

Allan MacRae: The Prophecies of Daniel: Lecture 13

We noticed in Daniel 7 a picture which, as Edwin Edward J. Young says, showed the whole process of human history from the time of Nebuchadnezzar down to the very end. It's a picture that reaches the climax in the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven with authority to overcome the little horn, which has made war with the saints, and in overcoming them the little horn is to be completely destroyed and a kingdom set up that can never be destroyed. We noticed in chapter 8 how it looked forward to the coming of Antiochus Epiphanes. And while Antiochus Epiphanes is very similar to the Antichrist, we have no reason to think that Antichrist is in that chapter. It is a clear picture of a great crisis to come many centuries after the time of Daniel, but it reaches forward to Antiochus and stops. That is the point which the critics think is the goal of all of Daniel and to which they would apply all of the presentations of Daniel. And then we looked chapters 11 and 12, which gave us a picture starting with the later kings of Persia, summarizing through the kings of Greece, then telling about Antiochus Epiphanes in detail, and then jumping forward with a long unmentioned interval to The Antichrist and making statements that can't possibly be referred to Antiochus Epiphanes, but that clearly describes The Antichrist and reaching forward to the picture of the resurrection in the beginning in chapter 12.

Now, in all these chapters we have nothing that can positively be said to be a prediction of the first coming of Christ, unless it be the origin of the stone, that the stone was cut without hands, which could apply to a virgin birth, but could apply equally well to the eternal existence of Christ, who was cut without hands, but the actual striking of the stone would seem to come at the end of the age. All these great blessings that God is going to bring us are founded upon the atonement of Christ, founded upon what he would do at his first coming. But in none of these chapters have we seen anything explicitly pointing to his atonement--to that thing which is at the very center of the Scripture.

There we have looked now at all of the prophetic passages of Daniel, except one, in which he looked forward into subsequent centuries. And that one consists of only 4 verses, Daniel 9:24-27. But these four verses have been argued as much as perhaps any four verses in the Scripture. I wish we had three hours to spend on this. I wish we had time to discuss them and to look at the various questions that might arise in your mind about them. In a way I was tempted to simply devote today to review our previous chapters, to look at any of these exam questions, and seeing if there were any of them on which you thought further clarification would be helpful, and not to go into these four verses at all. But I believe that we ought to take time to try rapidly to look at the most important matters that pertain to these four verses. I began looking at them last time.

But now I want to get over the basic things about Daniel 9:24-27, if possible. We already glanced at what is on this paper here about this passage. We want to emphasize what is clear and then fit in what is less clear. That is not the usual way of approaching the Scriptures. It is not necessarily the correct way to do it when you give an exposition to people with comparatively little background. But when you try to learn what the Scripture means, that is certainly the right approach, but one which I fear is more honored in theory than in observance. We mentioned last time A: "The situation that Daniel saw by books, that of the seventy years fulfilled in the desolation of Jerusalem." He of course was referring to Jeremiah. But Jeremiah nowhere makes any specific statement that Jerusalem will be desolate for 70 years. In Jeremiah 25:11-12 he says, "This whole land shall be a desolation and a horror, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon for 70 years." The 70 years is the time that all these nations are going to serve the King of Babylon. Most of this--the area of Jerusalem--will be in desolation, but it's tied up with desolation of the nations rather than just Jerusalem. And the next verses say: "It will come to pass when 70 years are accomplished that I shall punish the King of Babylon, and that nation," says the Lord, for their iniquity and the land of the Chaldeans I will make it a perpetual desolation." There's one other reference in Jeremiah, Jeremiah 29:10.

Daniel read it and it says, "Thus saith the Lord, 'After 70 years are accomplished at Babylon I will visit you and perform my good work toward you and cause you to return to this place.'"

