Daniel is asking for further light on the meaning of the previous answer. Actually the word that the NIV here renders as "so" is merely the common connective w^e, which could just as well be rendered as "and", "then", or even "but".^8

2) The rendering of *aharit* as "outcome." Out of the 61 occurrences of *aharit* in the Hebrew Bible the NIV has rendered it as "outcome" in only two places -- here and in Isaiah 41:22. *Aharit* is a noun based on the preposition *ahar*, which means "after" or "behind," so the noun could be taken either as "latter part" or as "what follows after." The NIV has rendered it as "latter part" in job 42:12 and Daniel 8:23 (and in each of these places the context shows clearly that this is a correct translation).

3) The unwarranted insertion of the word "all," which is not in the verse. Probably the NIV committee intended "all this" to represent the Hebrew word *elleh*, which is usually translated "these" or "those." There are doubtless places where the insertion of "all" might be permissible, perhaps even required by the context of a statement, but that is not the case here.

In Hebrew there is no distinction between "these" and "those." The word *elleh* is usually translated as "these", but every translation renders it as "those" in a substantial number of places. Thus we see that there is no valid philological objection to rendering Daniel's question in Daniel 12:8 in a way that fits the requirements of the con text.^9

In any translation the ideas of the translator are bound to affect the way words and sentences are rendered. A purely word-for-word translation would often be misleading, or might fail to give any reasonable understanding. The makers of the KJV had remarkable success in their effort to avoid inserting their own ideas where there might be ambiguity or uncertainty in the original text.^10

We noticed that the KJV rendering of Daniel's question