

Allan MacRae: The Prophecies of Daniel: Lecture 12

I have taken more time in reviewing certain sections Daniel than I had expected to. I think it's wise to get well in mind the material we are covering. It means that there are four verses though, which are quite unrelated in most ways to the rest of the prophesy which I had thought I would be able to spend 2 or 3 hours on. In such a case I wish you would write out any questions and get them to me if possible ahead of class, or at least before class starts.

Now we have looked at the history of Antiochus Epiphanes and we have seen how precise statements about him are found in Daniel 11. The idea that chapter 11 ends and all of a sudden chapter 12 has an unmentioned interval jumping forward to Antichrist, would be rather ridiculous because the preceding verses tell about Antiochus Epiphanes's ancestors and his brother in so much detail, and there's not much point to it except leading up to this terrible crisis that was faced by Judaism. And this terrible crisis is described by the long account of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, which was section D of the outline. And then in section E we already spoke about Daniel 11:36-12:3. Under that we noticed #1: "The king's character and career." I mentioned a number of points in which it was quite obvious that most of the material from 11:36 to 12:3 could not possibly be considered as a continued account of Antiochus. Those who hold a Macabean view of Daniel's authorship either say that these are the guesses of the writers of what might happen in the future, or else they say that these are things that actually happened that we have no historical record of, so that the particular events described in these verses just don't fit with anything we know about Antiochus Epiphanes. The account of the character of this man described in 11:36-12:3 is utterly different from Antiochus who had built great temples to the gods of his fathers; yet this is one in these verses will disregard the gods of his fathers and turn away from them. And we also noticed this is one who will honor the god of fortresses, a good expression for a purely

materialistic viewpoint, which would have been rather incomprehensible for people in ancient times, but which today fits exactly with the attitude of leaders for a very large part of the world.

In that section we have #2: "The time of trouble and deliverance." We looked briefly at that. This very terrible time that is described in 11:36-12:3 which could be taken as describing the time of the crisis under the Maccabees, but since we have a description of a very different situation than what occurred under the Maccabees, it's more reasonable to take it as something that is yet to happen in connection with a different person than Antiochus; a much later one.

And then we notice #3: we notice that chapter 12 verse 2 describes a general resurrection. And so if this section goes clear to the resurrection, it is obvious there must be a very long, unmentioned interval, at least 2,000 years since the resurrection has not yet occurred. The resurrection has to occur between the account of Antiochus Epiphanes and the end of time. It'd be rather absurd to put the unmentioned interval it just before the mention of the resurrection; it is much more logical to put it the place as we did, between verses 35 and 36. Though some have suggested other points at which to place the interval.

Now that was E, and I want to go on now to glance at F which is: "Daniel 12:4-13." As we have noticed, chapters 10-12 are one unit and it is very unfortunate that the archbishop made the division of chapter 11 where he did. If he made it one verse later, it would have been a reasonable division, though actually it's one continuous passage: chapters 10-12. And so 12:4-13, I want to say a few words about verse 4. I'll read from the New International Version now. Verse 4 says, "But you Daniel, close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end. Many will go here and there to increase knowledge." Now that is the translation that the NIV has. In the King James version it was a little more ambiguous. They rendered it, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge

shall be increased.” There’s not a great difference between the two in the wording but a tremendous difference in the meaning. As it stands in the King James version, “...shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.”