And so when this chapter begins in Daniel 9, it was in the first year, after the end of the Babylonian power, the first year of Darius son of the Ahasuerus, the descendent of the Mede, who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans by Cyrus the conqueror. And at that time Daniel realized that nearly 70 years had passed since he himself was taken a prisoner and carried away to Babylon. But just when would the desolation of Jerusalem have started? When would these nations have started to serve the king of Babylon? The King of Babylon had already been defeated by the Persians. How soon would the people of Israel go back? He did not assume. God has promised it, God is going to fulfill it. Let us just rest in God's promises and be content. That's not his prayer. His prayer is: "O Lord, you've sent these terrible things upon us because we deserve them. We have sinned against you. We've done what is wrong. You have given a promise. Oh, we pray our Lord that you will enable us such that you can give us these things that you have spoken of. That you will forgive our iniquities, that you will carry out these things."

And so he prayed this great prayer to the Lord, and the Lord sent Gabriel to give him an answer. And the answer must have been a very discouraging one to him. Instead of saying the 70 years are over, the captivity is over, you're again to be free, instead of that he said, "70 weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to bring in everlasting righteousness," and so forth. And it must have been a disappointment to Daniel.

We noticed the purposes here, and there are two clear facts about the purposes that are given in verse 24. The third of these purposes is to make atonement for iniquity. And that is the first clear statement in the book of Daniel about Christ's atonement. There are earlier clear statements about it in the Scripture. The great event at Calvary is clearly

predicted even as early as Genesis 3. But here is the first statement in the book of Daniel that must relate to the first coming of Christ, to make an atonement for iniquity. Now the first, second, and fourth purpose--to finish the transgressions, to make an end of sins, to bring in everlasting righteousness--would seem to require what is pictured in the complete destruction of the statue, in the complete burning of the fourth beast, and in the end of the power of Antichrist. It would seem then to look forward to the first advent and then to the second advent.

Now these four statements have had much discussion and disagreement about them. I've not gone at this moment into the other purposes given because there are very widely differing interpretations of them and you can find those in the discussions of these verses. And I believe we should look at what is clear and definite. But before we do so, I want to look at certain important uncertainties in verses 24-27. I do not mean, of course, that these are the least bit uncertain in God's sight. What I mean is, of course, they are places where we do not find it easy to know exactly what is meant. In anything that anybody has ever written there will be points of uncertainty. You have to clarify some verses by what else is said and by the one who speaks. That is no weakness of Scripture; it is true in all writing. And so before we begin making any dogmatic statements about this passage, it is vital that we note certain things in it on which we shouldn't jump to conclusions.

The first of these is: are the weeks, 70 weeks, weeks of years; or are they general periods of time? Now there are books that say they must be weeks of years. And there are books that say they cannot possibly be weeks of years. Now this latter statement I think we can flatly contradict. They can be weeks of years. We can say that definitely because the law of Moses includes a provision of six years of planting and reaping, and then one year the land is to lie fallow and enjoy its Sabbath. That the figure of the week is related to the seven year period is very clear in that provision in the law of Moses. And so that does not prove that these are weeks of years, but it does disprove the statement that they can't be weeks of years. Leupold in his commentary on Daniel, (don't worry about the

name right here, I'll have it on my chart later), Leupold says positively that the word week is never used in the Scripture for week of years. The NIV does not translate it "weeks"; it translates it "sevens," and that of course is playing safe, translating it "sevens." But it is exactly the same word that is used and is translated "week" in the Scripture. But is it a week of days? Is it a week of months? Is it a week of years? Is it a general period that we cannot be dogmatic upon? We must get our evidence elsewhere and see what fits in.

