'ê, hazôn and d<sup>e</sup>barîm are three different technical terms. Just how this context of hazôn and debarîm relates to his proposed distinction between mar'ê and hazôn is not made clear apart from his assertion that it is the “‘words’ that were to be shut up or sealed up, refer to the didactic or explanatory words of instruction that Gabriel brought to Daniel, as is clearly explained in Dn9:22-23.” (ibid, p.235) By calling the explanation of 8:17-26; 9:24-27 and 11:2-12:4 d<sup>e</sup>barîm or “instruction,” Shea can then limit mar'ê to just Dn8:13,14. (cf., par.13)
- (2) Par.8-13 includes Shea’s discussion on mar'ê. His thesis (par.8) is that mar'ê in Dn8:16 refers specifically to Dn8:13,14 and that although hazôn in v15 could include vs.13,14, Shea says that mar'ê should be applied more specifically to vs.13,14 and that hazôn consequently should be limited to vs.3-12. In his view, this point is further supported by the specific reference to the mar'ê of the evening-mornings of Dn8:26 (par.9,10).
- (3) According to Shea (par.11), “a hazôn (vision) is seen, but a mar'ê is both seen and heard because the personal being who appears to the prophet in the mar'ê also speaks words of information or propositional truth to him.” Evidence for this comes the Niph'al form of a mar'ê used in 8:26, which is translated “which was told,” and also from 10:8-9 where both sight and sound are a part of Daniel’s experience.
- (4) Shea’s next piece of evidence in para.8-13 concerns the connection between Dn8 and Dn9. Shea points out that in Dn8:16, Gabriel is told to make Daniel understand the mar'ê, yet in v27 we read that Daniel still did not understand the mar'ê, even though information was conveyed. When Gabriel was sent a second time, he was sent specifically to explain the mar'ê (9:23). The hazôn was not in need of further explanation, only the mar'ê. Following on then in Shea’s reasoning, if it is assumed that the mar'ê Gabriel comes to explain is the same mar'ê in Dn8:27, which Daniel didn’t understand, and if one assumes that the mar'ê of Dn8:27 is the same mar'ê as Dn8:16, which assumedly can only be v13,14 (as defined so by Dn8:26), then Dn9:23 refers specifically to Dn8:13,14.

This then constitutes Shea’s evidence in Dn8 supporting his thesis that “vs. 3-12, which describe the activities of the beasts and the little horn should be defined as a hazôn (vision), whereas these appearances of the two holy ones and Gabriel (either the first appearance or both appearances) should be defined by way of contrast with the word mar'ê.” (par.13)

### 3. Shea’s First Point.

Here is the part of the quote that relates to his first point:



The word *hazôn*, or "vision," occurs in two main contexts in these two chapters, both of which satisfactorily fit the definition derived for this word here.

2. In the first case *hazôn* has to do with the vision of ch 8, generally. This chapter begins with two references to the *hazôn* that Daniel saw (vs.1-2), which clearly include his view of the beasts and their activities that follow. In v13 two holy ones were seen and heard discussing the scenes Daniel had witnessed, and one asked the other, "How long [or until when] shall be the *hazôn* . . . " According to the details enumerated in the question asked by this holy one, obviously he referred to selected elements seen especially in the latter part of the overall *hazôn*, which covered, up to that point, what is described in vs. 3 to 12. On this basis it can be said that all of what is described as seen through v 12 clearly classifies as a *hazôn*. In v 15 Daniel referred again to the *hazôn* he had seen, which, from the evidence just discussed, certainly includes vs. 3-12 regardless of how vs. 13-14 are related to the *hazôn* described there.

3. In the second instance *hazôn* appears in the particular context of a theme recurring from this point on to the end of the book. That theme has to do with the instruction that the prophecies given to Daniel were for many days hence, for the time of the end, and consequently they were to be shut up or sealed until that time.

4. We first meet this theme in 8:17, where Gabriel instructed Daniel, "Understand O son of man, that the *hazôn* [vision] is for the time of the end." At the end of this interlude of instruction (v 26) Gabriel returned to this *theme*--"*S<sup>e</sup>thom* [shut up] *hazôn* [vision] . . . 'for it pertains to many days hence.'" Dan 9:24 also refers to *h<sup>e</sup>tom* (*sealing up*) the *hazôn* (the vision), we have already cited 10:14, where Daniel was told that the *hazôn* (vision) was for days yet to come.

5. The last two passages in which this theme is elaborated occur in ch 12. In v 4 Daniel was told to *s<sup>e</sup>thom* (*shut up*) the *d<sup>e</sup>barîm* (words) and *h<sup>a</sup>thom* (*seal up*) the *sépher* (book) until the time the end when knowledge concerning the prophecies would increase. In v 9 of the same chapter Daniel was told that the words were shut up and sealed up until the time of the end.

6. Thus this theme occurs as an envelope around Gabriel's instruction to Daniel in ch 8, in vs. 17 and 26, and again around his instruction to Daniel in chs 10-12, in 10:14 and 12:4, 9, it occurs at the beginning of the prophetic message he gave to Daniel in ch 9 (v 24). (*Ibid*, p.234)

**Part (a).** In regard to part (a) defined above, he lists four occurrences of hazôn, vs 1,2,13,15. The *general* references to hazôn in ch8: 1, 2, do not provide any indication as to which aspects of Dn8 they are referring. In regard to verse 13, Shea is correct however, when he observes that hazôn in this verse refers to the revelation prior to the question being asked, that is, before verse 13. The text could refer to just vs9-12 or it could include vs.3-12. However, the phrases appositioned to the word "vision" in v13 provide clear positive markers to make us choose vs9-12, a position that Shea does not endorse. It should be noticed in passing how Shea twists his sentence in the following to try and make the details from vs10-12 appositioned to the word "vision" in verse 13 refer to vs3-12:

" According to the details enumerated in the question asked by this holy one, obviously he referred to selected elements seen especially in the latter part of the

overall *hazôn*, which covered, up to that point, what is described in vs. 3 to 12. (*Ibid*, p.234)

Notice how the details from verses 10-12 were obviously meant when he talks about “the latter part of the overall *hazôn*.” Then he says that the vision covered up to these details. He then subtly jumps tracks and instead of referring to the details “in the latter part of the overall *hazôn*” as the qualifier of the word “vision,” making *hazôn* in vs13 refer to “the latter parts of the overall *hazôn*,” as he should have done if he was thoroughly candid, he allows the word to refer to the whole vision “which was covered up to that point!!” This allows him to say that *hazôn* in v13 refers to the whole vision in vs3-12. He starts the statement discussing what is covered by the term “vision.” He refers to the “obvious” references to vs10-12 and then, by sleight of pen, switches to make vs3-12 become the scope of the meaning of “vision.”

In regard to the incidence of *hazôn* in verse 15, Shea’s view is that this general reference could refer to either verses 3-14 or 3-12. Nothing can be argued categorically from this text. It does not give any clues as to whether it could apply to either sections of text. That decision has to be made from other references. These four texts are the incidence of the use of *hazôn* in a general sense in Dn8.

**Part (b).** Shea’s logic seems to be fuzzy here. He argues that the recurrence of the statement about the “time of the end,” or “many days hence,” acts as an “envelope.” The next question is, “An envelope around what?” His answer is, “An envelope around Gabriel’s instruction to Daniel in ch 8, in vs. 17 and 26, and again around his instruction to Daniel in chs 10-12, in 10:14 and 12:4, 9.” (*Ibid*, p.234) He mentions in his discussion here, the use of a third word - *d<sup>e</sup>barîm* occurring in chs. 8, 9 and 12. He considers this another technical word along with two other two - *mar’ê* and *hazôn*. He points out that this reference to “the time of the end” also occurs with the concept of “closing” and “sealing” either a vision, instruction or a book. Just how these themes relate to this “envelope” or prove the existence of an “envelope,” and what are the implications of the “envelope” is not easily extracted from his statements. One possibility that Shea could be implying is that this theme does not occur with *mar’ê* and consequently augur for a difference in meaning for both *hazôn* and *mar’ê*. Or perhaps he wants to say both the *hazôn* and the *d<sup>e</sup>barîm* are to be sealed or shut up, according to the conventional SDA view, from being understood. At the time of the end, when people read the *hazôn* and the *d<sup>e</sup>barîm*, their knowledge will be increased. Yet according to his next paragraph, he says that the *book* is to be sealed until the time of the end, which would presumably include also the *mar’ê* of Dn8:13,14 as well. Since Shea does not explain what he understands by the words “shut” or “seal,” he leaves us in the dark on this matter. Another question to address is whether the second theme (occurring in 8:17,26; 10:14) involves the declaration of the period to which the *hazôn* would be “unsealed” or “opened,” that is, “the latter days,” or the end of history. Does this mean that since a *mar’ê* is never said to relate to the time of the end, this is a signalled difference between the two words? This also is not clear.

Just looking once more at Shea’s concept of “envelope,” there are some major problems with this reasoning.

- It is admitted that the “closing” actions in both Dn8 and Dn12 are identical,

- since the two sections are to be preserved in an identical manner;
- In the first place however, it is not correct to group the “closing” of the vision in Dn8 and Dn12 with the “sealing” of vision in Dn12. It should be pointed out that there is no command to “seal” the “book” or even a “vision” in Dn8, because Daniel’s ministry had not yet finished. Dn8 only has the command to “close” the vision. This action of “closing” is also repeated at the end of the revelation in Dn12. “Closing” and “sealing” a clay or papyrus document are two entirely different actions, and cannot be compared. The “sealing makes” the document secure from being copied or interfered with, whereas “closing” a document just places the document where it can be preserved for retrieval at a later time, whether it be in a jar, or an archive. The purpose of these two actions is entirely different.
  - In the third place, it is not correct to group the “closing” of the vision in Dn8 and Dn12 with the “sealing” of vision and prophecy in Dn9:24. The sealing involved in Dn9:24 refers to documents already preserved and in circulation in the population. It does not imply any action on the part of Daniel; rather, this is a national action. As a nation, they were to “seal up vision and prophet.” All the other instructions in Dn8:26; Dn12:4,9 are instructions to Daniel individually. Therefore, Dn9:24 cannot be grouped with Dn8:26 or Dn12:4,9, and consequently, Shea cannot say that this “envelope” is a recurring theme until the end of the book. At best it only occurs twice, and on both occasions it is a natural command when it comes to the end of a document and the issues of preservation are raised.
  - In the fourth place, the action of “closing” and “sealing” are common to *most* documents, since, regardless of the medium used write on (whether it be clay or papyrus, the two most likely choices here), they had to be “closed” using the correct process, and if they were to be sealed, they had to have the correct “sealing” process applied to them. The concept of an “envelope” apply to most written documents needing to be “sealed.” Indeed, the original of most legal clay documents were sealed in a clay envelope, with the seal being applied to the outside clay envelope.

Shea then moves onto another theme and compares this context of hazôn with that of d<sup>e</sup>barîm (“words”), and concludes that mar’ê, hazôn and d<sup>e</sup>barîm are three different technical terms. Just how this context of hazôn and d<sup>e</sup>barîm relates to his proposed distinction between mar’ê and hazôn is not clear and is not explained by Shea, unless if, by calling the explanation of 8:17-26; 9:24-27 and 11:2-12:4 d<sup>e</sup>barîm, Shea can then limit mar’ê to just Dn8:13,14. (cf.,par.13)

Shea’s intended thrust in his material in par.3-7 is perhaps to be found in the implications he develops between d<sup>e</sup>barîm and mar’ê. As we read in par.7, Shea sees the d<sup>e</sup>barîm as “as the third of the three terms employed by Daniel for the prophetic information he received, along with, *hazôn* or ‘vision,’ and *mar’ê*, or ‘appearance.’” His evidence for this is “clearly explained” in Dn9:22-23. As he says,

“The “words” that were to be shut up, or sealed up, refer to the didactic or explanatory words of instruction that Gabriel brought to Daniel, is clearly explained in Dan 9:22-23. Thus this word should be carefully noted as the third of the three

terms employed by Daniel for the prophetic information he received, along with *hazôn*, or “vision,” and *mar’ê*, or “appearance.”

### What saith Dn9:22-23?

22 And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.

23 At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.

According to Shea, we are to find in these verses that “the ‘words’ that were to be shut up, or sealed up, refer to the didactic or explanatory words of instruction that Gabriel brought to Daniel...” (par.7) It will be noticed that there is *no* mention in these verses regarding either the shutting up, or sealing up of the “words.” In fact d<sup>e</sup>barîm does not occur at all in these verses! If he is referring to dâbâr translated “matter” in this verse, he has again left us completely in the dark as to how he understands this word which, in any commentators notes, has special significance in a prophetic context.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, Dn9:22,23 does *not* show us *at all* that the “the ‘words’ that were to be shut up, or sealed up, refer to the didactic or explanatory words of instruction that Gabriel brought to Daniel...” (par.7). Furthermore, Dn9:22,23 does *not* provide “clear” evidence that d<sup>e</sup>barîm is “the third of the three terms employed by Daniel for the prophetic information he received, along with *hazôn* or ‘vision,’ and *mar’ê*, or ‘appearance’” (par.7). The fact that the words “to shut” or “to seal up” occur with the words hazôn and d<sup>e</sup>barîm is no “envelope” around these two words, thereby meaning that they are different from each other. The very same logic could be used to argue that the same “envelope” around the word (“book” or “scroll”) would mean that sèpher would be different from hazôn and d<sup>e</sup>barîm, meaning in effect that a mar’ê or d<sup>e</sup>barîm could not be a part of the sèpher of Daniel!

Another observation worth noting is that Shea uses the occurrence of hazôn in Dn9:24 to support his theory regarding the meaning of this word in Dn8. Yet elsewhere Shea says that this instance of hazôn in Dn9:24 “occurs as a broadly inclusive collective for prophetic experiences: once in Daniel’s own case (1:17), and once in the case of the latter prophets” (1982, p.82). Thus it seems that Shea himself abandons the view that hazôn in Dn9:24 refers to Dn8. Accordingly, I will abandon a discussion on the matter. Readers may however, refer to the paper [Assumption No.18](#) for my discussion on “vision” in Dn9:24 applying to prophecy and prophets in general, rather than any particular part of the book of Daniel.

---

<sup>12</sup> cf. [Keil,1978](#), p.335: “A word of God, particularly the word which he announced to Daniel, verses 24-27.”

## 5. Shea's Second Point.

The second point listed above and presented in par.8-10, concerns the meaning of mar'ê in Dn8:16 and also in v26: "it is suggested that the mar'ê referred to in v16 should be applied more specifically to the intravisional discussion and explanation carried on by the two holy ones in their appearance to Daniel." (Ibid, p.235) This refers to vs.13,14. This is supported by "the next reference to the mar'ê in ch 8, which occurs in v 26, "the mar'ê [appearance] of the *evenings and mornings* which was told is true...." (Ibid) I concur with Shea on the point that v26 could refer to vs.13,14. But this does not eliminate hazôn in vs.15,17 and 26 also referring to vs.13, 14 as a component of the hazôn, nor does it eliminate the possibility of mar'ê in verse 26 referring to more than verses 13 and 14. Shea simply says that "it is suggested that the mar'ê referred to in v16 should be applied more specifically" to vs.13,14, yet v26 doesn't eliminate the possibility of hazôn properly including vs.13,14 as well. The mere suggestion is not evidence in itself! Rather than applying mar'ê in v16 to vs.13,14, the contents of the response of Gabriel recorded in vs.20-26 to the command given to him to make Daniel understand the mar'ê indicates that the hazôn in vs3-12 is to be considered the mar'ê in v16, instead of just vs.13,14. Dn8:20-26 is Gabriel's fulfillment of the command, and it is clear from these verses that vs.3-14 are included in the mar'ê to be explained.

As I argue elsewhere, Dn8:2-26 can rightly be called both a mar'ê and a hazôn. From this perspective, the incidence of mar'ê in v.16 and hazôn in v.13, 15 can all rightly refer to vs3-12 or vs.3-14, since his explanation in the last half of the chapter shows he understands the full vision is included in the mar'ê, which is also the hazôn.

## 6. Shea's Third Point.

The third point listed above which allows Shea to argue for different meanings of mar'ê and hazôn is that "a hazôn (vision) is seen, but a mar'e is both seen and heard ...." (par.11). But this difference in the style of delivery of the revelation has been assumed on the presupposition that vs.13,14 are not included in the meaning of hazôn referred to in ch8:15. It should be noted that in vs. 13,14, there is a verbal discussion between two onlookers of the vision. If Shea admits that vs.13,14 could be included in the hazôn in 8:15, then that would mean that a hazôn could also have elements that can be seen and heard!

While it is true that there is a paucity of explicit auditory material in Dn8:3-12, the question as to whether there were noises in the vision he saw may still be raised. When the goat came into conflict with the ram and "moved with choler against him" (v.7), were there no accompanying animal noises occurring but were not documented? When the he-goat "ran unto him in the fury of his power" (v6), were there no noises associated with that charge as there would be in the animal kingdom? When the goat broke the ram's horns, were there no noises of horns clashing or breaking? What about the wind and the water at the beginning of his dream in Dn7 when "the winds strove upon the great sea?" (7:2) Would not produce any noises? When the fourth beast in Dn7 "devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it" (v7), were there not sounds to be associated with actions like that? Is Daniel describing what he saw *and* heard? And Shea categorises this verse as a chazôn not a mar'ê. Did Daniel indeed record *every* detail of his dream, or did he record what seemed to him to be the salient details of the revelation? And

if he only recorded the salient features, then we cannot conclude that a certain aspect of a vision did not occur merely because it is not recorded.

Some examples of unrecorded details in the vision in ch8 include the following: How did Daniel know that he was in the province of Shushan? Were there things in the layout of the palace that made it easy to distinguish from other palaces? He hasn't detailed what they were. We merely take his definition at face value without any details to validate his statement. Looking at other visionary matter unrecorded, what about the following considerations? Was there a sky or a horizon in the vision (cf., the goat came from the west)? Was there water in the Ulai river? Did the animals have mouths, noses and four legs each? Were the horns thick or thin, straight or spiral? Was the ram chewing grass by the river when the goat attacked it? Or was it chewing its cud? Was it chewing at all? How does an animal "move with choler?" This phrase does not describe specific motor skills of the animal; rather, it is an interpretation of a combination of motor functions in the animal's body. It doesn't explain how the animal behaved with its head, legs, eyes, mouth or torso.

Thus it is fairly obvious that Daniel did not write a detail-for-detail account. His personal selection and interpretation of details passing through his consciousness is still in operation. His cognitive information processing and storing is still facilitated by a process of perception, which limited his attention to those factors that seem to be high priority details in the communication. A more remote question pertains to how a person "hears" a sound in a vision? Is it just another cognitive perception or did Daniel's auditory nerve receive impulses and relay them to the brain, so that in fact "what is heard" is a different kind of sensory experience from "what is seen?"

As can be seen from the few details listed above, Daniel's record of the vision is indeed cryptic, and as for Shea to say that Daniel's experience as recorded up to v12 does not include any sound is merely an argument from silence. Turning to Dn7, we notice details from this hazôn that effectively overturns Shea's idea. It will be noted firstly that Shea does recognise Dn7:1-18 as a hazôn:

the question remains, which was the first, or beginning, *hazôn*, or vision, to which Daniel referred in 9:21? This question is answered for us by Dan 8:1, which refers back to the vision of ch 7 as that which appeared to Daniel at first (*l'hilla*). Inasmuch as the same word is used to modify *vision* here as in 9:21, the vision of ch 7 must also be the vision to which Daniel referred in the latter passage. (p.237)

The following verses in ch7 detail specific auditory experiences in the hazôn :

5 And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: **and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.**

8 I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn



were eyes like the eyes of man, **and a mouth speaking great things.**

**11 I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spoke:** I beheld ever till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.

Dn7 explicitly indicates that sounds were a part of the vision, therefore allowing both the conversation in Dn8:13-14 to be rightly included in a chazôn as well as the *spoken* explanation of the vision in Dn8:20-26 which is supported by the reference in Dn9:21 to Gabriel in Dn8 as being a chazôn.

Little more needs to be said. The evidence is obvious to all. There *are* audible elements in a hazôn just as there is in a mar'ê! Shea's thesis is again in tatters!

## 7. Shea's Fourth Point.

Turning to the fourth point, Shea argues that in Dn8:16, Gabriel is told to make Daniel understand the mar'ê, yet in v27 we read that Daniel still did not understand the mar'ê, even though information was conveyed. Shea goes on to say that when Gabriel was sent a second time, he was sent specifically to explain the mar'ê (9:23). The hazôn was not in need of further explanation, only the mar'ê. Following on then in Shea's reasoning, *if it is assumed* that the mar'ê in Dn9:23 that Gabriel comes to explain is the same mar'ê in Dn8:27, which Daniel didn't understand (and is not the mar'ê in Dn9:24-27), and *if one assumes* that the mar'ê of Dn8:27 is the same mar'ê as Dn8:16, which *assumedly* can only be v13,14 (as defined so by Dn8:26), *then* Dn9:23 refers specifically to Dn8:13,14. As can be seen from glancing through this point, there is a whole plethora of assumptions present. In referring to my list of assumptions, it can be seen that he has invoked at least Assumptions No.3,4,5,6,7,8,10,12,13. It would be pointless to deal with all of these at this juncture, but some matters can be addressed. When Shea discusses the "direct connection between the prophet of Dan 8 and of Dan 9" in respect of the occurrence of mar'ê in Dn8:16, 27 and 9:23, he says: "according to Dan 8:16, Gabriel was instructed to cause Daniel to understand the mar'ê (appearance). At the end of Gabriel's explanation, however, Daniel still did not understand it (v 27)" (par.12).

It is interesting to note here how Shea avoids the issue of why Gabriel gave an explanation of vs.3-14 when, in Shea's view, Gabriel was *only* instructed to explain vs.13,14, not vs.3-12. If the answer comes back that vs.3-12 needed to be explained before vs.13,14 could be explained, then the question arises as to why Gabriel's instructor on the banks of the Ulai gave the wrong command? Did the command in v16 come from someone less intelligent than Gabriel, who didn't comprehend that the hazôn had to be explained as well in order for Gabriel to be able to explain the mar'ê? If the hazôn was somehow implied in the mentioning of the mar'ê, then surely the dichotomy between these two words that Shea is arguing for, is completely overturned!!