Isaac Newton, one of the greatest scientists that ever lived, wrote a discussion of Daniel and in his discription he said that this statement described how things would come to pass in the latter days--that many would go to and fro. There would be traveling such as the world has never seen before. “In fact,” he said, “I wouldn’t be surprised to see people travel as fast as sixty miles an hour.” And Voltaire, the great French atheist said that Newton’s commentary on Daniel was a good example of how when a great scientific mind turns to the study of the Bible he gets into nonsense. He says, “How could anybody travel at sixty miles an hour? They wouldn’t be able to take their breath. They would die immediately.” And of course, we know now how completely wrong Voltaire was. We know that what Newton thought was a tremendous leap; today it is quite commonplace. But actually, that’s not what the passage means at all. It doesn’t mean that there will be a great increase in travel; it is definitely related to the first part of the verse: that Daniel is to seal up the book until the days approach when the statements in the book are immediately relevant to the people’s situation. And then many will hunt back and forth and knowledge shall be increased. The NIV says “to increase knowledge.” Both are possible interpretations of the Hebrew. I think the King James says that as they hunt back and forth they are going to find more understanding of what the passage means. The NIV simply says in order to try to get more understanding of what it means. I think perhaps in this regard the King James is a little better there, but the NIV in the first part is much clearer than the King James’s “travel to and fro.” It is the same Hebrew word used in 2 Chr. 16:9, “The eyes of the Lord go to and fro throughout the earth in order to observe the good and the wicked.” It is not a traveling, but a hunting, a searching, a seeking for.

We have a number of important things to look at. And there is some of this that is not very clear exactly what it means. Daniel is told that the greater part of the purpose of his predictions is for a time in the future, quite a distance off. Now those who hold the Maccabean view hold that it was actually written at the time of the Maccabees, but pretended to be by Daniel telling things for that period. And that would fit. The prophecy would be a long distance off, to have it written about 530 BC and have it look forward to events about 160 B.C., a period of about 4 centuries later; that is a very, very long distance. If somebody had predicted events occurring now in the time of the pilgrim fathers, that would be very difficult to do; he'd we're looking way ahead. And so there is much in the book that looks way ahead to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But of course as we found in chapter 11, there is also a great deal that looks way beyond the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. And of course, the interesting thing is that we start our prophesy with chapter 2, where we see the complete destruction of the statue, representing human government through the years and that complete destruction has not yet come. So his prophecies begin with a look way on, thousands of years into the future, but then in later chapters he looks at the great crisis that comes at an earlier time than the end.

And now I've given you a couple of assignments on chapter 8. But we have not looked into chapter 8, and chapter 8 is the parallel to these other chapters which I thought it was good to leave until after our discussion of Antiochus Epiphanes under chapter 11 instead of under 8. Although in some ways chapter 8 is clearer about Antiochus Epiphanes than chapter 11 is. Each chapter tells us a good deal about him but there's no contradiction between the statements; various aspects are emphasized in them. And so I want to turn now to chapter 8. Now under that, 8 is "The Setting." I want to bring out the fact that Chapter 2 is given in the second year of Nebuchadezzar of 602 BC, and then the next prophetic vision we have is at least 45 years later. I say it's first year of Belshazzar, 556 B.C. or later. And you know the reason I say "or later"? It is because we have no record of the time when Belshazzar became king. His father Nabonidus became

king in 556 B.C., if I recall correctly. But Nabonidus at some time in his reign made his son Belshazzar co-king with him. I would think it unlikely that he did it immediately, but he certainly did it at least a few years before the conquest by Cyrus in 539 B.C.. And so the first year of Belshazzar is either 556 or later, 45 years at least after chapter 2. There we have Daniel's vision in chapter 7 which not merely shows the fourth kingdom shown in chapter 2, and not merely tells about the complete destruction of human government, as predicted, but in addition to that it shows something of the later days before that destruction. It tells about the little horn that fights against the saints and prevails against them until the Ancient of Days comes and gives the victory to the saints, and destroys entirely and completely the beast that was represented by the little horn.

And then in the third year of Belshazzar, two years later, we have this eighth chapter. The ninth chapter says at the beginning, "In the first year of Darius the Mede who was made king over the realm of Babylon," and the statement "was made king" should make it rather obvious that Darius the Mede was not the great emperor, but was Cyrus's representative. Professor D. J. Wiseman thinks that this was another name for Cyrus. It seems more likely that it is one who was spoken of in his inscriptions as Gobryus. At any rate, he was a man who was made king over the Babylonian province under the great emperor Cyrus. He evidently did not hold that position many years. In fact, it says he was quite elderly when he received the kingdom because chapter 10 begins in the third year of Cyrus the Persian, which would be about 537 B.C.