Number 2: "Is the 'anointed one' in verse 25 Christ or Cyrus?" I have already mentioned to you the fact that E. J. Young said in his commentary that since Christ is the only one who is both a priest and a king, the statement "Messiah the Prince" must only mean Christ. But this is a demonstrably false statement because the word "Messiah," or "Anointed," is used far more in the Scripture of a king than of a priest; in fact it is rarely used of a priest. It simply means one set apart by God for a special purpose. And it is used a very few times of a priest. It is used a number of times of a prophet. But it is used a great many times of a king. And so "Messiah the Prince," or "Anointed one--the Prince," can very easily mean a king. It certainly does not have to mean a priest; it certainly does not have to refer to Christ. And in Isaiah 44:26-45, as you have already noticed with your study of the word anointed, the Lord specifically calls Cyrus, "Thus says the Lord unto his anointed, to Cyrus." And a few verses before he said of Cyrus, "The Lord is the one who performs the word of his servant and performs the counsel of his messengers, who says to Jerusalem, thou shalt be inhabited and to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built." Verse 28 says of Cyrus, "He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built and to the temple thy foundation shall be laid." God predicted through Isaiah that Cyrus would be his anointed one to rebuild Jerusalem. Then when he says, "70 weeks are determined upon thy people, upon thy holy city," and he says, "understand that from the going forth of the commandment unto the Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks," we cannot rule out the possibility

that the word "Messiah" in verse 25 refers to Cyrus, regardless whether it refers to Christ in verse 26.

Number 3: At the beginning of verse 25 it says "know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem." But this word that is translated "commandment" in the King James version is simply the Hebrew word "word," not the common word for commandment. Now it is occasionally used for a commandment, but it can also be--and is far more often used--for a message declaration, a prophetic prediction or something else. And so we cannot dogmatically say that the word "word" there indicates a human command. It might indicate a divine command; it might indicate a divine prediction such as the one found in Jeremiah 32:42-44.

A fourth point of uncertainty: Will the three predicted periods of time follow immediately after one another, or are there unmentioned intervals between them? A professor of the Old Testament, a very fine, godly, Christian man wrote to me after I gave a paper on this subject about three years ago, and he said to me that two noted authorities that he named had proved that these 70 weeks must be continuous. And he gave the page numbers of their works. And I looked them up, and in each case the author dogmatically said: "Of course the 70 weeks must be continuous." Now, that is no proof. When you have three periods of time, do the three periods immediately follow one another? Or, are they separated by unmentioned intervals? Well, the author was so dogmatic about this, that, when you say, "70 weeks," and divide it in three periods, that must mean three continuous periods. Now I looked around to think of an illustration. And I made an illustration, which I believe is true to fact, and which corresponds exactly to the form of this prediction. This prediction says: "from the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, unto the Messiah, the prince, shall be 7 weeks; and 62 weeks the streets shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times. And after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself." And verse 27 says, "He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause sacrifice

and oblation to cease.” And so you have just about an exact parallel to the 70 week prediction. I don’t say that my parallel proves that the three periods do not immediately succeed one another. But I say it shows that it is entirely possible that they do not succeed one another since it appears there is a gap between the 7 weeks and the 62 weeks.

I have the sentence there on the board which I hope you will write down. I find difficulty in remembering it myself. But the principle in it, I think, is quite clear. Since World War I, the Republican party has held the presidency for 28 years. Does that have to be 28 continuous years? From the election of Harding to Franklin Roosevelt was 12 years. And 8 years Eisenhower occupied the White House. You don’t have to mention the fact that between the coming of Franklin Roosevelt and the election of Eisenhower there was a period of 16 years. I say Eisenhower occupied the White House-period. In the course of the last two-term period, Nixon resigned. Now that is an exact parallel to the structure of the sentence in Daniel’s 70 week prophecy. And that does not prove that these three periods have intervals between them. But it does show that you cannot dogmatically say that they must be continuous. They may have intervals between them. There is an exact parallel with my analogy to the structure here of these three verses.

Now a fifth uncertainty in the passage: What is the meaning of the phrase “and will have nothing” in verse 26? Can the KJV paraphrase “But not for himself” be right? It is very interesting that if you look at the NIV of verse 26, you will read the words, “after the 62 sevens, the anointed one will be cut off and will have nothing.” The King James Version says, “And after three score [20] and two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off but not for himself.” There’s quite a difference, isn’t there? Is the KJV a translation or is it a paraphrase? Those who had much Hebrew would immediately recognize it as a paraphrase. The NIV has a footnote there. After reading here in the text “will have nothing,” they have a footnote which says, “All will be cut off and will have no one or will be cut off but not for himself.” Well, now, there’s quite a difference between these statements. The Hebrew form says, “He will be cut off and have nothing.” Well, how can

the King James then say, “Be cut off, but not for himself”? Well, one thing we should notice is that the Hebrew word that is translated “and” is also very frequently translated “but.” So the translation “but” in the King James is entirely possible. “He will be cut off, but have nothing” or “He will be cut off, and have nothing.”