In the following statement by Shea he clearly answers his own query by implying that the vision threw up more questions and implications than the explanation touched:

Perhaps the particular part of the instruction from the mar'ê that Daniel did not understand and that shocked him so much was how the little horn power could



trample down God's host, His sanctuary, and its sacrifice under foot for so long a period of time as the 2300 evenings-mornings mentioned in this connection. (par.12)

It does not mean however that Gabriel's mission was to satisfy Daniel's interest and answer queries that would arise from the explanation of the vision. Notice an example from other revelations to Daniel. I have not read of any SDA historicists' commentary sat that Dn7 is an incomplete revelation, that is, that Dn7 had any unfinished explanations. Yet Daniel could say at the end of the revelation that it raised unanswered disturbing thoughts in his mind:

Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart.(7:28)

Also, Dn10-12 clearly shows that what the interpreter gave to Daniel in the way of revelation did give Daniel understanding (10:1), but it did not give him complete understanding since he is still asking questions up till the end (cf., 12:8,9,13). So then, the command in Dn8 to make Daniel understand did not necessarily mean that Gabriel was to answer Daniel's queries. Rather, it seems to indicate that Gabriel gives to Daniel the necessary details and Gabriel's commander knew that what is given to Daniel will give understanding of the necessary aspects of the vision to Daniel.

It has been shown previously, that the explanation only covers a small select number of items—presumably key items. Since the rest of these items remain unexplained, we can only assume that Daniel was skilled enough to interpret the vision with the scanty details given him, and that God knew Daniel's skills and gave him those details he needed. Thus the absence of any comment in regard to the starting date of the 2300 evening-mornings is just as much, if not more, evidence that Daniel understood its starting time as it is that he did not understand it.

The instance of mar'ê in 8:27 can be interpreted along the same lines as has been done above and applied to vs.3-14, since if Gabriel's commander asks him to explain the mar'ê and Gabriel in response explains vs.3-14, it can be quite reasonably assumed that mar'ê refers to vs.3-14 at least. Indeed if we took Shea's admission in par.13 that it could refer to vs.15-26, then mar'ê in v27 could refer to Dn8:3-26! There is another aspect about vs.3-12 Shea hasn't considered that is worthy of observation and could be used to apply Shea's definition of mar'ê to vs.2-12. Notice Dn8:2:

2 And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai.

Twice in this verse the statement is made:

and I saw in a vision.....that I was at Shushan in the palace

and I saw in a vision.....I was by the river of Ulai

These statements of Daniel's give us to understand that Daniel himself was in his own

vision; he saw himself as it were in third person by the river of Ulai or in the palace at Shushan. This thought is brought out in the emphatic pronoun in the New American Standard Bible and is also clearly conveyed in Moffat's translation:

“and I myself was beside the Ulai Canal” (NASB)

“in my vision I saw myself beside the river Ulai” (Moffat)

It is the Daniel-*in-the-vision* who sees all these things in Dn8:3-26, not the Daniel-having-the-vision; this latter Daniel just sees what the Daniel-in-the-vision sees in vision and the interaction that ensues after the vision. His personal presence is there by the river Ulai throughout the entire event right through to v26, just as Gabriel's personal presence is with him in vs.15-26. *All* of the actions and events occurring to Daniel in chapter 8 occur to the Daniel-in-the-vision, since they happen by the river Ulai. The Daniel-having-the-vision is still in Babylon, as is indicated in verse 27, where he rises from his bed of sickness and resumes his attention the king's business. It is the Daniel-*in-the-vision* who is standing by the river Ulai who hears the two holy ones talking and then the response by the other being between the banks of the Ulai. It is the Daniel-*in-the-vision* who falls into the dirt beside the river when Gabriel walks over to him from talking with the man on the Ulai river. It is the Daniel-in-the-vision who receives the instruction from Gabriel in vs.20-26. Thus, in line with Shea's definition of mar'ê – that it refers “more specifically to the appearance of a personal being in vision” (p.233), vs.2-26, which has Daniel continually in the vision –verses 3 to 26, fit Shea's criteria perfectly for being a mar'ê. By his own definition then, Shea's dichotomy between mar'ê and hazôn seems to have evaporated again and Dn8:16,27 need not refer specifically only to vs.13,14. Rather, even using the definition given by Shea to both words, we can have the whole of chapter 8 being both a mar'ê and a hazôn *at the same time*.

## **8. Summary of My Assessment of Shea's Definition of Mar'ê and Chazôn in Dn8 and Dn9.**

Having examined Shea's arguments for the difference in meaning between these two Hebrew words, we can conclude that there is no clear unambiguous instances of mar'ê indicating that mar'ê and hazôn are mutually exclusive terms referring to different sections of Dn8 and the connection between mar'ê in Dn9:23 and Dn8 as proposed by Shea (and SDA historicists) has yet to be established. It is clearly more consistent to see mar'ê in Dn9:23 referring to vs.24-27 of ch9, than relating it to Dn8:13,14.

## **9. Shea's Treatment of Chazôn in Dn9:21.**

Having concluded my comments on Shea's four arguments concerning mar'ê and hazôn in Dn8 and 9, it only remains to examine the “problem” occurrence of hazôn in Dn9:21,

which Shea discusses on pp.237-238 of his paper.<sup>13</sup> Here is his comments on this issue (again the paragraphs are numbered for convenience in referencing):

**a. Excerpt's from Shea's Rational for Dn9:21**

[1] Dan 8:3-12---the vision of the beasts and the little horn: *hazôn*

Dan 8:13-14--the intravisional appearance and explanation of the two holy ones: the *mar'ê* of Dan 8:16, 26, and 9:23

Dan 8:15-26--the extravisional appearance and explanation of Gabriel: could be included in the *mar'ê* of 8: 26 and 9:23 but does not have to be. Cannot be included in the *mar'ê* of Dan 8:16, which refers to what Gabriel was to explain. This explanatory function of Dan 8:15-26 makes the primary application of all three of these occurrences of *mar'ê* refer to Dan 8:13-14 regardless of how one relates Dan 8:15-26 to them.

2. There is one occurrence of the word, that at first glance might appear to contradict the interpretation of *mar'ê* proposed here, and that is the occurrence of this word in 9:21 where Daniel refers to Gabriel as the one "whom I had seen in the *hazôn* [vision] at first." Did Daniel refer to the personal "appearance" of Gabriel, which should have been described as a *mar'ê* according to the interpretation of that word advanced here, as a *hazôn* instead in this verse? If he did, then the distinction drawn between the technical application of these two words proposed above cannot be upheld. However, there is some qualifying information available from this verse that points in the opposite direction.

3. It is important to note that Daniel specifically refers to his view of Gabriel in 9:21 as occurring in the first, or beginning, vision. The word connected with *hazôn* here is *ʾēhillâ*, which occurs in the OT some 20 times. Most of these occurrences are translated as "beginning," as is the case in Dan 9:23, where it was at the beginning of Daniel's supplications that Gabriel was dispatched to him, but in some instances it has been translated as "first." Regardless of which way one translates this word here, the question remains, which was the first, or beginning, *hazôn*, or vision, to which Daniel referred in 9:21? This question is answered for us by Dan 8:1, which refers back to the vision of ch 7 as that which appeared to Daniel at first (*ʾēhillâ*). Inasmuch as the same word is used to modify *vision* here as in 9:21, the vision of ch 7 must also be the vision to which Daniel referred in the latter passage.

4. This means that Daniel saw Gabriel in the vision of ch 7 also. If that interpretation is correct the question is where is Gabriel in ch 7? In this case we may turn to the intravisional explanation given there, for it was given by "one of those who stood there" (7:16) in the great scene of the heavenly court in session. The attendant who

---

<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that it is only a "problem" for Shea's novel theory. The rest of the Christian world and most other SDA writers, including Hasel, see Dn9:21 as referring to Dn8, the most natural option. I have found only commentator that makes reference to Dn7; John Collins. His comments are: "*the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first*: Gabriel was explicitly identified in Dan.8:16, but the vision in chap. 8 was said to be "after that which appeared to me in the beginning" (8:1). Gabriel is probably identified with the anonymous "one of the attendants" in 7:16, who also has the function of interpreter." (1993, p.351) The logic of Collins' confusing the first vision of Daniel with the first appearance of Daniel can be questioned however, with the same arguments cited against Shea's justification for the proposal.

came to Daniel's aid in that case, although he is not named there, must have been Gabriel, according to this reference to him in 9:21. Gabriel is not designated by name as the messenger sent to Daniel in ch 10 either, but that identification certainly is a logical one because, by virtue of his three previous appearances, Daniel was well acquainted with him. In other words, Gabriel was the interpreter-messenger who appeared on each occasion when Daniel was given all four of his major prophecies. This is explicitly stated in 8:16 and 9:21; 9:21 refers back to 7:16, and it is strongly implied for Daniel's informant in ch 10.

5. Thus one reason why Daniel might have referred to Gabriel in the *hazôn* of ch 7, rather than using the word *mar'ê* for that appearance, is that Gabriel was a participant in the court scene that the prophet viewed. However, there is an additional explanation that may take precedence over this one. The vision of ch 7 was described, interpreted, and recorded with the exception of the last three verses in Aramaic. *Mar'ê* does not occur in Aramaic, and the common Hebrew root *ra'â*, from which this word derived, does not occur as a cognate in Aramaic. Therefore, when referring back to the "Aramaic" vision, it would have been natural for Daniel as a fluent bilingual speaker to refer to that appearance of Gabriel as having occurred in a *hazôn*, a cognate with Aramaic *hezev*, which occurs six times in Dan 7 (vs. 1, 2, 7, and 20).

6. In other words, the distinction between *mar'ê* and *hazôn* as proposed here is an intra-Hebrew phenomenon that applies only to the prophecies of Daniel given in Hebrew (8-12). It does not apply to ch 7 (which was given in Aramaic), to which Daniel applied the antecedent appearance of Gabriel referred to in 9:21. Thus this exceptional occurrence of *hazôn* in Daniel 9:21 does not provide sufficient evidence to contradict the basic distinction drawn above between the technical application of *hazôn* as a vision referring to the beasts and their activities in general and the *mar'ê*, referring more specifically to the appearance of personal beings such as the holy ones in ch 8 and God Himself in ch 10. (1981)

### **b. Summary of Shea's Statement.**

Before looking at the points put forward by Shea above, it would be useful to summarise his reasoning to catch the context of this "problem. Shea's thesis is that hazôn in Dn8 only applies to vs.3-12 (in contradistinction to appearances of personal beings, e.g., vs.13,14 and vs.15-26), yet 9:21 refers to Daniel seeing Gabriel in a previous hazôn. If it refers to Dn8:16-26 "then the distinction drawn between the technical application of these two words proposed above cannot be upheld," (par.2) and the SDA argument that Dn8:16-26 is just explanation and not vision. This would carry forward to Dn9, where it can be said that since Dn8:16-26 can be classified as vision, so can Dn9. Therefore, vs.24-27 can, quite legitimately, be called "vision" rather than explanation, and the expression to "consider the vision" could apply to the following verses rather than referring to Dn8. This would negate any necessity of connecting the 70 weeks of Dn9 with the 2300 days of Dn8.

This would mean that the "personal appearance" of Gabriel in vs.16-26 and his didactic explanation is called hazôn, making hazôn in 8:15,17 able to include vs.13,14 with vs.2-12 in their scope, and *everything* in Dn8 could be referred to as hazôn (and in some cases they could be mar'ê and hazôn). Following on from this outcome would be the inability to say that the mar'ê which Daniel didn't understand was the mar'ê of Dn8:13,14, since the word mar'ê in 8:27 and 9:23 would not point immediately to 8:13,14. Consequently, one of the few links used by SDA's to link the two time periods in Dn8 and 9 would be lost. So Shea

has to “get around” this problem in order to maintain his definitional thesis.

### **c. Examination of Shea’s Arguments on *Chazôn* in Dn9:21**

The thrust of this section is to see whether Dn9:21’s occurrence of hazôn confutes Shea’s proposals. The points that he makes in the section quoted above include the following:

- (1) “The word connected with *hazôn* in 9:21 is *t<sup>e</sup>hillâ*, which occurs in the O.T. some 20 times. Most of these occurrences are translated as “beginning,” (par.3) In this case, “the beginning” which it is referring to is the beginning of these visions, which is in ch7.
- (2) Gabriel is the “interpreter-messenger” in ch7 who gives Daniel the meaning of that vision, though he remains unnamed in that vision.
- (3) Daniel used hazôn to refer to “personal appearance” of Gabriel in Dn7 because there was no cognate word for mar’ê in Aramaic – the language in which Daniel 7 was written.
- (4) Therefore, this shows that the distinction between mar’ê and hazôn is one that is confined to Hebrew scripts, and the use of the Hebrew hazôn to refer to an Aramaic “personal appearance” does not negate the thesis.

Firstly, Shea needs to be congratulated for his honesty for being frank with the critical position of Dn9:21 in relation to his thesis. In a paper that consistently ignores competing interpretations, this admission is quite singular. Nevertheless, notwithstanding his frankness, Shea’s attempt to apply Dn9:21 to Dn7 rather than to Dn8 is a desperate, shallow but unsuccessful effort to divert the obvious – the demise of his thesis. Without this “new” lexical connection between Dn8 and 9, SDA historicists can only fall back on the faulty assumptions that have been used traditionally to support this doctrine.

Shea needs to consider this quote from Questions on Doctrine:

When the angel Gabriel, “whom I [Daniel] had seen in the vision [*chazon*] at the beginning” (Dan.9:21), returned to complete his explanation of the vision, he directed Daniel’s attention specifically to the vision (*mar’eh*) when he said, “consider the vision [*mar’eh*]” (verse 23)...There can be no mistake as to this identification of “the vision.” S. R. Driver, the noted critic (*The Book of Daniel*, 1936, pp.133), recognized this, and wrote concerning “the vision at the beginning” (Dan. 9:21) that it refers to “viii.16.” The chapter 8 usage and the chapter 9 tie-in appears inescapable...(Seventh-day Adventist, 1957, p.271)

In their view, the tie-in between Gabriel’s mention of the earlier vision and the vision of ch.8 where Daniel is mentioned is *inescapable*. Inescapable, Dr, Shea!! This terrible situation for Shea is vindication for my proposal that the word for vision in Dn8:13 refers to vs.9-12.

### **d. Other translations of the adverb “*batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ*” in Dn9:21.**

In the following pages I will illustrate why Shea’s argument regarding Dn9:21 is

untenable. But firstly, let me document here how various translations of the Bible and commentators on Daniel render “*batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ*” in 9:21:

the former vision	Moffat, Amplified Bible;
previously	NASB
at the beginning	KJV, ASV, Knox, RV, Leupold,
at the first	RSV, Keil, Baldwin, Porteous,
originally	Jerusalem
already	NEB
earlier	LB, NIV,
in the beginning	E.J. Young,
at the commencement	R. Young

Here is some lexical information from Brown, Driver & Briggs (1983), Koehler and Baumgartner (1994) and Tregelles (1952) regarding *t<sup>e</sup>hillâ*:

#### Brown Driver and Briggs (1962):

8462 <sup>†</sup>תְּחִלָּה n.f. beginning, תְּחִלָּה Ne 11<sup>17</sup>  
 (rd. תְּחִלָּה ⑤ SS Öt), בְּתִחְלָה Gn 13<sup>3</sup> + 10 t.;  
 cstr. תְּחִלָּת Ho 1<sup>2</sup> Pr 9<sup>10</sup> Ec 10<sup>13</sup>, בְּתִחְלָת 2 K 17<sup>25</sup>  
 + 4 t., תְּחִלָּת 2 S 21<sup>9</sup>, מִתְחִלָּת 2 S 21<sup>10</sup>:—cstr.  
 with nouns תְּחִלָּה 'ח Pr 9<sup>10</sup> *the beginning, first*  
*principle* of wisdom דְּבַר 'ח Ec 10<sup>13</sup> *the first*  
*word*, sq. rel. clause 'ח דְּבַר 'ח *at the beginning*  
*of, Yahweh spake* (=when Yahweh first spake)  
 Ho 1<sup>2</sup>; preceded by prep. בְּ 2 S 21<sup>10</sup>, elsewhere  
 by אֶ *in the beginning*, of the harvest Ru 1<sup>12</sup>  
 2 S 21<sup>9</sup> (Qr), of the kingdom Ezr 4<sup>6</sup>, of their  
 dwelling there 2 K 17<sup>25</sup>, of supplications Dn 9<sup>23</sup>,  
 of the shooting up of vegetation Am 7<sup>1</sup>, 'בְּתִחְלָה  
 as in the beginning Is 1<sup>26</sup>; 'בְּתִחְלָה *at first, first* in  
 order Ju 1<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>18,18</sup> 2 S 17<sup>9</sup>; *at the first, first* (or  
*former*) *time*, i.e. first in a series of occurrences,  
 Gn 13<sup>3</sup> (J), 41<sup>21</sup> (E), 43<sup>18,20</sup> (J), Dn 8<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>21</sup>.

BDB gives possibly the best idea in their comments. The appearance of Gabriel in Dn8 was “the first in a series of occurrences,” (the later one being that of Dn9); the vision of Dn7 was “the first in a series of occurrences.”



### Koehler and Baumgartner (1994):

תְּחִלָּה: I חלל, Bauer-Leander *Heb.* 495n; MHeb. Levy *Wb.* 4: 636 (Dalman *Wörterbuch* 441a); DSS (Kuhn *Konkordanz* 232); 1Qp Hab 8:9 עומדו בתחלת at the beginning of his duty, meaning when he took up his duty: cstr. תְּחִלָּת. —1. a) **beginning** Pr 9<sub>10</sub> Qoh 10<sub>13</sub>; בתְּחִלָּה at the start 2S 17<sub>9</sub>; first Ju 1<sub>1</sub> 20<sub>18</sub>; as it was before Gn 41<sub>21</sub> Is 1<sub>26</sub>, cf. Wildberger BK 10: 55; at the beginning, the previous occasion Gn 13<sub>3</sub> 43<sub>18-20</sub> Da 8<sub>1</sub> 9<sub>21</sub>.

—b) בתְּחִלָּת with a following genitive: α) 2S 21<sub>9Q</sub> 2K 17<sub>25</sub> Am 7<sub>1</sub> Ru 1<sub>22</sub> Da 9<sub>23</sub> Ezr 4<sub>6</sub>; בתְּחִלָּת 2S 21<sub>10</sub>; β) תְּחִלָּת as temporal accusative (Brockelmann *Heb. Syn.* §100b): תְּחִלָּת קָצִיר שְׁעָרִים at the beginning of the barley harvest 2S 21<sub>9K</sub>; תְּחִלָּת דִּבֶּר יְהוָה Hos 1<sub>2</sub> “at the beginning of the talking of Yahweh with (through) Hosea”, or alternatively translating more freely, “as Yahweh began to speak with (through) Hosea”, on which see Wolff BK 14/1<sup>2</sup> 6, 12f :: Rudolph KAT 13/1: 37 (bibliography), who takes these words as a heading: the beginning of the speech of Yahweh to (through) Hosea. —2. cj. Neh 11<sub>17</sub> pr. ראש תְּחִלָּה rd. with Sept.<sup>L</sup>, Vulg. ראש תְּחִלָּה, → I תְּחִלָּה 4. —3. expressions (selected): with דִּבֶּר (תְּחִלָּת) Hos 1<sub>2</sub> on which see above 1bβ; with הָיָה (תְּחִלָּת) Gn 13<sub>3</sub>, cf. 2K 17<sub>25</sub>; with יָרַד (תְּחִלָּת) Gn 43<sub>20</sub>; with נָפַל (תְּחִלָּת) 2S 17<sub>9</sub>; with עָלָה (תְּחִלָּת) Ju 1<sub>1</sub> 20<sub>18</sub>, cf. Am 7<sub>1</sub>; with רָאָה (תְּחִלָּת) Da 9<sub>21</sub>. †

KBL here also admits the correctness of seeing the meaning in Dn9:21 as being “previous,” as does Tregelles below.

### Tregelles (1952):

תְּחִלָּה fem. (from the root תָּלַל Hiphil, to begin) *beginning*, Hosea 1:2; Prov. 9:10; בתְּחִלָּה in the



beginning, i.e. previously, Gen. 13:3; 41:21; 43:18, 20; Isa. 1:26.

#### **e. The Three Elements in Dn9:21 that qualify its reference**

In considering the statement of Dn9:21, there are three things that qualify which vision is being referred to: (a) the classification of the messenger by two salient qualities: a name, Gabriel; and as a “man”; (b) hazôn being the type of revelation; and (3) its occurrence “*batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ*,” whatever that may mean. In par.4, Shea discusses Gabriel’s presence in Dn7. He refers to verse 16 and says: “The attendant who came to Daniel’s aid in that case, although he is not named there, *must* have been Gabriel, according to this reference to him in 9:21.” (Emphasis mine). It is amazing that Shea’s whole proposal rests on this “evidence.” His distinction between mar’ê and hazôn stands or falls on the meaning of hazôn in Dn9:21, and the only evidence that Shea can offer to relate Gabriel to 7:16 is the rhetorical “must.” It is all assumption. If salvation had the same basis as Shea has for his proposal all would despair of hope!!

#### **f. Is the reference in Dn9:21 to the former (“*batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ*”) vision a reference to Daniel 7?**

But that is not all. The sad state of his desperation to support his thesis is illustrated by his second argument to prove that the unnamed being in Dn7 is, in reality, Gabriel: “Gabriel is not designated by name as the messenger sent to Daniel in ch 10 either, but that identification certainly is a logical one because, by virtue of his three previous appearances, Daniel was well acquainted with him.” (par.4) This is such an amazing set of assumptions that one needs to stop, examine them and see how assumption is used to prove assumption. Shea is saying that we need not be bothered with the absence of Gabriel’s name in Dn7 because when he appears in ch10, his name is not mentioned here either. That is to say, it is characteristic of Daniel to omit Gabriel’s name because he is well acquainted with him by the time his last revelation occurs.

He then assumes again that Dn7 is Gabriel’s first introduction to Daniel and says that the occasion recorded in ch10 is the fourth occasion of Gabriel conversing with Daniel, thus there is no need to mention Gabriel’s name. If ever there was an example of crooked thinking, this is it. Shea’s identification is based on a rhetorical assertion that it is his proposals are “logical.” But Dn10 does not identify the messenger, neither does ch7 and that is the end of the matter. One has to assume so many things that have no basis in fact to gain insight into Shea’s “logical” conclusions. The absence of Gabriel’s name in either Dn7 or 10 indicates the obvious- that we cannot conclude the name of the messengers in these chapters; the author has left their names unspecified. The absence of the messenger’s name in Dn10 does not mean that he is same messenger as the one recorded visiting Daniel in ch7. It just means that they are two unnamed messengers. Nothing more. All else is merely speculation from silence, which can just as easily be reversed because there is no factual basis for the argument.

To say that Daniel did not need to record Gabriel’s name in Dn 10 because, “by virtue of his three previous appearances, Daniel was well acquainted with him” (par.4), may be tolerable in the case of Dn10, but is certainly out of order when referring to Dn7:16 where

Shea sees Gabriel's first appearance to Daniel. If ch7:16 is Daniel's first acquaintance with Gabriel, then by the same calibre of logic that Shea has applied to Dn10, one would naturally (or should I quote Shea and say "logically") expect to find the first mention of the name of this new acquaintance when Daniel is NOT "well acquainted with him."