And so chapter 8 is the third year of Belshazzar, and for #2 of the outline: I said: "Shushan." It says in the King James version that in his vision. Daniel was at the Shushan Palace. The NIV says, "In my vision I saw myself in the citadel of Susa." Now "Shushan" is what the Hebrew has "Susa" is the way the NIV takes it which is a city about 200 miles east of Babylon, in Persia. The fact is that both are true, because the ancient Babylonians wrote the word as "Shushan," but we have pretty good evidence that they didn't pronounce it "Shu"; they pronounced it "Su." So while it is actually written in

the Hebrew "Shushan," "Susa" is how they actually pronounced it. And Susa was a great capital of a regime that had fought the Assyrians for many years, though finally conquered by them, it was probably part of the area held by Cyrus at this time when Daniel had this vision. And so the fact that Daniel saw himself in this place, to which he had probably gone in the past as a diplomatic representative, and now he sees himself over there is a suggestion of great changes to come.

Now #3: "The order of presentation." This we need not linger over because it was an assignment I gave you some time ago, to look at chapter 8 and note how much was vision and how much was interpretation. Verses 2-12 is a vision, and then while he's still in the vision, Daniel hears a saint ask another a question and the other saint answer. Now that you might say is still part of the vision, but I've simply listed it separately here, verses 13-14. And then we have 5 verses given, 15-19, where God asks the angel Gabriel to explain the vision to Daniel. And Gabriel says he will explain it to him, and so verses 20-26 are the interpretation of the vision. And then the final verses are Daniel's reaction. He was tremendously upset as we read in the last verse of this vision.

Now we will call B as the part of the vision proper: "The two beasts." We have here two animals described that are very different from the animals in chapter 7. In verses 3-8 we have them described; in 20-22 we have the interpretation of them. And instead of the ferocious looking beasts described in chapter 7, we have a goat and we have a ram. And the first one goes butting his way, pushing and covering the ground going across the earth, toward the west, and the north, and the south. It a good description of Cyrus' conquest. The goat is described as coming from the West and going so fast that he hardly touches the ground. It exactly fits. And so we have the description of Alexander the Great's very rapid conquest. Cyrus' conquest was tremendous, but Alexander the Great's was much faster. These verses describe it rather vividly. We won't take time to go into them in detail, but we notice that in the interpretation in verses 20-22, that the NIV reads "the two horned ram that you saw represents the kings of Media and Persia. The shaggy

goat is the king of Greece. And the large horn between his eyes is the first king. The four horns that replace the one that was broken off represent four kingdoms that will emerge from his nation but will not have the same power.” That would seem to make it very definite that this is a picture of the same events which are described in chapter 7 and described again in chapter 11.

But then we have something new in Daniel 8. Here we find that we are confused by the fact that in the King James version speaks of a little horn. The NIV says, “Out of one of them came another horn which started small but grew in power.” That is quite different from the King James’s “little horn.” Actually in chapter 7 where we had the little horn that represents the Antichrist, the word "little horn" there was in the Aramaic and literally means that: a horn, a little one. But here the wording in the Hebrew is “a horn from littleness.” And "a horn from littleness" the NIV has very well described by saying, “another horn which started small but grew.” "A horn from littleness," or it could point to an opposition "away from littleness." This Hebrew preposition is used in these two senses "from" or "away". It shows origin from or it shows opposition: “more than.” And so if you took a horn “more than” littleness, you could mean a strong horn, and the ancient Greek translation here renders it "a strong horn." I think probably the NIV interpretation is the more accurate one, a horn that began little and became great. But it is not the same terminology as in chapter 7. Now the holder to the Maccabean interpretation of course would say the little horn in chapter 7 is Antiochus Epiphanes and so he is the little horn in chapter 8; they’re both Antiochus Epiphanes. Well, in chapter 7 the little horn comes out of the fourth kingdom, in chapter 8 it comes out of the Greek kingdom which is the third kingdom, and this horn "from littleness" describes Antiochus Epiphanes, who did not have a right to the throne, but who came in with a small force and managed to get control.