And then we have a question: He will be cut off and then have nothing of what? You notice the NIV said, “or be cut off and have no one.” But we may think of the one cut of as having nothing or possession, or nothing of power, nothing of supporters, or nothing of people. But one ancient Greek translation, or perhaps to some extent paraphrase of the passage, translated it this way, “He will be cut off while having no crime, no iniquity.” And so he will be cut off and have nothing, nothing of what? Nothing of guilt. Nothing to deserve being cut off. And I say the KJV is not a translation, it is a paraphrase, but it is an entirely permissible paraphrase. The “and” can just as well be “but” and the “have nothing” can be “have nothing of guilt,” “nothing of reason why he should be cut off,” instead of, “be cut off and lose all of his possessions.”

Now those are five points that should not be decided in advance, but the problems should be noted and then we should proceed to see what the evidence is and then decide which of these is most likely. And so we move on to D: “A fact clearly involved, but generally ignored, should be recognized at the start.” This fact is that there are three periods, not two which are predicted, and the first of these is 7 weeks, not 69. Now most modern translations, including the King James Version say, “From the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem under the Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks; (Semicolon) the streets shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times.” But the Hebrew is accented in such a way to show that in the opinion of the Hebrew scribes the semicolon should not be after 62 weeks, but after 7 weeks, exactly as in the parallel sentence in which I gave you. To Messiah, the Prince, is 7 weeks; and in 62 weeks the following situation will exist.

Now that is not nearly as important, the fact of the accentuation of the Hebrew, as

the beginning of verse 26. Verse 26 begins, “And after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off.” After the 62 weeks. Now most interpreters take it as if there were two periods, one of 69 weeks and one of 1 week. And while they may in a footnote somewhere or in some small type make a guess as to where there is a slight break between 7 weeks and 62 weeks, they treat it as if it’s one period of 69 weeks. But clearly the passage makes a break after 7 weeks, and the clear proof that the Hebrew accentuation is right is found in the beginning of verse 26 because verse 26 says, “after the 62 weeks.” It does not say, “after the 69 weeks.” Now, the Living Bible is a paraphrase; it attempts to give you what the translators think the original means rather than to give a real translation. The King James and the NIV both attempt to be translations, though any translation occasionally - like the KJV’s “not for himself” - occasionally falls into a paraphrase. It is impossible for a translation to avoid doing so, but we must keep it as seldom as possible that we fall into a paraphrase. However in making a paraphrase, like the Living Bible, it is good to show exactly what you think it means. And so the Living Bible begins verse 26 with the statement, “After the 69 weeks.” And that is what Gabriel would’ve begun with if that is what he meant. But Gabriel specifically begins it with the words “after the 62 weeks,” which makes it clear that there are three parts, not two; so to the Messiah, the Prince, is 7 weeks, and then the 62 weeks is the second period, the period during which there is a rebuilt city standing there. And so this is a fact that should be recognized; that there are three periods and that the first period is a period of 7 weeks, not a period of 69 weeks.

Then E: It is equally clear that if a human command to rebuild Jerusalem is in view, it must refer to the edict of Cyrus in 538 B.C. “From the command to rebuild Jerusalem, to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah, the Prince, is 7 weeks.” If this refers to a human command it must be Cyrus’s edict in 538 B.C. And many, many commentaries say explicitly this is what it means, this is what it must mean. Cyrus is the one who gave the command to rebuild. And yet there are some commentaries, and quite a number, that insist that that is not the command it refers to, but a later command. And that I say is