Notice also Shea's circular logic in the sentence previous to the one quoted. He says: "The attendant who came to Daniel's aid in that case, although he is not named there, must have been Gabriel, according to this reference to him in 9:21." (par.4) That is to say, to prove Shea's proposal that *bat<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn9:21 refers not to ch8, but to ch7, Shea says that the person in 7:16 is Gabriel because 9:21 says so. He is saying in effect that by assuming the validity of his conclusions (that Dn9:21 refers to 7:16) to support his premise (Gabriel appears in 7:16), it can be seen that his conclusion is correct. To put it another way, if you assume that Dn9:21 says that Gabriel appears in Dn7:16, then Gabriel does indeed appear in Dn7:16, because Dn9:21 says so, thus proving that Dn9:21 does refer back to Dn7!!

Shea would object to this and say that the occurrence of *bat<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn8:1 clearly refers us to Dn7 for the first hazôn referred to in Dn9:21 but this assumption has not considered other possibilities of the meaning of *bat<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn9:21. These will be discussed when I deal with the third of the three things which qualify hazôn. Suffice it to say that the circular nature of his reasoning still stands as that -circular!

#### **g. The First Feature in Dn9:21: "Gabriel" is his name and the being is a "man."**

In looking at the presence of Gabriel in the hazôn mentioned in Dn9:21, two features are stated by Scripture: firstly, that he is man-like in appearance; and secondly, that his name is referred to as Gabriel. Taking Dn7 and 8 and listing those verses where either of these two features occurs, we yield the following:

man:                      ch7:4,8,13;    ch8:15,17

Gabriel:                      ch8:16

In regard to the occurrence of "man", ch 7:4 refers to the change of the lion's heart to a man's heart; ch7:8 refers to the eyes of a man in the horn of the nondescript beast; ch7:13 has "one like the son of man" who "came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days."; ch8:15 refers to a being which stood before Daniel in the appearance of a man who was then identified as Gabriel by the being that stood on the Ulai river; and lastly, in ch8:17 there is the reference by Gabriel to Daniel, who was called a "son of man." In regard to the occurrence of the name "Gabriel," we only find it in 8:16 where a being is identified as being called by that name. Thus, by the simple process of correlating the references of both these features, we come up with one answer- Dn8:15,16 is the only place where these two features are a characteristic of one personage.

But it seems that the obvious isn't obvious to Shea so I would like to spend some time to explore his ideas a little further. If one is to be guided by the two features of this person who visited Daniel in Ch9, and one of those features does not occur in ch7, then perhaps the logical thing to do would be to take the other feature and use it as a guide. In the case of

ch7, this would mean that because the name Gabriel doesn't occur, the second feature "man" is the next guide to ascertain whether this visitant could be in the record of Dn7.

Taking this line of argument, we would find that the son of man mentioned in 7:13 would be the only personage in this chapter specified by Daniel at 9:21. And the implications of this conclusion are such that I'm sure Shea would not want to see the name Gabriel being linked to this personage! It will be noticed that in 7:16 there is no mention as to whether 'them that stood by' were human, human-like or angelic. It could be argued that the "standing by" of these personages is the posture of those "ten thousand times ten thousand" mentioned in v10, and by a comparative study it could be shown that these are the angels, as also is Gabriel. But that argument misses the point.

Though Daniel is well aware that the being who was caused to fly swiftly from the very throne room of God to answer Daniel's prayer was not a son of Adam, he still refers to him as "the man Gabriel" – a very specific reference to both his humanlike appearance and also to his name. If Daniel, being cognizant of Gabriel's superhuman qualities, still refers to him by these features, then we should take the same lead and seek the reference where these features are explicitly evident. If we do this with scholarly objectivity, the only place where that occurs is in Dn8:15,16. But that simple deduction seems to be too difficult for some scholars.

#### **h. The Second Feature– it has to be a chazôn.**

The second thing in Dn9:21 that helps us to locate where Daniel had recorded Gabriel's previous visit is the definition of it as a hazôn. And here again Shea falls foul of the evidence. According to Shea's dichotomy of Dn7 on p.230, there are two parts to the revelation – A Vision and an Explanation. After a careful examination of Dn7, it is evident that the hazôn finishes at v14. Notice the comparative similarity between Dn7:16 and Dn8:15,16:

7:15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me

7:16 I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of an this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things.

8:15 And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.

8:16 And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.

Notice the following similar details that are common to both 7:15-16 and 8:15-16:

- (1) The vision had finished;
- (2) Daniel seeks for meaning or interpretation of the completed vision;
- (3) A dialogue on this matter occurs between Daniel and someone else;
- (4) The other person responds willingly and proceeds to give Daniel the desired interpretation.

In Shea's categorisation of Dn8, v15 does not come under the hazôn. It doesn't even come under the category of Shea's "intravisional explanation", which Shea applies to vs.17,18. The fact that 7:15-16 should not be included in the hazôn is supported by two other features. The first is the statement that the interpretation was to begin, thus making vs.15-27 an extravisional explanation in Shea's terms, and not as Shea states in par.4, an intravisional explanation. If Shea is to follow his own dichotomy on p.230, how can he say that Dn7 has both "intravisional explanation" as well as "explanation" after the "vision?" And if the "intravisional explanation" is *the* explanation of Dn7, how can it be separate from the "vision" as indicated on p.230 and yet be called "intravisional" – an explanation that is within the "vision?" Notice v16 again: "I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the *interpretation* of the things." This is very definitely interpretation or explanation, not vision, according to Shea's dichotomy.<sup>14</sup> This text clearly indicates that the interpretation is an integral part of the vision itself.

Shea's says in par.4 that Dn7:15-16 should be properly called mar'ê but because there is no Aramaic equivalent for mar'ê, Daniel uses hazôn in Dn9:21 when referring to Dn7:15-16. This is a very dubious argument. The fact that Daniel is bilingual doesn't mean that when using Hebrew he can't categorise according to the Hebrew tongue, even if it does have nuances that Aramaic doesn't have. Because Aramaic may not have an equivalent for mar'ê in its terminology (and that has not been examined yet), there is no reason why Daniel cannot, when referring to an aspect of an experience by using Hebrew, use appropriate Hebrew "technical" terminology. Daniel's revelation in ch7 was not experienced in Aramaic; it was only written down in Aramaic. It was experienced in the same manner as the revelation of Dn8- by the person himself. Thus for Daniel to be using hazôn and mar'ê as Shea proposes he is using it, it would be more expected that mar'ê or d'barîm should occur at Dn9:21 in referring to Dn7:16 than that hazôn should occur.

The second feature which lends support to the view that Dn7:15,16 should not be included in the hazôn (Aram. *hezv*) is the reference throughout 7:1-15 concerning the "visions" of Daniel's head in the night. It occurs five times in this chapter in the following ways:

1 In the first year of Belshazzar I king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.

---

<sup>14</sup> The correct position is of course that the interpretation is also a part of the vision referred to in Dn7:1, in much the same way as the interpretation in Dn8 is also a part of the vision referred to in Dn8:1.

2 Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.

7 After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast....

13 I saw in the night visions and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me.

The details of Daniel's dream are either called "the visions of my head"(v15) or "the night visions"(vs.7,13). The statement in verse 15 refers to Daniel's reaction to the details revealed earlier in his dream and is not a part of the night vision. That is to say, Daniel's grieving of the spirit in the midst of his body is not a part of the visions of his head. The phrases "visions of my head" or "night visions" do not occur again. Therefore unfortunately, Shea's identification of one of those "who stood by"(v16) as a part of the hezey in Dn7 is out of alignment with the characterisations used by the chapter itself. So unless Shea can produce a case identifying someone in Dn7:2-14 as Gabriel, the reference to the hazôn in 9:21 cannot refer to Dn7.

### **i. The Third Feature in Dn9:21 – the adverb "*batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ*."**

The third point which qualifies what vision is referred to by Dn9:21 is the occurrence of *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in this verse. In looking at the meaning of *t<sup>e</sup>hillâ*, Shea asks the question "which was the first, or beginning, hazôn, or vision to which Daniel referred in 9:21?" (par.3) Is chapter 8 the first or beginning hazôn? If one checks Dn8, it says in v1:

In the third year of the reign of the king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.

If we take the adverbial phrase "at the first" at its literal meaning, then this text clearly says that Dn8 was not the first or beginning hazôn.<sup>15</sup> Thus for Shea, the phrase *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn8:1 clarifies *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn9:21 and so he says it must refer to a hazôn earlier than ch8.

Inasmuch as the same word is used to modify *vision* here as in 9:21, the vision of ch 7 must also be the vision to which Daniel referred in the latter passage.

---

<sup>15</sup> In my view, the best translation of this text is "before, previous" making the text "In the third year of the reign of the king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me *before / previously*." This is the more accurate translation of this phrase because his *first* vision was the one given in a dream in ch2.

It will be noted that in par.3 Shea has not even considered the meaning of *ṭhillâ* in its context in Dn9:21. Notice 9:21 again:

21 Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.

The clause “whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning” is an object adjectival clause qualifying its antecedent “the man Gabriel.” The main verb in the subordinate adjectival clause is a perfect Qal of *r’ââ* “had seen” and it is followed by two phrases, both of which modify the main verb. The first phrase “in the vision” is a *locative* adverbial phrase indicating “where” this “seeing” was done (that is, the place of the “seeing”). The second phrase, “in the beginning/before” is a *temporal* adverbial phrase indicating the time “when” this “seeing” occurred. This may be expressed even more simply:

### Subject

“The man Gabriel”

### Object Adjectival Clause

“Whom I had **seen**...

### Locative Adverbial Phrase

**Seen where?** ... “in the vision”

### Temporal Adverbial Phrase

**Seen when?** “Before, Previously, at the first.”

The implications of these two accusatives of the verb are that these phrases *both modify the verb, not each other*! That is to say, the temporal adverbial phrase “in the beginning//before” modifies the “seeing” by Daniel, not the vision, as Shea says.

This may be a subtle difference to some and not worthy of attention, but when Shea’s logic is considered, it does have a direct bearing on the outcome. Our task is *not* to try and locate the first/former vision, and then try and find Gabriel somewhere in it; but rather, our task is to locate where Gabriel is first/formerly seen, and *that* is the vision to which the phrase *batt’hillâ* is referring. That which is the “first/former” in Daniel’s “seeing” to which



Dn9:21 refers is not a hazôn but a sighting of Gabriel.

Put differently, the adjectival clause can be split into two separate strands if this clarifies the relationship of the phrases to the clause and to the subject of the clause:

- (1) the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision;
- (2) the man Gabriel, whom I had seen formerly/before;

These two phrases are conflated in the clause thus making one statement with the two varying prepositional phrases forming a compound clause, but they still modify the main verb of the clause. Thus our search should attempt to locate where Gabriel is “seen” before/formerly by Daniel, and this path leads us to Dn8:16, not Dn7:16.

There is another way that the grammar can also be seen. It could be argued that the second adverbial phrase modifies the first adverbial phrase rendering the two phrases to say: “whom I had seen in the vision which was in the beginning/at the first.” This would mean that the second prepositional phrase is an adjectival phrase describing the antecedent “the vision,” making the second phrase *subordinate* to the first one. But there is good reason to dismiss this line of reasoning. The two phrases literally translated read: “...in the vision, in the beginning...”<sup>16</sup> They appear as *co-ordinate phrases*, not subordinate phrases.

The second adverbial phrase, if it was going to qualify the noun hazôn as an adjectival clause, would need to clearly indicate that it was not modifying raîî, “had seen.” But the presence of the preposition before the definite article “the,” and the fem noun “first” gives unambiguous evidence that it is a prepositional phrase acting in an adverbial manner. There are elements of the clause ellided. The elements are “whom I had seen.” If we were to include those elements, the full unellided sentence would read:

Yea, whiles I was still speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision **and whom I had seen before/formerly**, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening sacrifice.

As can be seen from this simple exercise, the ellided adjectival clause even written out shows unequivocally that the adverbial phrase *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* still modifies the *verb* “had seen” of the clause and not the *noun* that the clause is describing.

Or more simply, the adverbial phrase could be relocated to the verb “had seen” to show its association more clearly, thereby eliminating the need to consider an ellided clause:

Yea, whiles I was still speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen **before** in the vision, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening sacrifice.

---

<sup>16</sup> Can you find other similar constructions in BHS?

OR

Yea, whiles I was still speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had **formerly** seen in the vision, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening sacrifice

Whichever option you choose, Shea's idea that *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* qualifies the noun "vision" is merely wishful thinking. It would be quite agrammatical to refer to "the at-the-first vision;" "the before vision;" "the formerly vision." It is a simple rule of grammar even in Hebrew that adjectives qualify nouns and adverbs modify verbs. The adverbial phrase *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in this context can only ever modify a verb. Even the translation "the former vision" is incorrect because *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* is governed by the preposition *b<sup>e</sup>* making the phrase act as an adverb and not as an adjective. Thus the possibility of this counterargument having any plausibility is thereby ruled out. Shea's efforts are the reverse of what the context in 9:21 demands, and for these reasons, his argument is invalid. But wait! There is more!!

There is other evidence that also dismisses Shea's meaning of *t<sup>e</sup>hillâ* as incorrect. Shea only considers the meanings "first" or "beginning" for *t<sup>e</sup>hillâ*. He has overlooked the fact that the phrase *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* can have the generalised meaning of "earlier." This is borne out by the occurrence of *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn8:1. Dn8:1 doesn't call the revelation which was given to Daniel in ch7 a hazôn, but rather just uses hannirâ, the ambiguous Niphal participle of râ'â, which can rightly be translated "that which was shown." Even if the Niphal participle did refer to a hazôn, *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* cannot be translated as being "the first" if it refers to Dn7 and be correct.

The reason for this is that the first hazôn/hezey does not occur in Dn7 but Dn2! The first hezey (Aramaic for hazôn) in the book of Daniel is Nebuchadnezzar's metallic image. The second hezey, the hezey of the great tree of Dn4, is like the first in that it was not revealed to Daniel but to Nebuchadnezzar. But in ch2, although the king saw the hezey (2:28,29), the record specifically says that the vision and the explanation of it was given to Daniel in a hezey of the night (2:19). Thus Daniel's first hezey is *not* recorded in Dn7, but occurred much earlier and is detailed in Dn2! And unfortunately for Shea, he has correctly acknowledged the bilingual equivalence between the Aramaic hezey and the Hebrew hazôn (p.238) Therefore, Shea should be using Dn9:21 to refer us to Dn2 and not Dn7!! His problems are getting worse!! The upshot of this is that it would be more correct to translate *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn8:1 as "earlier" since it is referring to ch7, but ch7 is not the first hazôn/hezey. The narration of the metal image vision and its interpretation by Daniel as recorded in ch2 are the contents of the first hezey Daniel had received from God.

If *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* in Dn8:1 be translated in the lines suggested by Brown, Driver and Briggs – that Dn7 is the first vision in a series of visions – then in that sense, Dn7 can be the first vision in a series of visions, since the visions of Dn7-12 were given to Daniel himself, in contrast to the visions of Dn2 and 4 which were given to the king and Daniel was only an interpreter of the king's visions. From this perspective, the visions of chs7-12 can be seen as a series beginning at ch7, but on the other hand, the first hazôn in the book is that of ch2.

As a final word, Walter Read, who contributed to the book Doctrinal Discussions, produced by the SDA Ministerial Association, says concerning the significance of the

mention of the angel Gabriel in Daniel 9:21:

The mention of Gabriel we believe is an indication of the tie between chapters 8 and 9. In Daniel 9:21 Gabriel, who comes to make Daniel understand the vision, was the angel Daniel saw in the beginning of the vision as recorded in chapter 8. There Gabriel is counseled by someone of higher authority to give understanding of the vision to Daniel (Daniel 8:16). It was the same angel that was with Daniel when he fainted, and who comforted and assured him that the vision was true. In the seventh chapter there is no mention of Gabriel and no evidence that Gabriel gave that vision to Daniel. (Ministerial Association, 1961, chapter 4)

### **Conclusion on Shea's Explanation of Dn9:21**

In any case, Dn9:21 neither refers to Dn2 nor Dn7, but rather to Dn8:15,16, as is clearly indicated in the arguments above. The position is almost universally endorsed by commentators, regardless of the various school's of thought presented in the commentaries. This means firstly, that Dn9:21 refers at least to Dn8:15-26 as a hazôn; thus coupling it with the hazôn of vs. 2-14 making the whole chapter (vs.2-26) one hazôn, which is what it is called in v1:

In the third year of the reign of the king Belshazzar a **vision** [hazôn] appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.

This verse refers only to one hazôn being experienced by Daniel during this particular year. Dn8:14 calls vs.2-12 a hazôn; Dn8:15 calls vs.2-14 a hazôn; and Dn9:21 calls at least vs.15-26 a hazôn, thus making the whole chapter a chazôn in accord with the statement of Daniel in verse 1.

### **E. Conclusion on Shea's Method.**

1. According to the points discussed previously, vs.2-26 are one visionary experience, an experience which occurred all at one time, with no change in perceptory experience taking place between vs. 2-14 and vs.15-26, even though the contents or the subject of that experience taking place between vs.2-14 and vs.15-26 changes. The whole chapter is a chazôn being experienced by Daniel seeing himself have this revelation by the banks of the river Ulai. Thus the word hazôn can be used for the whole vision or parts of it, as is also evident from the usage of the same word (hezey) in ch7.
2. Secondly, the hazôn of Dn8:2-26 includes Shea's mar'ê of vs.13,14- Shea's mar'ê of the evening and the morning (v26) thus leading us to the next conclusion;
3. Thirdly, since hazôn and mar'ê both describe the same blocks of material e.g., vs.15-16 and vs.2-14 (cf.vs.20-26), they are not different technical terms referring to different sections of Dn8. Therefore the "technical" terminology of Dn8 and 9 does not link Dn9 to Dn8 in the way that Shea would like it to. Dn9:21 is linked to Dn8:16 and according to Shea's own admission, that link destroys any discretionary uniqueness between hazôn and mar'ê.

In conclusion, after examining Shea's material presented in his papers, no evidence can

be found to support the definitions of mar'ê and hazôn proposed by him. Without recourse to this argument to link the seventy weeks of Dn9:24-27 to the 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14, Shea and those who wish to support this connection can only resort to the traditional arguments as presented in "Assumption 2."

### **Third Method: Dr. Gerhard Hasel's Approach.**

Leaving Dr. Shea's work, I would like to the efforts on this topic by Dr. Gerhard Hasel. Hasel's first major published paper on this subject came out simultaneously with Shea's paper in the same volume in 1981 and was entitled "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8." Hasel's paper looked at the literary structure of Dn8, the nature, expansion and the activity of the little horn, and the audition about the sanctuary. In his brief mention of the similar terminology between Dn8 and Dn9, he discusses three terminological links, one of which is the use of mar'ê. In his notes (1981, note 152, p.221), Hasel refers his readers back to an article entitled "Revelation and Inspiration in Daniel" he wrote in the October, 1974 edition of "*The Ministry*," a periodical for the SDA clergy. It would be appropriate therefore, to examine this article before looking closer at Hasel's 1981 discussion of the links between Dan 8 and 9 to which Hasel refers us.

#### **A. Excerpt From Hasel's 1979 Ministry Article.**

The following extracts from this paper illustrate his discussion on the usage of mar'ê in Dn8 and 9:

Therefore, one may maintain, on grounds of internal evidence, that Daniel 9:24-27 does indeed interpret a "vision" revealed for the first time in the book itself (Dan. 8) as is consistent with the general nature of revelation in the book of Daniel.

This consideration, together with other arguments that strongly support the tie-in between Daniel 8 and 9, can be further strengthened by the unusual Hebrew term for "vision," used in crucial sections in both of these chapters in contrast to the regular term chazon (vision). In Daniel 9: 23 Gabriel states "understand the vision (mar'eh) " The Hebrew term mar'eh<sup>12</sup> is identical to the one used in Daniel 8:16, 26ff. In verse 26 Gabriel explicitly refers to "the vision [*mar'eh*] of the evening and morning," which is not interpreted because Daniel fell ill by what he had already heard. It is this *mar'eh* that the very same angel Gabriel again mentions in 9:23. This connection is recognised also by various critical scholars. The noted German commentator O.Plöger points out that *mar'eh* in 9:23 shows that this term "is formulated by depending on 8:16."<sup>13</sup> S.R. Driver<sup>14</sup> and more recently A. Bentzen<sup>15</sup> maintain correctly that the words "as at first" in the phrase "in the vision as at first" (9:21) refer back to 8:16.

The closeness of the connection between chapters 8 and 9 is further supported by the reference to the identical angel-interpreter Gabriel mentioned in both chapters. Plöger writes on this point, "The connection with Daniel 8 is also established in that Daniel recognizes in the messenger (of ch. 9) the very Gabriel mentioned in ch. 8."<sup>16</sup> These internal considerations give additional support to the soundness of the interpretation that the seventy weeks in Daniel 9 explain the only unexplained aspect of the symbolic vision of Daniel 8, namely the 2300 days-years aspect.

#### Hasel's Footnotes

12.The regular Hebrew term for "vision" is chazon.

13. Plöger, *Daniel*, p.134.
14. Driver, *Daniel*, p. 133.
15. A. Bentzen, *Daniel* (Tübingen, 1953), p. 66.
16. Plöger, *Daniel*, p. 139.

### Summary of Hasel's arguments

Hasel's arguments are as follows:

- (1) In Dn9:23, Daniel uses the unusual term mar'ê;
- (2) This term is used in Dn8:16 and again in v26 where the explanation of the vision is not given due to Daniel's illness;
- (3) It is this same mar'ê that is referred to in Dn9:23;
- (4) Critical scholar O. Plöger says that the precedent for using this term mar'ê in Dn9:23 is based on the usage in Dn8:16;
- (5) Critical scholar S. R. Driver and Bentzen point out that *batt<sup>e</sup>hillâ* refer back to Dn8:16, and rightly so says Hasel;
- (6) A further connection between Dn8 and 9 that Plöger mentions is the fact that Gabriel is recognised in Dn9;
- (7) These considerations support the view that the seventy weeks of Dn9:24-27 explain the 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8:14.

If one compares Hasel's discussion with that of QOD, it will be apparent that the argument is virtually identical. Only two items are added in Hasel's discussion: firstly, there is mention that mar'ê is used in an unusual way in Dn8 and 9 for "vision" instead of "the regular term chazôn (vision)"; and secondly, in order to support the link between Dn8 and 9, Hasel uses as evidence, the work of Plöger, Driver and Bensen as though the mere mention of their names means that they are supporting the SDA position on the relation of these time periods. This may be an exercise in legitimising a suspect argument, but certainly is not evidence. What are the arguments supporting Plöger's, Driver's and Bensen's work? They are not presented. We only see those of their conclusions that Hasel wants us to see.