So the tendency of the critics to try to equate the two is one we must avoid, but that doesn’t mean we should go to the opposite extreme and say wherever it speaks of a great

enemy of God it always describes Antichrist, because we have two great crises in the book of Daniel. The prophecies look forward to Antiochus Epiphany, a long way off, nearly four centuries after the time when Daniel wrote; and we look forward to the coming of Antichrist, at least 2,000 years after that. And so we have two different crises described. The little horn in chapter 8 comes out of the third kingdom, not the fourth as in chapter 7. So in chapter 7 we looked forward to a great crisis that has not yet occurred. Here we are looking at a great crisis that did occur in the time of the Maccabees. And so the account tells us about how Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) came from one of the parts of Alexander's empire. It describes his arrogance and it says that he caused sacrifice to cease. Chapter 8 verse 12 says the daily sacrifice was taken away. He did away with the daily sacrifice. And we find exactly how that was fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes, who so polluted the temple that no pious Jew could enter it, so the regular morning and evening sacrifices were no longer made. He also put up a statue of Jupiter and polluted the temple even more, and the Maccabean revolt eventually resulted in the Jews' getting control of the temple again and taking out the altar that had been polluted.

So this is a description of Antiochus Epiphanes then; all these things were precisely fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes. And yet it is strange, we mustn't go to the other extreme from the critics and say that every time it speaks of a great enemy of God in these passages it's speaking about The Antichrist. But there are many who find it difficult to think that chapter 8 is simply telling about the great crisis under Antiochus Epiphanes, that is indeed only what is described there. They think that The Antichrist must in some way be in chapter 8, just as he's very clearly in chapter 7 and he's very clearly in chapter 11. In fact, both Antiochus and The Antichrist are very clearly in chapter 11, as we've seen. But there are many who insist that he must be in chapter 8 as well. Some have even gone so far as to say the vision here is about Antiochus Epiphanes but the interpretation's all about The Antichrist. Well, since the interpretation starts with saying that they represent the kings of Media and Persia, and the king of Greece, is described, it seems

ridiculous to take that view. And so a larger number will say that this is describing Antiochus Epiphanes, but that he is a type of Antichrist. It seems to me that we introduce unnecessary confusion in the Scripture when we make some future thing a type of some other future thing if there's no Scriptural statement that says that is the case. It seems to be quite clear that here in chapter 8 we are talking exclusively about Antiochus Epiphanes.

Now, the reason why many feel that this must be about The Antichrist is verses 17 and 19. I'll read them from the NIV, starting with 16. "I heard a man's voice from the Ulai calling, 'Gabriel tell this man the meaning of the vision.' As he came near the place where I was standing, I was terrified and fell prostrate. 'Son of man,' he said to me, 'understand that the vision concerns the time of the end.'" Well that phrase, "the time of the end," can suggest the time of the end of the age. But the expression "end" is used in the Scripture in many different ways. "The end of your faith." "You are receiving the end of your faith in the salvation of your souls," says the New Testament. It can speak of the end of somebody's reign, or the end of some situation. It means it concerns something that is not in Daniel's time, but is quite a distance forward, a time of an end. There are many cases where it very obviously does not refer to the very end of the age.