completely impossible. The edict that Cyrus gave is quoted in Ezra 1:1-4. His command was that the people be enabled to go back and build their temple. And building a temple implies building a city around the temple. That command is clearly given in Ezra 1:4. And then some years later that edict of Cyrus is quoted by Darius in Ezra 6, quoted and reaffirmed by Darius, quite a few years later. And more important even than those--that I think would completely prove my thesis--more important even than that is the fact that Isaiah said in Isaiah 44 that Cyrus is the one who will rebuild Jerusalem. "He is the one who will build my city." God predicts it will be Cyrus through Isaiah. And if Cyrus is not the one who is meant, the going forth of the command, if it means a human command, then Isaiah must have been a false prophet and we should cut his book out of the Bible. It must be Cyrus if it refers to a human command.

Now we go on to F: "Great confusion has been caused because the passage is generally approached with unwarranted assumptions." That is why there is so much confusion: the passage is generally approached with unwarranted assumptions.

Number 1: It has been generally assumed that the prediction shows the exact time when Christ's first advent would occur. Now that is an assumption that is taken by just about all of those who take the weeks to be weeks of years rather than general periods of time. A one-time head of Scotland Yard wrote a book called, "The Coming Prince" in which he said, "These 69 weeks come right to Palm Sunday, the exact date." Only he gave a date that hardly any scholar I know of now believes to have been the date of Palm Sunday. But I would say that such an assumption is quite unjustified, because it would be contrary to usual practice in Scripture. It is not usual in Scripture to tell us a century or two ahead exactly when something is going to happen. We should note the New Testament statements about the time of the Second Advent, in which our Lord so clearly said, "It is not for you to know times or seasons." He said, "You are not to know when the Son of Man will come back. The Father has kept that in his own power. But you are always to be ready." He told the Patriarchs who went down to Egypt that "after 400 years

your people will be back,” and scholars argue about whether those 400 years include the time in Palestine and the time in Egypt, whether it’s from Abram’s first visit to Egypt of when they came back, or whether it’s after Jacob went down to Egypt. It’s an approximation, but a precise time for something centuries ahead would be quite contrary to usual practice in Scripture.

And if Daniel had predicted so closely that you could know within a decade or so when Christ would appear, it would be strange indeed that no New Testament writer points out the fact that Daniel did so. That wouldn’t prove that Daniel had, but that is a very strange thing, if Daniel gave a precise prediction like that. More important, perhaps not more important but equally important, such an assumption of continuous 69 weeks of years does not work out. The decree of Cyrus was given in 538 B.C. Seven weeks of years would be 49 years. 49 years after 538 (489 B.C.), Jerusalem had to be rebuilt, but Jerusalem was simply standing there as a small town, most of the people were in exile, no one came then who could properly be called Messiah, the Prince. 62 weeks after this would be 434 years after, still more than 100 years before Christ’s birth. If you take 69 weeks as one period instead of two, that is a period of 481 years, which is still more than 50 years short of reaching the time of Christ. And so an assumption which takes the only reasonable interpretation, if this means a human command is that it refers to the decree of Cyrus, but it still does not work. But it also fails if the unwarranted assumption is made that the command to rebuild starts in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, or 445 B.C.

Now, this head of Scotland Yard said, "We will start from the 20th year of Artaxerxes." Why did he say that? Because we read in the first chapter of the book of Nehemiah that Nehemiah heard that much of Jerusalem was in disrepair. The walls were in bad shape, and the tombs of his ancestors were not being kept up. So he went before the King, carrying on his regular function there as a high functionary for Artaxerxes’s court, and Artaxerxes saw him looking sad and said to Nehemiah, “Why are you so sad?” And Nehemiah said, “Because the tombs of my ancestors are not in good repair.” And the

