
DANIEL 9: THE SEVENTY WEEKS

Bob Waldron

I. The background of this passage.

- A. Daniel is well aware that Jerusalem is destroyed, and **why** it is destroyed.
- B. He has understood by the books “the number of the years whereof the word of Jehovah came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the **accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years.**” Remember that this will help us to know the meaning of the revelation Daniel receives.
- C. It is Daniel’s great desire for his people to be forgiven, to return to Israel, to rebuild Jerusalem, and to rebuild the temple, toward which he has prayed for these 70 years (Dan. 6:10).
- D. He understands that the time is pretty well up that had been stated by God through Jeremiah for the desolations of Jerusalem (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10).
- E. Daniel sets his face toward the Lord. He does not reason that if the Lord has promised to restore His people in seventy years, and the seventy years are almost up, then he doesn’t need to pray about it. Instead, his anticipation of the fulfillment of this great dream of Daniel spurs him to an intense effort of prayer to Jehovah.
- F. During his prayer, Daniel asks that the anger and wrath of God be turned away from Jerusalem (Dan. 9:16). All during the prayer, the city is very much on his mind (Dan. 9:7, 16, 18, 20).
- G. Also remember that all the praying that Daniel has done at his window for these years has been in keeping with the agreement of God in answer to the prayer of Solomon (1 Kings 8 & 2 Chron. 6) and God’s response (1 Kings 9; 2 Chron. 7).
- H. Because God greatly loves Daniel, He commands His angel to go give Daniel some information, particularly about Jerusalem and its future.
- I. Basically what God tells Daniel is that, yes, Jerusalem is going to be rebuilt, but after a period of time it will be destroyed again, after which it will never hold any special place in God’s plan.
 1. This promise was in keeping with the plan of God to set up a spiritual kingdom in which there would be no earthly shrine or headquarters (John 4:21).
 2. The prophets were full of this message (Zech. 2:4-5; Isa. 4:3-6; Amos 9:11-12). Zion was to be a spiritual reality, not a physical place.
- J. If these things were borne in mind, men would never introduce their speculative fancies into Daniel 9 unless they were committed to some doctrine or agenda that required it.

II. An overview of various theories about the seventy weeks:

- A. **Premillennial theory** (exemplified by Ironside, Barnhouse, Larkin, Lindsey, and a host of others):
 1. Premillennialism uses the figure of 70 weeks to construct a chronology of events.
 2. The beginning is reckoned from the command to rebuild Jerusalem, commonly given as 445 in the reign of Artaxerxes (Neh. 2:1).
 3. Seven weeks accomplish the rebuilding of the city.

4. Sixty-two weeks take us up to the Messiah. Then He is cut off.
5. At this point the premillennialists insert a gap: from the cross to the Rapture. This is known as the Mystery period, a period not revealed to Daniel. Therefore they say that verse 27 refers to the antichrist and what he will do with the Jews (Chart #1).
6. There is, however, no such gap taught or implied (Chart #2).

B. “Realized Eschatology”:

1. Max King, in his “Realized Eschatology,” has a theory about the seventy weeks as fanciful as the Premillennialists.
2. In his theory, a 30 year gap is put between the 69th and the 70th prophetic week, and the six items of verse 24 are fulfilled within the 7 year period between A.D. 63 and A.D. 70 (see chart #3) (*Spirit of Prophecy*, p. 46).
3. “The first division of seven weeks, or 49 years, was the time involved in the restoration of Jerusalem. This time was to be counted from the going forth of the commandment to rebuild the city until the work was completed. From the rebuilding of the city unto the ‘cutting off’ of the Messiah was an additional 62 weeks, or 434 years. This makes a total of 69 weeks, or 483 years from the giving of the commandment to rebuild Jerusalem until Christ is rejected or cut off” (*Spirit of Prophecy*, p. 47)
4. “The problem that enters here is determining what time, or decree is involved in the beginning of these 70 weeks.” King mentions several decrees (2 Chron. 36:22-23; Ezra 6:3-8; 7:7), but nothing is said about rebuilding the city in these decrees. He says the first mention of any such decree is recorded in Nehemiah 2:1-8. This was in the 20th year of Artaxerxes (445 B.C.), “which must therefore become the starting point of this ‘time’ prophecy” (*Spirit of Prophecy*, pp. 47-48).

C. The problem with all such efforts is that they are too arbitrary.

1. It is very common to begin figuring the seventy weeks from the 20th year of Artaxerxes, and since he began his reign in 465, that would make the time 445.
2. It seems clear that anyone who is going to have the seventy weeks composed of 70 periods of 7 years each (weeks), i.e., 490 years, and commencing with 445 is going to wind up with a time about A.D. 45, which has no theological significance, unless one inserts a gap.
3. All the theories that begin with Artaxerxes ignore the passages that designate Cyrus as the one who would decree that the city be rebuilt.