And so he continues in verse 19; he said, "I'm going to tell you what will happen later in the time of wrath because the vision concerns the appointed time of the end." And one commentary says that nothing ended at the time of the Maccabees, and so it must look forward to Antichrist. But of course that is an erroneous statement, "nothing ended at the time of Antiochus." The persecution that Antiochus began, that great persecution, came to end when the Maccabees gained their freedom and set up Judea as a separate state. Or if you want something bigger than that to come to an end, the captivity began as you know in the time of the taking of Jerusalem, and the exile began then in 586 B.C. The exile ended in 538 B.C. because Cyrus gave a decree that the people who desired could go back and could rebuild the city of Jerusalem. And so the exile ended there, but

not the captivity because they were still under control of the Persians. And they continued under their control until Alexander the Great destroyed the Persian empire, and then Palestine was under the control of the Ptolemies for 100 years after Alexander died, and then under the Selucids. So the captivity continued till the time of the Macabees, but the captivity ended with the Macabees. They had about 100 years of being independent before the Romans took over. So it certainly is a "time of an end" of a very vital development of the history of Israel.

Well, while there's more detail that would be interesting in this chapter, if we had considerable time, I would like to take the statements of Antiochus in the first part of the vision and parallel them with the statements in the interpretation. And it's very interesting to see how each of them gives us some information that is not given in the other. But I don't think we will take time for that now since the semester is drawing so near to the close I would like to put on the board for a minute now a brief outline of these four different chapters. It doesn't cover anything but what we've already looked at, but it perhaps makes it a little more vivid. In Daniel 2, the four parts of the statue, or the five parts of which the last two are joined together. In chapter 7, the four animals, then followed by the little horn. In chapter 2 we have the complete destruction of the statue. In chapter 7, the beast of which the little horn is part, is completely destroyed and his body given to the fire. And then the new kingdom in chapter 2, and the Son of Man's kingdom in chapter 7. Now one of the suggested questions I've put there is, "What is said about saints in the book of Daniel?" And we find that as we looked at one place this morning, in chapter 8 he heard a saint enquire of another. Now whether that word "saint," means a "holy one" or a "saint," we don't know exactly what it refers to there, but the word saint is used several times in chapter 7 where The Antichrist fights against the saints and is about to destroy them, but the Ancient of Days comes and the kingdom is given to the saints. The Son of Man is given a kingdom; he shall reign. It's a kingdom that cannot be destroyed, but the kingdom is given to the saints. There is at least a part of

the time when the Son of Man reigns in power over the earth when the saints are his representatives in power.

You find many people talking about the eternal age. Some say there can be no Millennium when Christ comes back, there must be only an eternal age because the kingdom, we are told, cannot be destroyed; it's the kingdom of Christ. Well, it is quite plain that the kingdom of Christ cannot be destroyed, but there is no reason it cannot change its form in such ways as He may choose. And so the kingdom of the saints would seem to last for 1000 years, and what is after that we do not know. I do not find the words "eternal state" anywhere in Scripture. I think they are a philosophical conception that has no solid basis. I see no evidence that time comes to an end. Time is simply the possibility of things following one another and there's no reason to think that things can't follow one another after the Great White Throne Judgement. But God has not revealed to us what will happen then.

But notice in chapter 8, I put the ram a little lower down in the picture here because it doesn't tell us in chapter 8 which of the animals, or parts of the statue, the ram corresponds to. But the description makes it very clear that it is the second, and that the he-goat is the third animal. And then the "horn from littleness" comes, and at that point we have a great crisis. Then in Daniel 11, we have the same two kingdoms described: Persia and Greece. And then we have the crisis in verses 21-35. And then we jump to a still greater crisis in verse 36 and following.

Now there's much more we could say about chapter 8, but I want to have a few minutes at least on the four verses which are found in Daniel 9:24-27. Now in Daniel 9 we have a great prayer which Daniel gives in response to a prophecy given by Jeremiah that Jerusalem would be desolate for 70 years. When does that desolation begin? Does the desolation begin with the destruction of the city (586 B.C.), or does it begin with the great destruction in the territory nearby and the great number of people taken into captivity at the same time Daniel was taken into captivity (605 B.C.)? It is pretty hard to

be sure when those 70 years actually began. But in chapter 9 we find that Daniel, after the Babylonian empire has been destroyed, and Darius the Mede has taken over as Cyrus' representative, Daniel prays. He figures it had been about 70 years since he was in Jerusalem, and for which time the territory around Jerusalem had been desolate. Now he could pray: "O God, you said there would be 70 years of desolation. Now is a time we can go back to our homeland, we can reestablish the glory of Jerusalem. We can have things established as they were before." But he says, "O we were a sinful nation. We deserved what you've done and we still are sinful." And so what is the Lord going to do? And so the greater part of chapter 9 is made up of this great prayer. And then God sends the angel to Daniel to bring him an answer. And the angel gives him an answer in four verses which have been argued about perhaps as much as any four verses (24-27) in the Bible. And there's much in these four verses that is not at all clear. And there are about six views that are held and held very tenaciously, by various individuals. People become very emotional that their view is correct. But most of those who interpret these four verses, Daniel 9:24-27, most who do so approach it with a definite idea in mind. And then they try to fit everything into that definite idea.

Now there are two definite ideas that are widely held: there are those who say these verses must tell us exactly how many years it would be before Christ would come. Now that would be a very strange thing, if 400 years in advance he told exactly when Christ would come. That would be a very strange thing. We do not find predictions like that elsewhere in the Scripture. God could do that if he chose, but we have no right to assume that he did that and no right to twist the statements around in order to force them into giving us an exact number of years from the time of Daniel to the time of when Christ would come. I would say we have no right to do that. There are others who say we must do it, or at least we do it without saying anything about it; just insist that it occurs. But I say we should not approach it with such a presupposition. We should look at it and try to see what is there, and then when we do, we should emphasize what is clear first and then

should try to fit in what is less clear with what is clear. That I feel is the only reasonable approach to it.

Now I see that I have already discussed what I have called A, "The situation," by discussing the prayer and Daniel's answer coming to him. This is the situation. Verse 24 tells about the purpose. Verse 24 says that, "70 weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision in prophesy and to anoint the most holy." I asked you for today to look at these verses and to see exactly what you think they mean and whether there is a definite order. Many commentaries will insist that the first three phrases of verse 24 are paralleled by the last three: the first by the fourth, the second by the fifth, the third by the sixth. And I think that is entirely imaginary. So I was interested to see how many of you would suggest that sort of an arrangement. And there were one or two papers that were given to me last Wednesday which said that the first the three are negative and the last three positive, and that is an important observation. You can say there are three that are rather negative, they speak of destroying sin. And then number four speaks of bringing in everlasting righteousness. So it might be divided into two threes on that basis. But to say that 1 corresponds to 4, 2 to 5 and 3 to 6, you find dogmatically stated in many commentaries, and I do not think it is warranted. I should mention at this point that there is another approach that is taken that does not contradict the first false approach I just mentioned, and that is to say this must point exactly to the time of Christ. Many make the assumption that this passage must look to the first coming of Christ and to nothing else. Now there are a number of books written in recent years that take that assumption, which assume it can point to nothing else: it must only point to the coming of Christ. Now, we notice that in the other chapters, except chapter 8, the other three visions all look specifically to the time of the complete destruction of human government. And we have not found in the book of Daniel any other clear prediction, anywhere else but in

these four verses, of the first coming of Christ. Therefore, to assume that these verses must only point to the first coming of Christ is quite unwarranted. I believe they do point to the first coming of Christ, but to assume that that's all they point to is quite unwarranted. And there are many who interpret the statement in verse 27 which says, "he will put an end to sacrifice and offering" or "he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease" as meaning that Christ, by his death on the cross, put an end to sacrifice and offering. And it seems to me that is taking an assumption and reading it into the text, because we have the statements in two other places in Daniel how the little horn is going to cause sacrifice and offering to cease, referring to his putting an end to them. To say that in this case it means that Christ by his death on Calvary, will cause sacrifice and offering to cease is quite out of parallel with what you find elsewhere in the book of Daniel. These other chapters point very definitely to the second coming of Christ. It would be strange if there was nothing in this chapter, in this particular prediction that pointed to that. So that doesn't prove it. But to assume it points only to the first coming is utterly unwarranted.

Now as you look at these purposes, some of them have been interpreted in many different ways. And I believe that to approach the passage, we should emphasize what is clear and then fit in what is less clear, and consequently I believe that we should place considerable emphasis on the third purpose, which in the NIV is "to atone for wickedness." In the King James version it says "to make reconciliation for iniquity." But this word "reconciliation" used in the KJV is used about 70 times in the Old Testament to mean "atone," and there are only four cases where this word is translated "reconciliation" in the King James Version. I don't know why they did it in this passage because there is no passage I know of where it means to reconcile in today's sense. Perhaps in the time of King James, the meaning would fit. But today, if I reconcile you, it simply means I make each of you stop thinking false things about the other and become friends again. And that's not what this term means. This term means; when one is at fault to provide some way of remedying the fault so that they can again be friends. In other words,

"atonement." It is used constantly in the Old Testament in connection with the sacrificial system: the making of atonement. This is the standard word for atonement. And so I don't know why the King James Version in this particular case translated it, "to make reconciliation." The word definitely means atonement and in the few cases where it is not used in connection with the sacrificial system, it is used of somebody making somebody else friends with him again by repaying him for something, or making up for something he's done to hurt him. So that it is an exact parallel in the few cases where it's used in relation to people or to what it means in our relationship with God.

So this third statement, "to make atonement for sin," it seems to me is, we can say, definite proof that this passage, the only one in the book of Daniel, does look to the first coming of Christ. I think we can say that positively from the third purpose. And then when you look at the first, second, and fourth, they are read in the King James, "to finish transgressions, to put an end to sin, to bring in everlasting righteousness." Now there have been various interpretations of those. I know of one very fine Christian writer who insists they all describe what Jesus Christ did at his first coming. He makes one of them, "getting rid of wickedness," described as when Jesus went into the temple and drove out the money changers, for instance. It seems to me this is a rather small thing to make in view of these great purposes here described. But there are a number of writers now who insist that they must all refer to the first coming of Christ. But these three purposes, "to finish transgression, to put an end to sin, to bring in everlasting righteousness," seem to me must refer to that which is stressed elsewhere in Daniel to the complete end of the reign of wickedness over the world, with the complete destruction of the statue and the complete destruction of the fourth beast.

So I think we can say that we can reasonably expect to find clear references to both the first advent and then to the second advent in this passage. I see I got ahead of my outline there. I mentioned that second advent - some or all of first, second, and fourth purposes.

Now we have the sabbatical year; we have the seven sevens followed by the Jubilee. I feel it is utterly wrong to say they can't be precise periods. But we have no right dogmatically to assume they are precise periods. It is also possible to approach it with the question: "Are they exact number of years or are they general periods of time?" And some very good interpreters have taken this later view. Number 2, "Is the anointed one verse 25 Christ, or Cyrus?" I believe that is important. Isaiah 44:26-45 says "Cyrus will rebuild Jerusalem. He will Rebuild my city. He is my anointed." This very term, "Messiah," or "Anointed," is used of Cyrus. We have no right to assume that this word Messiah in verse 25, means Christ. I believe it does in verse 26, but in verse 25 we have no right to assume it in either case without examination. And certainly no right to assume that in 25. So one must be careful to examine each reference in its context rather than making sweeping generalizations based on a theory imposed on the text. That will have to be it for today.

Edited and narrated by Dr. Perry Phillips

Initial editing by Ted Hildebrandt

Transcribed by Tyrel Borowitz