In his 1981/1986 work, Hasel refers us to this article to confirm that "the unexplained time element of Dan8:13-14,26, is taken up in the next chapter which has definite links with Dan8." In his note at the end he says, "See the discussion of the links between Dan8 and 9 in G.F. Hasel, 'Revelation and Inspiration in Daniel, *Ministry* 47/10 (Oct., 1974): 20-23.'" (1981, note 152, p.221) One would expect that upon reading the article there would be information to substantiate the links between Dn8 and Dn9. Alas, that is far from the case. And in Hasel's 1981 and 1986 work, no elaboration is given to this point; readers are merely referred back to this article as though this article provides the basic argumentation (cf., Hasel, 1981, note 152, p.221) So what we have is just a useless circular reference without the foundational premises of the links between Dn8 and 9 clearly delineated and argued.

### The meaning of mar'ê

The issue of the regularity of mar'ê and hazôn needs to be addressed before we examine Hasel's later papers on this subject. Hasel says, "the tiein between Daniel 8 and 9, can be further strengthened by the unusual Hebrew term for "vision," used in crucial sections in both of these chapters in contrast to the regular term chazon (vision)." It is surprising that Hasel could make such a statement given his familiarity with the corpus of German theological philology. Articles such as Jepsen in THAT, IV, pp280 -290 point out that rà'â and its derivatives are the *regular* Hebrew terms for supernatural visionary activities, whereas chàzâ and its derivatives are borrowed from the Aramaic tongue.

Notice this statement from Jepsen:

The root *hzh* is the usual word for "see" in the various dialects of Aramaic. It has a wide range of meanings, referring both to the natural vision of the eyes and to supervision visions of various kinds. Heb *ra'ah* occupies an analogous position; it, too, is used for vision in general as well as for unusual experiences, as, for instance, at the beginning of Isaiah's vision *va'er'eh eh 'eth 'adhônî*. This holds true also for the root's derivatives such as *mar'eh* and *ro'eh*. If Hebrew could use *ra'ah* for all kinds of sight and vision, the word *chazah* appearing alongside it must be considered an Aramaic loanword. The question is then: what led to the introduction of this loanword and with what meaning was it used? (1980, pp.281-282) (see note 1 in this article for other scholars, pro and con, on the Aramaic origin of hzh.)

Notice also both BDB and KBL indicate that both mar'ê and hazôn include supernatural sight experiences (excluding the references in Dan).



מִרְאָה, SamP.<sup>M192</sup> *mārī*: I רָאָה, Bauer-L. *Heb.* 491n; MHeb.: מִרְאָה (Qoh 11<sub>9</sub> K מִרְאִי), (מִרְאָךְ Q Song 2<sub>14b</sub>), מִרְאָה, מִרְאָךְ (Song 2<sub>14b</sub> Q מִרְאָךְ), מִרְאָיו (all sg., Bauer-L. *Heb.* 584c): —1. **seeing**, נִחְמַד לִמְ lovely to behold Gn 2<sub>9</sub>, according to all that the eyes of the priest are able to see Lv 13<sub>12</sub>, widely visible Dt 28<sub>34-67</sub>; נִדּוּל לִמְ to all appearances Is 11<sub>3</sub>, עֵינֶיהָ לִמְ when she saw them Ezk 23<sub>16</sub>; עֵינֶיךָ לִמְ where your eyes lead you Qoh 11<sub>9</sub>; —2. **appearance** (→ מִרְאָה) Song 2<sub>14</sub> (parallel with קוֹל); a) with יָפָה Gn 39<sub>6</sub> 1S 17<sub>42</sub> (David), with יָפָה Gn 12<sub>11</sub> 29<sub>17</sub> 2S 14<sub>27</sub>, with יָפָה Gn 41<sub>2-4</sub> with טוֹבָה 24<sub>16</sub> 26<sub>7</sub> 2S 11<sub>2</sub> Est 1<sub>11</sub> 2<sub>3-7</sub>, with טוֹבִי Da 1<sub>4</sub>, with טוֹבוֹת Est 2<sub>2</sub>, with רָע Gn 41<sub>21</sub>, with רָעוֹת 41<sub>3-4</sub>; b) of a thing: הֵנִנֵּעַ מִן the appearance of a spot, meaning disease becomes apparent Lv 13<sub>3</sub> (9 times in Lv 13 and 14); (healthy) appearance Da 1<sub>13-15</sub>; c) countenance, look of a person Ju 13<sub>6</sub> 1S 16<sub>7</sub> Is 52<sub>14</sub> Ezk 1<sub>5-28</sub> (15 times) 8<sub>2-4</sub> 10<sub>1-9f-22</sub> 11<sub>24</sub> 23<sub>15</sub> 40<sub>3</sub> 41<sub>21</sub> 43<sub>3-ej</sub> 10 Jl 2<sub>4</sub> Nah 2<sub>5</sub> Jb 4<sub>16</sub> 41<sub>1</sub> (rd. נִם even at the sight of him) Da 8<sub>15</sub> 10<sub>18</sub> (= דְּמוּת v.16); מִן לֹא unsightly Is 53<sub>2</sub>; form Song 5<sub>15</sub> (פִּלְבֹנוֹן); —3. **phenomenon, appearance** (→ מִרְאָה): Ex 3<sub>3</sub> 24<sub>17</sub> Nu 8<sub>4</sub> 12<sub>8</sub> (rd. לֹא בְּמִן :: Noth ATD 7:82) Da 8<sub>16-26f</sub> 9<sub>23</sub> 10<sub>1</sub>; —4. **lustre, brilliance**: מִן אֵשׁ Nu 9<sub>15f</sub>, בְּרִק מִן Da 10<sub>6</sub>; —2S 23<sub>21</sub> (rd. אֵשׁ מִן, 1C 11<sub>23</sub>).

מִרְאָה, Bauer-L. *Heb.* 492p; MHeb., Tigr. (Littmann-H. *Wb.* 116a) *merāyat*: pl. cs. מִרְאָה (SamP.<sup>M192</sup> *mārā'ot*): —1. **apparition, vision** (= מִרְאָה 3) Nu 12<sub>6</sub> 1S 3<sub>15</sub> (reve-

lation of a divine word !) Da 10<sup>7f-16</sup>; pl. with  
 לִילָה Gn 46<sup>2</sup> (Sept. Pesh. sg.), with אֱלֹהִים  
 Ezk 1<sup>1</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 40<sup>2</sup>; 43<sup>3</sup> rd. כְּמִרְאָה; Sir 41<sup>2</sup> margin  
 הַמִּרְאָה, M<sup>1112</sup> הַמִּרְאָה; —2. **mirror**, MHeb.,  
 1QM 5<sup>5</sup> מִרְאָה פָּנִים, Arb. *mir'āt*; = מִחְזִית  
 MHeb. JArm. EgArm.; BRL 493; Yadin  
*BarKokhba* 1:125ff; Reicke-R. *Hw.* 1831: Ex  
 38<sup>8</sup>. †

### Brown, Driver and Briggs

759 †1. מִרְאָה **n.f.** vision, as means of revela-  
 tion: 'מ' abs. Nu 12<sup>6</sup> (E), 1 S 3<sup>15</sup> Dn 10<sup>16</sup>, as acc.  
 cogn. v<sup>7.7.8</sup>; appar. pl. abs. מִרְאוֹת Ez 43<sup>3</sup>, but  
 rd. מִרְאֵה הַרְקֵב Ⓞ Co Berthol Siegf Krae, or del.  
 Toy Krae (as altern.); cstr. מִרְאוֹת הַלֵּילָה Gn  
 46<sup>2</sup> (E), מִרְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים Ez 1<sup>1</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 40<sup>2</sup>.

758 מִרְאָה<sup>102</sup> n.m. Ex 3.3 sight, appearance, vision;—מ' abs. Gn 12<sup>11</sup>+; cstr. מִרְאֵה Dt 28<sup>34</sup>+; sf. מִרְאֵהוּ Jo 2<sup>4</sup>+; מִרְאֵה Lv 13<sup>4</sup>+; appar.pl.cstr. מִרְאֵי Ec 11<sup>9</sup> (Kö<sup>11.1.112</sup>), sf. (prob. in fact sg. Ges<sup>93.55</sup>) מִרְאֵיהֶּ Ct 2<sup>14.14</sup>, מִרְאֵיהֶּן Na 2<sup>6</sup>+, etc.;—**1.** †a. *sight, phenomenon, spectacle* Ex 3<sup>3</sup> (J). b. *appearance* מ' נִחְמָד לְמ' Gn 2<sup>9</sup> (J) *desirable in appearance*, מ' נָדוּל Jos 22<sup>10</sup>; *appearance of man* (or woman), Ju 13<sup>6.6</sup> (angel), Is 52<sup>14</sup> (servant of י'), Ct 5<sup>15</sup> Dn 8<sup>15</sup> 10<sup>18</sup>; = outward person (opp. inner man) 1 S 16<sup>7</sup>; visible form Ct 2<sup>14.14</sup> Dn 1<sup>13.13.15</sup>; מ' בָּמ' Nu 12<sup>8</sup> (E; so rd. Sam ⑥ ⑥ ③ Di, for MT מִרְאֵה), i.e. in personal presence (< Ew Pat<sup>11pt</sup> בָּמ' לֹא בָמ'); of crocod. Jb 41<sup>2</sup>; מ' הַנָּנֶעַ Ex 24<sup>17</sup> (P), מ' הַנָּנֶעַ Lv 13<sup>3</sup>, מ' אִישׁ Nu 9<sup>15.16</sup>, בָּרֶק מ' Dn 10<sup>6</sup>+; esp. Ez *appearance* pers. vel rei (27 t., sta. redundant), 1<sup>5.13.26</sup> 8<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>1</sup>+, מ' מִתְנַיִי 1<sup>27.27</sup> 8<sup>2</sup> (|| מִתְנַיִי); of beauty מִרְאֵה יִפְהָ *fair of appearance* Gn 39<sup>6</sup> (J; + יִפְהָתָאֵר), cf. 1 S 17<sup>42</sup> (rd. עָלָם [q.v.] for עָם); fem. יִפְתָּ-מ' (אִשָּׁה) Gn 12<sup>11</sup> (J), 29<sup>17</sup> (E; + יִפְתָּתָאֵר), 2 S 14<sup>27</sup>; of kine יִפְתָּ (ה) מ' Gn 41<sup>2.4</sup> (E), opp. מ' (ה) רְעוּת v<sup>3.4</sup>, מִרְאֵיהֶן רַע v<sup>21</sup> (all E); of women also מ' טִבָּת מ' Gn 24<sup>16</sup> 26<sup>7</sup> (both J), 2 S 11<sup>2</sup> Est 1<sup>11</sup> 2<sup>3.7</sup>, מ' מִזְבֹּחַ 2<sup>2</sup>; of boys מ' טוֹבֵי מ' Dn 1<sup>4</sup>, cf. מ' alone in וְנִחְמָדָהוּ (of suffering servant of י') Is 53<sup>2</sup>; מ' אִישׁ מ' 2 S 23<sup>21</sup> (but rd. as || 1 Ch 11<sup>23</sup> מִדָּה אִישׁ We Dr al.). †c. *appearance, sight, vision* Nu 8<sup>4</sup> (P). †2. in gen. *what is seen*, מ' עֵינָיו Is 11<sup>3</sup> i.e. what his outward eyes see (cf. 1 S 16<sup>7</sup> **1 b**), מ' עֵינָיָהּ Ez 23<sup>16</sup>, מ' עֵינֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּרְאָה Dt 28<sup>34.67</sup>, מ' עֵינֶיךָ לְבַל-מ' Lv 13<sup>12</sup> (P). †3. *specif. a* (supernat.) *vision* (in Ez Dn; oft. acc. cogn. c. רֵאָה): Ez 8<sup>4</sup> 11<sup>24</sup> 43<sup>3.3.3</sup>, rd. also מִרְאֵה הָרֶקֶב v<sup>3</sup> (for מִרְאֹת v. 1. מִרְאֵה supr.); מ' בָּמ' 11<sup>24</sup>; Dn 8<sup>16.27</sup> 9<sup>23</sup> 10<sup>1</sup>; מ' הָעֶרֶב וְהַפֶּקֶר 8<sup>26</sup>. †4. *sight, vision* = power of seeing (and enjoying), late: מ' עֵינַיִם Ec 6<sup>9</sup>, הַלֵּךְ בְּרִכְי לִבְךָ וּבְמִרְאֵי עֵינֶיךָ 11<sup>9</sup>.

While it is clear that this usage of *mar'ê* is extant, it does need to be acknowledged that

hazôn usually occurs in passages associated with supernatural vision. However, that does not automatically put it in contrast with mar'ê, which, according to the evidence of both Daniel and Ezekiel, indicate that this word was being used in their day to describe both natural and supernatural vision. Indeed, that is one of the questions that Jepsen raises in his statement above: given that *ra'ah* and its derivatives were so comprehensive, what was the need to have a loan word like *chazon* introduced? Consider too that Ezekiel, like Daniel, would have also been fluent in Aramaic.

Another point to consider is how Hasel defines “usual” and “unusual.” Is a certain meaning of a word “usual” when it occurs in that context more than 50% of the time? Is it “unusual” if it occurs less than 50% of the instances? What about the situation where a word has a range of applications and they all occur less than 50% of the combined instances for that word? Does this mean that all the meanings for that word are “unusual?” And what about words that only occur a few times in Scripture? Are we going to judge the “usual” or “unusual” nature of their application merely from the few instances that they occur in Scripture? Surely that is not good science!

I would assert that even just a few instances of a certain meaning of a word, given the validity and reliability of the lexical proof, is thereby an authentic “usual” meaning of the word, regardless of the ratio of that meaning to the entire occurrence of the word. Hasel’s use of the concepts of “usual” and “unusual” is highly questionable. We have so little literature of the period to make such a sweeping judgment. It is clear, however, that the use of mar'ê in a supernatural setting does occur outside the Book of Daniel (cf., The Book of Ezekiel). Thus Hasel’s proposal for a tie-in between Dn8 and 9 is not strengthened by the “unusual” use of mar'ê in Dn9:23 instead of hazôn when Daniel was referring to Dn8 (if he really was doing that in 9:23 at all; a point that I will argue against). Far from being a basis for Hasel’s work in 1981 and 1986, this article offers no clear evidence linking the mar'ê of Dan9:23 to the mar'ê of Dn8:16.

Turning now to Hasel’s 1981 and 1986 papers, it will be noticed by a careful comparison between the two papers that the sections that deal with the links between Dn8 and 9 are identical in both papers. The following extract from his 1981 and 1986 papers give his thoughts on this matter:

### Excerpts from Hasel’s 1981 Writings

p.196

The unexplained time element of Dan 8:13-14, 26, is taken up in the next chapter which has definite links with Dan 8.<sup>152</sup> Among the links between Dan 8 and 9 are the following:

*1. Similar terminology.* The designation for "vision"<sup>153</sup> in the form of the term *mar'eh*<sup>154</sup> appears in Dan 8:16, 26-27. In the latter section it refers specifically to the *mar'eh* of the "evenings-mornings." This term appears again in Dan 9:23, "understand the vision [*mar'eh*]." Different scholars have recognised a link between Dan 8 and 9 because of the usage of this term.<sup>155</sup> A second terminological link between Dan 8 and 9 is the phrase "at the first" in 9:21, which refers back to 8:16 where Gabriel's interpretation

p.197

of the vision (*mar'eh*) is introduced. The third terminological link is found in the usage of a variety of forms of the verb *bîn* (to understand) in Dan 8:15, 16, 17, 23, 27; 9:1, 22, 23. The same imperative form "understand" (*hàbèn*), which appears in 8:17 where Gabriel introduces his answer to the end-time emphasis on the 2300 "evenings-mornings," reappears in 9:23 by the same angel in the interpretation of the 70-week prophecy.<sup>156</sup>

2. *Cultic perspective.* Daniel 8:13-14 contains a cultic perspective as regards the sanctuary. Daniel 9:24-27 contains likewise a cultic perspective in terms of atonement (*kpr*), anointing (*msh*), "holy of holiest" cutting off of Messiah, cessation of sacrifice and offering.<sup>157</sup>

3. *Common angel-interpreter.* The angel-interpreter Gabriel is first introduced in 8:16 and charged to interpret the vision to Daniel (vs. 17, 19). In Dan 9:21-23, "Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first, came to me...and...said to me ...understand the vision [*mar'eh*]."

4. *Auditory revelation.* It cannot be overlooked that in Dan 8:26-27 the time element of the auditory revelation remains unclear to Daniel ("and...did not understand it"). Daniel 9: 24-27 contains no vision, but there is auditory revelation in which the time element figures most prominently. Both Dan 8:13-14 and Dan 9:24-27 are auditory revelations. The latter provides the beginning of the time span of Dan 8.

5. *Conceptual link.* Daniel 9 climaxes in the anointing of the sanctuary (*qódes godàsîn*, v 24) and Dan 8 in the cleansing of the sanctuary. If the first auditory revelation in 8:13-14 points to the end of the long time period of 2300 "evenings-mornings," then it would seem that the second auditory revelation of the 70 weeks in Dan 9:24-27 would give its starting point. On the basis of this its termination point could be determined. The omission of this datum in Dan 8 had left Daniel without understanding (*mèbîn* v 27). If the auditory revelation of Dan 9:24-27 has its starting point with the issuance of the first decree of Artaxerxes in his seventh year [Ezr 7:7-8), or 458/457 B.C. with the return of Ezra in 457 B.C.,<sup>158</sup> this would mark the starting point of the 2300 "evenings- mornings"<sup>159</sup> of Dan 8:14. Then the end point of the 2300 year-day<sup>160</sup> prophecy falls in the-year A.D. 1844. This point of time and beyond has the center of attention in Dan 8. For that matter, it is pivotal in the whole book of Daniel.

152. See the discussion of the links between Dan 8 and 9 in G. F. Hasel, "Revelation and Inspiration in Daniel," *Ministry* 47/10 (Oct., 1974):20-23.

153. The normal designation for "vision" in Daniel is the term, *hazôn*, a possible loan word from the Aramaic (M. Wagner, *Die Lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* [Berlin/New York, 1966], Nrs. 93-98), which appears in Dan 1:17; 8:1, 2 (2x), 13, 15, 17, 26; 9:21, 24; 10:14; 11:14.

154. Dan 8:15, 16, 26, 27; 9:23; 10:1, 6, 7 (2x), 8, 16, 18 where either *mar'eh* or *mar'ah* is employed. The latter is used only in Dan 8:16, 26, 27; 9:23; 10:1.

155. Plöger, p. 134, argues that "Dan 9:23 is formulated by depending on 8:16." Similarly Ginsberg, p' 33: "Consequently 9:21 [9:23] presupposes ch. 8 with v. 16 in it." Lacocque, p. 190 "Chapter 9 presupposes at least vv. 15-16 of chapter 8 which is a weighty argument in favor of a single Author for these two chapters."

156. See J. Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study," in this volume.

157. Ibid.



158. See L. H. Wood and S. H. Horn, *The Chronology of Ezra 7* (2d ed.; Washington, D.C., 1970), pp. 91-116.

159. See n. 133 above and n.142 below.

160. The year-day principle of interpretation has been linked to Dan 4:16, 30 where "seven times" is understood as "seven years." Usually Num 14:34 and Eze 4:5-6 are invoked to provide keys for the year-day model of interpretation. Daniel 9:24-27 provides another key where the seventy weeks become 490 literal days or prophetic years. The major key rests within the books of Daniel and Revelation.

p.198

#### The Content of the Question of Dan 8:13

We have just observed that the question of Dan 8:13 opens with the time element "until when . . ." which is answered in v 14 with "until ['ad] 2300 evenings- mornings, then [w<sup>e</sup>]. . . ." <sup>161</sup> Let us move from the temporal aspect of the question to content matters expressed in it.

The grammar in the question is unusual<sup>162</sup> and has led to numerous textual emendations. Caution is thus in order. A literal translation may be appropriate. Words that are supplied are put in parentheses: "Until when (is to be) the vision, (about) the continuance and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?"

The reader should be aware first of all that the question "until when" ('ad-matay) does not emphasize duration of time. Duration of time would be the focus of the question "how long." The question "until when" has its focus on the point of termination of the time period indicated. This is contextually stressed in the answer "thou" ('ad) in v 14. When the point of termination has been reached something relating to the sanctuary shall take place.

When the point of termination is stressed the inevitable matter of the beginning of the time period comes into view also. In other words beginning and end belong together and implicitly also what takes place during the vision. Questions of considerable import emerge at this point. Does the time span of the vision begin during the beginning of the entire vision that covers the ram, he-goat, and "little horn" periods? Or, is the time span of the vision limited to but the "little horn" period? Fortunately the text provides an answer to these questions. It has been pointed out that the question itself according to Hebrew syntax comes to an end with the clause; "Until when (shall be) the vision?" <sup>163</sup> Those who would limit the intent of the question to the period of the "little horn" <sup>164</sup> are insensitive to the Hebrew noun for "vision" which is *hazôn* in v 13. This term appears no less than six times in the eighth chapter of Daniel (v 2) [two times], 13, 15, 17, 26b). A study of this term here and in the remainder of the Hebrew of the book of Daniel (cf. 9:23; 10:14) reveals that it is distinguished from the word *mar'eh*, "appearance" (Dan 8:1b, 26a, 27), often translated also as "vision." The word *hazôn*, "vision," in Dan 8:13 contextually refers to the vision of the ram, he-goat, and the "little horn" as its first usages in v 2 clearly indicate. The *mar'eh*, "appearance," more narrowly refers also in Dan 8:16, 26a, 27 to the "appearance" of heavenly beings which engage in conversation. To put it differently

161. The sequence 'ad . . . waw means "until . . . then." Cf Jgs 16:2, BDB, p. 724. Plöger, p. 120, renders this temporal sequence as "after . . . then."

162. Lacocque, p. 164: "The terms of the question posed by the seer are not put together in terms of orthodox grammar. There are definite articles where there should not be, and they are absent where they should be."

163. Montgomery, p. 341.



164. Charles, p. 210; Leupold, p. 351; Young, p. 173; Hartman and Di Lella, p. 226.

p.199

the *mar'eh* is the "appearance" where the prophet engages in "audition" or "hearing" whereas the *hazôn* causes him to be in "vision" in which he is engaged in seeing the ram, he-goat with its horns, and the "little horn" of Dan 8:3-12. The textual evidence of this technical vocabulary is pivotal for answering the question of the time span covered by the vision. In short, the time span covered by the *hazôn*, "vision," in the question of Dan 8:13 covers the entire vision of vs. 3-12. Contextually and terminologically it is not limited to the "little horn" period alone.

This conclusion is not negated by the brief expressions that follow the word *hazôn* in v 13, such as "the continuance and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling." The syntax and pointing of the Hebrew text does not allow these expressions to be an extended genitival construct chain that limits "the vision" (*hehazôn*) to the following expressions. Let us take a brief look at the Hebrew syntax and what is called for if the word "vision" were in a genitival construct relationship to what follows. If *hazôn*, "vision," were in construct, this noun (1) should not have an article as it does, i.e., *hahazôn*, "the vision," and (2) it should manifest a reduction of vowels, i.e., the Masoretes should have pointed it *hazôn* with a *Pathah* instead of the *qames*. The fact that the consonantal text has the article rules out a genitival construct relationship. The Hebrew term *hehazôn*, "the vision," is in the absolute state and not in a construct state, which is usually a *nomen rectum*, can be a noun clause, it still calls for the substantive (*nomen regens*) which is in construct with the noun clause to be in the construct state. The syntax of Dan 8:13b does not allow an interpretation of "the vision" that limits it to the subsequent expressions. This leads to the suggestion from the point of view of Hebrew syntax that the question "until when" (*'ad-matay*) is omitted by ellipsis before the following expressions. The intent of the last part of Dan 8:13 with the respective ellipses may be understood as follows, indicating the ellipses in parenthesis: "Until when the vision, (until when) the continuance and the transgression causing horror, (until when) to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?" However that may be, the description of v 13 covers the entire vision of vs. 3-12, indicating that the 2300 evenings (and) mornings cover the period all the way from the ram and he-goat through the activities of the "little horn" to the end of time (vs. 17, 19). This makes it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the year-day principle is functioning in Dan 8. The 2300 evenings (and) mornings must cover the whole period from somewhere during the ram period to the end of time. An understanding of the 2300 evenings-mornings as literal days does not fit the context of the question. The prophet thereby demonstrates that the unusual expressions of "evenings (and) mornings," which has no article, no plural, and no conjunction, stands symbolically for

p.200

years. The prophet himself provides the key to the year-day principle which functions on the basis of contextual, linguistic, philological, and syntactical relationship in Dan 8:13-14.

### Excerpts from Hasel's 1986 Work:

p.436

Links Between Daniel 8 and 9

The unexplained time element of 8:13-14, 26 is taken up in chapter 9, which has definite links with chapter 8.<sup>29</sup> Among the links between chapters 8 and 9 are the following:

29. See the discussion of the links between Daniel 8 and 9 in G. F. Hasel, "Revelation and Inspiration in Daniel," *Ministry* 47 (October 1974): 20-23.

p.437

**1. Similar terminology.** The designation for "vision"<sup>30</sup> in the form of the term, *mar'eh*,<sup>31</sup> appears in 8:16, 26-27. In the latter verse it refers specifically to the *mar'eh* of the "evenings-mornings." It appears again in 9:23, "understand the vision [*mar'eh*]." Different scholars have recognised a link between chapters 8 and 9 because of the usage of this term.<sup>32</sup>

A second terminological link between the chapters is the phrase, "at first," (9:21). The expression naturally refers the reader back to 8:16 where Gabriel's interpretation of the vision (*mar'eh*) is introduced.

The third terminological link is found in the usage of a variety of forms of the verb *bîn* ("to understand") in 8:15-17, 23, 27; 9:2, 22-23. The same imperative form, "understand" (*hàbèn*), which appears in 8:17 where Gabriel introduces his answer to the end-time emphasis on the 2,300 evenings-mornings, reappears in 9:23 on the lips of the same angel in his presentation of the 70 week prophecy.<sup>33</sup>

**2. Cultic perspective.** Daniel 8:13-14 contains a cultic perspective with respect to the sanctuary. Daniel 9:24-27 likewise contains a cultic perspective in terms of atonement (Hebrew root, *kpr*), anointing (Hebrew root, *msh*), "holy of holies," cutting off of the Messiah and cessation of sacrifice and offering.<sup>34</sup>

30. The normal designation for "vision" in Daniel is the term *hazôn*, a possible loan word from the Aramaic (M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* [New York, 1966], Nos. 93-98), which appears in Daniel 1:17; 8:1-2 (3x), 13, 15, 17, 26; 9:21, 24; 10:14; 11:14.

31. Daniel 8:15-16, 26-27; 9:23; 10:1, 6-7 (2x), 8, 16, 18, where either *mar'ah* or *mar'eh* is employed. The latter is used only in 8:16, 26-27; 9:23; 10:1.

32. Plöger, p. 134, argues that "Dan 9:23 is formulated by depending on 8:16." Similarly Ginsberg, p. 33: "Consequently 9:21 [9:23] presupposes chap. 8 with vs. 16 in it." Lacocque, p. 190: "Chapter 9 presupposes at least vv. 15-16 of chapter 8 which is a weighty argument in favor of a single Author for these two chapters."

33. See J. Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," AUSS 17 (1979): 4-6; reprinted in, *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, eds. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner (Washington, DC, 1981), pp. 251-76.

34. Doukhan, pp. 10-13.

p.438

**3. Common angel-interpreter.** The angel-interpreter Gabriel is first introduced in 8:16 and charged to interpret the vision to Daniel (vss. 17, 19). In 9:21-23 the same angel returns to complete his commission. "Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first, came to me ...and he said to me ...understand the vision [*mar'eh*]" (RSV).

**4. Auditory revelation.** It should not be overlooked that the time element of the auditory revelation in chapter 8 remained unclear to Daniel—"and [I] did not understand it" (vs. 27, RSV). Daniel 9:24-27 contains no vision, but there is an auditory revelation in which the time element figures most prominently. Both

8:13-14 and 9:24-27 are auditory revelations, and both deal with a time element. The latter provides the beginning point for the time span announced in the former revelation.

**5. Conceptual link.** Daniel 9 climaxes in the *anointing* of the sanctuary (*qódes qódasîm*, vs. 24), and Daniel 8 in the *cleansing* of the sanctuary (*qódes*). If the first auditory revelation (8:13-14) points to the *end* of the long time period of 2,300 evenings-mornings, it would seem that the second auditory revelation of the 70 weeks in 9:24-27 would give its *starting point*. Its termination point could then be determined on the basis of such information. The omission of this datum in chapter 8 left Daniel without understanding (rnèbîn, vs. 27).

If the auditory revelation of 9:24-27 begins with the issuance of the first decree of Artaxerxes in his seventh year—458/457 B.C.—with the return of Ezra in 457 B.C. (Ezra 7:7-9),<sup>35</sup> this would mark the starting point of the 2,300 evenings-mornings of 8:14. Then the end point of the 2,300 year-day<sup>36</sup> prophecy falls in the year A.D. 1844. This point of time—

35. See L. H. Wood and S. H. Horn, *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC, 1970), pp. 91-116.

36. The year-day principle of interpretation has been linked to 4:16, 23-25, 32, where "seven times" is understood as "seven years." Usually Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:5-6 are invoked to provide keys for the year-day model of interpretation. Daniel 8 demonstrates the function of this principle as we have noted earlier. Daniel 9:24-27 provides another key where the 70 weeks become 490 literal days or prophetic years. The major indicators rest within the books of Daniel and Revelation.

p.439

and beyond—has the center of attention in chapter 8. For that matter, it is pivotal to the whole book of Daniel.

### Content of the Question (vs. 13)

We have just observed that the question in verse 13 opens with an inquiry about time ("until when... ?") which is answered in verse 14 ("until [*'ad*] 2,300 evenings- mornings, then [*w<sup>e</sup>*] ...").<sup>37</sup> Let us now move from the temporal aspect of the question to examine the content matters expressed in it.

The grammar in the question is unusual and has led to numerous textual emendations.<sup>38</sup> Caution is thus in order. A literal translation may be rendered as follows with supplied words in brackets: "Until when [is to be/will be] the vision, the continuance, and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?"

### Continuance

The first expression requiring our attention is "the continuance."<sup>39</sup> This phrase occurred earlier in verses 11-12 (the *tamîd*). Although it is customary to supply the word "sacrifice" in these instances, contextual and manuscript evidence do not support this procedure.<sup>40</sup> "The continuance" carries the same meaning as it does in verses 11-12: Christ's priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. See our discussion in the previous section. The expression is not qualified by another word in the Hebrew text, although scholars have suggested that a word should be added.<sup>41</sup>

37. The sequence '*ad* . . . *w<sup>e</sup>*' means "until. . . then"; cf. Judg 16:2, BDB, p. 724. Plöger, p. 120, renders this temporal sequence as "after . . . then."

38. Lacocque, p. 164: "The terms of the question posed by the seer are not put together in terms of orthodox grammar. There are definite articles where there should not be, and they are absent where they should be."

39. Montgomery, p. 341, translates, "the Constant"; Young, p. 173, renders the term with "the Continual."

40. See also Schwantes, pp. 375-81, or pp. 462-74 in this volume.

41. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge, 1892), p. 135, suggested that the participle of *rûm* in the form of *mûram* (R. Kittel, ea., *Biblia Hebräica*, 3rd ed. [Stuttgart, 1966], and K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebräica Stuttgartensia* [Stuttgart, 1976], hereafter cited as BHK, BHS) "is removed," (KBL, p. 881; CHAL, p. 335; HAD, p. 257) should follow *hattâmîd*. He is followed by van Gall, p. 52, et. al. Plöger, p. 122; Lacocque, p. 158, et al., do not follow this emendation. Hartman and Di Lella, p. 226, supplies the infinitive *hârêm* or *hâsêr* (to remove).

## Problems with Dr. Hasel's Method

As can be seen from the above, these sections of Hasel's 1981 and 1986 papers are identical. Since the arguments dealing with the "common-angel interpreter," "auditory revelation," and the distinction between "mar'ê" and hazôn have been raised earlier in my notes on Shea's proposals, the reader is referred to them. I have also covered the second terminological link concerning Dn9:21. There are however, certain points that Hasel raises that need to be addressed.

### 1. An Assessment of Hasel's first link – Similar terminology

#### a. The first terminological link - mar'ê

The first terminological link cited by Hasel is the term mar'ê. The earlier discussion in this paper covers most of the Hasel's proposals, but we need to consider his third sentence: "Different scholars have recognized a link between chapters 8 and 9 because of the usage of this term." His footnote to this comment says"

Plöger, p.134 argues that "Dan 9:23 is formulated by depending on 8:16." Similarly Ginsberg, p.33: "Consequently 9:21 [9:23] presupposes chap. 8 with v16 in it." Lacocque p.190: "Chapter 9 presupposes at least vv.15-16 of chapter 8 which is a weighty argument in favor of a single author for these two chapters."

Hasel has not given his readers the benefit of understanding why he thinks Plöger, Ginsberg, and Lacocque can make these conclusions from the usage of mar'ê in Dn8:16,26-27 and Dn9:23. Is the issue only because it is the first incidence of this word in the book of Daniel? The conclusions of these scholars, together with their argumentation need to be examined to see if they indeed support what Hasel wants them to support, namely, a link between Dn8 and 9 "because of the usage of this term [mar'ê]." But it is clear that the reason these authors argue the link between these chapters is entirely different than that proposed by Hasel. For instance, Lacocque uses his argument merely to point out this as an indication of a single author. He does not argue anything near what Hasel wants to link between the two chapters. The most obvious answer to this issue is that Plöger, Ginsberg and Bensen see the reference in Dn9:23 concerning the previous visitation of Gabriel as referring to Dn8:15, 16. Given the validity of this, this is no support to the other links proposed by Hasel or SDA historicists. We cannot infer any relationship between the time periods in Dn8 and Dn9 merely on the basis of the usage of mar'eh in both chapters. Indeed, this term is also used in the last revelation given to Daniel, in chapters 11-12. we

could argue a link between Dn8 and Dn11-12 on the basis of *mar'eh* in both revelations so that we can then prove that the time periods used in both revelations are to start together, or provide the starting point for the 2300 days? In fact, Dn11-12 goes one step further than Dn8 in that it calls the whole revelatory experience a *mar'eh*.

Like Shea, Hasel has not considered other possibilities for the meaning of *mar'ê* in Dn9:23. He has totally ignored any alternate propositions such as that *mar'ê* in Dn9:23 referring to vs.24-27. There is a solid body of evidence which supports the view that “word” and “vision” in Dn9:23 refers to the communiqué of vs.24-27 (cf Keil, 1978, p.? Gæbelein, 1985, p.?). This is not even hinted at by Hasel. Why does Hasel spend meticulous effort examining various theories regarding for instance the unity of Daniel 8 (1986, p. 383-386), yet when it comes to the crucial issues such as the links between the 2300 days of Dn8:14 and the 70 weeks of Dn9:24, Hasel’s scholarship falls far short of the mark? Is he depending on the reader’s ignorance of the alternate arguments in his attempt to persuade them concerning the validity of the traditional SDA proposal for the relationship between the two time periods in Dn8:14 and Dn9:24?

#### **b. The second terminological link – “at first,” in Dn9:21**

A second terminological link between the chapters is the phrase, “at first,” (9:21). The expression naturally refers the reader back to 8:16 where Gabriel’s interpretation of the vision (*mar'eh*) is introduced.

Hasel’s assessment of this word is correct and does indeed refer to Dn8:16. But Gabriel’s visit does not finish at verse 16; it continues through to the end of the chapter. Therefore, it must include Dn8: 16-26. It is interesting that Hasel says that the interpretation of Gabriel introduced in verse 16 and provided in the latter half of the chapter explains the *mar'eh* because, the contents of these verses shows that he actually explains vs.3-12. This is indeed a terminological link between Dn8 and Dn9, but it does not mean that the time periods are linked; it just highlights the continuity of Gabriel’s ministry to earth. As highlighted in Assumption 22, *no-one except* Gabriel would be expected to visit.

#### **c. The third terminological link - *bîn***

Moving onto Hasel’s third terminological link under the “similar terminology” heading, he says:

The third terminological link is found in the usage of a variety of forms of the verb *bîn* (“to understand”) in 8:15-17,23,27;9:2,22-23. The same imperative form, “understand” (*haben*), which appears in 8:17 where Gabriel introduces his answer to the end-time emphasis on the 2300 evenings mornings, reappears in 9:23 on the lips of the same angel in his presentation of the 70 week prophecy. (p.437)

It is surprising that Hasel would cite the use of the verb *bîn* by Daniel as one of the terminological links between Dn8 and Dn9. The same variety of forms of this verb occur also in Dn10, 11, and 12. There is nothing to be gained from this line of reasoning. It is worth noting that in addition to my previous discussion on the parallelism in Dn9:23 which equates *dábár* with *mar'ê*, the use of *bîn*, the first in Qal Imperative “understand the matter!” and the second in Hiphil Imperative “consider the vision,” the interchange between

the regular and the causative form of the verb has no significance as far as Hasel's argument is concerned, because a comparison with the use of these forms in ch10-12 indicate the both forms are used to describe the same cognitive response which is elicited from Daniel by his informant; (cf. Qal: Dn10:1; Hiph'il: 10:11,12,14,16,17)

Another point worthy of consideration is that Hasel quotes the following footnote in both his 1981 and 1986 papers:

32. Plöger, p. 134, argues that "Dan 9:23 is formulated by depending on 8:16." Similarly Ginsberg, p. 33: "Consequently 9:21 [9:23] presupposes chap. 8 with vs. 16 in it." Lacocque, p. 190: "Chapter 9 presupposes at least vv. 15-16 of chapter 8 which is a weighty argument in favor of a single Author for these two chapters."

This footnote comes under the following statements:

**1. Similar terminology.** The designation for "vision" in the form of the term, *mar'eh*, appears in 8:16, 26-27. In the latter verse it refers specifically to the *mar'eh* of the "evenings-mornings." It appears again in 9:23, "understand the vision [*mar'eh*]." Different scholars have recognised a link between chapters 8 and 9 because of the usage of this term.

It is Plöger's argument that because the first incidence of *mar'eh* occurs in Dn8:16, therefore Dn9:23 has to be formulated on the occurrence of this word in Dn8:16. But this raises problems for both Hasel and Shea. If we are to use the usage of *mar'eh* to determine its usage elsewhere, then we would have to conclude that *mar'eh*. You will notice Ginsberg's statement: "Consequently 9:21 [9:23] presupposes chap. 8 with vs. 16 in it." Observe that Hasel has supplied the verse 9:23 in place of Ginsberg's reference of 9:21. If Ginsberg was referring to 8:16 from 9:21, it is because this is the first direct naming of Gabriel in the book of Daniel, not because of the word *mar'ê*. *Mar'ê* does not occur in 9:21, only *hazôn*. Does Ginsberg want to refer to *mar'eh* in his comment, or is he referring to the incidence of *hazôn* in verse 21.

Hasel also has the following footnote:

38. Lacocque, p. 164: "The terms of the question posed by the seer are not put together in terms of orthodox grammar. There are definite articles where there should not be, and they are absent where they should be."

This note comes under the following statement:

The grammar in the question is unusual and has led to numerous textual emendations.<sup>38</sup> Caution is thus in order. A literal translation may be rendered as follows with supplied words in brackets: "Until when [is to be/will be] the vision, the continuance, and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?"

Hasel just quotes Lacocque to support the assertion that the grammar is unorthodox. Hasel is not concerned with the absence or supposed misplacement of the definite articles nor does he offer an emendation for the definite articles. If they were to be corrected and genitive constructs included (which Hasel argues against), we would see something like this in transliterated Hebrew:

How long (will be) **the** vision *of the* continuance and *of the* transgression causing horror, to



make both *the* sanctuary and *the* host a trampling?

In the view of those arguing for a genitive construct chain, they would like to see the *omission* of the definite article in the Hebrew text for the first “the” in bold above. The omission of the first “the” with “vision” would enable them to add the genitival construction “of the” as included above in plain italics *as well as* providing a definite article for “vision.” They would also like to see the *inclusion* of the last two definite articles as above in the Hebrew text where they do not appear.

Hasel spends an inordinate amount of space arguing against this position, yet ignores the position of Shea and so many others – that the construction is one of apposition. Perhaps he only quoted Lacocque in order to give himself leave to propose his own explanation of the “unorthodox grammar” in this verse. Either way, both of these footnotes are devoid of any concrete evidence of the so-called terminological links with Dn8 and 9.

Shea dispensed with the proposal of a genitival construct relationship in one sentence:

They do not stand in an adjectival relationship and the presence of a construct chain here is ruled out by the use of the article with the last word of the opening clause and the first noun of the succeeding phrases (“how long *the* vision *the* daily....”) (1982, p.80)

## 2. Assessment of Hasel’s second link – “the cultic perspective.”

The second link between Dn8 and 9 proposed by Hasel – “the cultic perspective” – is far too general to have any direct bearing on the relationship between the two time periods under discussion. Needless to say, we have the mention of “sanctuary” in Dn 11:31 as well. Therefore, this “cultic perspective” is not unique to these two chapters. Three of the last four revelations in the last half of the book mention the “cultic perspective.” This link therefore is not a valid item to use to provide a link between Dn8 and Dn9.

## 3. An Assessment of Hasel’s third link – “a common angel-interpreter.”

The third link – “a common angel-interpreter” - has been previously answered, that is, that the same personage does not thereby imply that the same vision given over a decade previously is going to be discussed again. Hasel has inserted the incorrect assumption that Gabriel comes to “complete his commission”(p.438). The text only states that Gabriel had come in response to Daniel’s prayer for God’s blessing on His people and His city. Nothing is mentioned at all by Gabriel that can indicate, either explicitly or implicitly, that Gabriel had an unfulfilled commission to complete.

## 4. An Assessment of Hasel’s fourth link – “auditory revelation.”

The fourth link – “the auditory revelation” – assumes different meanings for hazon and mar’ê in order for him to say that mar’ê in 8:27 refers only to vs.13,14. He further assumes in common with QOD and Shea, that Dn9:24-27 “contains no vision but there is

auditory revelation in which the time element figures prominently. Both Dn8:13-14 and 9:24-27 are auditory revelations, and both deal with a time element.” (p.438)

It is interesting to note how Hasel has overlooked the fact that by his own admission that Dn9:21 refers to Gabriel’s appearance in Dn8:15-26, he has inadvertently placed himself in an awkward dilemma. The question must be put to Hasel: What is Dn8:15-26? Is it vision? Is it an audition? Is it both? Is it neither? If it is vision and/or audition, can it be interpreted as well?

According to his 1981 paper, and audition is “a part of the vision, yet separated from it by a subtle but important shift.... The audition is introduced by the words ‘and I heard’ (v13a), indicating that within the vision a new aspect appears. It is a dialogue between celestial beings.” (p.178) Yet when he comes to delineating the structure of Daniel 8 (p.180-181), “audition” is listed, not as a part of vision as he stated on page 178, but as a separate unit!! Furthermore, by his listing of vs.20-26 as “interpretation of vision,” he has thereby separated this section from the category of “vision.” His structural presentation of Dn8 limits the word “vision” to vs. 3-12. Here is his structural outline:

- I. Introduction, 8:1-2
  - A. Time, 1a
  - B. Seer, 1b
  - C. Place, 2
- II. Presentation of Vision-Audition, 8:3-14
  - A. Vision, 3-12
    - 1. Animals, 3-8
      - a. Ram, 3-8
      - b. He-goat, 5-8
    - 2. Little horn, 9-12
      - a. Origin, 9a
      - b. Expansion, 9b
      - c. Activity, 10-12
        - (1) Attack upon the host, 10
        - (2) Self –magnification, 11a
        - (3) Removal of continual, 11b
        - (4) Destruction of place of sanctuary, 11c
        - (5) Giving over of the host, 12a
        - (6) Giving over of the continual, 12b
        - (7) Casting of truth to ground, 12c
        - (8) Success of little horn, 12d
  - B. Audition, 13-14
    - 1. Dialogue of Celestial beings, 13a
    - 2. Question asked, 13b

3. Question answered, 14
- III. Interpretation of Vision-Audition, 20-26
  - A. Introduction, 15-19
    1. Seer, 15a
    2. One like a man, 15b
    3. Place, 16a
    4. Gabriel, 16b
    5. Seer addressed, 17a-b
    6. Theme of end-time, 17c-d
  - B. Vision, 20-26
    1. Animals identified, 20-21
      - a. Ram = Medo-Persia, 20
      - b. He-goat = Greece, 21
    2. Little Horn, 23-25
      - a. Time of Origin, 23
      - b. Power, 24a
      - c. Activity, 24b-25
        - (1) Fearful destruction of mighty men and saints, 24b-d
        - (2) Self-magnification, 25a-b
        - (3) Destruction of many, 25c
        - (4) Opposition to the Prince of princes, 25d
        - (5) End of the little horn, 25e
  - C. Audition, 26
    1. Truth, 26a
    2. Sealing, 26b
    3. End-time emphasis, 26c
- IV. Conclusion, 8:27
  - A. Seer's exhaustion, 27a
  - B. Seer's recovery, 27b
  - C. Seer's perplexity over the vision, 27c

From examining this outline we can notice the following immediate problems. Hasel's readers are given an contradictory message: "audition" is a part of the "vision" (p.180f); "interpretation" is not a part of the "vision" (p.180f), yet "interpretation" is called a "vision" (by his own acknowledgement that "vision" in Dn9:21 applies to Dn8:16 (p.197)).

A further "clarification" of these terms, as they are understood by Hasel at least, is given in his paper on page 197. He says "Daniel 9:24-27 contains no vision, but there is auditory revelation in which the time element figures most prominently. Both Daniel 8:13-14 and Daniel 9:24-27 are auditory revelations." (1981) How Daniel 8:13-14 can at the same time be an auditory revelation, as well as a part of a vision, yet not a vision is a question that begs to be put to Hasel.

Notice how the terms “auditory revelation” and “audition” are both applied to Dn8:13-14. Does this mean that the terms are synonymous? Is Dn9:24-27 not only an auditory revelation (p.197), but also an “audition?” If this is the case, then it would seem that the words “and I heard” *do not* have to introduce an “audition/auditory revelation” as is the case in Dn8:13-14 but is *not* the case in Dn9:24-27. This would mean that dialogue is the major characteristic, in Hasel’s terms at least, of an “audition/auditory revelation.” Yet Dn9:24-27, which is not explicitly defined by Hasel as “audition” but rather as “auditory revelation” does not have dialogue but is rather just a monologue by Gabriel. Since Dn8:13-14, which has dialogue, is categorized as an “auditory revelation,” it would seem that an auditory revelation” includes both the dialogue and monologues. This then would open the way for Dn8:20-26 being classified as “audition/auditory revelation.”

Coupling together with this is the fact that Dn9:21 defines Dn8:15-26 as hazôn, we find Hasel’s position faced with difficulty to say the least. The upshot of this would be firstly, that an “auditory revelation” is explicitly a part of a vision (hazôn) (Dn8:15); secondly, that interpretation is explicitly called “vision” (hazôn) (cf. Dn 8:15-26); and thirdly, since auditory revelations are called “visions” (Dn8:13,14 is called mar’ê in Dn8:26 whereas Dn8:15-26 is called hazôn in Dn9:21), Dn9:24-27 can also be called a vision (mar’ê), given that Hasel says that Dn8:15-26 and Dn9:24-27 are identical forms. This endorses the application of the word “vision” (mar’ê) in Dn9:23 to vs.24-27.

A further consideration which reinforces the equivalence between Dn8:15-26 and Dn9:24-27 is the admission by Hasel that both Dn8:15-26 and Dn9:24-27 are interpretation – that is to say, what is not supplied in the interpretation recorded in Dn8:15-26 is supplied in Dn9:24-27, thus making Dn9:24-27 a continuation of Dn8:15-26. But since Hasel acknowledges that Dn9:21 applies to Dn8:16, then the continuation of that form in Dn 9 would necessitate that Dn9:24-27 be also of the same form – a vision. This would be another argument that mar’ê is virtually synonymous with hazôn.

In conclusion to my comments on this link by Hasel, very little can be advanced in opposition to the assertion that both Dn8:15-26 are identical in style of revelation. Therefore, “vision” is a term that can apply to Dn9:24-27, and given both the appearance of mar’ê in v23 referring to the dābār which was about to be communicated to Daniel, and the virtual synonymous use of mar’ê and hazon (as testified in Dn8:15,16,20-26), Dn9:24-27 can quite legitimately be referred to as a “vision” (mar’ê).

## 5. An Assessment of Hasel’s fifth link – “a conceptual link.”

Daniel 9 climaxes in the *anointing* of the sanctuary (*qódes qodasîm*, vs. 24), and Daniel 8 in the *cleansing* of the sanctuary (*qódes*). If the first auditory revelation (8:13-14) points to the *end* of the long time period of 2,300 evenings-mornings, it would seem that the second auditory revelation of the 70 weeks in 9:24-27 would give its *starting point*. Its termination point could then be determined on the basis of such information. The omission of this datum in chapter 8 left Daniel without understanding (*rnèbîn*, vs. 27).

If the auditory revelation of 9:24-27 begins with the issuance of the first decree of Artaxerxes in his seventh year—458/457 B.C.—with the return of Ezra in 457 B.C. (Ezra 7:7-9), <sup>35</sup> this would mark the starting point of the 2,300

evenings-mornings of 8:14. Then the end point of the 2,300 year-day<sup>36</sup> prophecy falls in the year A.D. 1844. This point of time—

The fifth link proposed by Hasel – “the conceptual link” – is just a set of assumptions which, by themselves, provide no evidence. Notice the following:

- (a) “Daniel 9 climaxes in the anointing of the sanctuary”(p.197);
- (b) “If the first auditory revelation in 8:13-14 points to the *end* of the long time of 2300 ‘evening-mornings’...”(Ibid) “...then it would seem that the second auditory revelation of the 70 weeks in Dan9:24-27 would give its *starting point*” (Ibid); and
- (c) “The omission of this datum in Dan8 had left Daniel without understanding.” (Ibid)

**Dn8 climaxes in the cleansing of the sanctuary, the anointing of the Sanctuary is the Climax of Dn9.**

The actual vision in Dn8, according to Hasel’s definition of the vision, finishes at verse 12. The climax of the vision in verse 12 is the decimation of the people of God; the sublimation of truth for error; and the abolition of the daily sacrifice. The discussion of the restoration of the sanctuary is a part of the audition. So by his own definition, Hasel contradicts himself.

The vision in Dn9, which Hasel refuses to call “vision,” and instead calls it “audition” climaxes at verse 27. This verse does not even mention the sanctuary, not its restoration. This vision climaxes, not in the anointing of the sanctuary, but in the decimation of the enemy of God’s people. In the words of Daniel, “he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.” Clearly the statement connected with the sacrifice and oblation refers to events that are half a week from the climax of this vision. Therefore, even if we equated these references to an indirect reference to the sanctuary, they do not occur at the climax of the 70 weeks. Therefore Hasel is incorrect again.

**The auditory revelation in Dn8 points to the *end* of the 2300 days; the auditory revelation in Dn9 points to the *start* of the 2300 days.**

Hasel is only half correct with his assertion that “the auditory revelation in Dn8 points to the end of the 2300 days.” What he calls the “auditory revelation” in verses 13-14 uses as many words referring to the events that *begin* the 2300 days as it does concerning the *end* the 2300 days. This is amply illustrated below where the words referring to these matters are in bold font.

13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, **How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?** (28 words in English; 10 words in Hebrew)

**14** And he said unto me, **Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.** (13 words in English; 8 words in Hebrew.)

In the texts above, verse thirteen refers to the events that signal the beginning of the oppression of God's people and that continue throughout for a period of time. The question raised asks for how long will these things be allowed? Verse 14 then, as the answer to the question deals with the time period it will continue and then states what will happen at the end of the period concerned.

In fact, if we are to make a conclusion based on the number of words in verses 13 and 14, then the text uses more words to refer to the *beginning and the duration* of the 2300 days, than it does to refer to the *end* of the 2300 days. Contrary to what he asserts, Hasel's "auditory revelation" points to events that *begin and continue during* the 2300 days, *as well as* to the event that will *terminate* the end of 2300 days. Therefore, contra Hasel, "the first auditory revelation (8:13-14)" *does not point* "to the *end* of the long time period of 2,300 evenings-mornings;" rather, it deals with the events that mark its beginning, and also with events that continue throughout that period.

When it comes to his assertion that "it would seem that the second auditory revelation of the 70 weeks in 9:24-27 would give its *starting point*," one has to take one enormous leap into the darkness to come to such a conclusion. There is absolutely no evidence at all in the text of Dn9 that forces us to this conclusion. If we assume all the assumptions listed in this site, then we may endorse Hasel's position. But as will become clear as the papers on the other assumptions are examined, none of these assumptions have any Scriptural basis. They are not valid. Therefore, Hasel's assertion here must also be invalid.

As will be shown by this paper, all these assumptions are open to debate and provide no evidence for this "conceptual link" between Dn8 and 9. Furthermore, the major assumption that Hasel appears to make in his fifth link is that since Dn8:14 deals with the "cleansing of the sanctuary" and Dn9 deals with the "anointing of the sanctuary," there is a conceptual similarity between these two actions in relation to the sanctuary which warrants viewing the two time periods as being interrelated. He sees the "anointing" of the sanctuary as occurring before the "cleansing" of the sanctuary. But this is not necessarily the case.

It would be equally correct to assert that after the sanctuary had been "cleansed" of some "desolating" factor, an "anointing" or "re-consecration" would be expected to occur, thus restoring the sanctuary to its former sacred uses and activities. Again, it could be reasonably argued that the "cleansing" could include the "anointing" simultaneously, and that the "anointing" was the cleansing since the word nitsdaq ("cleansed") can be rightly translated as "restored to its rightful state." (NIV)

Therefore, there does not appear to be any explicit evidence in this fifth link outside his dependence upon many assumptions that have been considered. For all practical purposes then, this fifth link can be disregarded.



## Conclusion on Hasel's Arguments

I have looked at the hub of Hasel's theories regarding the meaning of these two Hebrew words. He proposed five links that strengthen the sense of connection between Dn8 and Dn9. His first link, that of similar terminology, using the word "mar'eh," "battehillâ," and "bîn" is invalid. His second link, that of "cultic perspective," is invalid, because these perspectives also occur in the last revelation as well, proving that these "perspectives" are not unique to Dn8 and 9, but are present in Dn8, 9, and 11-12. His third link, that of a common-angel interpreter is nonsense, since by SDA historicists' admission, no-one else would be expected to visit and communicate to Daniel, other than Gabriel.

As has been adequately shown, Hasel's "Auditory Revelation" is also a fanciful creation of a wishful scholastic imagination. But it is invalid. Both the interpretation of Dn8 and the revelation in Dn9 are both called "visions." Dn8:16-26 is called a hazôn-vision by Dn9:21 and Dn9:23 calls vs24-27 a mar'eh-vision. The fifth link – a conceptual one – was found to be a fabrication of totally invalid contrasts. The contrasts that Hasel wants to assert, just do not line up with the evidence in the texts.

Thus Hasel's contribution to the clarification of this subject is merely cosmetic and offers nothing substantial that stands up under close scrutiny. Even if all the links proposed by Hasel were correct, it would not substantiate the position that the time periods – the 2300 days and the seventy weeks in the two chapters are linked. At the most, we can do as Lacocque has done and use any links between the chapters as indicative of the book's cohesion and unity.

His discussion on the meaning of mar'ê and hazôn must now be considered before leaving this section. Notice that Hasel himself says, "the textual evidence of this technical vocabulary is pivotal for answering the question of the time span covered by the vision." (1981, p.199) Given his observation on the importance of this evidence, it is surprising to see Hasel provide such paltry argumentation in support of this "pivotal" question. The following quotation, identical in both his 1981(p.198f) and his 1986 paper (p.434), provides none of his "evidence," nor any scholarly references where this "evidence" may be found:

Those who would limit the intent of the question to the period of the "little horn"<sup>28</sup> are insensitive to the Hebrew noun for "vision" which is hazon in verse 13. This term appears no less than seven times in chapters 8(vs.1-2 [three times],13,15,17,26b). A study of this term here and in the remainder of the Hebrew of the book of Daniel (cf.9:21;10:14) reveals that it is distinguished from the word mar'ê, a word which carries the meaning of "appearance" but, at times is also translated as "vision."

The word hazon ("vision") in verse 13 contextually refers to the vision of the ram, he-goat, and the "little horn" as its first usage in verses 1-2 clearly indicate. The mar'ê ("appearance") more narrowly refers to the "appearance" of heavenly beings who engage in conversation regarding the trampling of the sanctuary and its restoration (cf.8:16,26a-27).

The textual evidence of this technical vocabulary is pivotal for answering the question of the time span covered by the hazon-vision in the question of verse 13 includes the entire range of events the prophet was shown in verses 3-12. Contextually and terminologically it is not limited to the "little horn" period." (1986,

p.434)

<sup>28</sup> Charles, p.210; H.C. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel (Grand Rapids, 1969), p.351; Young, p.173; Hartman and Di Lella p.226.

Hasel states that a study of the occurrences of hazon and mar'ê in Dn8-12 reveals that the meanings of these two terms are different. Yet no study is provided, nor is any reference given as to where this study may be found. It is surprising that he doesn't refer his readers to Shea's 1981 paper. If we are to assume that his "evidence" is provided in the second paragraph quoted above, I refer my readers to my discussion of apposition in Dn8:13 in Shea's paper. Perhaps Hasel can see the failings of Shea's 1981 paper which refers Dn9:21 to Dn7 and is not prepared to recommend that paper to an informed reader, even though the BRI does. In his 1981/1986 papers Hasel does refer readers to other articles in the same volume that his paper appeared in (cf. 1981, note 156 refers us to the article of J. Doukhan in the same volume). So this cannot be the reason for his reluctance to refer us to Shea's work. He was aware of the contents of the papers being submitted for inclusion in the book, and could have easily referred us to Shea's material if he had wanted to.

Again, as with Shea, the mere proposal of this thesis concerning the distinction in meanings between hazon and mar'ê is taken as enough evidence to make it legitimate. Alternate explanations are not considered and argued down. Nothing is examined. It is all assumed by Hasel. Given that Hasel (rightly) sees this point as "pivotal," it is disappointing that a scholar of such acumen could present such a sloppy work to the world under his name as "evidence" in support of the traditional exegesis of the 2300 days. Again, as in the previous material, Hasel's contribution is merely a cosmetic one.

On a personal note, in reading his work, it left me with the impression that he was trying to make the issue more clouded. He puts in an inordinate amount of comment where it is not needed and totally ignores areas of vital concern where comment is essential. He has not even critically examined Shea's work, even though his ideas of Dn9:21 applying to Dn8:16 and not Dn7 conflict with those of Shea. And even more disappointing is the fact that the world headquarters of the SDA church, the General Conference of SDA's, are happy to recommend this "research" to the best minds throughout the world as epitomising the benchmark of research for validating the SDA position on prophetic issues!!! History will judge it harshly and see it as another desperate attempt to plug a hole in a sinking ship. It is terrible scholarship and reflects the desperation to find something solid to defend the invalid arguments endorsed by SDA historicists.

## **Recent SDA writers.**

Following on from the lead made by the DARCOM series, contemporary writers on the subject wishing to deal with some of the more complex issues in the time prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9, usually incorporate the material proposed by either Shea or Hasel in their work. Some show they have done some thinking in this area; some show they are merely repeating the work of these two men without doing any critical thinking about what they are quoting. Examples follow:

## Clifford Goldstein:

Also two different Hebrew words are translated “vision” in Daniel 8. In verses 1 and 2, Daniel three times makes reference to the “vision” of the chapter, and each time it comes from the same Hebrew word, *hazôn*....Daniel then describes what he sees in the *hazôn*: the ram, the goat, the little horn, etc. *Hazon* therefore, refers to the general vision of chapter 8. In contrast, when he talks specifically about the 2,300 days, Daniel uses a different word for vision, *mareh*. “And the vision [*mareh*] of the evening and the morning which was told is true...And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king’s business; and I was astonished at the vision [*mareh*], but none understood it” (Daniel 8:26, 27).

Thus, we have two words for “vision” in Daniel 8: *hazôn* for the whole vision, and *mareh* for Daniel 8:14, the vision about the 2,300 days and the sanctuary being cleansed – the part that Daniel didn’t understand (Daniel 8:27).

Now, these two words appear again, in Daniel 9, when Gabriel appears to Daniel after his prayer....Notice, Daniel refers to Gabriel, the angel he had seen in the *hazôn* of Daniel 8 (Gabriel is the one who, in Daniel 8:16, is told to explain to Daniel the vision). Notice too, that Gabriel comes to Daniel and says that he’s here to give him “skill and understanding.” Skill and understanding about what? The last time we left Daniel, he didn’t understand the *mareh* of Daniel 8:14....

This point becomes even clearer when we examine the word for “vision” that Gabriel uses in verse 23 just before giving Daniel the seventy-week prophecy. Look at this carefully: “At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore, understand the matter, and consider the vision [*mareh*].”

*Mareh?* What *mareh*? There’s only one, the *mareh* of the 2,300 evenings and mornings in 8:14 that Daniel didn’t understand. We have the same angel interpreter as in the *hazôn* of Daniel 8, to which Daniel himself refers when Gabriel first appears. Gabriel then promises to give Daniel *bin* (understanding), and the last time we see Daniel needing *bin* was in reference to the 2,300 evening and mornings of Daniel 8:14. Gabriel then points him specifically to the *mareh* and tells him to “consider” it (“consider” also comes from *bin*).

Another point. What kind of prophecy was the *mareh* of Daniel 8:14? It was a time prophecy. What is the first thing that Gabriel gives to Daniel? Of course, a time prophecy – the seventy weeks – the he begins to explain in Daniel 9:24.

Without question, Gabriel comes to Daniel in chapter 9 in order to give him the explanation about the 2,300 days in chapter 8.

Adventists aren’t the only ones to see this link, either. I have in my office an orthodox Jewish commentary on Daniel. What’s amazing is how this commentary handles the seventy weeks of Daniel 9:24-27. Below is the extract on the phrase “consider the *mareh*,” though this commentary translates it “gain understanding of the vision,” a more accurate translation of the verb in the phrase (*bin* in the *hiphil*). What does this commentary do with the seventy-week prophecy?

“This refers to Daniel's vision in chapter 8 in which the part that disturbed him so (v.14) is characterized in vs. 16-26 as a *mareh*.” [Goldstein footnotes: “*Daniel*, Art Scroll Tanach Series, (Mesorah Publications, Brooklyn, NY), 1988, p.258.”]

The first thing it does is to point back to Daniel 8:14. In other words, who certainly don't have the same "agenda" as Adventists, nevertheless see the same link between Daniel 8:14 and the seventy-week prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27....

How interesting too, that the *mareh* of Daniel 8:14, unlike the rest of the *hazôn*, constitutes an audition, something that Daniel *hears*, as opposed to something he *sees*, as in the rest of the vision. Read Daniel 8; the *mareh* of the 2,300 days is revealed in words, not in visible symbols. In Daniel 9, when Gabriel returns and gives him the explanation, he doesn't give Daniel a vision of rams, goats, little horns etc.; he gives him something to hear, an audition, as with the *mareh* of chapter 8. (2003, pp.76-78)

Goldstein here merely reiterates the ideas of Shea and Hasel, which have been adequately answered earlier.

### **Donald Earnest Mansell.**

Another SDA writer who repeats the ideas of Shea and Hasel is Mansell.

#### **Two words for vision: *chazôn* and *mareh*.**

The use of two Hebrew words in Daniel 8 and 9 provides a link between these two chapters – specifically between the 70 weeks of years prophecy in chapter 9 and the 2,300 days/years prophecy of chapter 8:14. This link is important, because without it we would not have no starting point for the 2,300 years.

The two Hebrew words are *chazon* and *mareh*. While both terms can – and are – translated “vision,” they are not exactly synonymous. *Chazon* means “a vision in the ecstatic [i.e., prophetic] state.” [Mansell footnotes here: “Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The New Brown – Driver – Briggs – Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985, p.909b).” –FB] This word is used to refer to the whole vision of chapter 8 (see, e.g., vs. 1,2 13, 15. 17. 26b). *Mareh*, on the other hand, means a “sight, phenomenon, spectacle, appearance.” [Mansell footnotes: “Ibid., p.302b.” –FB] This word is used of the “appearance” within the vision of the two beings, one of whom raises the question “Until when...?” that the other answers with “till evening-morning two thousand three hundred” (see vs. 16, 26a, 27).

It was the *mareh* that, in verse 16, Gabriel was commissioned to help Daniel understand. But at the close of chapter 8, Daniel says he “was astonished by the *mareh*” and did not understand it. Then, in Daniel 9:23, Gabriel appears to the prophet again and tells him to “consider the word and understand the *mareh*.” So, Gabriel’s explanation in chapter 9 was given specifically to explain the 2,300 evening-mornings of chapter 8.

Now let’s work through in a more detailed way through Daniel 8 and 9: Gabriel commences to fulfill his commission by explaining in literal or quasi-literal language the meaning of the various symbols of the “vision” (*chazon*), such as the ram, the he-goat, the great horn, the four horns, and the “king, fierce of face” (see chap.8:20-25, Young). In verse 26 Gabriel refers to the matter of the “evening-morning two thousand three hundred,” which he calls the *mareh*, or “appearance.” Then, in the latter part of verse 26, he states that the *chazon*, which, as we have seen began with the Medo-Persian ram and has its fulfillment “after many days” (Young; cp v. 17,” the appointed time of the end”).

Daniel says that upon hearing this he “fainted and was sick for days” (v.27), after which “rose and went about the kings’ business.” He says he fainted because he was “astonished by the vision [the *mareh* concerning the evening-morning two thousand three hundred.]” Obviously, Daniel had concluded that the temple in Jerusalem would be trampled down for 2,300 years – far into the distant future.

It is Daniel’s failure to understand why the sanctuary would be trampled down for so long that underlies his long prayer recorded in chapter 9:4-19. This explanation is confirmed by the fact that in his prayer Daniel repeatedly refers to the desolations of Jerusalem (see vs. 12, 16, 18) and pleads for the Lord to cause His face to shine on His sanctuary “that is desolate” (v.17, Young).

But the expression that clinches this conclusion is the prophet’s plea “*do not delay*, for Thine own sake, O my God, for Thy name is called on Thy city and on Thy people” (v.19 Young, emphasis supplied). Why would Daniel implore God to not delay if he were not concerned that the desolation of the sanctuary had been extended far beyond the 70 years of Jeremiah’s prophecy?...<sup>17</sup>

Daniel 8 ends with the statement that Daniel didn’t understand the *mareh* of the 2,300 evening-mornings.

Now, in response to Daniel’s prayer recorded in chapter 9, Gabriel, who had begun to explain that which Daniel did not understand (the 2,300 evening-mornings), returned to continue his explanation. So, Gabriel is a link between these two chapters.

But there is an even stronger link between these chapters, likewise based on the various forms of the word *understand*. In Daniel 9:22 Gabriel says he came to give Daniel “understanding,” and in verse 23, he explicitly urges the prophet, “Understand thou concerning *the matter* and consider the vision [*mareh*]” that perplexed the prophet, namely, the 2,300 evening-mornings. This must be what he meant since there is no other vision (*chazon* – or *mareh*, for that matter) between Daniel 8 and this verse to which the angel could possibly have been referring. Gabriel then began his explanation of the 2,300 evening-mornings by referring to a timer period – which is another link. (2002, pp.62-64)

## Gerhard Pfandl

Daniel employs two words for “vision.” One is *chazon* (verses 1, 2, 13, 15, 17, 26), and the other is *mareh* (verse 16, 26, 27). The first word refers to the vision as a whole; the second focuses on the 2300-evening-and-morning time element. The angel had explained the animal and the little horn symbolism in chapter 8. What the prophet did not comprehend was the meaning of the “vision [*mareh*] of the evenings

---

<sup>17</sup> Here we see another false argument being based on an another invalid assumption. There is absolutely no evidence as to what Daniel was meaning by the phrase “do not delay.” It does not have to be linked with the 2,300 days at all. It is clear that he did not desire that the years of exile be extended beyond the allocated seventy, but the thoughts behind that thinking is not given. And it certainly does not “clinch this conclusion” that “Daniel had concluded that the temple in Jerusalem would be trampled for 2,300 years – far into the distant future.” This type of reasoning is ludicrous and embarrassing. Talk about error being the foundation for further error!!! This is a classic example of the rubbish produced and published by SDA historicists. How could one say that this reasoning “clinches” the conclusion unless he is totally blind to the fallacies of his own reasoning??

and mornings (Dan. 8:26). “I was astonished by the vision [*mareh*], but no one understood it” (verse 27). Therefore when Gabriel says in Daniel 9:23, “consider the matter and understand the vision,” he does not use the word *chazon*, which refers to the vision as a whole, but employs *mareh*. This is an important link between chapters 8 and 9 that many have not recognized. One who does discern it is the Jewish commentator Rabbi Hersh Goldwurm, who, after citing the words of Gabriel in Daniel 9:23, “understand the vision,” correctly explains that “this refers to Daniel’s vision in chapter 8 in which the part which disturbed him so (verse 14) is characterized in verse 16-26 as a *mareh*. [Inserts footnote: “Hersh Goldwurm, *Daniel*, (New York: Mesorah Publications, 1979), p. 258”]

Daniel 9 therefore, is an integral part of Daniel 8. Gabriel in chapter 9 directs the prophet back to the unexplained part of chapter 8 – the time period of 2300 evenings and mornings, i.e., days. The link between these two chapters is underscored when Gabriel, after referring to the *mareh* vision (the 2300 days), tells Daniel that 70 weeks are “cut off” for the prophet’s own people. Cut off from what? Obviously, from the 2300 days to which Gabriel had just been referring when he mentioned the *mareh* vision in Daniel 9:23. (Pfandl, 2004b, p.99)

## **Summary of Assumption 1.**

I have examined the assumption presented by QOD, Shea and Hasel, that the two Hebrew words in Dn8-12 translated by the English word “vision” have specialised and different meanings that support the SDA argument that the 2300 days covers the whole vision of Dn8 and not just the events of the little horn. I conclude by saying they take a position on the two words for “vision” in Dn8 and 9 that Scripture cannot support.

The two words in Dn8-12 translated by the English word “vision” do *not* have the specialised meanings as proposed by QOD, Shea or Hasel supporting the SDA argument. This reasoning cannot be used to say the 2300 days covers the *whole vision of Dn8* and not just the vision of the oppressive activities of the little horn. If there is a difference in meaning in these words, it does not materially affect the meaning in Dn8 because the same text is both *chazôn* and *mar’ê*. The readers can trust any translation of the Bible that renders these two words as simply “vision.” As Shea himself says, if Dn9:21 refers to Dn8, “then the distinction between the technical application of these two words proposed above [by Shea and also indeed by Hasel and QOD] cannot be upheld.” (1981, p.237) I have shown, in concert with the rest of the scholarly world and SDA writers like QOD, and Hasel, that Dn9:21 does indeed refer to Dn8, thereby rendering redundant Shea’s fanciful notions of trying to locate Gabriel in Dn7. His idiosyncratic dichotomy of the two technical words for “vision” is incorrect, and will not outlive him. And Hasel’s attempt at clarifying the issue was a hopeless piece of research.

Believing that I have adequately demolished the highly fanciful proposals of QOD, Shea and Hasel, I propose that SDA apologists can only use the two traditional arguments examined in the paper on Assumption No.2. These will also be shown to be flawed.

## **TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF THE USAGE OF *MAR’Ê*, *CHAZÔN* AND *CHEZEV*.**



The following table summarises the position I take on the meaning of the two Hebrew words for “vision” as they appear in chapters 1 to 12. There are two texts listed not discussed in this paper that I offer an opinion for as well. These are marked with an asterisk.

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
1	Dn1:17*	Chazôn	As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and wisdom: and Daniel had understanding in all <b>visions</b> and dreams.	Refers to <i>any</i> type of visionary material, not necessarily in the Biblical tradition.
2	Dn2:19	Chezev	Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night <b>vision</b> . Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven.	Refers to Daniel’s dream of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream.
3	Dn2:28	Chezev	But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the <b>visions</b> of thy head upon thy bed, are these. <sup>18</sup>	Refers to the dream of Nebuchadnezzar.
4	Dn4:5	Chezev	I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the <b>visions</b> of my head troubled me.	Nebuchadnezzar’s dream.
5	Dn4:9	Chezev	O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the <b>visions</b> of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof.	Nebuchadnezzar’s dream.
6	Dn4:10	Chezev	Thus were the <b>visions</b> of mine head in my bed; I	Nebuchadnezzar’s dream.

<sup>18</sup> The use of the phrase “latter days” is interesting here because the latter days covered by this vision includes everything from the present time of the Babylonian king to the end of time. So although Daniel says the vision relates to the latter days, it is probably better to translate that concept to a broad statement “the future.” Perhaps it would be fruitful to apply this interpretation to the use of this phrase latter in the book as well, rather than referring to a period beyond the end of the 1260 days. Examine this.

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
			saw, and behold, a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great.	
7	Dn4:13	Chezev	I saw in the <b>visions</b> of my head upon my bed, and behold, a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven	Nebuchadnezzar's dream.
8	Dn7:1	Chezev	In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and <b>visions</b> of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream and told the sum of the matters.	Daniel's dream.
9	Dn7:2	Chezev	Daniel spake and said, I saw in my <b>vision</b> by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heavens strove upon the great sea.	Daniel's dream
10	Dn7:7	Chezev	After this I saw in the night <b>visions</b> , and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.	Daniel's dream
11	Dn7:13	Chezev	I saw in the night <b>visions</b> , and, behold, one like the Son of man came with clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.	Daniel's dream.
12	Dn7:15	Chezev	I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the <b>visions</b> of my head troubled me.	Daniel's dream
13	Dn8:1	Chazôn	In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a	Refers to the whole of chapter 8.

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
			<b>vision</b> appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.	
14	Dn8:2	Chazôn	And I saw in a <b>vision</b> ; and it came to pass when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in vision, and I was by the river of Ulai.	Refers to the whole of chapter 8.
15	Dn8:2	Chazôn	And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in <b>vision</b> , and I was by the river of Ulai.	This refers either to the vision of the whole chapter or if my theory is correct, the vision of vs.3-12.
16	Dn8:13	Chazôn	Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the <b>vision</b> concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot.	Refers to the items listed in the apposition in v13, i.e., the actions of the little horn in vs10-12.
17	Dn8:15	Chazôn	And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the <b>vision</b> , and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.	Refers to a revelation previous to this statement; therefore must be either vs3-12 or vs3-14. Probably vs3-12 is taken as the best reference. (Note: this text also uses <u>mar'ê</u> for "appearance.")
18	Dn8:16	Mar'ê	And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the <b>vision</b> .	The scope of the answer by Gabriel clearly shows that this word refers to vs3-12/14.
19	Dn8:17	Chazôn	So he came near 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; for at the time of the	Refers to vs.3-12/14.

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
			end shall be the <b>vision</b> . <sup>19</sup>	
20	Dn8:26	Mar'ê	And the <b>vision</b> of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.	Refers either just to vs.13-14 or it could be a title for the entire vision of vs.3-14 or vs.3-25. The statement that it "was told" probably refers to vs.13-14 but it could include that which was told Daniel in vs.20-25. Since the word <u>chazôn</u> is used in the second half of the verse to refer to the same thing, it is good evidence that <u>mar'ê</u> is synonymous with <u>chazôn</u> and refers to the whole chapter. <sup>20</sup>
21	Dn8:26	Chazôn	And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the <b>vision</b> ; for it shall be for many days.	Refers to the whole revelation in ch8.
22	Dn8:27	Mar'ê / Mar'â	And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and was astonished at the <b>vision</b> , but none understood it.	Refers to the whole chapter of Dn8. If my theory is correct, this would refer to the appearance of himself in his vision, and would refer to vs.3-26.
23	Dn9:21	Chazôn	Yea, whilst I was speaking in prayer even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the <b>vision</b> at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.	Definitely refers to vs.16-26, and most probably to the whole chapter.
24	Dn9:23	Mar'ê	At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly	Refers to vs.24-27

<sup>19</sup> This statement is very similar to the one in Dn2, and considering the contents of the vision, it would be a fair translation to render this phrase "time of the end" as "future" as well, since it includes the Persian, Greek and Roman empire up to the destruction of the Roman power.

<sup>20</sup> Are there any instances in Scripture where the concept of "was told" actually refers to something that "was shown?"

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
			beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the <b>vision</b> .	
25	Dn9:24	Chazôn	Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the <b>vision</b> and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.	Refers to all visions and prophets/prophecies that relate to the end of time and the consummation of Lord's kingdom.
26	Dn10:1	Mar'ê	In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the <b>vision</b> .	Refers to chs.11-12.
27	Dn10:7	Mar'â	And I Daniel alone saw the <b>vision</b> : for the men that were with me saw not the <b>vision</b> ; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves.	Refers to the appearance of the person in Dn10:5.6.
28	Dn10:8	Mar'â	Therefore, I was left alone, and saw this great <b>vision</b> , and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned into corruption, and I retained no strength.	Refers to the appearance of the heavenly person in Dn10: 5,6.
29	Dn10:14	Chazôn	Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the <b>vision</b> is for many days.	Refers to the vision given in Dn11-12.
30	Dn10:16	Mar'â	And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of	Refers to the appearance and statements of the heavenly person in

	Text	Word	Text in KJV Version.	Scope of Word in the Verse.
			men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my lord, by the <b>vision</b> my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.	Dn10:5-15.
31	Dn11:14*	Chazôn	And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the <b>vision</b> , but they shall fall.	Refers to that part of the vision in Dn11-12 dealing with the person concerned, (and possibly indirectly any other vision dealing with the same person)

A cursory reading through this list after going through the research of this paper brings the following conclusions:

- Shea argued that Dn10 must be the chapter from which an understanding of the meaning of these two words can be derived. Daniel 10 in fact does play a large part for clarifying the meaning of chazôn and mar'eh. The use of chazôn in Dn10:14 referring to the vision of Dn11-12 coincides with the use of mar'eh in Dn10:1 to refer to the same thing. Therefore Daniel chapter 10 indicates that these words can be used synonymously.
- This endorses the view that the use of chazôn in Dn9:21 to describe the monologue interaction of Gabriel with Daniel in Dn8, which is also referred to in Dn8:27 (and perhaps v.26) as a mar'eh shows that the terms are used synonymously here as well.
- The explanation of Gabriel in Dn8:20-26 in response to the command on verse 16 to explain the mar'eh compared with the details of the chazôn from vs3-12, shows that the words are used synonymously here too. He was told to explain the mar'eh (Dn8:16) and a comparison of the explanation in vs.20-26 with the chazôn of vs.3-12 shows that the mar'eh he explained was the chazôn.
- At the end of the chapter, the man Gabriel says that the mar'eh is true and that the chazôn should be shut. Comparing that with Dn8:1,2 where he says that only a chazôn was given, we can confidently say that the statement in Dn8:26 equates the two words together, and in commanding to close the chazôn, this meant the mar'eh. Another way of paraphrasing v.26 is, "The vision of the evening and the morning is true, therefore close it..." In this paraphrase, the word chazôn is replaced with a pronoun to give what I would say is the correct sense of the text. This also highlights the synonymy of



the two words. This view is endorsed in other places where the two words are used synonymously.

- Mar'â/ mar'ah is used in the book of Daniel to refer to the appearance of personal beings, such as in Dn10:7, 8, 16, where it clearly refers to the heavenly being who appeared and conversed with Daniel. The fact that the Hebrew renders these as mar'ah instead of mar'eh is significant and may account for this difference in meaning from the other instances of mar'eh elsewhere in the book of Daniel.<sup>21</sup> This being the case, we should respect the Hebrew text as it stands and opt to see these three texts as distinct and separate from the use of mar'eh elsewhere in the book.
- The association of the word mar'eh with those revelations given through an oratory monologue, such as we see in Dn9, lends weight to the conclusion that this word is used where there is an interaction between the prophet and heavenly beings. This does not discount their possibility of them also being referred to as a chazôn, as in the case of Dn8 and Dn11-12. It may be that chazôn was the more global or general word and mar'eh the more specific. This is counterbalanced however by Daniel's choice of words in the beginning of Dn8 and Dn10 to summarise the revelations given in those chapters. In Dn8, he chooses to summarise the *whole* experience of that chapter as a chazôn, even though he calls it in other places in the chapter a mar'eh. In Dn10, he defines the *whole* experience as a mar'eh even though he refers to it in 10:14 as a chazôn.

The last word however, has certainly not been written on the distinction between these two words.

## **Appendix No.1 My proposal for the use of mar'ê and hazôn in Daniel**

If there is to be any different meanings between these two words, then I propose that they would follow the following pattern:

- (1) Daniel had a hazôn-vision in the third year of the reign of Belshazzar, which he didn't understand and it comprises all that is recorded in ch8 (Dn8:1;9:21);
- (2) That hazôn-vision consisted of a mar'ê-vision watching himself having a hazôn-vision at the Shushan palace(Dn8:2);
- (3) This mar'ê-vision of himself encompassed vs.3-14 then vs.15-26. Verses 2-12 are to be included in the mar'ê because the real Daniel was watching while the Daniel-in-the-vision saw the things recorded in these verses.

---

<sup>21</sup> The marginal reading of mar'ah for Dn8:27 in BHS should perhaps be seen as a response of the strengthening of the vowel at the end of the sentence, indicating we should keep this word as mar'eh.

- (4) The hazôn-vision that the “Daniel-in-the-vision” saw consisted of vs. 3-12;
- (5) The mar’ê referred to in verse 26 as the mar’ê of the evening and the morning is “told” to the Daniel-in-the-vision, and includes verses 13 and 14. This mar’ê experienced by the Daniel-in-the-vision comes within the hazôn of the real Daniel. From this perspective we can agree with QOD’s definition of a mar’ê being a subpart of the hazôn, yet for an entirely different set of reasons. There are two hazôns in Dn8—the first being experienced by the real Daniel (vs.2-26), and the second being experienced by the Daniel-in-the-vision (vs.2-12). The mar’ê of v.13-14 is a subpart of the hazôn seen by the real Daniel, but it is not a part of the hazôn seen by the Daniel-in-the-vision.
- (6) The explanation of vs. 15-26 is explained to the “Daniel-in-the-vision” and is still part of the hazôn/mar’ê that Daniel is watching.
- (7) Dan8:15-26 is still a mar’ê-vision because it involves the communication between Gabriel and Daniel. Yet at the same time it is a hazôn-vision because Daniel is watching this communication between Gabriel and Daniel in his hazôn-vision and it is called so by Dn9:21.

This explanation presupposes that Dn8:2 does *not* mean that “Daniel was in spirit conveyed to Susa,” (Keil, 1978, p.289) but rather, that he saw *himself* in vision. “He saw himself standing on the bank of this canal.” (Archer, 1985, vol7:p.96) The Hebrew literally reads (cf., words within ( ) are supplied; words within [ ] have variants in the manuscripts; words with a slash are choices of meaning), “And I saw in the vision and it was in my seeing and/that I (was) at/in Shushan the palace which (is) in Elam the province [and I saw in the vision] and I was beside the canal/river Ulai.”

My position is that the most obvious sense of the text is that he saw himself in vision in the province of Elam. It was “in his seeing” that he saw himself “beside the canal Ulai.” He is looking at himself as though he is looking at another person entirely. When he records about himself lifting up his eyes, seeing (vs.3,4,5,7,15), hearing (vs.13,14,16), standing(v17,18), falling on his face (v17), sleeping(v18), being set upright(v18), seeking for meaning(v15), he is referring to the Daniel-in-the-vision person and not himself. Yet at the same time, it is he himself doing it as a third person, it is because he himself is in the vision that he refers to the person doing these things in the vision using the first person pronoun “I.” He could not refer to the Daniel-in-the-vision as anyone else other than “I,” since it was himself that he was seeing. How else could he express it? This is confirmed by the use of “I” in v16 where he clearly shows that he is still talking about the Daniel he is seeing in the vision by locating him at the river Ulai. Thus, the Daniel-in-the-vision *sees* vs.3-14, and the same Daniel-in-the-vision *is the actor in* vs.15-26. And all the time, Daniel is watching himself as though he is watching a third person.

When he sees Gabriel explaining the vision to the Daniel-in-the-vision, it is the real Daniel who is having this hazôn as referred to in Dn9:21. But the Daniel-in-the-vision is not having a hazôn; he is having a mar’ê of Gabriel, and he is doing this within the hazôn of the real Daniel. What does the hazôn in Dn9:21 include? It includes both Gabriel and the Daniel-in-the-vision in the exchange of information, with Gabriel as the speaker and Daniel as the listener. This exchange is for all practical purposes identical to both Dn9 and Dn11-12 and although Dn9 is called a mar’ê (Dn9:23), Dn11-12 is called both a mar’ê and a

hazôn, a usage identical to that in Dn9:21 when it refers to Dn8:15-26. This explanation fits every usage of the two words in the book of Daniel.

Keil (336) says that “hazôn” is used for seeing things in visionary mode, but mar’ê is used when he sees things with his natural eyes. In this case Daniel’s whole vision of ch 8 is a hazôn but he saw himself watching these things in the revelation as he-in-the-vision was awake.

This view also coincides with Shea’s definition of the difference between mar’ê and chazôn in Dn10 ([see above](#)).

A problem text for the interpretation proposed above is verse 16, where Gabriel is told to make the Daniel-in-the-vision “understand the mar’ê. This is problematic, in that Gabriel clearly begins to explain the hazôn, rather than vs.13, 14. I had previously stated that for the Daniel having-the-vision, the mar’ê is the Daniel-in-the-vision. To the Daniel-in-the-vision, the statement in v26 could refer to vs13.14, yet in this verse (16), the reference either means that hazôn and mar’ê are synonymous (since he begins to explain the hazôn, when told to make Daniel understand the mar’ê), or it means something else.

In verse 16, we must ask what mar’ê is this referring to? It certainly does not refer to the experience of seeing himself in vision. So it must refer to something in the actual vision itself. We can only judge from the explanation of Gabriel as to what is meant. The fact that Gabriel includes the vision experienced by the Daniel-in-the-vision in his explanation is clear indication that he makes the Daniel-in-the-vision understand the hazôn. We are constrained therefore, to conclude that these words in chapter 8 are synonymous, as they are in chapter 10. This must be balanced against incidences of mar’ê where it obviously refers to the appearances of people, such as in Dn10:7, 8, 16.

Another alternative to solving this problem, is that v16 is addressing, not the Daniel-in-the-vision, but the Daniel-having-the-vision. That is to say, when he says, “Make this man to understand the mar’ê, he is saying “Make the Daniel-having-the-vision to understand the vision.” This does appear plausible but not the best answer. It does not fit with all the parameters in the context. In all the dialogues, the people are speaking *to* or *near* the Daniel-in-the-vision. The Daniel-having-the-vision is just a silent observer. Gabriel gives his answer, not to the Daniel-having-the-vision, but to the Daniel-in-the-vision. The two holy ones (vs.13,14) discuss the vision and the length of the atrocities involved in the presence of the Daniel-in-the-vision.

Norman Porteous makes the point clear beyond doubt concerning the location of Daniel during this vision:

As Jeffrey (p.483) rightly points out the fact that Daniel gets up after a few days indisposition and gets on with his work in the king’s service proves that he had been in Babylon all the time and that his presence in Susa was merely visionary.” (1979, p.130)

In summary:

- (1) For the Daniel-having-the-vision, vs. 2-26 are one hazôn and one mar'ê;
- (2) For the Daniel-in-the-vision, vs.3-12 are a hazôn, and so is vs9-12, as indicated by vs.13 (that is to say, the word hazôn can apply to the *whole* vision or just a *part* of it);
- (3) There are therefore two hazôns in Dn8—one experienced by the real Daniel and comprises the whole chapter; and the second one experienced by the Daniel-in-the-vision, comprising verses 3-12.
- (4) What is vs.15-26 for the Daniel-in-the-vision? Is it mar'ê? Is it hazôn? Is it both? Is it neither, but only explanation? It cannot be hazôn for the Daniel-in-the-vision, because his hazôn had finished at verse 12. There is only one answer: Dn9:21 definitely calls vs.15-26 hazôn, and so it is, but for the Daniel-having-the-vision. For the Daniel-in-the-vision it is a continuation of the appearance of Gabriel – a mar'ê. This position clearly shows that for these texts, the two words are synonymous.
- (5) What does the mar'ê in v.16 refer to? It has to be a mar'ê seen by the Daniel-in-the-vision. But what is a mar'ê in ch8 for the Daniel-in-the-vision? It refers to what Gabriel makes the Daniel-in-the-vision to understand, that is, the hazôn. This conclusion shows that the two words are synonymous in this verse.

It will be seen that this categorisation accepts the concepts that mar'ê applies to the appearance of personal beings and that hazôn applies to a broader form of visual, auditory and cognitive communications. Unfortunately, this explanation gives no support to the lexical theories of QOD, Shea or Hasel. It rather supports the position taken by the bulk of Bible translators when they render these two words into contemporary language by the one word “vision.”

## **Appendix No.2 The meaning of the phrase “the vision of the evening and the morning.”**

There are certain qualifications in this statement of verse 26 that help us to identify what Gabriel is referring to.

1. It is associated with the time periods of evening and morning.
  - a. This could be the vision of vs.3-12 if the time period refers to the whole vision;
  - b. It could refer to the vision of vs10-12 if the time period refers to the activities of the little horn;
2. It is a thing that was *spoken* to him as opposed to *shown* him.
  - a. This would limit it to the information contained in vs13-25, if it refers to *all* the visionary material that was *spoken*.
  - b. It could limit it to the discussion of the time period in vs.13-14, since the time period is the answer to the question of verse 13.
3. If we ask ourselves what the time period of the evening and the morning refers to in the vision, we must answer it by saying that it is the answer to the question of verse 13. If we ask ourselves the next question, as to what the content of the question is about, then of course this becomes a sticky one with SDA historicists, since they

want to make it refer to the whole vision. The grammar of the question however, indicates that the scope of the question refers to that section of the vision which deals with the items listed in the question; that is to say, vs.10-12.

4. Since therefore, the question deals with the items of vs.10-12, the time period deals with the period that these events will have an effect; ie., there will be a period of time before things are returned to what they were before the activities of the little horn. That time period will continue for 2,300 evenings and mornings.
5. Consequently, the phrase “vision of the evening and the morning” refers, not to the whole vision, but to the activities of the little horn. And Gabriel assures Daniel that those terrible events will occur. God will not step in to prevent it. They are true.

### **Appendix No.3 The incidence of the word “vision” in the Old Testament.**

The following is a list of all the references of the incidence of the English word “vision” in the King James Version of the Bible. They are listed according to Young’s Concordance, and any other useful texts not translated as “vision” of that particular word will be noted at the end of the entries for that Hebrew word. I have given the transliterations just as they appear in Young.

#### **CHESEV.**

#### **“Vision”**

Dn 2:19 Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night **vision**. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven.

2.28 But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the **visions** of thy head upon thy bed, are these;

4.5 I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the **visions** of my head troubled me.

4.9 O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the **visions** of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof.

4.10 Thus were the **visions** of mine head in my bed; I saw, and behold, a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great.

4.13 I saw in the **visions** of my head upon my bed, and, behold a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven;

7.1 In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and **visions** of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.

7.2 Daniel spake and said, I saw in my **vision** by night, and, behold, the four wins of the heaven strove upon the great sea.

7.7 After this I saw in the night **visions**, and behold, a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.

7.13 I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

7.15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the **visions** of my head troubled me.

## CHAZON

### “Vision”

1.Sa. 3.1 And the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli. And the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open **vision**.

1.Ch.17.15 According to all these words, and according to all this **vision**, so did Nathan speak unto David.

2Ch.32.32 Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold, they are written in the **vision** of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, and in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel.

Ps.89.19 Then thou spakest in **vision** to thy holy one, and sadist, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out the people.

Prov.29.18 Where there is no **vision**, the people perish: but he that kept the law, happy is he.

Isa.1.1 The **vision** of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The fact that Isaiah lists this vision occurring during the reign of all these kings, indicates that this word is intended to compass the entire book of his writings, and not just one vision during that time. This is further evidence that this word can have visions as subparts, which I argue is the sense of the word in Dn8:13 where it refers to just a section (vs.10-12) of the overall vision of Dn8. The Chronicler takes the same view, where he refers to the entire writings of Isaiah as one vision.



- 29.7 And the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her munitions, and that distress her, shall be as a dream of a night **vision**.
- Jer.14.14 Then the Lord said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false **vision** and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.
- 23.16 Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a **vision** of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord.
- Lam.2.9 Her gates are sunk into the ground; he hath destroyed and broken her bars: her prophets also find no **vision** from the Lord.
- Eze.7:13 For the seller shall not return to that which is sold, although they were yet alive: for the **vision** is touching the whole multitude thereof, which shall not return; neither shall any strengthen himself in the iniquity of his life.
- 7.26 Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour shall be upon rumour; then shall they seek a **vision** of the prophet; but the law shall perish from the priest, and counsel from the ancients.
- 12.22 Son of man, what is the proverb that ye have in the land of Israel saying, The days are prolonged, and every **vision** faileth?
- 12.23 Tell them therefore, Thus saith the Lord God; I will make this proverb to cease, and they shall no more use it as a proverb in Israel; but say unto them, The days are at hand, and the effect of every **vision**.
- 12.24 For there shall be no more any vain **vision** nor flattering divination within the house of Israel.
- 12.27 Son of man, behold, they of the house of Israel say, The **vision** that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of the times that are afar off.
- 13.16 To wit, the prophets of Israel which prophesy concerning Jerusalem, and which sees **visions** of peace for her, and there is no peace, saith the Lord God.
- Dn.1.17 As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and wisdom: and Daniel had understanding in all **visions** and dreams.
- 8.1 In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a **vision** appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.

- 8.2 And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in **vision**, and I was by the river of Ulai.
- 8.13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the **vision** concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot.
- 8.15 And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the **vision**, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.
- 8.17 So he came near 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; for at the time of the end shall be the **vision**.
- 8.26 And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the **vision**; for it shall be for many days.
- 9.21 Yea, whilst I was speaking in prayer even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the **vision** at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.
- 9.24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the **vision** and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.
- 10.14 Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the **vision** is for many days.
- 11.14 And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the **vision**, but they shall fall.
- Hos.12.10 I have also spoken by the prophets, and I have multiplied **visions**, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the prophets.
- Obad.1 The **vision** of Obadiah. This saith the Lord God concerning Edom; We have heard a rumour from the Lord and an ambassador is sent among the heathen, Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle.
- Mic.3.6 Therefore night shall be unto you, and ye shall not have a **vision**; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them.

Nah.1.1 The burden of Nineveh. The book of the **vision** of Nahum the Elkoshite.

Hab.2.2 And the Lord answered me, and said, Write the **vision**, and make it plain upon the tables, that he may run that readeth it.

2.3 For the **vision** is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry.

### **CHAZOTH** (Hebrew)

#### **“Vision”**

2Ch.9.29 Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Silonite, and in the visions of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat?

### **Other incidents of CHAZOTH** (Aramaic)

#### **“Sight”**

Dn4:11(8) The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the **sight** thereof to the end of all the earth.

4:20(17) The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, whose height reached unto the heaven, and the **sight** thereof to all the earth.

### **CHAZUTH**

#### **“Vision”**

Isa.21.2 A grievous **vision** is declared unto me; the treacherous dealer dealeth treacherously, and the spoiler spoileth. Go up, O Elam: besiege, O Media; all the sighing thereof have I made to cease.

29.11 And the **vision** of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed.

## Other incidents of CHAZUTH

### “Agreement”

Isa, 28.18 And your covenant with death shall be annulled, and your **agreement** with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.

### “Notable” (marg, “sight”)

Dn.8:5 And as I was considering, behold, an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a **notable** horn between his eyes.

### Notable one”

Dn8.8 Therefore the goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four **notable ones** toward the four winds of heaven.

## CHIZZAYON

### “Vision”

2 Sa.7.17 According to all these words, and according to all this **vision** so did Nathan speak unto David.

Job.4.13 In thoughts from the **visions** of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men,

7.14 Then thou scarest me with dreams, and terrifiest me with **visions**;

20.8 He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found: yea, he shall be chassed away as a **vision** of the night.

33.15 In a dream, in a **vision** of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings on the bed;

Isa.22.1 –The burden of the valley of **vision**. What aileth thee now, that thou art wholly gone up to the housetops?

22.5 For it is a day of trouble, and of treading down, and of perplexity by the Lord God of hosts in the valley of **vision**, breaking down the walls, and of crying to the mountains.

Joel 2.28 And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see **visions**:

Zech.13.4 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his **vision**, when he hath prophesied; neither shall they wear a rough garment to deceive:

## MACHAZEH

### “Vision”

Gen.15.1 After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abram in a **vision**, saying Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and they exceeding great reward.

Num.24.4 He hath said, which heard the words of God, which saw the **visions** of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open:

Eze.13.7 Have ye not seen a vain **vision**, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say, The Lord saith it; albeit I have not spoken?

## MARAH

### “Vision”

Gen.46.2-4 And God spake unto Israel in the **visions** of the night, and said, Jacob, Jacob. And he said, Here am I.

And he said, I am the God, the God of thy father: fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation:

I will go down with thee into Egypt; and I will surely bring thee up again: and Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eyes.

Num.12.6-8 Here now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a **vision**, and will speak unto him in a dream.

My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house.

With him I will speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold: wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?

1.Sa.3.15 And Samuel lay until the morning, and opened the doors of the house of the Lord. And Samuel feared to shew Eli the **vision**.<sup>23</sup>

Eze.1.1 Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, in the fifth day of the month, as I was among the captives by the river Chebar, that the heavens opened, and I saw **visions** of God.

In the fifth day of the month, which was the fifth year of King Jehoiachin's captivity, the word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi....

8.3 And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the **visions** of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the inner gate that looketh toward the north; where was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy.

40.2 In the **visions** of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city on the south.

43.3 And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw, even according to the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city: and the **visions** were like the vision that I saw by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face.

Dan.10.7 And I Daniel alone saw the **vision**: for the men that were with me saw not the **vision**; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves.

10.8 Therefore, I was left alone, and saw this great **vision**, and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength.

10.16 And behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my lord, by the **vision** my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.

---

<sup>23</sup> From this text we see that the word "vision" here not only applies to the personal appearance of God, but it also applies to the message given. In fact, from the request of Eli the following morning, we can assume that it was the message that was important, not who the visitor was and what he looked like etc. In a similar vein, "vision" in Dn9:23 and Dn10 et passim, refers to the message that followed rather than limiting it to just the appearance of a heavenly being.



## Other incidents of MARAH

### “Looking-glass”

Ex.38.8 And he made a laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the **looking glasses** of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

## MAREH

### “Vision”

Eze.8.4 And behold, the glory of the God of Israel was there, according to the **vision** that I saw in the plain.

11.24 Afterwards the spirit took me up, and brought me in a **vision** by the spirit of God into Chaldea, to them of the captivity. So the **vision** that I had seen went up from me.

43.3 And it was according to the appearance of the **vision** which I saw, even according to the **vision** that I saw when I came to destroy the city: and the visions were like the **vision** that I saw by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face.

Dan.8.16 And I heard a man’s voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the **vision**.

8.26 And the **vision** of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.

8.27 And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king’s business; and I was astonished at the **vision**, but none understood it.

9.23 At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the **vision**.

10.1 In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the **vision**.

## Other incidents of MAREH

### “Appearance”

Num.9.15 And on the day that the tabernacle was reared up the cloud covered the tabernacle, namely, the tent of the testimony: and at even there was upon the tabernacle as it were the **appearance** of fire until the morning.

9.16 So it was always: the cloud covered it by day, and the **appearance** of fire by night.

Eze.1.5 Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their **appearance**; they had the likeness of a man.

1.13 As for the likeness of the living creatures, their **appearance** was like burning coals of fire, and like the **appearance** of lamps; it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning.

1.14 And the living creatures ran and returned as the **appearance** of a flash of lightning.

1.16 The **appearance** of the wheels and their work was like unto the colour of beryl: and they four had one likeness: and their **appearance** and their work was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel.

1.26 And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of the throne, as the **appearance** of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the **appearance** of a man above upon it.

1.27 And I saw as the colour of amber, as the **appearance** of fire round about within it, from the **appearance** of his loins even upward, and from the **appearance** of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the **appearance** of fire, and it had brightness round about.

1.28 As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake.

8.2 Then I beheld, and lo, a likeness as the **appearance** of fire: from the **appearance** of his loins even downward, fire; and from his loins even upward, as the **appearance** of brightness, as the colour of amber;

10.1 Then I looked, and, behold, in the firmament that was above the head of the cherubims there appeared over them as it were a sapphire stone, as the **appearance** of the likeness of a throne.

- 10.9 And when I looked, behold the four wheels by the cherubims, one wheel by one cherub, and another wheel by another cherub: and the **appearance** of the wheels was as the colour of a beryl stone.
- 10.10 “And as for their **appearances**, they four had one likeness, as if a wheel had been in the midst of a wheel.
- 10.22 And the likeness of their faces was the same faces which I saw by the river Chebar, their **appearances** and themselves: they went every one straight forward.
- 40.3 And he brought me thither, and, behold, there was a man, whose **appearance** was like the **appearance** of brass, with a line of flax in his hand, and a measuring reed; and he stood in the gate.
- 41.21 The posts of the temple were squared, and the face of the sanctuary; the **appearance** of the one as the **appearance** of the other.
- 42.11 And the way before them was like the **appearance** of the chambers which were toward the north, as long as they, and as broad as they; and all their goings out were both according to their fashions, and according to their doors.
- 43.3 And it was according to the **appearance** of the vision which I saw, even according to the vision when I came to destroy the city: and the visions were like the vision that I saw by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face.
- Dn.8:15 And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the **appearance** of a man.
- 10.6 His body also was like the **appearance** of lightning, and his eyes as the lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude.
- 10.18 Then there came again and touched me one like the **appearance** of a man, and he strengthened me.
- Joel 2.4 The **appearance** of them is as the **appearance** of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run.

### “beautiful”

- Esth.2.7 And he brought up Hadassah, that is, Esther, his uncle’s daughter: for see had neither father nor mother, and the maid was fair and beautiful; whom

Mordecai, when her father and mother were dead, took for his own daughter.

### “beauty”

Isa. 53.2 For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

### “countenance”

Judg.13.6 Then the woman came and told her husband, saying, A man of God came unto me, and his countenance was like the countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God, very terrible: but I asked him not whence he was, neither told he me his name.

1 Sa. 16.7 But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.

17.42 And when the Philistine looked about, and saw David, he disdained him: for he was but a youth, and ruddy, and of fair countenance.

2 Sa.14.27 And unto Absalom there were born three sons, and one daughter, whose name was Tamar: she was a woman of a fair countenance.

Song. 2.14 O my dove, that art in the clefts of the rock, in the secret places of the stairs, let me see thy countenance, let me hear thy voice; for sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is comely.

5.15 His legs are as pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold: his countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars.

Dan.1.13 Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the children that eat the portion of the king's meat: as thou seest, deal with thy servants.

1.15 And at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat.

### “Fair”

Esth.1.11 To bring Vashti the queen before the king with the crown royal, to shew the people and the princes her beauty: for she was **fair** to look upon.

2.2 Then said the king's servants that ministered unto him, Let there be **fair** young virgins sought for the king,

2.3 And let the king appoint officers in all the provinces of his kingdom, that they may gather together all the **fair** young virgins unto Shushan the palace, to the house of the women, unto the custody of Hege the king's chamberlain, keeper of the women; and let their things for purification be given them.

### **“Form”**

Job. 4.16 It stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying...

### **“Pattern”**

Num.8.4 And this work of the candlestick was of beaten gold, unto the shaft thereof, unto the shaft thereof, unto the flowers thereof, was beaten work: according unto the **pattern** which the Lord had shewed Moses, so he made the candlestick.

### **“Sight”**

Gen.2.9 And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the **sight**, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Exod. 3.3 And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great **sight**, why the bush is not burnt.

24.17 And the **sight** of the glory of the Lord was like the devouring fire on the top of the mount: and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights.

Lev.13.3 And the priest shall look on the plague in the skin of the flesh: and when the hair in the plague is turned white, and the plague in **sight** be deeper than the skin of his flesh, it is a plague of leprosy: and the priest shall look on him, and pronounce him unclean.

13.4 If the bright spot be white in the skin of his flesh, and in **sight** be not deeper than the skin, and the hair thereof be not turned white; then the priest shall shut up him that hath the plague seven days;

13.20 And if, when the priest seeth it, behold, it be in **sight** lower than the skin, and the hair thereof be turned white; the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is a plague of leprosy broken out of the boil.

- 13.25 Then the priest shall look upon it: and, behold, if the hair in the bright spot be turned white, and it be in **sight** deeper than the skin; it is a leprosy broken out of the burning: wherefore the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is a plague of leprosy.
- 13.30 Then the priest shall see the plague: and, behold, if it be in **sight** deeper than the skin; and there be in it a yellow thin hair; then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is a dry scall, even a leprosy upon the head or beard.
- 13.31 And it the priest look on the plague of the scall, and, behold, it be not in **sight** deeper than the skin, and there is no black hair in it; then the priest shall shut up him that hath the plague of the scall seven days;
- 13.32 And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the plague: and behold, if the scall spread not, and here be in it no yellow hair, and the scall be not in **sight** deeper than the skin;
- 13.34 And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the scall: and behold, if the scall be not spread in the skin, nor be in **sight** deeper than the skin; then the priest shall pronounce him clean: and he shall wash his clothes, and be clean.
- 14.37 And he shall look on the plague, and, behold, if the plague be in the walls of the house with hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, which in **sight** are lower than the wall...
- Deut.28.34 So that thou shalt be mad for the **sight** of thine eyes which thou shalt see.
- 28.67 In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! And at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! For the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.
- Job.41.9 Behold, the hope of him I in vain: shall not one be cast down even at the **sight** of him?
- Eccl.6.9 Better is the **sight** of the eyes than the wandering of desire: this is also vanity and vexation of spirit.
- 11.9 Rejoice, young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the **sight** of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God shall bring thee into judgment.

Isa.11.3 And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the **sight** of the eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of the ears:

**“Visage”**

Isa.52.14 As many as were astonished at thee: his **visage** was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men

**“Apparently”**

Num.12.8 With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even **apparently**, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold; wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?

**“Appear” 1**

**“Goodly” 1**

2 Sa.23.21 And he slew an Egyptian, a **goodly** man: and the Egyptian had a spear in his hand; but he went down to him with a staff, and plucked the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and slew him with his own spear.

**“Seem”**

Nah.2.4 The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways, they shall **seem** like torches, they shall run like lightnings.

**“To Look on”**

Gen.12.11 And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman **to look upon**...

24.16 And the damsel was very fair **to look upon**, a virgin, neither had any man known her: and she went down, to the well, and filled her pitcher, and came up.

26.7 And the men of the place asked him of his wife; and he said, She is my sister: for he feared to say, She is my wife; lest, said he, the men of the place should kill me for Rebekah; because she was fair **to look upon**.

2 Sa.11.2 And it came to pass in an eveningtide, that David arose from off his bed, and walked upon the roof of the king's house: and from the roof he saw a woman washing herself; and the woman was very beautiful **to look upon**.



Esth.1.11 To bring Vashti the queen before the king with the crown royal, to shew the people and the princes her beauty: for she was fair **to look upon**.

**“to look to”**

Lev.13.12 And if the leprosy break out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of him that hath the plague from his head even to his foot, wheresoever the priest **looketh**;

Eze.23.15 Girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes **to look to**, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity.

**“as soon as”**

Eze.23.16 And **as soon as** she saw them with her eyes, she doted upon them, and sent messengers unto them into Chaldea.

**“To see to”**

Josh.22.10 And when they came unto the borders of Canaan, the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh built there an altar by Jordan, a great altar **to see to**.

**ROEH**

**“Vision”**

Isa.28.7 But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in **vision**, they stumble in judgment.

**RAAH**

**“Vision”**

2.Ch.26.5 And he sought God in the days of Zechariah, who had understanding in the **visions** of God: and as long as he sought the Lord, God made him to prosper.

## Bibliography

- Archer, Gleason,**  
1985           “Daniel,” in The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, with the New International Version of the Holy Bible in Twelve Volumes, Volume 7: (Daniel – Minor Prophets), Grand Rapids, Michigan: Regency Reference Library.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles A.,**  
1983 (1906)    The New Brown – Driver – Briggs Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. (No Location of Printer): Christian Copyrights, Inc.
- Charles, R. H.,**  
1927           The book of Daniel, Introduction, Revised Version with Notes, Index and Maps. London: T.C & E. C. Jack.
- Collins, John J.,**  
1993           Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, in *Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible Series*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Elliger, K et Rudolph (Eds.),**  
1984           Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, Stuttgart, Deutschland: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Goldstein, Clifford,**  
1988           1844 Made Simple, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.  
1994           “The Significance of Daniel 8:14,” *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.11-17.  
2003           Graffiti in the Holy of Holies, an impassioned response to recent attacks on the sanctuary and Ellen White, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- Hasel, Gerhard F.,**  
1974           “Revelation and Interpretation in Daniel,” *Ministry*, Oct.: Washington, D.C: Review and Herald, pp.20-23.  
1976           “The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27,” insert in the *Ministry*, May, Washington, D.C: Review and Herald Publishing Association.  
1977           “The First and Third Years of Belshazzar,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol.15, pp. 153-168.  
1979           “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Daniel,” *Ministry*, January, pp.9-11.  
1980           The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27 Paper prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.  
1981a          The ‘Little Horn,’ the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8, in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner, (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.  
1981b          “The Book of Daniel: Evidences Relating to Persons and Chronology,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Spring, Vol.19, No.1, pp.37-49.

- 1986a "Fulfillments of Prophecy." in, The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series volume 3. Frank Holbrook (Ed.) Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
- 1986b "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in, The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series volume 3. Frank Holbrook (Ed.) Washington, D.C; Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
- 1986c "Establishing a Date for the Book of Daniel," in Symposium on Daniel, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series Volume 2, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1986d "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8: 9-14, in Symposium on Daniel, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series Volume 2, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1987 "The Rise and Wane of Biblical Authority," *Adventist Perspectives*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp.8-16.
- 1992 "2300 Days: The Message of the Prophecy of Daniel 8, *Adventists Affirm*, Fall, pp.5-9, 11.
- 1992 "Is the 'Little Horn' Antiochus?" *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.10-18, 35.
- 1992 "How Our Pioneers Discovered the Sanctuary Doctrine," *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.19-28.
- 1993a "Who are the Remnant?" *Ministry*, Fall, pp.5-13, 31.
- 1993b "The Hebrew Masculine Plural for 'Weeks' in the Expression 'Seventy Weeks' in Daniel 9: 24," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Summer, 1993, No.2, pp.105-118.
- Jastrow, Marcus,**  
1950 A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalemi, and the Midrashi Literature, New York: Pardes Publishing Inc.
- Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F.,**  
1978 (1872) Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Daniel: Translated from the German by James Martin.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter**  
1994 The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, subsequently revised by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E. J. Richardson, Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Mansell, Donald Ernest,**  
2002 Open Secrets of the Antichrist: has the beast of Bible prophecy identified himself? Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,**  
1961 Doctrinal Discussions: a compilation of Articles originally appearing in *The Ministry*, June, 1960 – July, 1961, in answer to Walter R.

Martin's book, *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald.

**Pfandl, Gerhard,**

2004a "Daniel," *Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide*, Oct-Dec, 2004, Warburton, Australia: Signs Publishing Co.

2004b Daniel: The Seer of Babylon, Hagerstown, M.D.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

**Porteous, Norman,**

1979 Daniel, A Commentary, Second, Revised, Edition, Old Testament Library, London: SCM Press.

**Seventh-day Adventists, (Full Title of Author: A Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors),**

1957 Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief., Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957. (Note: For convenience. the author's name is limited to Seventh-day Adventist and the title is its common short form –Questions on Doctrine).

**Shea, William H.,**

1980 *Daniel and the Judgment*, Paper prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

1981 *The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9*, in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner, (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1982 Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation, (Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Volume 1), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1986 "The Prophecy of Daniel 9: 24-27," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series volume 3, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.) Washington, D.C; Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

1996 Daniel 7-12, (Prophecies of the End Time), *The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier*, George R Knight, General Editor, Boise, Idaho and Oshawa, Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

2003 "Historicism, the best Way to Interpret Prophecy," *Adventist Affirm*, Spring, 2003, pp.22-34.

**Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux,**

1952 (1846) Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament Scriptures, translated with additions and corrections from the author's thesaurus and other works, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

1883 Remarks on The Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel, (with Notes on Prophetic Interpretation in Connection with Popery, and a Defence of the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel, sixth Edition, London: Hunt, Barnard & Co.