King said, "What would you like me to do?" He said, "I wish you'd send me to Jerusalem, and give me permission to fix things up a bit there." And the king said, "Alright I will give you the permission." There is no edict quoted by Artaxerxes. There is no command by Artaxerxes to rebuild this city. It had already been rebuilt for over 100 years, though, but nothing like its ancient splendor. It was standing there as an unwallled city which had been rebuilt nearly a century before. Now there was something of walls around it, some remains of the old walls. But there certainly were many, many people living there, and the temple services were being carried on. Dr. Walvoord in his commentary on Daniel says, "This must start from the 20th year of Artaxerxes," following the suggestion of the detective from Scotland Yard whom I mentioned. Professor Wood of Grand Rapids wrote a commentary on Daniel not long ago in which he said, "If you figure 481 years from 445 B.C. you get about 10 years after the time of Christ." That doesn't work out so he said, "We'll take the edict that Artaxerxes gave in his 8th year instead of his 20th year." Well, Artaxerxes did not give any edict to build the city in the 8th year. And, therefore, very few people make it start at that point. But Artaxerxes did give an edict then, permitting Ezra to go to Jerusalem and ordering him to make sacrifices and offerings in the temple in Jerusalem on behalf of the King Artaxerxes. Well, in order to make sacrifices in a temple which the order recognizes is already standing, then the order is not an order to rebuild Jerusalem. And so Wood is the only book which I happen to notice, which begins from the 8th year of Artaxerxes. There is certainly no evidence of an edict to rebuild the city starting then.

Now Anderson, the Scotland Yard leader, realizing his scheme would run at least several years after any date for the death of Christ as is now known and certainly far after any date for the birth of Christ, says, "Let's figure the years not as 365-day years, but as 360-day years." And the reason for that is because sometimes a month is spoken of as 30 days. And sometimes as a general way of speaking for five months, it'll say 150 days. And so he says, "There is a prophetic year consisting of 360 days." And that way he gets

rid of a certain number of days, and by moving back that way and by moving the death of Christ ahead that way, he thinks he makes it come exactly together. There are charts now today and there are some books that contain that exact statement, but there is no evidence of any such so-called prophetic year of 360 days ever having been used by any people in any country anywhere.

Now, a second false assumption that is sometimes made is: "Some recent writers assume that the entire prophecy must be related to the first advent." It's very interesting. Edward J. Young's commentary, which recognizes Antichrist as the subject of the last part of chapter 11, and which recognizes that chapter 7 goes right to the very end of the age says of chapter 9, that everything in it must relate to the first coming of Christ. He says on page 209 of his commentary, "This entire passage is Messianic in nature and the Messiah is the leading character. The general theme of the passage, introduced in verse 24, is surely Messianic. The blessings therein depicted were brought about by the Messiah and they form their climax in the anointing of a Holy of Holies." Now that is a purpose on which there is much argument as to exactly what it means, the "anointing of a Holy of Holies." There is no place where it can be proved that the phrase "Holy of Holies" refers to a man; it's used a number of times for a building. It is a part of the purposes which we can't be dogmatic about. And the absurdity of interpreting it all as relating to the first coming of Christ becomes clear when you note the statement that "In the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease." Young says, "When it says 'it will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease,' he means that Christ, by his death on the cross, will cause oblation and sacrifice to cease." But sacrifice went on 40 years after Christ's death. He did not cause it to cease then. Well the answer some would give would be, "Yes, but the sacrifices were no longer valid after Christ's death." Well, if they no longer had validity, what validity did they have before? Hebrews says the blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sin. The sacrifices point to Christ. You can point to him before, you can point to him afterwards. But they did not cease; they were not made to

cease. If you meant something different, different phraseology could be used. It is utterly absurd to interpret it this way, but Young is far from being the only one who interprets it in that way. There are many now, more in recent years than before, who try to make the whole thing point to the first coming of Christ.

Number 3: "It is often, but unnecessarily assumed that the periods must immediately follow one another." We have noticed that rather clearly. Now I want to, as quickly as we can, examine the view of Kiel and Delitzsch. It is very interesting that Young in his commentary says in the beginning of the commentary that he must acknowledge his great help from Kiel's commentary. He says, "This is, I believe, by far the best commentary on Daniel." And yet where he quotes the views of many scholars on Chapter 9, he makes no reference whatever to Kiel's view, which is about as far different from Young's view as any view could possibly be. But he makes no mention of it. He mentions many recent writers whom he derides and shows that their claims are utterly impossible, but Kiel's view, which is just as different from his as any of them, he does not even mention. Now, the view of Kiel and Delitzsch is this: There are three periods, thus they are indefinite periods. The first period of 7 weeks reaches from Cyrus to Christ. The second period of 62 weeks reaches from Christ to the coming of Antichrist. And the third period of one week is the period of Antichrist before the return of Christ. That view is held by Kiel, in what Young says is the finest commentary ever written up to his time on the book of Daniel, Leupold, the Lutheran commentator who has written a number of commentaries, follows Kiel in this view. His points in the favor of this view are: First, that it recognizes three periods, not just two periods. Second, that it parallels other predictions concerning the bringing in of eternal righteousness and to the ending of sin, as do the 69 weeks, according to this view. And Third, it recognizes the decree of Cyrus as the starting point, if it is a human command to which it points.

However the theory has two very questionable features. One of these is that the periods are quite disproportionate. If there was a period of 7 weeks from Cyrus to Christ,

then if you're going to have a period of 62 weeks, nearly 9 times longer before the coming of the Antichrist, that should be at least another 2,000 or 3,000 years longer than it has been. Now that can still be for all we know, but it does seem to be too long a period. That is a small objection. A big objection is the fact this theory it takes the first Messiah as Christ, "Messiah, the Prince." but the second Messiah, where it says that "Messiah shall be cut off and have nothing" as "This view says that means that when Antichrist takes over at the beginning of the week, Christ loses all power on earth, He's cut off, He has nothing now." Well I don't believe that the Scripture teaches there will ever be a time when you can say that Christ has absolutely no power on earth, when you can say He'll have no followers on earth, when you can say He has nothing. Christ, His power is universal, His power cannot be destroyed. He may withdraw part of his power for a time, but to say He will have nothing, I say is impossible. So, in my opinion, this problem of "cut off and have nothing" completely destroys Kiel's and Delitzsch's view.

And so, I finally propose a solution that fits the facts. A solution, I feel, that will fit the facts where the facts are clear and will make a choice where a choice is possible.

Number 1: The word, or command to rebuild is not a human command, but a divine prediction--the prediction to which I already called your attention. Jeremiah 32, verse 1, shows that this verse was in the last year before Jerusalem was destroyed, which was long after Daniel had been taken into Babylon. Verses 42-44 show that God ordered Jeremiah then to say that in this place there will be business transacted and carried on again, which is a prediction of the reestablishment of Jerusalem. And so we have the divine prediction of the reestablishment of Jerusalem, which Jeremiah gave, exactly 49 years before Cyrus made his edict. And this thing of giving three parts to a prediction, of which the first part would already have been fulfilled, is exactly like what we found in chapter 7, where the account of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity, which had already occurred, is described in the description of the fourth beast. That had already occurred, and you could see it already occurred, and this gives you renewed assurance that the rest of the prophecy will be

carried out.

And so that would be the first period of 7 weeks. Then there would be an unmentioned interval, followed by a period of 62 weeks, a period of something around 400 years (434 to be exact), but just when it starts, you don't know. There's no mention in the passage of the start of the second period. But these 400 years easily fit the time period between the word in Jeremiah and the first coming of Christ. And then after the death of Christ, which is described in verse 25, we have verse 26 that tells of the new destruction of Jerusalem, by the "Prince that shall come" and shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. This refers to the destruction of the Temple and the city of Jerusalem by the Romans in A.D. 70. "The Prince that shall come" refers specifically to Titus. And then after that there would be another unmentioned interval another rebuilding of the city, and then the coming of Antichrist, which is the way that Kiel and Delitzsch and many interpreters take verse 27.

Now we're already past time so I'll have to stop here. And if you find that we've covered too much in this period, don't worry too much about it because we've covered a great deal else in the course of the year.

Edited and narrated by Dr. Perry Phillips

Initial editing by Ted Hildebrandt

Transcribed by Tyrel Borowitz