III. An analysis of Dan. 9:24-27.

- A. The period of seventy weeks is divided into three groups of weeks: seven weeks, 62 weeks, and 1 week.
1. In the article by Homer Hailey on Daniel 9, you will notice that he does not attempt to use the seventy weeks to construct a literal chronology. Neither does E. J. Young. In general, it is only those commentators who begin with a speculative agenda, such as premillennialism, who endeavor to construct a literal chronology from the seventy weeks.
 2. Young quotes from Kliefoth, and says that Keil follows him in believing that the seventy weeks is “an intentionally indefinite designation of a period of time measured by the number seven, whose chronological duration must be determined on other grounds” (Edward J. Young. *The Prophecy of Daniel*, p. 196).

-
3. Nevertheless, Keil and Kliefoth believe that the 7 weeks are from Cyrus until Christ, and the 62 weeks are from the first advent of Christ until the consummation of time. This is, however, contrary to the Messianic context of verse 24.
 4. It is often argued that the date of beginning is 445, as we have indicated above.
 5. There are a couple of references in Isaiah that must be figured into all this:
 - a. "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built; and of the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isa. 44:28).
 - b. "I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will make straight all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free, not for price nor reward, saith Jehovah of hosts" (Isa. 45:13).
 - c. In both of these verses, the decrees of Cyrus regarding the captives returning home, their building the temple, and their building Jerusalem are all affirmed of Cyrus.
 - d. Therefore a powerful argument can be made that the decree to rebuild the city of Jerusalem dates from the days of Cyrus. (And Young so argues, pp. 201-203. See also Calvin, Keil and others.) Of course such a date would throw a literal 490 years into total disarray. Such a period would not fit anything, and would be entirely over before Christ was even born.
 6. Therefore, the seventy weeks are to be taken as a symbolic period of time.
 - a. Notice the things marking the beginning and the end of the period: the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the Desolation.
 - b. According to Daniel 9:2, Daniel understood Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years accomplishing the desolation of Jerusalem (Jer. 29:10).
 - c. God wanted Daniel to know that the desolation of Jerusalem at the hands of the Chaldeans would not be the last, however. It would be seventy weeks from the rebuilding to utter desolation.
 7. Without the needless gap of premillennialism, the meaning of the 70 weeks is perfectly plain.
 - a. Jerusalem was about to be rebuilt.
 - b. God said that from this point till the time of Jerusalem's utter desolation is 70 weeks (Dan. 9:25a).
 - 1) If the beginning point is 445 B.C., A.D. 45 would be the end point, and 45 A.D. has no particular significance. But as I have already indicated, evidence contradicts the idea that the beginning point is 445 B.C. According to Isa. 44:28; 45:1, 13, the going forth of the commandment would be at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, when he told the Jews to go home.
 - 2) I do not believe therefore that we are to attempt to convert the 70 weeks into literal time. Jerusalem was utterly destroyed in A.D. 70.
- B. In verse 24 the things to be accomplished within that seventy weeks are set forth. We will now analyze the six phrases that set forth what will be accomplished in the period of seventy weeks. We will look at the Hebrew words, and we will include the rendering of *The Holy Scriptures*, translated by the Jewish Publication Society.
1. Finish transgression. "To finish the transgression." **Lekhale hapeshah.**
-

a. **Lekhale** is the infinitive of the word **kala'**.

- 1) *Finish* means rather *to restrain*. If the translation is to be “finish,” then we would find the word **kalah (ending with the he)** instead of **khale (ending with the aleph)**.
- 2) Bagster’s little lexicon defines “restrain, confine, withhold.” Sin that has hitherto been before God’s face will be shut in and hidden by God, that is, by the putting away of sin (Heb. 9:26).
- 3) The two words **kalah** and **Kala'** are closely related “both semantically and formally” (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 7, p. 143). In the article on **kalah**, however, the editors make this point: “Even if the two verbs can hardly be distinguished morphologically, great caution is necessary in analyzing the semantic consequences” (p. 158).
- 4) Of the literal usage of **kala'**, the word in Dan. 9:24, the point is made that the verb appears primarily in narrative texts, four of which refer to an act of restraining others (Exod. 36:6, where Moses stops the people from bringing any more offerings; Num. 11:28, where Joshua asks Moses to restrain two ecstasies; 1 Sam. 25:33, where Abigail restrains David from an act that would involve bloodguilt; out of reverence for Yahweh, the psalmist in Ps. 119:101 restrains his feet from every evil way (*TDOT*, Vol. 7, p. 144). