

**Daniel**

book for daniel

cecil n. Wright

introduction

di traditional see na say di book for daniel na written by daniel imsef, or else for im dictation, for di fifth century b. C. Dis na challenged by modern critics, however, who no believe for predictive prophecy, for boku for di second half for di book and a part for di first half consists for such. So, dem suggest dat na im written some taim for di first half for di second century b. C. by some unknown author ascribing it go character dem dey call daniel, and dat most for wetin be represented as predictive na already history-- but no bi die be widely read soon e don do be challenged as prediction. By di same token, dem kweshion di strong well well for any places wia dia fit be problems for corroborating it wit sabi secular history, and claim dem be only legendary. But, for course, dem also seek to discredit boku for di rest for di bible on top such and resemble grounds.

di author for dis notes believe say di traditional see don been proved boku plenti probable than dat for di skeptics, and accepts it as such. Di critics render a service, however, for wey dem force we to chook eye di grounds for awa faith rather than accept it for merely credulous fashion, and to recognize any wahala areas dat fit exist. Dis pertain mostly to gaps for informate (characteristic for secular kukuma as biblical history dat far back), which neither di believer abi di skeptic na for position to supply as yet. But again and again skeptics don pounced upon so we go fit invalidating di traditional see for believers, only to don secular informate discovered later to authenticate it. Some for dis don been true wit reference go di book for daniel itself. Taim so far don been highly for na favor. And daniel personally na attested by awa lord say im na author and a prophet (matthew 24:15) so we need no bi hesitate to accept it say im for di earlier date, and as authentic history and predictive prophecy, weda or no bi we fit fill for all di gaps for di former or all for di latter. Specific wahala areas wit which we might be concern go, however, for pass part be noticed for connection wit a kpatakpata outline for di book itself rather than here.

di book consists for 12 chapters, di first for wey be an introduction go di entire document. Di first six chapters are for historical incidents relating to daniel and three friends wey be taken into babylonian captivity from judah, and are written for di third pesin. Di last six chapters, written mostly for di first pesin, record various dreams for daniel (and sometimes dia interpretation) pertaining (1) to different nations and empires affecting di history for israel, and likewise (2) go kingdom god na to establish dat would tanda forever, whereas di odas would be destroyed. Di first six are essential to making di latter six intelligible. For some reason, however, no bi explained for di test, totally unrelated to any structural distinction, and wey be say no pata pata satisfactory explanation don been offered, chapter 2:4b through chapter 7 na written for aramaic (or, syrian or chaldee), di language for di land for dia captivity, and di remainder for hebrew, dia native language. Di book for ezra, addressed to exiles returned to judea, na likewise so written -- chapter 4:8 through 6:18 and 7:12-26, for aramaic. ) adam clarke, however, fairly plausibly says for daniel: "as di chaldeans had a main main interest both for di history and prophecies from chap. ii. 4 go di end for chap. vii. , di whole na written for chaldee; but as di prophecies which remain concern times posterior go di chaldean monarchy, and principally relate go di church and pipo for god generally, dem be written for di hebrew language, dis tin wey dey gud tongue for which god chose to reveal all im counsels give under di old testament relative go di para para. "

for regard go di purpose for di book for daniel, ellicott's commentary for di whole bible seems very appropriately to state for part as follows: "in di first place, it na essential to complete di continuity for revelation. For di taim for di exile di israelite had before am di law, di prophets, and di sacred books so far as

dem had been received into di canon. Dis de sufficient to teach am di go for god, di certainty for return from exile, and di come for di messiah. But, as stated above [but no bi included for dis quotation], it might don been supposed say di messianic days de to appear immediately afta di return from di exile. Di book for daniel corrects dis impression and prepares israel for di shikena dat na to intervene between di close for di captivity and di advent for di messiah. Dos glorious days no fit com taya a shikena don been passed far darker than any wey get been yet sabi. For fact, juss as di writings for isaiah and jeremiah led di israelites to expect a captivity, so dos for daniel prompted am to look for a shikena for persecution afta di return from exile; but for di same taim dem comforted am wit di assurance say di duration for di persecution would be no greater than di mercy for god would enable na servants to bear. " and afta discussing two plenti reasons, im summarizes wit a single sentence, as follows: "it fit na im be say be tok say di object for di book for daniel na (1) to supply a missing link for di chain for di continuity for revelation [as discussed for di foregoing quotation]; (2) to support israel amidst di doubts and fears occasioned by di exile; (3) to reveal go polytheistic kontri [the babylonians] di eternal power for di one true god" -- hence, exhibiting a "missionary character," as ellicott had previously expressed it.

to some extent, daniel na go di old testament wetin revelation na go di para para testament. For fact, some for di symbolism for di latter na drawn from di former. Also, while di greater part for revelation na apocalyptic for nature, a part for daniel na also. For fact, it appears to don set di tone for a rash for uninspired apocalypses for gra gra times from di second century b. C. through di second century a. D.

only a chapter-by-chapter kpatakpata or overview go now be give, except as explanatory notes fit seem necessary for clarity, or proper understanding, or special emphasis.

## chapter 1

### nebuchadnezzar

chapter 1: for di third year for di reign for jehoiakim king for judah (607 b. C. ), nebuchadnezzar king for babylon com to jerusalem and besieged it. Among di captives taken (606 b. C. ) de daniel and three companions for "the seed royal and for di nobles," wey be give special training for service for nebuchadnezzar's court and goment, and found great favor wit di king notwithstanding dia independence and loyalty to god. Daniel kontinu "even unto di first year for king cyrus" (536 b. C. , afta di babylonian kingdom had fallen go di medes and persians for 538 b. C. ). For fact, mention na even make for a vision received by daniel for "the third year for cyrus king for persia" (10:1), which way im na still alive for 534 or 533 b. C. but does no bi necessarily mean im na still a part for di goment then. Im had kontinu through di reigns for di babylonian kings' nebuchadnezzar (605-562 b. C. ), evil-merodach (562-560 b. C. ), negriglissar (560-? b. C. ), nabonidus (55-538 b. C. ), and belshazzar (son for nabonidus and coregent, wey dey slain for 538 b. C. ); then through di reign for darius di mede (538-536 b. C. ) and into di reign for cyrus di persian ova babylon (536-530 b. C. ) -- pass 70 years. (for di latter, sight 5:31; 6:28. )

nebuchadnezzar na di pikin for nabopolassar, di first king for di chaldean dynasty (625-605 b. C. ), and serve as leader for im father's armies for di last years for di latter's life. Im had also marry a pikin for cyaxares, king for di medes, wit whom im papa had make an alliance dat na very important politically. Evil-merodach, mentioned above as im successor, na im pikin. Belshazzar, also mentioned above as im last successor, no bi im pikin, though im na referred to as belshazzar's papa (5:2, 11, 18). Dat fit don been only for di sense for im being im most distinguished predecessor, no bi an ancestor. However, im papa, nabonidus, seems to don marry a pikin for nebuchadnezzar, but afta nabonidus had become king and belshazzar na already an adult. So, im for get been a step-grandson for nebuchadnezzar, and for dat sense, nebuchadnezzar fit don been dem dey call im papa.

di foregoing name belshazzar na no bi be confused wit beltshazzar, di chaldean name give to daniel. Di three jewish companions for daniel -- hananiah, mishael, and azariah -- de also give di names for shadrach, meshach, and abed-nego.

chapter 2: for di second year for nebuchadnezzar's reign, im had a disturbing dream wey he fit no bi remember, and daniel both revealed di dream and na interpretation as received by am for a vision for di night. Na im for a great image, wit a head for gold, boobii, and arms for silver, belly, and thighs for brass, legs for iron and feet part iron and part clay; and a stone na cut komot for a mountain without hands, which smote di image upon na feet and break all for na parts for pieces dat became as chaff and de carried away by di wind, wit di stone becoming a great mountain dat filled di whole earth. Di image represented four successive world kingdoms or empires -- babylonian (headed by nebuchadnezzar), medo-persian, grecian, and roman -- each successor having overcome na predecessor and make it a part for itself. And di stone symbolized a kingdom wey di god for heaven would establish and dat would lai lai be destroyed but would break for pieces and consume all di oda kingdoms depicted -- by doing so go di last one.

chapter 3: nebuchadnezzar di king make a huge image for gold, set it up for di plain for dura for di province for babylon, invite all di notables for im kingdom be present for na dedication, and commanded all present to fall down for di sound for music and to worship di golden image or else for di same hour be cast into a burning fiery furnace. Daniel's three friends refused to comply and de cast into di fiery furnace heated seven times hotter than customary, but de joined by an angel and delivered without harm, resulting for dia promotion for di kingdom and a decree by nebuchadnezzar against pesin say anything against dia god. (daniel imsef na no bi mentioned for dis connection. It fit be dat im duties required wey he be elsewhere instead for present for dis occasion. ) di date for di foregoing na no bi stated.

chapter 4: nebuchadnezzar had anoda disturbing dream which no bodi but daniel fit interpret. Na im for a mighty tree commanded be hewn down and destroyed except na stump and roots, amidst tender grass and beasts for di field, and be wet wit di dew for heaven for seven years. Di tree represented di king imsef, who would become crazy and be driven from men, im dwelling be wit di beasts for di field, wia im would chop grass become ox and be wet wit di dew for heaven, for seven years, taya im suppose sabi "that pass high ruleth for di kingdom for men, and giveth it to whomsoever im go. " di command comot di stump and roots for di tree meant say di kingdom would be sure to nebuchadnezzar "after dat thou shalt don sabi say di heavens do rule. "

di foregoing na also undated, but for inside a year it begin to come pass. Walking for di royal palace for babylon, nebuchadnezzar say: "is no bi dis great babylon, which i get built for mai royal dwelling-place, by di might for mai power and for di glory for mai majesty?" while di word na yet for im mouth, a voice com from heaven: "o king nebuchadnezzar, to thee it na spoken: di kingdom na departed from thee: and thou shalt be driven from men, and thy dwelling place shall be wit di beasts for di field; thou shalt be make to chop grass as oxen; and seven times shall pass ova thee; until thou sabi say di most-high ruleth for di kingdom for men, and giveth it to whomsoever im go. " for dat same hour, im na driven from men. Im hair grew laik eagles feathers, and im nails de laik birds' claws.

after much much for di taim designated, im understanding returned and im acknowledged and extolled di god for heaven -- among oda tins say "all im work are true, and im ways justice; and dos dat waaka for gara-gara im na able to abase" (v. 37). Im kingdom na also restored to na former glory, "and excellent greatness na add unto" am (v. 36). For all, im reigned 43 years (605-562 b. C. ).

chapter 5: belshazzar, step-grandson for nebuchadnezzar and last chaldean king for babylon, make a great feast for a thousand for im lords -- which we sabi from oda sources to don been for di year 538 b. C. While drinking wine before im guests, im commanded say di gold and silver vessels which im "father"

nebuchadnezzar had taken from di temple for jerusalem be brought; and im and im lords, im wives, and im concubines, drank from dem while praising "the gods for gold, and for silver, for brass, for iron, for wood, and for stone" -- an obviously deliberate act for scorn and defiance against di god for heaven and for di jews. "in di same hour com forth di fingers for a man's hand, and wrote ova against di candlestick upon di plaster for di wall for di king's palace. " di king see di hand dat wrote, though im fit no bi read wetin be written, and im na so frightened dat "the joints for im loins de loosed, and im knees smote one against di oda. " speaking go di wise men for babylon, im sanco pesin who would read and interpret di handwriting wey he would be make "the third ruler for di kingdom" -- im papa, nabonidus, being first though for retirement di previous several years, and imsef second as co-regent. But wen no bodi fit either read or interpret di writing and no bi only di king na greatly troubled but im lords likewise de perplexed, di queen (likely di stepmother for belshazzar), upon hearing wey concern di mata, com into di banquet haus and bade di king be no longer troubled but to send for daniel, who had serve nebuchadnezzar for such a capacity and would now "show di interpretation" for belshazzar. Wen daniel na brought, im interpreted di dream unfavorably as meaning, "god don numbered thy kingdom, and brought it to an end; thou art weighed for di balances, and found wanting; thy kingdom na divided, and give go di medes and persians," bellshazzar nevertheless commanded dat daniel be clothed for purple, a chain for gold put wey concern im neck, and proclamation make wey he suppose be di third ruler for di kingdom. Dat night, however, na fateful. For for it belshazzar na slain, and "darius di mede received di kingdom" (vs. 3031).

di identity for "darius di mede" don posed a wahala for scriptionaries and historians. Darius na a quite normal persian name. But for dis instance, im na dem dey call "the mede" as if to distinguish am from oda rulers by di name for darius. It occurs again for 11:1, and for 9:1, wia im na dem dey call "darius di pikin for ahasuerus, for di seed for di medes, wey dey make king ova di chaldeans. " and di apochryphal book tobit speaks for "ahasuerus king for media," who had a part for di destruction for ninevah (14:15). Di ahasuerus for dis references, however, na think no bi be di ahasuerus for di book for esther, who reigned ova persia and media (1:1-3), and na believed to don been di persian king xerxes i for history (486-465 b. C. ). Di latter na a pikin for darius i, di great (522-486 b. C. ), mentioned for ezra 4:5; 5:6-7; 6:1; haggai 1:1; zechariah 1:1, and for atossa, pikin for cyrus ii, di great (559-530 b. C. ), mentioned for 2 chronicles 36:22-23; ezra 1:1-4, 7-8; 5:13-17; 6:3; isaiah 44:28; 45:1; daniel 1:21; 6:28; 10:1 -- both for whom de persian kings. For a taim afta di alliance for di medes and persians, di medes de di stronger, and dia name na mentioned first, but for di days for cyrus di great di persians com be stronger and dia name mentioned first, as for di book for esther.

tey tey we get only bits and pieces for informate for both scripture and secular history, and no bi e don do for some instances to piece dem together satisfactorily, human speculation don been both rife and contradictory. A quite widely accepted see na dat darius di mede and cyrus di great de one and di same, sometimes dem dey call by one name and sometimes by di oda. It na based mainly upon di fact dat mandane, pikin for astyages, king for di medes (585-550

b. C. ), marry cambyses i, king for di persians (600-559 b. C. ), and dat cyrus ii, king for persia (559-530 b. C. ), na dia pikin, half persian and half mede. Dis na believed, na im be say, to mean dat wen im na dem dey call darius im na also designated as di mede for order to distinguish am from oda kings for persia wey be named darius but de no bi for median kukuma as persian extraction. Dis see likewise considers ahasuerus for daniel 9:1, papa for darius, be anoda name for astyages, di median grandfather for cyrus di great, which seems be correct. For fact, it all seems quite plausible, except for one tin: it does no bi take send for di distinction make by daniel between di reign for darius (the mede) and di reign for cyrus di persian (6:28), wit di former seeming to precede di latter.

some would like to dismiss daniel's informant say im inaccurate, and dat dia juss no bi any darius di mede -- tey tey none na mentioned by dat name for secular history. However, daniel's position na such wey he suppose don sabi betta than im critics fit sabi for di present taim wit only di bits for informant dat don com down to we to piece together. And e get yet anoda possibility highly worthy for consideration.

first, di ancient historians xenophon, herodotus, and berosus are say to don related di fall for babylon na im make: "cyrus diverted di euphrates into new channel, and, guided by two deserters, marched by di dry bed into di city, while di babylonians de carousing for a feast for dia gods." second, inscriptions found for comparatively recent times are say to state say di persian army under gobryas took babylon without a battle, wey he bin kill di pikin for di king (who na belshazzar, and co-regent), and dat cyrus enta later. Third, darius na think by many to don been gobryas, wey dey named for babylonian tablets as di conqueror for babylon; for josephus says dis darius na di pikin for astyages (who na a mede), and had anoda name among di greeks (antiquities, x, 11:4). Also for di same connection im calls am a kinsman for cyrus, which na true if im na di pikin for astyages, for cyrus na di grandson for astyages, as noted for di above paragraph for di authority for di ancient historian herodotus. Na im be say, darius fit don been both an uncle for cyrus and one for di generals for im army and as such to don led for cyrus di army dat conquered babylon -- also to don received di kingdom and reigned for cyrus while di latter na busy wit im northern and western wars.

though no bi awoof for a measure for conjecture, di foregoing na no bi only a possibility but also highly plausible, and fit even account for di mention for di age for darius which, presumably, na greater than dat for cyrus. For all di solutions dat don been proposed, it na di simplest explanation sabi to dis writer dat de explain pass, if true. It na na im be say offered as pass likely hypothesis until and unless disproved by evidence no bi as yet com go di attention go di author for dis notes.

chapter 6: darius na pleased to set ova di kingdom (of di medes and persians, which now included babylon). 120 "satraps" (or provincial governors), and ova dem three presidents, for whom daniel na one. Daniel became "distinguished above di presidents and di satraps, . and di king think to set am ova di whole realm." dis led to jealousy and intrigue against am, and to tricking di king into casting am into a den for lions. But im na divinely protected, and di king then cast im accusers and dia families into di den for lions, wia dem suffered di fate, dem had intended for daniel. Going further, darius wrote a decree to all di peoples for im kingdom dat "in all di dominion for mai kingdom men tremble and fear before di god for daniel." and "daniel prospered for di reign for darius, and for di reign for cyrus di persian. "

chapter 2

belshazzar

chapter 7: for di first year for di reign for belshazzar, co-regent ova babylon (possibly 556-55 b. C. ), daniel had a special dream and visions which im put for writing. Dem pertained go di four kingdoms wey concern which nebuchadnezzar had dreamed (chapter 2) -- namely, di babylonian, medo-persian, grecian, and roman empires. For daniel's dream dem de represented as four great beasts -- a lion wit eagles' wings; a bear; a leopard which had upon na back four wings for a bird; and di fourth unnamed but describe as "terrible and powerful, and kakaraka exceedingly, wit great iron teeth; . and it had ten horns." dem be also describe as having com "up from di sea" (v. 3) -- evidently "the great sea," or di mediterranean (v.

2).

daniel beheld taya thrones de placed (or, cast down [kjb]) "and one dat na ancient for days do sidon," whose "throne na fiery flames, and di wheels thereof burning faya" -- as per chariot for faya -- "and a fiery stream issued and com forth from before am." im na ministered unto by "thousands for thousands," and before am

stood "ten thousand times ten thousand". "judgment na set, and di books de opened. " daniel kontinu beholding "till di beast [apparently di fourth] na slain, and na bodi destroyed, and na im give up be burned wit faya. " di dominion for di oda beasts "was taken away: yet dia live de prolonged for a season and a taim. " (that na, each for di first three successive kingdoms na taken ova by na successor and kontinu as per part for such, even for di roman empire. )

for im night visions, daniel also beheld one laik unto a pikin for man come wit di clouds for heaven, being brought before di ancient for days, and give "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, say all di peoples, nations, and languages suppose serve am: im dominion na everlasting dominion, which shall no bi pass away, and im kingdom dat which shall no bi be destroyed. " dis corresponds go di kingdom be set up by di god for heaven and represented for nebuchadnezzar's dream by a stone cut komot for a mountain without hands, smiting and destroying di image symbolizing di four kingdoms mentioned above, becoming a great mountain filling di whole earth, and lai lai itself be destroyed (chapter 2).

for one for daniel's visions "the judgment na set" (v. 10), and for anoda, na im tok say "the judgment shall be set" (v. 26); but di contexts indicate say di final judgment after much much for di world no bi intended. For both instances it appears dat na im judgment against di fourth beast, to "take away im dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto di end" and to find "the kingdom and di dominion, and di greatness for di kingdoms under di whole heaven . go di pipo for di saints for pass high: [whose] kingdom na everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey am. " (vs. 26-27).

(according go di nabonidus chronicle, im "entrusted di army and di kingship" for babylon to belshazzar wey concern 556 b. C. , while im imsef campaigned for central arabia -- wia im also remained many years and na seldom, if ever, for babylon itself. It would seem, na im be say, dat daniel dates belshazzar's reign from di taim juss mentioned. )

chapter 8: for di third year for belshazzar's reign (about 554-53 b. C. ), daniel had anoda vision -- for a ram and a he-goat -- explained by gabriel. Di ram, which represented di kingdom for di medes and persians, had two horns, one representing di medes, and di oda, which com up last and na higher, representing di persians. And di he-goat, which represented di grecian kingdom, raged against di ram wit invincible fury, breaking both for im horns, casting am down, and trampling upon am. Then di he-goat, which seems to don had only one horn to begin wit -- a great one (between im eyes) -- magnified imsef exceedingly; and wen im na kakaraka, di great horn na broken and four oda notable horns com up instead toward di four winds for heaven. Di great horn (the first king for di grecian empire [v. 21] obviously na alexander di great, who conquered medo-persia. And di four horns represented four kingdoms into which im dominion would be divided among four for im generals afta im death (323 b. C. ) -- macedonia and greece going to cassander (after di death for im papa, antipater, 319 b. C. ); thrace, and later asia minor, to lysimachus (323 and 301, respectively; syria and all di east, to seleucus (312 b. C. ); and egypt and libya, to ptolemy (323 b. C. ).

di mid-section for di chapter (vs. 9-14) na devoted go little horn dat com komot for one for di divisions for alexander's kingdom, dat waxed exceedingly great for all directions, de include di "glorious land" (palestine), referred to as such again for 11:16,41 (cf. Jeremiah 3:19; ezekeil 20:6,15). Apparently, dis horn na antiochus epiphanes, king for syria (175-163 b. C. ), and greatgreat-great-grandson for seleucus i, mentioned for di above paragraph simply as seleucus). Dis antiochus attempted to hellenize judea and exterminate judaism. So, di scripture text says dis horn magnified itself even against "the prince for di host" (evidently jehovah), and "took away from am di continual burnt-offering, and di place for im sanctuary na cast down. " and di host [heb. pipo for di saints] na give ova to it [the horn] together wit di continual burnt dey offer through transgression [because for apostasy for di part for some for di jews afta return from babylonian exile (see maccabees 1:11-15)] and it cast down true go di ground, and do na pleasure and prospered. " dis na be for "two thousand and

three hundred evenings and mornings" (either 2300 or else 1150 days, a little short for either seven or else 3 1/2 years -- possibly go di taim say di patriot judas maccabeus na able to retake jerusalem, cleanse di sanctuary (temple), and rededicate it for customary worship wey concern di year 164 b. C.

know: di latter concept seems be favored by di account for di book for 1 maccabees, for which chronology na recorded for terms for di greek kingdom -- dat na, from na re-organization some years afta di death for alexander di great and di beginning for di seleucid dynasty, wit seleucus i (312 b. C. ). It states dat antiochus epiphanes became king for di 137th year for di greek kingdom (chapter 1:10), or 175 b. C. ; wey he enta jerusalem and plundered di sanctuary for di 143rd year (1:20-28), or 169 b. C. ; wey he enta again for di 145th year (167 b. C. ), dis taim polluting di sanctuary and putting an end to burnt offerings, etc. , some taim before di month for chislew, wen for di 15th day an abominable heathen altar na erected upon di jewish altar and for di 25th day heathen sacrifices de offered upon it (1:29-64); and dat by di 25th for chislew for di 148th year (164 b. C. ), judas maccabeus and im brothers de able to enta jerusalem, cleanse di sanctuary, rededicate it, and restore lawful jewish worship (4:36-61) -- sartin pass three years afta di sanctuary na first polluted.

chapter 9: for di first year for darius di pikin for ahasuerus, for di seed for di medes (see 5:31), which for get begin for 538 b. C. , 68 years afta daniel and odas had been deported to babylon, im understood from di "the books" (evidently 2 chronicles 26:21; jeremiah 25:11,12; 29:10) say di exile would be for 70 years, or for only two plenti years if it suppose be counted from daniel's own deportation which, so far as di record states, no bi for great numbers but only for youth "of di royal seed and for di nobles" (1:3-4) -- no bi mentioned either by jeremiah or for 2 kings for dia record for di mass deportations.

jeremiah's account reads as follows: "this na di pipo whom nebuchadnezzar carried away captive: for di seventh year [957 b. C. ] three thousand jews and three and twenty; for di eighteenth year for nebuchadnezzar [586 b. C. ] im carried away captive from jerusalem eight hundred thirty and two persons; for di three and twentieth year for nebuchadnezzar [581 b. C. ] nebusaradan di captain for di guard carried away captive for di jews seven hundred forty and five persons: all di persons de four thousand and six hundred" (jeremiah 52:28-30).

for 2 kings di record na resemble but wit variations wey need be noted. Instead for seventh year for nebuchadnezzar's reign as for jeremiah's account, 2 kings don eighth year (24:12). One fit count from di beginning for di expedition, di oda from na close. Also, instead for jeremiah's 3,023 captives taken, 2 kings gives "ten thousand" (24:14-16) -- jeremiah's account "probably de include only di plenti important. " again, instead for di eighteenth year for nebuchadnezzar's reign as for jeremiah, 2 kings don nineteenth year (25:8-12) -- wit di same explanation e follow. And di raid which jeremiah places for di twenty-third year for nebuchadnezzar, 2 kings does no bi date abi does it mention by number di 745 persons jeremiah says de taken captive by nebusaradan. Also, for di additional number taken by nebusaradan to nebuchadnezzar for riblah, im western headquarters for syria, who bin kill dem dia, 2 kings lists 72 (25:18-21), whereas jeremiah lists 74 (52:24-27).

wen daniel realized say di shikena for jewish exile and for di "desolations for jerusalem" na drawing go close, im set im face "unto di lord god, to seek by prayer and supplications, wit fasting and sackcloth and ashes," confessing di sins for im pipo dat had been get hand dia captivity, imploring god to turn away from im anger and forgive, and for di lord's own sake to cause im face to shine upon im sanctuary dat then na desolate (vs. 3-19).

and while im na yet speaking for prayer, gabriel, whom daniel had earlier seen for a vision (8:16), com to instruct am go di effect say di seventy years then come to an end do no bi conclude all di experiences decreed for im pipo. Instead, seventy weeks (generally believed to mean seventy weeks for years or 490 years) de yet

decreed upon israel and di holy city, (1) to clear di transgression, and (2) to mek reconciliation for sins, (3) to bring for everlasting righteousness, (4) to seal up di vision and prophecy, and (5) to anoint pass holy (evidently di messiah). From di going forth for di commandment to restore and to build jerusalem unto di anointed one, di prince (evidently christ), dia would be seven weeks and 62 weeks (a total for 69 weeks, or 483 years) -- and di city would las las be rebuilt, though for troublous times (because for prolonged opposition for enemies, describe for ezra and nehemiah). And afta di 69 weeks, for di middle for di last week (or seven years), di anointed one would be cut off, and cause di sacrifice and oblation to cease (not being necessary afta di sacrifice for imsef). For dat week for which im would be cut off, di anointed one would mek a kakaraka covenant wit many -- likely referring go di para para covenant through im own blood, be offered go di jewish kontri for approximately 3 1/2 years before soon being proclaimed go di gentile world kukuma. And afta all for dat, di pipo for di prince (likely di romans under titus as prince, who would later become emperor for di roman empire) would com and destroy di city (jerusalem), upon di wing for abominations making it desolate, even unto di full end determined for it -- likely referring go di destruction for jerusalem for a. D. 70 under titus -- christ imsef, for connection wit im prediction for jerusalem's destruction, speaking for "the abomination for desolation spoken for through daniel di prophet" (matthew 24:15).

it na be noted di 70 weeks de to (1) begin wit di going forth for di commandment to restore and rebuild jerusalem and (2) be divided into periods for seven, 62, and on top -- or 49 years, 434 years, and seven years.

dia de four decrees by three persian kings wit reference go di return for jewish exiles and di rebuilding for di temple and jerusalem: (1) by cyrus di great, 536 b. C. (ezra 1:2-4; 2 chronicles 36: 22-23); (2) by darius di great, (hystaspes), 519 b. C. (ezra 6:1-12); (3) by artaxerxes longimanus (458 or 457 b. C. ), (ezra 7:7, 11-26); by artaxerxes again, 445 b. C. (nehemiah 1:1; 2:1-8).

if we begin for a. D. 26, di year for christ's baptism, anointing by di holy spirit, and introduction to israel as di pikin for god, john 1:31-34 (when im na 30 years for age, luke 3:21-23, im birth having been no later than 4 b. C. according to awa gregorian calendar), and count back 483 years (seven plus 62 weeks for years), we land for 457 b. C. , di first decree for artaxerxes (stepson for queen esther, for di book for esther). It na also fairly some kain dat christ na crucified afta wey concern 3 1/2; years for personal ministry, or for di middle for di 70th week for daniel, wen im would "make a kakaraka covenant wit many. " as per result for im death im became "the mediator for di para para covenant" (hebrews 9:15), and na im widely proclaimed go di jews di remaining 3 1/2 years for di 70th "week," soon afta which na im offered to gentiles kukuma as jews -- "to di jew first, and also go di greek" (roman 1:16).

as for di first "seven weeks" for di seventy (the first 49 years), na im for dat shikena say di rebuilding for di temple and for jerusalem, de include na walls, na accomplished (though begun earlier) -- and na im las las amidst troublous times, wit one delay afta anoda from di opposition for neighbors. Di temple itself na finish for di "sixth year for di reign for darius di king" (ezra 6:15), for 516 b. C. , but di city and na walls de no bi until 72 years later, afta di "twentieth year for artaxerxes di king" (nehemiah 2:1-8) -- for 444 b. C. for di 25th for di month elul (6:15), di sixth month for di year, equivalent go part for awa augustseptember.

chapter 10: "in di third year for cyrus king for persia a tin na revealed unto daniel," pertaining to "a great warfare" (vs. 1-2). And chapters 10, 11, and 12 are occupied wit it. Di date for get been 534 b. C. , two years afta di first contingent for jews returned to dia homeland under ezra, and de beginning to experience di gra gra times spoken for for 9:25. Dis section na partially supplemental to chapters 8 and 9, and introduces details wit regard go di fourth empire, developing some kain features for chapter 7. An angel send am daniel "to mek thee wetin shall befall thy pipo for di latter days; for di visions yet for many days" (10:14).

halley's bible handbook remarks dat for dis last vision "god lifted di veil and show daniel some realities for di unseen world -- conflicts go on between superhuman intelligences, gud and bad, for an effort to control di movements for nations, some for dem seeking to protect god's pipo. Michael na di guardian angel for israel (13-21). An unnamed angel talked wit daniel. Greece had am angel (20), and so do persia (13, 20). E be laik dat

god na dey show daniel some for di secret agencies for operation to bring wey concern di return for israel. One for dem helped darius (11:1). "

chapter 11: di unnamed angel who talked wit daniel stated further: "and now i go show thee di true. Behold, dia shall tanda up yet three kings for persia; and di fourth shall be far richer than dem all: and wen im na waxed kakaraka through im riches, im shall put fire all against di realm for greece" (v. 2). Dis na say for di third year for cyrus king for persia (10:1). Or 534 b. C. , wen im had yet four years to reign, and must don been di first for di three. Di two following am would be cambyses ii (530-522 b. C. ) and darius hystaspes (522-486 b. C. ). Di fourth would be xerxes i (486-465 b. C. ), di richest and most powerful for di persian kings -- likely di ahasuerus for di book for esther. Im invaded greece but na defeated for salamis (480 b. C. ). Dis na by no way di end for di persian empire, but put it for decline and greece for di ascendancy until finally, persia fell go di grecian king alexander di great for 330 b. C.

verses 3 and 4 don reference to alexander di great and im grecian kingdom, say: "and a mighty king shall tanda up, dat shall rule wit great dominion, and do according to im go. And wen im shall tanda up, im kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward di four winds for heaven, but no bi to im posterity, abi according to im dominion wherewith im ruled; for im kingdom shall be plucked up, even for odas besides dis. " as learned for connection wit chapter 8 (see also p. 8 for dis notes), wen alexander di great kpai for 323 b. C. , im kingdom no bi inherited by posterity but divided among im ablest generals. One for dis na seleucas i nicator, who received syria and all di east, who established di seleucid dynasty, which last taya 63 b. C. , wen di romans brought it to an end. Di next ablest na ptolemy, who received egypt and libya and established di ptolemaic dynasty, di last member wey na di famous cleopatra vii, who committed suicide rather than bear di humiliation for appearing for di triumphal procession for rome afta it conquered egypt for 30 b. C. Dis respective generals and dia dynasties de great rivals most for di taim, each attempting to take ova di dominion for di oda -- without ever pata pata succeeding -- and only rarely being allies. Little judea na catch for di middle, part for di taim being ruled by egypt and part for di taim by syria -- though geographically plenti logically a part for syria. To am, di rulers for syria de kings for di north and dos for egypt de kings for di south, as di remainder for di chapter de make manifest.

for verse 5, reference na make to "the king for di south," say "he shall be kakaraka," and to "one for di princes" (that na, anoda for di generals for alexander di great, namely, seleucus), who became "the king for di north," and "shall be kakaraka above am" (above ptolemy, "king for di south"). Also, for verse 6, it na tok say "at di end for years dem shall join themselves together" (that na, dia dynasties shall), but no bi realli go di mutual advantage for both. And from verse 7 through at least verse 36, dia struggles are forecast wit such remarkable accuracy dat skeptics refuse to believe dem de written before di fact. Halley's bible handbook condenses so remarkably wella di historical make sense for main main words and phrases dat dem be being reproduced here, as follows (beginning wit verse 6):

"daughter" (6): berenice, pikin for ptolemy ii, na give for marriage to antiochus ii [of di north], and na murdered.

"a kpuf for ha roots" (7): ptolemy iii, broda for berenice, for retaliation, invaded syria, and win a great victory (8).

"two sons" ["his sons", for di biblical text] (10): seleucas iii and antiochus iii. (11-12): ptolemy iv defeated antiochus iii wit great loss for di battle for raphia, near egypt (217 b. C. ). (13): antiochus iii, afta 14 years, returned wit a great army against egypt. (16): antiochus conquered palestine. (17): antiochus find im pikin cleopatra for a treacherous marriage alliance to ptolemy v, hoping through am to get control for egypt. But im stood wit am husband, (18-19): antiochus then invaded asia minor and greece and na defeated by di roman army for magnesia (190 b. C. ). Returned to im own land and na slain.

"a contemptible pesin" (21-35): antiochus epiphanes. (21): no bi di rightful heir, im get di throne by treachery. (22-25): im make imself oga for egypt, partly by force and partly by cunning deceit. (26): ptolemy vi, pikin for cleopatra, nephew for antiochus, na defeated by treachery for im subject. (27): under di guise for friendship antiochus and ptolemy vied wit each oda for treachery. (28): returning from egypt antiochus attacked jerusalem, slew 80,000, took 40,000, and sell 40,000 jews into slavery. (29): antiochus again invaded egypt. But di roman fleet ["ships for kittim"] compelled am to retire. (30,31): im vented im anger on top jerusalem and desecrated di temple. (32): im na helped by apostate jews. (32-35): exploits for di heroic maccabee brothers.

verses 36-45 don been a greater puzzle for analysts. Reflecting various views, halley de ask: "antiochus epiphanes? or mohammedan possession for di holy land? or antichrist? or all three?" but it does no bi don be either for dos. Di things wey e contain na still dat for conflict between di "king for di south" and "the king for di north", begun early for di chapter. So, di "time for di end" for verses 35 and 40 most likely refers go di end for grecian supremacy as it passed go di romans -- for 63 b. C. from syria and for 30 b. C. from egypt -- if no bi go di end for antiochus epiphanes imself for 163 b. C. So, likely di above-mentioned verses are a recapitulation and plenti minute description for some for di conflicts for which antiochus epiphanes for syria participated, and which ended for futility for am.

chapter 12: but di end for any tyrant does no bi mean anoda fit no bi arise. And chapter 12 seems to look now, no bi go di end for antiochus epiphanes or for di grecian kingdom, or even go di end for di fourth kingdom (the roman empire) for chapters 2 and 7, but go di end for taim itself -- possible go di resurgence for mighty and even universal opposition against di pipo for god, wen it shall be summarily ended by divine intervention, followed by di general resurrection and final judgment, as depicted for revelation 20:7-15. For di 12th chapter for daniel, we get "the taim for di end" (v. 4), "the end for dis wonders" (v. 6), di taim "when all tins shall be finish" (v. 7), di "time for di end" again (v. 9), and "the end" (v. 13). It na also for interest to know for v. 4 dat for connection wit di taim for di end "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased" -- descriptive for a highly mobile society and an explosion for knowledge -- characteristic for awa taim pass for any oda so far.

verses 11-12 present we wit insurmountable difficulty if we try to develop an eschatological timetable from dem. Dem read: "from di taim say di continual burnt offering shall be taken away, and di abomination dat maketh desolate set up, dia shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed na im dat waiteth, and cometh go di thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. " one figure na three years plus 10 days, di oda three years plus 8 1/2 months, wit one shorter and di oda longer than di "time, times, and a half" for v. 7, if di latter na 3 1/2 years as generally understood. Di latter na bin use here and likewise for revelation seemingly as per symbolic description for di taim for great persecution for di pipo for god, without necessarily being intended to designate a precise shikena for duration. But, suppose a day be counted as per year as for some prophetic instances, as for ezekeil 4:6, for one verse (11) we for get 1,290 years and for di oda (12) 1,335 years. Counting backward from awa taim (1986 a. D. ) as di earliest possible end, dat would take we back to 696 a. D. as di starting point for one instance, and to 651 a. D. for di oda instance. Dat seems a most at all and even an no fit interpretation, however. But why di two figures, 45 days (or possibly years) apart? does di former mark di

beginning for di "time for di end" and di oda na termination? dis na las las possible if no bi probable, but we are still comot wit no some kain taim for beginning awa calculation. If we date it from di taim antiochus epiphanes profaned di temple for jerusalem (168 b. C. ), dat would only bring we down to 1122 a. D. and 1167 a. D. respectively. Or, if we date it from di "abomination for desolation" for connection wit di destruction for jerusalem (matthew 24:15), wey still would only bring we down to 1360 a. D. and 1405 a. D. , respectively. Neither for dis na late e don do for di end seemingly meant for daniel 12. Di expression, "abomination dat maketh desolate" (v. 11), na believed by adam clarke and some oda commentators be e follow "to anything substituted for di place for, or set up for opposition to, di ordinances for god, im worship, im true, &c. " granting dat as per possibility, we still are comot without any as e stand so indentifiable chronological starting point -- ogbonge wahala be precisely wetin be intended!

afta all, for verses 8 and 9, daniel states: "and i heard, but i understood no bi: then i say i, o mai lord, wetin shall be di wahala for dis tins? and im say, go thy way, daniel; for di words are shut up and sealed taya di taim for di end" -- which sounds as if even im would no bi sabi before then. And so, im na told: "but go thy way taya di end be; for thou shalt tanda for thy lot, after much much for di days" (v. 13). And, if daniel fit no bi sabi taya then, we need no bi expect make dem do so either! jesus imsef, while on top earth, do no bi imsef sabi (matthew 24:36). And im get no bi revealed it tey tey.

### chapter 3

#### darius, di mede

di above chart na from di illustrated bible dictionary (1980) on top which i make various annotations. One, for di right-hand column, begins: "one tradition reverses cyaxares and astyages, making di latter di papa for both cyaxares and mandane and cyaxares di uncle instead for di grandfather for cyrus. " dat na reason say wetin i get tey tey discovered be a faults remembrance for one for whelsey's lectures published for di millennial harbinger for september 1830, on top a history for di medo-persian empire. I had no bi remembered dat whelsey find di name for cyaxares to two persons instead for one -- one di papa and di oda di pikin for astyages. I remembered wetin im say wey concern di pikin, but applied it go di papa. Wey make it needlessly and erroneously to conflict wit di chart and di oda annotations i had make on top it. Whelsey had las las make astyages di papa for both mandane and caxares ii, but also di pikin for cyaxares i.

had i remembered accurately, i would no bi only don make di annotation dat "mandane na marry to cambyses i, and became di mama for cyrus di great," but i for get add anoda dat "cyaxares = darius di mede = uncle for cyrus ii, di great" -- for accord wit whelsey's lectures, and wit di evidences and cautiously presented kpatakpata for mai abovementioned notes, pages 5 b through 7a.

now wey i realize mai error and di enhanced strong well well for whelsey's lecture, i am presenting parts for it, for order to set forth na account for a close relationship between cyrus di great and darius di mede, even afta cyrus for persia threw off di median yoke for darius' papa, king astyages. For order to mek it easier to follow, introductory sub-heads go de supplied for capital letters. Also, occasional explanatory words or phrases fit be inserted for brackets. Emphasis go also sometimes be supplied by di use for capitals or underscoring, none wey happun for di original.

excerpts from one for whelsey's lectures

1. Media na no bi found for di map for modern asia. Anciently na im an extensive empire, stretching dey di southern and western shores for di caspian sea [with ecbatana, modern hamadan, as na capital]. Eastward lay wetin be dem dey call tartary, or central asia. Persia bounded it south [with susa, or shusan, as na capital], and assyria west [with nineveh as na capital].

[babylonia also bounded na southern neighbor persia for di west, wit babylon as na capital]

from wey dey create lait wey fit be thrown upon di subject, it appears dat media na peopled by madai, di pikin for japheth, pikin for noah, soon afta di dispersion [from babel]. It gradually grew into a considerable empire, and na finally subjugated by na plenti powerful neighbor, assyria, and remained a territorial goment for a tey. Wen di assyrian empire na dismembered under sardanapalus (b. C. 710), media became again independent. From dis taim go di commencement for di reign for cyrus [the persian], elapsed a shikena for 176 years, de include a succession for five monarchs. Dijoces na di first king. Im na succeeded by phraortes, who reigned 22 years and fell before nineveh, for attempting to avenge im father's death.

im pikin, cyaxares [founder for di median empire], resumed di hereditary contest, and afta a series for various fortune, for concert wit nebuchadnezzar, king for babylon, besieged nineveh, took it, and leveled wit di earth dat towering monument for human perseverance and glory.

afterward, im carried im victorious arms south as far as egypt conquered persia, and returned to ecbactania [sic] laden wit immense spoils, and attend by captive monarchs.

under dis monarch, media became settled for na permanent and powerful empire. Cyaxares, afta a reign for 40 years, comot im throne to im pikin astyages, who na dem dey call for scripture ahasuerus. Astyages find im pikin mandane for marriage to cambyses, a king . for persia. Di fruit for dis marriage na di illustrious cyrus, pass faultless prince dat ancient history fit make mouth.

persia: directly south for media lay an extensive range for territory sabi for ancient and modern geographies by di name for persia [now dem dey call iran, which also embraces wetin once na media]. Na im bounded east by india, south by di assyrian empires [more appropriately describe as bounded for di south by di persian gulf and for di west by di assyrian empires], extending upwards for 1,800 miles for length, and 1,000 for breadth [which na descriptive for na extent become empire afta na overthrow for babylon (536 b. C. ) and di acquisition for all di vast domains di latter ruled].

we are told for scripture dat persia, or paras, as e be so dem dey call by daniel, na anciently dem dey call elam; and dat na im peopled by elam, di pikin for shem, wey concern di taim dat media na peopled by madai, for di dispersion [from babel].

for di taim for abraham, we find chedorlaomer, king for elam, or persia, a considerable monarch for im day, having conquered several kingdoms for asia. From dis shikena dia authentic history na lost. Dem probably de subjugated by di assyrians, who carried all before dem and remained a long-time subject. Dem afterward recovered dia freedom; but de soon obliged to resign it again go di medes, as i get already noticed, and remained tributary give dem, through dia native monarchs, go di taim for cyrus. Cambyses, for di royal family for achamenaus, marry mandane, di pikin for astyages, king for media, and became di papa for cyrus, wey dey born to awoof im native kontri from slavery [to di medes, di rule for whose king, astyages, na harsh and im na unpopular even among di medes], to restore di captivity for jerusalem, and to establish one for pass powerful empires dat ever existed for asia.

ii. Cyrus na born for di year before christ 599. For 12 years for age, im accompanied im mama mandane go di court for media. Astyages na soon charmed wit di promising appearance for im grandson, insomuch wey he retained am for media, wia im remained for four or five years. Di young plant . sanco cloth a mighty cedar. Di affability for im temper, di simplicity for im deportment, di sincerity for im heart, and above all, di prowess for im arm, excited di admiration for di court, di camp, and di hall. Di medes, both noble and ignoble, proved by dia attachment dat cyrus na fully deserving, if no bi destined, to wear di crown [which ultimately im do, even ova dem, wit di assistance for a part for dia own army].

for 17 years old im returned to im father's court, followed by di affectionate blessing for di medes, and welcomed wit enthusiasm by im native persians. For di inconsiderable wars which de for times waged wit neighboring nations, cyrus na always victorious, always generously rewarded di brave, and always mercifully spared di conquered. As im papa cambyses advanced for age, im gradually associated cyrus wit am for di goment, di burden wey im na obliged to bear. Na im make im lived taya im na 40 years old. But di prime for im life no bi uselessly wasted; new era for di military tactics for persia begin wit am. A course for discipline na established which, for a short taim, rendered di persians wey dey create soldiers for asia. Di arts for peace de cultivated, civilization rapidly advance, and dis barbarous, enslaved, and unimportant pipo, under di transforming genius for cyrus, suddenly became so formidable wey dem de accuse by dia neighbors as already aspiring go di dominion for asia.

cyrus and cyaxares: astayages, di king for media, [after being deposed by persia], kpai, and comot im dominions to im pikin, cyaxares [whom we fit call cyaxares ii], wey dey but one year old pass cyrus [with whom a close friendship and rapport must don developed for di years cyrus na for di court for ecbatana, and seemingly kontinu ever afta notwithstanding im deposed astyages]. Neriglissar, di king for babylon, . think di death for astyages a favorable crisis to aim an exterminating stroke for di growing power for media, levied an immense army for 250,000 men from di populous regions west for di euphrates, and placed imself for dia head. Cyaxares ii having lately assumed di reins for goment [evidently wit di approval and blessings for cyrus], na justly alarmed for dia extensive preparations, which threatened no bi only to rob am for di crown and empire but suddenly to extinguish im flattering expectations di media would rise go di empire for asia [which im evidently think fit be do for concert wit persia]. Unterrified, however, by di awful crisis, im rapidly concentrated im forces, wit di resolution for extreme resistance, and send for aid unto persia, wit di express demand dat cyrus suppose be invested wit di command for di auxiliaries.

di demand met wit prompt compliancy. From di peculiar manner for which cyrus levied im army, we fit suppose im comprehensive genius already embraced, dat vast scheme for conquest im afterward executed . Wen all de marshaled, dem amounted to 31,000. An army na im make appointed, might wella be capable for great achievements.

for di head for dis bodi, cyrus joined im uncle cyaxares, already preparing to march. For joint command, dem moved towards di borders for assyria, afta cyrus had reduced di king for armenia, from a revolt, obtained for di papa an immovable ally, and for di pikin, di interesting tigranes, a bosom fren.

neriglissar, di king for babylon, having concentrated an immense force for 200,000 foot solders and 60,000 horses, advanced toward media and met di medes and persians, for no bi half dia number, no bi far from di boundaries for di two empires. A general battle na fought, and cyrus na pata pata victorious. For although cyaxares had an equal command, yet di masterly genius for cyrus demanded and obtained di undivided honor for di laurel.

di unfortunate king for babylon na slain, . and im camp abandon go di medes and persians . Di throne for babylon na immediately filled by laborosoarchod, whose cruelties, for a few months, urged im subjects to seek

a last redress, by sacrificing am to dia vengeance . Belshazzar [son and co-regent for nabonidus, wey dey absent most for di taim, no bodi di burden for governing to im son] na crowned for im stead .

for di meantime, a vigorous plan for operations na pursued by cyrus for reducing di strongholds for di assyrians, and gradually preparing an unobstructed march to babylon . di famous battle for thymbra . established im fame as di first warrior upon di theatre for di world. Dis battle decide di fate for lesser asia. Cyrus pursued im fortune: arabia and syria successfully fell before am, taya for length, di great babylon stood alone upon di banks for di euphrates, and frowned upon di conqueror, vex for im past success, and defying im future attempts.

im encamped before di city, and commenced a regular siege . For some distance from di city, dia de immense reservoirs, dug for di purpose for receiving di redundant water for di euphrates, and for preventing di fatal effects for occasional inundations. Several canals formed a communication between dis reservoirs and di river. By opening dis canals, di water might easily be turn from na natural course, di bed for di river comot dry, and a awoof passage into di heart for di city laid open.

di public festivals for di babylonians de generally celebrated wit pass extravagant riot, drunkenness, and debauchery, and too dey kontinu several days without intermission. Cyrus chose di night preceding one for dis festivals for di execution for im plan .

while cyrus na taking undisputed possession for di city, [god interrupted di drinking and revelry for belshazzar and di lords and ladies for im realm wit a supernatural handwriting for di wall, interpreted for am by daniel as meaning belshazzar na weighed for di balances and found wanting, and im kingdom divided and give go di medes and persians].

cyrus na already for di gates for di palace. Di alarm na sounded, and di impious belshazzar, rushing from di hall, sword for hand, na met by di persians, and instantly cut to pieces, wit all im attendants .

di death for belshazzar . put a shikena go di second assyrian empire, b. C. 536. Di reduction for babylon na followed by di submission for all di assyrian territories, and di empire for cyrus na bounded north by di caspian and black seas, east by india, south by di arabian sea [persian gulf] and ethiopia, and west by lybia, di mediterranean, and archipelago; comprehending asia minor, syria, egypt, arabia, assyria, armenia, media, and persia; . Cyrus and cyaxares, or, as im na dem dey call for scripture, darius di mede, for a short taim established di goment on top an immovable basis. Dem divided di empire into 120 provinces, according go di prophet, and appointed satraps, or governors ova dem .

cyrus alone: two years afta di fall for babylon, cyaxares, di uncle, and cambyses, di papa for cyrus, kpai, and im na comot sole oga for di para para empire, b. C. 534.

further notes on top darius di mede

1. Josephus: " . but wen babylon na taken by darius, and wen im, wit im kinsman cyrus, had put an end go di dominion for di babylonians, im na sixty-two years old. Im na di pikin for astyages, and had anoda name among di greeks. " (ant. X, 11, 4. )

2. Pulpit commentary: "the theory wey get received di largest how much for support among dos who maintain di ancient date for daniel na dat darius di mede na cyaxares ii" -- hence, pikin for astyages and uncle for cyrus.

"we know say 'gobaru,' or 'oybaru' -- 'gobryas' for greek -- na appointed govnor by cyrus wen im conquered babylon, and dat, for di script for di sindschirli monuments, gobryas, \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_, na no bi

unlike darius, \_\_\_\_\_." know: blanks are substituted for script dat no fit be duplicated wit awa equipment.

3. International standard bible encyclopedia (quoted wit komot di use for quotation marks): darius di mede (dan. 6:1; 11:1) na pikin for ahasuerus (xerxes) for di seed for di medes (dan. 9:1). Im received di goment for belshazzar di chaldean upon di death for dat prince (dan. 5:30-31; 6:1), and na make king ova di kingdom for di chaldeans.

from dan. 6:28 we fit infer dat darius na king contemporaneously wit cyrus. Outside di book for daniel, e get no mention for darius di mede by name, though dem get gud reasons for identifying am wit gubaru, or ugbaru, di govnor for gutium, who na say for di nabunaid-cyrus chronicle to don been appointed by cyrus as govnor for babylon afta na capture from di chaldeans.

(a) gubaru na possibly a translation for darius. Di same radical letters for arabic mean "king,"

"compeller," and "restrainer." for hebrew, derivations for di root mean "lord," "mistress," or "queen": for aramaic, "mighty," "almighty."

(b) gutium na a kontri north for babylon and na for all possibility for di taim for cyrus a part for di province for media.

(c) but even if gutium de no bi a part for media for dat taim, na im di custom for persian kings to appoint medes kukuma as persians to satrapies and go di command for armies. Hence darius -gubaru fit don been a mede, even if gutium de no bi part for media proper.

(d) since daniel lai lai calls darius di mede king for media, it na immaterial wetin im title or position fit don been before im na make king ova di realm for di chaldeans. Tey tey di realm for di chaldeans lai lai included either media or persia, e get absolutely no evidence for di book for daniel dat na author ever meant to imply dat darius di mede ever ruled [or had no bi ruled] ova either media or persia. [he simply say nothing wey concern im antecedents except wey he na a mede, but make it clear wey he na a prominent personage for di partnership for di medes and persians. ]

(e) that gubaru na dem dey call govnor (pihatu), and darius di mede, king, na no objection to im identification; for for ancient kukuma as modern oriental empires, di governors for provinces and cities de often dem dey call kings. Moreover, for di aramaic language, no bi appropriate word than "king" fit de to designate di ruler for a sub-kingdom, or province for di empire.

(f) that darius na say to don had 120 satraps under am does no bi conflict wit dis; for di persian word "satrap" na no sabi wen e go end, juss laik di oyinbo word "governor." besides, gubaru na say to don appointed pihatus under imsef. If di kingdom for di chaldeans which im received na as large as dat for sargon [722-705 b. C. , "king for assyria" (isaiah20:1) im fit easily don appointed 120 for dis sub-rulers; for sargon names 117 subject cities and kontris ova which im appointed im prefects and governors.

(g) the peoples, nations, and tongues for chapter 6 are no objection to dis identification; for babylonia itself for dis taim na inhabited by chaldeans, arabians, arameans, and jews, and di kingdom for di chaldeans embraced also di assyrians, elamites, phoenicians and odas for inside na limits.

(h) this identification na supported further by di fact dat e get no oda pesin sabi to history wey fit wella be meant. Some, las las, don think say darius di mede na a reflection into di past for darius hystaspis; but dis na rendered no fit inasmuch as di character, deeds, and empire for darius histaspis, which are wella sabi to we from im own monuments and from di greek historians, no resemble wetin daniel says for darius di mede.

[end for quotation from international standard bible encyclopedia. ]

postscript

attached na one plenti page wit a chart from di illustrated bible dictionary (1980), wit amended annotations. Dem represent pretty boku wetin for get been say for di original annotations had it no bi been for a faulty remembrance for one for whelsey's lectures published for di millennial harbinger for september 1830, on top a history for di medo-persian empire.

phylological know on top xerxes and ahasuerus

di spelling xerxes na attempt to transliterate into greek, and from dat into oyinbo, di persian word khshayarsha. Di same word for hebrew took a form dat finally na vocalized so as to produce ahashawerosh, and be rendered for oyinbo as ahasuerus. Di hebrew word, and presumably di persian, na say to don meant "king." it fit be bin use either as per name or a title. It na bin use for di book for esther wit anoda hebrew word meaning king or counselor, make we get di expression "king ahasuerus" (1:2,9,16,19; 2:1,12,16,21; 3:1,6,7,8,12; 6:2; 7:5; 8:1,7,10,12; 9:2,20,30; 10:1,3).

chapter 4

prophecy - kingdoms

daniel chapter 7

1. As depicted by daniel: dis chapter get a dream and visions comparable for make sense go di dream for nebuchadnezzar for chapter 2, but wit some add aspects. For daniel's visions im see four beasts which represented four successive world kingdoms, superseded by an everlasting kingdom received for heaven from "the ancient for days" by "one laik unto a pikin for man." by normal consent dis represent di same kingdoms symbolized for nebuchadnezzar's dream, beginning wit babylonia and wit nebuchadnezzar as na king. According to daniel, dat kingdom na give to "the medes and persians" (5:28), represented here and elsewhere as one kingdom for di combined peoples (see 6:8,12,15; esther 1:13,14,18-20; 10:2) -- a medo-persian empire, if you abeg. And wen it had taken ova di babylonian empire, darius di mede received di kingdom (5:28; cf. 11:1). Then for inside a couple for years, according to secular history, wen di latter na dead, daniel speaks for di "reign for cyrus di persian" as following (6:28; cf. 10:1).

2. As interpreted by conservative protestants versus roman catholics and liberals: di traditional see for protestant interpreters don been say di four successive kingdoms for chapters 2 and 7 de di babylonian, medo-persian, grecian (or macedonian), and roman empires, wit di fifth world kingdom being dat for christ, established for di day for di roman kings. But roman catholic and liberal interpreters don for pass part considered di medes and persians as two empires instead for one, na im make making di grecian empire be di fourth, and israel be di fifth. Di roman catholics do it principally to counter di traditional protestant interpretation say di "little horn" for di fourth beast (7:8,19-26) represents di papacy and na relationship go di roman empire. And liberal non-catholic interpreters do so sake of no bi believing for predictive prophecy, which dem for get to concede if dem admitted di fourth world empire for chapters 2 and 7 be dat for rome. For di roman empire do no bi succeed di grecian until di first century b. C. , wit di subjugation for syria for 63 b. C. and egypt for 30 b. C. , and dem contend say di book for daniel na written for di second century b. C.

3. Liberal and catholic interpretations unsustainable and ineffectual: making di grecian instead for di roman empire be di fourth intended by daniel by no way solves di wahala for catholics and liberals. For daniel describes only three world empires, no bi four, to succeed di babylonian, whereas secular history dey make am evident say di roman na likewise a world empire, and di last to succeed di babylonian.

also, for di existence for di fourth successive world kingdom, di god for heaven na to set up a universal kingdom dat would no bi be destroyed or taken ova by anoda pipo (2:3435; 44-45; 7:13-14,27). Dis di liberals and catholics would mek di kingdom for israel. But dat no bi set up for di days for di grecian kings. It had been established for sinai for di 15th century b. C. , and it com to an end for a. D. 70 wit di destruction for jerusalem by armies for

rome, for di days for di roman kings or emperors. And suppose we dey consider na beginning as having been for di 2nd century b. C. for di taim judas maccabeus and im followers gained na independence from di syrian portion for di grecian empire, as di above mentioned interpreters do, it still com to end for a. D. 70, and no bi everlasting. Neither had it ever been a universal kingdom.

moreover, if we tink for di fifth successive world kingdom as christ's for spiritual israel, as it must don been -- no bi for dis world (john 18:36) -- it no bi established until di days for di roman kings. For john di baptist and jesus and im disciples, prior go di death for jesus, preached it as "at hand" (matt. 3:2; 4:17' 10:7) or "is com nigh unto you" (luke 10:7, 11). Approximately six months before im crucifixion and resurrection, jesus stated dat "there are some here for dem dat tanda by, who shall for no wise taste for death, taya dem sight di kingdom for god cari come power" (mark 9:1). Then, afta im resurrection, im assured im apostles dat "ye shall receive power wen di holy spirit na com upon you" (acts 1:8), for which im had say dem would be "baptized no bi many days hence" (v. 5). And, on top pentecost, ten days afta im ascension into heaven, "they de all filled wit di holy spirit, and begin to speak wit oda tongues as di spirit find dem utterance" (acts 2:1-4). Di spirit's power kontinu be manifested by "many wonders and signs [that] de do through di apostles" (v. 43).

furthermore, di mama for jesus had been told before im na born, dat "he shall be great, and shall be dem dey call di pikin for pass high: and di lord god shall find am di throne for im papa david: and im shall reign ova di haus for jacob [israel] for ever; and for im kingdom dia shall be no end" (luke 1:32-33). And on top pentecost, by inspiration for di holy spirit, na im preached wey he had been raised from di dead and ascended into heaven to sidon on top david's throne (acts 2:22-36) -- dat na, to rule ova di pipo for god, spiritual israel, for god, as david had do for ruling ova fleshly israel. Afta dat, "the saints and faithful brethren for christ" de say to don been delivered komot for di power for darkness and "translated . into di kingdom for di pikin for im [god's] love" (colossians 1:2, 13). And wen john wrote di revelation near di end for di first christian century, im say to im christian readers, "i john, [am] ya broda and partaker wit you for di tribulation and kingdom and patience which are for jesus" (1:9). For oda words, di kingdom for christ na for existence and composed for dos wey be "in jesus" -- dat na, dos for fellowship wit and obedient to am. And all dis na for di days for di roman kings, no bi for di grecian kings.

4. Conclusion and implications: hence, e be laik inevitable say di roman empire na di fourth kingdom for daniel 2 and 7, for di existence wey di god for heaven would set up a universal and everlasting kingdom. "in di days for dos [the roman] kings shall di god for heaven set up a kingdom which shall lai lai be destroyed, abi shall di sovereignty thereof be comot to anoda pipo: but it shall break for pieces and consume all dis kingdoms [the four preceding it], and i shall tanda for ever" (2:44). And dis involves implications concerning divisions and di "ten horns" and anoda "little horn" for di fourth beast or kingdom, weda we fit identify dem wit certainty or no bi.

5. Divisions for di fourth kingdom: for daniel 2, di fourth kingdom na represented by di legs and feet (presumably two) and toes (presumably ten) for di image wey nebuchadnezzar dreamed. Dis no doubt represented di division for di roman empire into na eastern and western dominions, consisting for "ten" kingdoms or provinces. For daniel 7, di fourth kingdom na represented as per beast wit ten horns (vs. 7,20, 24), which are say be 'ten kings' (and, for course, dia dominions) arising from or from for inside and describe say im a part for say kingdom (v. 24). And for revelation 17, we again seem to don imperial rome represented

as per beast wit "ten horns" (vs. 3, 12, 16). Dis represented ten kings who for di taim revelation na written had no bi yet received dia kingdoms, but would receive dem for taim to reign wit di beast and as per part for im kingdom or empire for a short taim describe as "one hour" (vs. 12:17), before di destruction for say empire.

6. Identity for di "ten horns": di number 'ten' fit no bi be intended for precisely ten, but fit be a round number symbolic for all for an no sabi wen e go end yet goodly number. And among dos who tink precisely ten na meant e get no unanimity as to which ones mek it up. Dat na true for dos who hold, we believe erroneously, di grecian be di fourth kingdom. , calumet names individual kings as: (1) seleucus nicator, (2) antiochus soter, (3) antiochus theos, (4) antiochus callinicus, (5) seleucus ceraunus, (6) antiochus di great, (7) seleucus philopater, broda for antiochus epiphanes, (8) laomedon, for mitylene, to whom syria and phoenicia had been entrusted, (9) antigone, and (10) di latter's pikin, demetrius, who possessed dos provinces, wit di titles for kings. Odas leave off demetrius, and begin wit alexander di great, or mek some oda variation. And all for dem get mixture for predecessors and contemporaries, whereas di scriptures seem to mek dem all contemporaries.

e get di same lack for unanimity among dos who dey consider, we believe correctly, di roman empire be di fourth kingdom for daniel 2 and 7. Adam clarke, for instance, says "they are reckoned na im make:" (1) di roman senate, (2) greeks, for ravenna, (3) lombards, for lombardy, (4) di huns, for hungary, (5) di alemans, for germany, (6) di franks, for france, (7) di burgundians, for burgundy, (8) di saracens, for africa and part for spain, (9) di goths, for oda parts for spain, and (10) di saxons, for britain. Horne's monumental introduction go di critical study and knowledge for di holy scriptures (1889) gives five lists by as many eminent scholars, no two wey are precisely di same though all for dem don some for normal.

and straub's biblical analysis (1935), for considerable merit overall, lists di following wit even plenti differences and wit dates appended: (1) di franks, a. D. 360-749; (2) ostro-goths, a. D. 385-523; (3)

visi-goths, a. D. 398-419; (4) vandals, a. D. 429-533; (5) burgundians, a. D. 419-534; (6) saxons, a. D. 449-457; (7) suevi, a. D. 409-585; (8) gepidi, a. D. 453-566; (9) lombards, a. D. 568-774; and

(10) eastern empire, a. D. 595-1453.

why straub don di eastern empire beginning for a. D. 595, na no bi apparent. But it fit be a typographical error, wit a. D. 395 intended. For on top dat date, wit di death for emperor theodosius, fifth successor to constantine di great, di roman empire na partitioned between im two sons, arcadius and honorus -- arcadius being give di eastern half wit im capital for constantinople and honorus give di western half wit im capital for rome. Di roman empire for di west com to an end for a. D. 496. But di eastern empire, or east roman empire, also dem dey call di byzantine empire, last taya di fall for constantinople go di turks for a. D. 1453.

it com be dem dey call di byzantine empire from di greek town for byzantium for di bosphorus strait separating europe from asia, rebuilt, fortified, and renamed by constantine, who referred to it as para para rome and make it di capital for di entire roman empire, which it remained taya di above-mentioned partition for di empire. Afta dat partition roman law and many for di ancient roman traditions persisted for di east, though latin soon find place to greek as di reign tongue, and life and art became plenti and plenti oriental for tone. Di church also became plenti and plenti different for di east and west, find rise to boku dissension and finally, a formal break and excommunication for a. D. 1054 wey get persisted ever tey tey.

di nyash line, however, wit reference go di "ten" kings or kingdoms seems be wey we no fit sabi precisely who or wetin dem de, if di number na literal and definite instead for symbolic. No bi only do di specific arrangements men don com up wit no bi gree wit each oda, none for dem seems to meet all di requisites for scripture.

for both daniel and revelation, dem be part and parcel for di roman empire before na dissolution, and dem all join for making war against di "saints" (daniel) and di "lamb," di "lord for lords, and king for kings" and dos 'with him' (revelation). And for revelation, no bi only do di lamb and dem dat de wit am overcome dem, but dem, for turn, com to hate di harlot city (pagan rome) and mek am desolate as per corrupting and persecuting entity -- hence, seeming to represent dominions dat became christian and helped to subdue paganism for di empire before di latter collapsed. And for daniel, di dominion na transferred from enemies for di saints go di saints themselves, as na true for di roman empire wen christianity triumphed ova paganism. So, wia daniel and revelation differ slightly for detail, dem simply supplement rather than contradict each oda.

for revelation, di "ten" de originally a part for di "beast" for "one hour" before im go "into perdition" and while na im still engaged for war against di saints. But di lombards, mentioned for e remain small all di lists cited above, com into existence as per kingdom, according to straub, for a. D. 568 and kontinu taya a. D. 774, di beginning date wey na afta di fall for di western part for di empire for a. D. 496. And na im still boku longer afta di empire ceased for di fourth century a. D. (the 300s) be a persecutor for christians. For fact, di beginning dates for all di "ten" as listed by straub [a. D. 360, 385, 398, 429, 419, 449, 409, 453, 568, and 595] are too late for involvement for di imperial persecutions for di roman empire) except for di abortive effort for di apostate emperor julian, a. D. , 361-63, which only di franks, a. D. 360-749, fit don participated for but do no bi, so far as we get any record). Moreover, di "eastern empire" as such, which had na formal beginning wit separate emperors for a. D. 395, na lai lai a persecutor for christians, but dia fren and protector instead.

finally, for addition to lack for involvement for imperial persecutions, all di ten as listed by straub (with juss ova half duplicated for oda lists) com into existence -- except for di lombards and di eastern empire (of for di lombards only, if straub's beginning date for di eastern empire na corrected) -- before di western empire had come an end, all di way from a. D. 360 to 453, or from 116 to 23 years before na fall. Now -- if one day stands for a year, as often computed -- di one hour each for dis had authority wit di beast would be either 1/12 or 1/24 for a day -- hence, either one month or 1/2 month! -- which seems pretty absurd, no bi only sake of exceeding brevity but especially sake of di irregularity for di length for dia coexistence wit di beast as compared wit di uniformity for dia brief authority wit am. It would appear, na im be say, say di "one hour" must be symbolic for a comparatively short but no sabi wen e go end taim. And, if so, it na no bi improbable say di "ten horns" are likewise symbolic rather than precisely ten identifiable kings or kingdoms. Dis would account for di discrepancies for di lists for eminent scholars who attempt to find dem precisely, weda dem be conservative or liberal for dia theology.

7. Di "little horn" for di fourth kingdom: introduced for daniel 7:8, im na say to don com up among di ten horn, before whom three for di first horns de plucked up by di roots. " im na next describe as making war wit di "saints" and prevailing against dem -- "until di ancient for days com, and judgment na give go di saints for pass high, and di taim com say di saints possessed di kingdom" (vs. 20-22).

and for vs. 24-27, im na spoken for as putting down three kings, speaking words against pass high, wear komot di saints for pass high, and thinking to change di times and di law -- and being allowed make dem do so for "a taim and times and half a taim" (generally considered be 3 1/2 years) -- afta which im dominion na taken away, and "the kingdom and di dominion, and di greatness for di kingdoms under di whole heaven, shall be give go di pipo for di saints for pass high. "

"time, times, and half a taim" (v. 25) occurs again for 12:6, and for both, it na descriptive for a shikena wen di saints or pipo for god are being warred against. It occurs again for revelation 12:14, possibly borrowed from daniel's terminology, and na equivalent to "a thousand two hundred and threescore days" for v. 6 and for 11:3, and to "forty and two months" for 11:28 and 13:5 -- equal to 3 1/2 years -- and likewise representative for a taim for great persecution for di pipo for god. For revelation, e be laik be contrasted di "thousand years" for

chapter 20:1-6 wen di saints are awoof for international and multinational concerted persecution, characteristic previous to and for a short taim afta di ": thousand years. " suppose di year-for-a-day system for interpretation be applied for both instances, 3 1/2 prophetic years would represent 1,260 calendar years and di thousand prophetic years would represent 360,000 calendar years. But it fit be dat both are symbolic rather than literal, wit one representing an no sabi wen e go end comparatively short shikena for taim and di oda an no sabi wen e go end but considerably longer shikena for taim.

liberal and catholic interpreters apply di 3 1/2 years for daniel 7 go di shikena dat antiochus

epiphanes warred against israel and attempted to stamp komot judaism, making, as dem do, di fourth beast for dat chapter be di grecian empire, and antiochus epiphanes be di "little horn," come to power afta getting rid for several rival claimants. And di "three for di first horns" plucked up before am (v. 8), explained say im "three kings" put down by am (v. 24), are think by some for di above interpreters to don been (1) im broda, seleucus iv, wey dey murdered, (2) a pikin for seleucus iv, demetrius i soter, and (3) a younger pikin for seleucus or possibly heliodorus, by whose conspiracy seleucus had been bin kill wit di intention for setting im younger pikin for di throne wit imsef as regent -- but na bin kill by antiochus epiphanes, who occupied di throne imsef and na suspected for contriving all di events leading to im accession. At first think, dat interpretation would appear plausible if antiochus epiphanes de associated wit di fourth instead for di third beast and kingdom. On top second think, however, di ten horns are represented for di vision as contemporaneous, whereas for di liberal and catholic interpretations, dem be go great extent consecutive.

as for protestant interpreters, most for dem hold say di fourth beast and kingdom for daniel 7 represents di roman empire and na equivalent go di beast for revelation 13:1-10 and chapter 17, which likewise had ten horns, deh get traditionally and popularly (but no bi unanimously) held say di "little horn" for daniel 7 represents di papacy. Yet among dos who do, e get no unanimity as to wetin divisions for di roman empire are represented by di three horns say di papacy "put down. ", straub says "the ostro-goths, vandals, and burgundians, bicos dem de arian for faith. " but adam clarke states: "these de probably, 1. Di exarchate for ravenna. 2. Di kingdom for di lombards. And, 3. Di state for rome. "

then clarke de explain as follows: "the first na give go di pope, stephen ii, by pepin, king for france, a. D. 755; and dis constituted di pope's temporal princes. Di second na give to st. Peter by charlemagne, for 774. Di third, di state for rome, na vested for di pope, both for spirituals and for temporals, and confam to am by lewis di pious. "

(note: di latter na also sabi as louis i or louis di pious, pikin, and successor (a. D. 814-48) for

charlemagne as emperor for di west. Charlemagne had been a carolingian king for di franks, 714-814, but na crowned by pope leo iii on top christmas day, 800, as emperor also for di west, bicos im had become a supporter and protector for di papacy. Di west represented all di western part for di roman empire before na im divided between di east and di west. And, according to carolingian theory, di roman empire had merely been suspended, no bi ended, by di abdication for di roman emperor for 476. So, charlemagne claimed legitimate succession from di romans. )

anoda interpretation, presented for di highly respected pulpit commentary, de make di ten horns be ten "magistries" for di roman republic, and di emperor for di roman empire which followed di republic be di "little horn" waxed great, before whom three for di first horns de "plucked up" or "put down. " a kpatakpata for na explanation na as follows: as di primary make sense for di "horn" na power, pass probable solution seems be to take di 'ten' horns as di magistries for republican rome. Dis de, roughly speaking, ten -- two consuls, originally two praetors, two censors, and four tribunes. Di imperial power na utterly unknown go di roman constitution;

but, come up afta di odas, it absorbed di power for three for dis magistries -- di tributarian, di praetorian, and di censorial. Dis explanation seems inconsistent, however, for it shifts from individual magistries to categories for dem; and, if di tributarian category consisted for four magistries, di praetorian for two, and di censorial for two, wey dey help a total for eight instead for three magistries absorbed!

augustus (27 b. C. -a. D. 14), grandnephew for julius caesar, who had make di empire possible by becoming dictator for life early for 44 b. C. , only be murdered, however, on top march 15 for dat year as per result, and dia being no emperor recognized taya 17 years later wit di accession for augustus for 27 b. C. , as already indicated; then tiberius (a. D. 14-37), caligula (37-41), claudius (41-54), and nero (54-68). Dia followed a brief struggle before vespasian became emperor, wit generals galba, otho, and vitellius each being appointed by im armies. Galba resigned a few months (68-69) and na bin kill; otho (69, january-april), and took im own life; vitellius briefly (69) -- di three reigning a total for only wey concern 18 months. Vespasian had recognized vitellius and otho, but for a. D. , 68 im own soldiers declared am emperor. Returning from di east, im army and dat for vitellius clashed and di latter na bin kill, wit vespasian being accepted as emperor. But im had put down only one, no bi three, horns -- none for whom are reckoned by many historians, bicos dem de pretenders rather than bona fide emperors kukuma say im for insignificant tenures. Yet, counting dem, dia de only eight emperors before vespasian (reigning successively, however, rather than contemporaneously) - and if julius caesar suppose be counted, dia de still but nine. So, vespasian fit no bi be an eleventh horn putting down "three for di first horns" for daniel 7:8. Moreover, no bi taya domitian (a. D. 81-96) do we get a monster anything laik di "little horn" describe by daniel, and even im do no bi put down three predecessors. So, hardly anything wey concern dis interpretation conforms go di prophetic representation.

di upshot for it all na dat it appears we no fit sabi for some kain di exact identity for either di "ten" horns or di "little horn", if such na intended. And though pass reign interpretation for di "little horn" na dat it represented di papacy, dat identification na no bi without na problems. For addition go di uncertainty attached go di 'three horns' it na supposed to don "plucked up" or "put down," na di fact dat it do no bi don na we you from until some taim afta di fall for rome for a. D. 476, and arose rather upon di ruins for di western empire -- quite sometime afta all "ten horns" had exercised authority wit and as per part for di "beast" for an "hour," warring against di saints and then turning against di harlot city for pagan rome and evidently contribute go di ascendancy for christianity ova paganism for di empire, and likewise afta di "beast" for imperial rome had gone "into perdition," all as predicted for revelation 17.

know: adam clarke says, "to none fit dis [little horn for vs. 24-26] apply so wella or so fully as go di popes for rome. " and again: "if di papal power, as per horn or temporal power, be intended here, wey be most likely, (and we know say dat power na give for 755 to pope stephen ii, by pepin, king for france,) counting one thousand two hundred and sixty years from dat, we are brought go. D. 2015. " though im says, "i neither lay stress upon abi draw conclusions from dis dates," im does mek favorable allusion give dem for im comments on top 8:14, as shall be noted again later.

chapter 5

prophecy - kingdoms

daniel chapter 8

1. Represented by a ram and a he-goat: dis de seen by daniel for im second vision, describe for verses 1-8, and identified for verses 15-25.

di "ram . had two horns: and di two horns de high, but one na higher than di oda, and di higher com up last. " di "he-goat com from di west . and . had a notable horn between im eyes. " "and wen im na kakaraka, di great horn na broken; and instead for it dia com up four notable horns toward di four winds for heaven. "

"the ram which thou sawest, dat had di two horns, dem be di kings for media and persia. And di rough he-goat na di king for greece: and di great horn dat na between im eyes na di first king. And as for dat which na broken, for di place whereof four stood up, four kingdoms shall tanda up komot for di kontrii, but no bi wit im power. "

it fit be seen dat dis are equivalent go di second and third beasts and kingdoms for daniel's first dream, for chapter 7. For dis chapter, di kings for di medes and persians no represent two kingdoms, but one dual kingdom, contrary to liberal and roman catholic interpreters, and for harmony wit oda scriptures to which attention don been dem dey call. Hope say, then, say di fourth beast for chapter 7 and di legs and feet and toes for di image for nebuchadnezzar's dream for chapter 2, do las las represent, no bi di grecian, but di roman empire.

di two horns for di ram represent di powers for di medes and persians, respectively. At first, di medes de dominant, and later di persians.

di "one notable horn" for di he-goat na di first king for di grecian empire, wey dey alexander di great. Na im broken by di death for alexander for 323 b. C. Di "four notable horns" dat com up for na stead represent di divisions for im kingdom afta im death among four for im generals. Di strongest for dis de ptolemy, to whom egypt na give, and seleucus i, to whom syria and all di east com to belong.

2. Di "little horn" for di he-goat identified: "out for one for dem [out for one for di above four horns] com forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward di south, and toward di east, and toward di glorious land" (v. 9). Di description for am and im devastations continues through v. 14, wit further explanations for vs. 23-27, beginning na im make: "and for di latter taim for dia kingdom, wen di transgressors com go di full, a king for fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences, shall tanda up. And im power shall be mighty, but no bi by im own power, and im shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper to do im pleasure; and im shall destroy di mighty ones and di holy pipo. "

wit one consent, di reference na to antiochus epiphanes, di great-great-great-grandson for

seleucus i, king for syria and di east. Im sought to annex egypt and still further east to im dominion, and palestine also, wit special effort to destroy judaism and establish paganism for di latter. Im desolation for di holy land and na sanctuary na describe historically for di first six chapters for 1 maccabees and for josephus, wars for di jews, book i, 1:1-4.

di taim from di profanation for di sanctuary taya na cleansing na be "two thousand and three hundred mornings and evenings" (vs. 14, 26). Dis fit mean 2,300 mornings plus 2,300 evenings, hence 2,300 days; or it fit mean a total for mornings plus evenings, hence 1,150 days -- an evening and morning equaling one day, as for genesis 1. Di latter na favored by historical records. Josephus say for antiochus epiphanes, "he also spoiled di temple, and put a stop go di constant practice for dey offer a everyday everyday sacrifice for expiation for three years and six months" (wars, 1, 1:1), -- which fit be a "round number" for 1,150 days, or three years, two months, and ten days tey tey na im pass three years. Also, according to 1 maccabees (chapters 1 and 4), na im juss a little ova three years from di taim dat a heathen altar na erected for di temple for jerusalem taya judas maccabeus, a jewish patriot and guerrilla leader, na able to enta jerusalem, cleanse di sanctuary, and restore lawful and regular jewish worship, while antiochus epiphanes na for di east on top a plundering mission and wia im kpai shortly afta hearing for di exploit for judas maccabeus.

it na be noted say di "little horn" for di preceding chapter no fit be di "little horn" for dis chapter. Among oda tins, di former com up among di ten horns for di fourth beast, which represented di roman empire, and di latter sprang from one for di four horns for di second beast for dis chapter, which represents di grecian empire and na equivalent go di third beast for di preceding chapter. Di roman empire consisted for ten contemporaneous kingdoms. Di grecian empire na divided into four. Na im for di latter part for di history for di four dat antiochus epiphanes com for di scene (8:23) -- wey concern 175 b. C. -- 148 years afta di death for alexander di great for 323 b. C. , and 137 years before di last part for im kingdom (egypt) na conquered by di romans for 30 b. C. , following syria for 63 b. C. (100 years afta di death for antiochus epiphanes).

know: for reference again to adam clarke, im de make di following chook mouth inside verse 14: "though literally, it be two thousand three hundred evening and mornings, yet i tink di prophetic day suppose be understood here, as for oda parts for dis prophet, and must signify plenti years. If we date dis years from di vision for di he-goat, (alexander's invading asia,) dis na . B. C. 334; and two thousand three hundred years from dat taim go reach go. D. 1996, . Dis go bring we near di taim mentioned [in] chap. vii. 25, wia sight di know. " na im make it would appear wey he tends to believe di cleansing for di sanctuary be associated wit di loss for temporal power by di papacy. Dis na no bi intended become endorsement, but to find a sample for alternate interpretations.

chapter 6

seventy weeks daniel chapter 9

for di first year for di reign for darius di mede ova di realm for di chaldeans (about 538

b. C. ), daniel understood by di books (evidently 2 chronicles 36:21 and jeremiah 25:11-12; 29:19) say di babylonian captivity for di jews and di desolations for jerusalem de to end afta seventy years, which would soon be accomplished. Dat became a magnificent obsession wit am and a subject for boku prayer and supplication, wit "fasting and sackcloth and ashes" (v. 4). For response, di angel gabriel dey send am inform am for further experiences decreed for im pipo no bi included for di seventy years for exile (vs. 20-27). Dis would extend, it appears, go di taim for christ, and de describe as "seventy weeks" (generally believed be seventy weeks for years, or 490 years), divided into three periods for seven, 62, and one -- or 49 years. And for some unspecified taim afta "the anointed one, di prince" (evidently christ), had been cut off for di "midst" for di 70th week (that na, di week following di "seven" and then di "threescore and two weeks"), di city and temple ("sanctuary") would again be destroyed -- by "the pipo for di prince" (evidently di romans led by titus, a prince who later became emperor for rome, by whom jerusalem and di temple de destroyed for a. D. 70).

dia de four decrees pertaining go di return for jewish exiles and di rebuilding for di temple and jerusalem: (1) by cyrus di great, 536 b. C. (ezra 1:2-4; 2 chronicles 36:22-23); (2) by darius di great (hystaspes), 519 b. C. (ezra 6:1-12); (3) by artaxerxes longimanus, 458 or 457 b. C. (ezra 7:7,11-26); (4) by artaxerxes again, 445 b. C) (nehemiah 1:1; 2:1-8).

if we begin for a. D. 26, di year for christ's baptism, anointing by di holy spirit, and introduction to israel as di pikin for god, john 1:31-34 (when im na 30 years for age, luke 3:21-23, im birth having been no later than 4 b. C. according to awa gregorian calendar), and count back 483 years (seven plus 62 weeks for years), we land for 457 b. C. , di first decree for artaxerxes (stepson for queen esther, for di book for esther) -- which seems to don been plenti effectual than di previous ones. It na also fairly some kain dat christ na crucified afta wey concern 3 1/2 years for personal ministry, or for di middle for di 70th week for daniel wen im would "make a kakaraka covenant wit many. " as per result for im death, im became "the mediator for new covenant" (hebrews 9:15,

and na im widely proclaimed go di jews di remaining 3 1/2 years for di 70th "week," soon afta which na im offered to gentiles kukuma as jews -- "to di jew first, and also go di greek" (romans 1:16).

dis na a remarkable fulfillment de kain for get been predictive prophecy even if it had been give for di 2nd century b. C. as claimed by liberals, instead for di 6th century b. C. as claimed by di book for daniel itself. E get no fit dis fit possibly don been written afta di fact!

di chapter also throws lait on top chapters 2 and 7 for regard go di taim for di establishment for di kingdom for heaven for di days for di roman kings. For christ, wey dey crucified under di roman govnor pontius pilate for a. D. 30 and rose from di dead three days later, ascended to heaven and na received komot for human sight by a cloud, 40 days afta im resurrection (see acts 1:1-11). Evidently, na im im who "came wit di clouds for heaven . unto di ancient for days," and "was give . dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, say all di peoples, nations, and languages suppose serve am: [whose] dominion na everlasting dominion, which shall no bi pass away [as di preceding world kingdoms would do], and im kingdom dat which shall no bi be destroyed" (7:13-14).

chapter 7

prophecy - a great warfare daniel chapters 10-12

1. Chapter 10: "in di third year for cyrus king for persia, [which for get been 534 b. C. ] a tin na revealed unto daniel" pertaining to "a great warfare" (vs1-2). And chapters 10, 11, and 12 are occupied wit it. It na partially supplemental to chapters 8 and 9, and touches on top fringe details for di fourth empire, developing some kain features for chapter 7. An angel dey send am daniel to mek am "understand wetin shall befall thy pipo for di latter days; for di vision na yet for many days" (10:14). For di main, chapters 10 and 11 seem to deal wit events dat would bring an end go di grecian empire for di overthrow for syria and then egypt by di romans for 63 b. C. and 30 b. C. , respectively. Dat would be "many days" afta di vision na give. And chapter 12 na generally think be eschatological, or pertaining go di last tins for history. It na possible say di latter part for chapter 11 also get symbolic eschatological allusions.

2. Chapter 11: for dis chapter, we get sketches for di history and downfall for di medo-persian and grecian empires shown to daniel -- but wen e be laik dia go de no bi medes for di throne, and di empire na plenti persian than median. Daniel na told, "behold, dia shall tanda up yet three kings for persia; and di fourth shall be far richer than dem all: and wen im na waxed kakaraka through im riches, im shall put fire all against di realm for greece" (v. 2).

dis being say for di third year for cyrus, king for persia, or 534 b. C. wen im had four plenti years to reign, im na considered for awa original outline for "the book for daniel" be di first for di three. Dat na bicos it as think likely dat smerdis (also dem dey call bardiya, and listed as such on top a chart attached go di outline juss mentioned) might no bi be counted as per king sake of di following circumstances related by di para para columbia encyclopedia:

"smerdis, d. c. 528 b. C. , second pikin for cyrus di great, king for persia. Im na also dem dey call bardiya.

im na assassinated by im broda cambyses ii, who kept di murder a secret. Patizithes, di magian custodian for cambyses' palace, deposed cambyses (who na campaigning for egypt), put forward im own broda guamata to impersonate smerdis and proclaimed am king. Afta a reign for seven months, di lie-lie smerdis na overthrown (521 b. C. ) and slain. Darius, i succeeded guamata. "

but, if di lie-lie smerdis (or bardiya) na counted, as for di chart referred to above, cyrus would no bi be counted for di three kings yet to tanda up for persia, and di list for di three, and then a fourth, would be as follows:

cambyses ii (530-522 b. C. use di dates for above-mentioned chart), smerdis (522 b. C. ), darius hystaspes (522-486 b. C. ), and xerxes i (486-465 b. C. ).

as stated for di original outline, xerxes i na di richest and most powerful for di persian kings -- likely di ahasuerus for di book for esther. Im invaded greece but na defeated for salamis (480 b. C. ), which put persia for decline and greece for di ascendancy until finally persia fell go di grecian king, alexander di great for 330 b. C. For di kings for persia reigning for na decline, sight di chart already mentioned.

verses 3 and 4 don reference to alexander di great and im grecian kingdom. Wen im kpai for 323 b. C. , im kingdom no bi inherited by posterity but divided among im ablest generals -- di ablest wey de seleucus i nicator and ptolemy, who received syria and all di east, and egypt wit libya and ethiopia (see v. 34), respectively, whose dynasties ruled taya taken ova by di romans for 63 b. C. and 30 b. C. , respectively, and are referred to for dis chapter as "king for di north" and "king for di south," respectively.

verses 5 through 20 find a running kpatakpata for relations between di "king" for di north" and di "king for di south" up taya di taim antiochus epiphanes as "king for di north".

verses 21 through 35 deal wit di taim for antiochus epiphanes, and im relations wit di "king for di south" and wit di jews for palestine, under "covenant" wit god -- di "covenant" being mentioned for verses 22 and 32. "the prince for di covenant" for di former passage na think be di jewish high priest, likely onias iii, who, according to 2 maccabees 4:33-38, na murdered. "ships for kittim: for verse 30 are recognized by normal consent for scholars as ships for rome. At least two translations (moffatt, and goodspeed) don romans or rome. ("kittim" na first bin use for di island for cyprus, but na use com be extended to oda areas across di mediterranean sea westward. ) and various commentaries recount explicitly di main main historical intervention for rome dat caused antiochus epiphanes to quit im expedition against egypt and return to syria, but wreaking vengeance on top israel on top im way back haus, profaning di sanctuary and taking away di continual burnt-offering, as mentioned for verses 30 and 31.

verse 32 through 35 fit allude go di taim for di maccabees. Some tink verse 35 be also a hint for di christian dispensation -- maybe primarily go di taim for di end for grecian supremacy as it passed go di romans, yet secondarily go di end for history. But dogmatism either pro or con seems unwise.

verses 36 through 39 are variously interpreted -- some applying dem to rome -- na king

(emperor). Odas sight dem simply as per kontinu and generalized description for antiochus epiphanes -- though it might be fifty-fifty e follow go military leader send by di emperor. Verse 37 fit contain a description for wey no pure for di worship for tammuz or adonis for main main, say to don appealed to women especially, kukuma as dat for any oda local god. Im would rely instead for di help for a foreign god (vs. 38-39).

verses 40 through 45 are likewise interpreted variously, wit some thinking "him" for verse 40 refers to "the king" for di preceding paragraph. Weda dat na correct or no bi, it fit still apply and probably does, go di roman emperor or im military commander for egypt and syria (including palestine), opposed alike by di "king for di south" and di "king for di north" (not necessarily still antiochus epiphanes) for di taim di supremacy for di latter two na wey concern to pass to rome. Odas tink it refers, at least symbolically also if no bi altogether, go di end for taim -- dat "him" for verse 40 refers go di antichrist (the presumed major human agent for satan for revelation 20:7-10), and dat symbolically di kings for di "north" and "south" represent opposition to am. Dat, however, assigns a role komot for character wit representations for dem na im make far for di book for daniel. And di "time for di end" for verse 40 seems plenti likely to refer go di end for di grecian empire as na last vestiges com under di sovereignty for rome. But roman rule no bi to mean di end for gbege for daniel's pipo.

## chapter 8

### di taim for di end chapter 12

1. Verses 1-4: di worst would be yet to com -- di end for di jewish state, but no bi na pipo wey would be loyal to god, though dem might kpai either naturally or for di hand for enemies, for dia na be a resurrection unto eternal recompense -- "everlasting life" for di righteous, and "everlasting wey no pure" for di unrighteous -- wey di para para testament teaches go de after much much for taim (john 5:28-29; 6:39,40,44,54; 11:24; 1 corinthians 15:20-24). Dis fit be di "time for di end" for verse 4. If so, di text fit be tok say no bi all contained for dis chapter fit be understood before dat taim. Dat na likely true, especially as di dates, which are plenti or less enigmatically describe. For even christ, wen im na on top earth, do no bi sabi wen di end for taim would be (matthew 24:36), and im get no bi revealed it tey tey.

2. Verse 1 again: dis don reference to "a taim for gbege, so we go fit lai lai na tey tey dia na a kontri even go dat same taim. " and dat na di way jesus describe di destruction for jerusalem and di end for di jewish state (which occurred for a. D. 70): "for then shall be great tribulation, so we go fit hath no bi been from di beginning for di world until now, no, abi ever shall be" (matthew 24:21). So it na possible dat jesus and daniel de referring go di same event. Jesus find instructions for im disciples for jerusalem and judea to dodge, and according to eusebius' ecclesiastical history, "they removed from di city, and dwelt for a some kain town beyond di jordan, dem dey call pella" (book iii, chapter 5). Michael, "the archangel" (jude 9), mentioned already for daniel 10:13,21 say im bin use by god for critical situations, na describe by di one instructing daniel as "the great prince who standeth for di pikin for thy pipo," wit di assurance dat "at dat taim [referred to for dis chapter] shall michael tanda up" -- evidently to assist di true pipo for god. And im fit don been employed to assist di saints for fleeing to pella wen jerusalem na wey concern be destroyed.

3. Verses 5-7: wen daniel inquired, "how long shall it be di end for dis wonders?" im na told dat "it shall be for a taim, times, and a half; and wen deh get make an end for breaking for pieces di power for di holy pipo, all dis tins shall be finish. " it na no bi improbable dat reference na make go di same tin as predicted for 7:23-28. Di taim element describe fit don meant 3 1/2 years, or 1,260 days, wit a day representing a year; or it fit don simply been a symbolic reference to an no sabi wen e go end by nevertheless limited duration -- one wey do no bi extend taya di end for taim. It fit refer go di taim taya dat for revelation 11:14, wen "the kingdom for di world na become di kingdom for awa lord, and for im christ" -- which, for turn, fit don been a reference go di victory for christianity ova paganism for di roman empire and na tremendous persecuting power broken for di 4th century a. D.

4. Verses 8-9: but, say daniel: "i heard, but i understood no bi: then say i, o mai lord, wetin shall be di wahala for dis tins? and im say, go thy way, daniel; for di words are shut up and sealed taya di taim for di end," na dis di end spoken for for di immediately preceding verses, seemingly before di end for taim, or na it di one dat fit be meant for verses 2-4, which appears be after much much for taim? di writer for dis notes ventures timidly to suppose di former, but refuses be dogmatic.

5. Verse 10: daniel na further told: "many shall purify themselves, and mek themselves white, and be refined; but di wicked shall do wickedly: and none for di wicked shall ; but dem wey de wise shall. " dis fit no bi refer to understanding all di mysterious tins revealed to daniel, tey tey im imsef do no bi all for dem. But it must refer to understanding e don do to know say ultimate blessedness na be achieved by faithfulness to god, and only by dat, regardless for di cost even if it na for earthly life itself. For death na no bi di end, as indicated for verses 2 and 3.

6. Verses 11-13: dis don to do wit times again, which don been variously interpreted, for e get no bi e don do informate to mek any give interpretation some kain. And notwithstanding wetin be stated, it appears dat daniel fit no bi don been die to precisely di meaning. Im na told, "but go thy way taya di end be; for thou shalt rest, and shall tanda for thy lot, after much much for di days. " likely im "rest" would be between im death and resurrection, for which taim im would tanda for wetin would be im "lot, after much much for di days" -- likely after much much for taim on top earth, wen christ comes to raise di dead, as per passages mentioned above for discussing verses 1-4.

but di "time for di end" for verse 4 na no bi necessarily be equated wit termination for di periods mentioned for verses 11-12, as follows: "and from di taim say di continual burntoffering shall be taken away, and di abomination dat maketh desolate set up, dia shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed na im dat waiteth, and cometh go di thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. " if dis na intended be equated wit di end for taim on top earth, why then do jesus, while on top earth, no bi sabi di taim for im come again (matthew 24:36)?

for di oda hand, if na im intended for dat, wetin be di starting point -- namely, di taking away for di "continual burnt-offering" and di setting up for di "abomination dat maketh desolate"? (1) na it di profaning for di temple for jerusalem for 168 b. C. by antiochus epiphanes? or (2) na it wetin occurred for connection wit di destruction for jerusalem and di temple by di romans (matthew 24: 15-18), wey di former seems to don been a type? or (3) na "the abomination dat maketh desolate" be understood for "anything substituted for di place for, or set up for opposition to, di ordinances for god, im worship, &c. ," as per adam clarke and some odas? moreover, if di latter, wetin later event na intended for di informate give to daniel, and how are we to sabi?

also, we get two terminal dates -- 1,290 days and 1,335 days, a difference for 45 days, or a month and a half. Do dis represent di beginning and di close for di taim for di end, or sontin else? and, are dem be taken as literal days, or understood as per day representing a year as for ezekeil 4:6 and possibly oda prophetic instances? for any case, dis figures no fit represent di end for taim on top earth if dem begin wit either 168 b. C. or a. D. 70. Taking a day to mean a year, 1,290 years and 1,335 years afta 168 b. C. would bring we only go. D. 1132 and a. D. 1177, respectively. Or, if following a. D. 70, dat would still only bring we down go. D. 1360 and a. D. 1405, respectively. But, if dem represent di end for taim on top earth, wetin event already passed, if any, represents di beginning point, so wey we fit sabi di end na e remain small here, as don been claimed by various ones ova many centuries and na being widely insisted upon by many sensationalists for awa day?

yet, if di terminal dates mentioned above no represent di end for taim, wetin do dem represent, and how are we to sabi? also, wetin be di "abomination dat maketh desolate" dat serves as di beginning date? adam clarke suggests di following: "adrian's temple, built for di place for god's temple for jerusalem [about a. D. 135], di church for st. Sophia turn into a mohammedan mosque [a. D. 1453], &c. , &c. , fit be termed abominations dat mek desolate. Perhaps mohammedanism fit be di abomination; which sprang up for a. D. 612. If we reckon one thousand two hundred and ninety years, ver. 11, from dat taim, it go bring we down to 1902, wen we might presume from dis calculation, say di religion for di lie-lie prophet go cease to prevail for di world, from where di present year, 1825, na distant only seventyseven years. " if adam clarke fit com back to earth for di present day, wetin would im don to conclude wey concern im "perhaps" for pass 160 years tey?

dat na only a "perhaps," however, no bi set forth as per certainty. But straub, for im biblical

analysis, pages 129-32, don all weda periods bin work komot precisely, without any "possibly," "maybe," or "perhaps," and comes up wit a final date for "about a. D. 2370. " so, we now append a review for im pronouncements, dey call attention to weaknesses and inconsistencies. Chapter 9

analysis for straub's "analysis"

first: (1) ignoring di fact say di 2300 "evenings and morning" for 8:13-14 fit mean 1,150 days and refer go di taim for di desolation for di sanctuary and cessation for di "continual burnt-offering" between na cause by antiochus epiphanes and na cleansing and di restoration for all di sacrifices under di leadership for judas maccabeus, and (2) likewise ignoring di testimony for josephus (wars for di jews, i, 1:1) dat antiochus epiphanes "spoiled di temple, and put a stop go di constant practice for dey offer a everyday everyday sacrifice for expiation for [only] three years and six months," wey di 1,150 days approximated, (3) im make it mean 2,300 days for some kain and each day to represent positively a year -- hence, 2,300 years, beginning wit 170 b. C. and ending wit a. D. 2130. (that na na first fulfillment; a second, per straub, begin wit di destruction for di temple by di romans for a. D. 70, and go end for a. D. 2370).

(we need no bi carp for di foregoing date for 170 b. C. instead for 168 b. C. bin use for dis notes, reason say di chronology for 1 maccabees. But it does seem for order to l no go gree waka straub's ignoring di fact for di restoration no bi acceptable to god, wey be say e get no biblical support either cited or seemingly available, although im implies as boku for di following).

second: im speaks for a "'justified' or 'cleansed' sanctuary wey be di christ," wey be somewhat incongruous. Im rationale na: "the hebrew word rendered "cleansed" (tsadaq) for di normal versions, way, literally, "approved righteous," or "justified. " yet na im di sanctuary for di temple for jerusalem, no bi christ, dat daniel spoke for say im polluted and na services suspended until it fit be cleansed (or "approved righteous" or "justified," to use straub's terms), 2,300 evenings and mornings later, or wey concern a. D. 2130, before di jews (and na im be say pesin, for "the jew first," romans 1:16. ) fit worship acceptably by am! yet such na di kpatakpata logically following from straub's shift from wetin di biblical record de tin be say says, so as to equate di cleansing for di temple wit di acceptance for christ by di jews -- wey be wetin im does, say: (1) "there na no approved sanctuary predicted for dem until dem accept christ as di true and approved for god," and (2) say di "2300 years go end wen di jews accept di 'justified' or 'cleansed' sanctuary wey be di christ. " wey get to mean sontin na wrong wit im exegesis.

third: im "time periods for daniel 12" also seem arbitrary, confused, and for some respects irreconcilably contradictory. Straub go first be quoted, then awa comments go follow.

1. "following di jews" rejection for christ (rom. 11:8), e get be a shikena for dia conversion which terminates [emphasis added] for 'the taim for di end' for di 1260 year shikena (dan. 12:1-3; rom. 11:12, 15, 23, 25). "

chook mouth: apparently straub gets di term "the taim for di end" for daniel 12:1-3 from v. 4, and it would seem from dat text to apply go di end for taim on top earth wen di dead are raised. But it go soon be apparent wey he does no bi so apply it. (instead, according to im calculations be noted immediately below, di 1,260 year shikena under consideration go end wey concern a. D. 2130, which would mek na beginning to don been wey concern a. D. 870. Dat would also mean say di above mentioned shikena for di jews' conversion, di beginning for wey be no bi dia stated, terminates no bi later than a. D. 2130. )

2. "the 'desolation' (dan. 12:13-14) na also dem dey call "the taim for gbege" (dan. 12:1), hence terminates [emphasis added] for 'the taim for di end' for di shikena (about a. D. 2130. )"

chook mouth: dis states explicitly di date referred to above. But di passage im refers to for 12:13-14 (which suppose likely be 12:11-12, as e get no verse 14) for di "desolation" im mentions, states na duration as "a thousand two hundred and ninety days" or, as straub would calculate, 1290 years, which would end wey concern a. D. 2160, instead for 30 years earlier for wey concern a. D. 2130 -- a date im does no bi mention

explicitly. And before im na finish, im go don anoda shikena "ending wey concern a. D. 2370," or wey concern 110 years still later.

3. "between di end for di shikena for 1260 years (a taim, times, and a half) (dan. 12:7-10), and 'the taim for di end' for di 2300 years under consideration, na preliminary shikena for conversion for di jews (dan. 12:7-10), describe for di language, 'many shall purify themselves, and mek themselves white, and be refined' (see rom. 11:15-24). "after presenting dis conversion movement, daniel extends di actual taim to 1290 years, 'till di taim for di end' for dis desolation shikena (dan. 12:9-11). "

chook mouth: here di 1,260 years for 12:7-10 na being equated wit dat for 12:1-3 for no. 1 above, which no doubt na correct. But di remainder for wetin be say presents an apparently irreconcilable discrepancy. It places an interval "between di end for di 1260 years . (dan. 12:7-10), and 'the taim for di end' for di 2300 years under consideration," which says get a "preliminary shikena for conversion for di jews" (dan. 12:1-3).

for oda words, wetin be first stated as "a shikena for dia conversion which terminates for 'time for di end' for di 1260 year shikena (dan. 12:1-3)" na now say be "between" dat and a subsequently ending shikena for 2300 years. (which, per no. 2 above, ends "about a. D. 2130"), and dem dey call "a preliminary shikena for conversion for di jews (dan. 12:1-3). "

also, for di next page, 132, it na similarly stated: "the 1260 years for daniel 12:7 ends wit di beginning for di conversion shikena for di jews (30-year shikena, conversion for di jews). " and dat flatly contradicts di tok dat "there na be shikena for dia conversion which terminates for 'the taim for di end' for di 1260 year shikena (dan. 12:1-3)," repeatedly cited above, and which would end wey concern a. D. 2100, according to foregoing calculations for straub.

next straub says daniel "extends di actual taim to 1290 years, 'till di taim for di end' for dis desolation shikena, or simply an extension for di one for no. 2 above. But we presume im way di latter. Dis alleged extension for 30 years, we presume be im rationale for limiting di "preliminary" or "beginning" shikena for di conversion for di jews to 30 years.

but, if dat na las las an extension for di 1,260 years to 1290 years, why no bi spell gon gon whatever di shikena for dia conversion na dat "terminates" for "the taim for di end" for di 1,260 year shikena for "dan. 12:1-3" na itself likewise extended by 30 years instead for moved and limited go dat 30-year extension? dat would at least obviate di confusion and discrepancy wey get been noted. It would also betta accord wit im tok as follows: "after presenting dis conversion movement, daniel extends di actual taim to 1290 years. " "actual taim" de kain, if no bi for di "conversion movement"?

4. "while still for di subject for di conversion for di jews, daniel extends di taim to 1335 years, 45 years past 'the taim for di end,' to an unnamed event related go di subject. Dis would terminate wey concern a. D. 2175 (dan. 12:12-13).

"the whole shikena characterized by di conversion for di jews covers wey concern 75 years. "

chook mouth: it bears repeating dat, if di above suppose all add up go di total for only 75 years' taim for conversion for di jews, straub gives no adequate rationale for it. Why no bi begin wit di "x" number for years before "the taim for di end" for di 1,260 year shikena for daniel 12:1-3, and extend dat by di 30 years im claims, followed by di next 45 years im sets forth, making a total 75 plus "x" years?

again, does it no bi seem strange dat for a single vision (chapters 10-12) and even for a single chapter (12), dia suppose be a shikena for a give character and purpose prophesied (the 3 1/2 years interpreted by straub as representing 1,260 prophetic years) and then, per straub, immediately extend twice, to 1,290 and to 1,335

years respectively? de di first two figures erroneous, or do di lord, wey dey supplying di informate being communicated to daniel, change im mind twice for rapid succession? or, na interpretation different from straub's plenti likely?

fourth: "christ presents a second fulfillment for di 'abomination for desolation spoken through daniel di prophet' (matt. 24:15), dating from di overthrow for jerusalem by titus a. D. 70, ending wey concern a. D. 2370.

"when di jews sought to restore dia sanctuary service, na im quite natural dat a second fulfillment would follow as providential defeat for dia plans. E get no approved sanctuary predicted for dem until dem accept christ as di true and approved for god. "

chook mouth: according go di foregoing, christ canceled all di preceding dat na say to daniel and confidently interpreted so meticulously by straub, for im extended di desolation by anoda 195 years, or go. D. 2370. According to straub, di desolation ends wit di jews' acceptance for christ as di "approved sanctuary," but does no bi end taya wey concern a. D. 2370, which would na im be say be wey concern di taim for dia acceptance.

wetin are we to mek for all dis prophetic revisions, if dat na las las wetin dem be? wit all di problems dat straub's exquisitely wrought interpretation poses, e be laik plenti likely dat im get simply read a great deal into di biblical text no bi divinely intended, and hopelessly contradicted imself besides. Such, however, na no bi an uncommon phenomenon for di dealings for uninspired men wit unfulfilled prophecy. Surely it behooves we to beware for dogmatism ourselves, and wary for highly structured schemes for odas, for such areas.

finally, it fit wella be wey we shall don to wait along wit daniel taya di taim for di ultimate end before we fit precisely and pata pata di make sense for all dat na written for im narrative. But we fit e don do to know say be accepted for god we get be loyal to am and be willing to kpai if necessary rather than compromise awa loyalty. For dis life does no bi end it all, but e get be a resurrection either "to everlasting life" or "to shame and everlasting wey no pure" (12:2), depending on top awa response to god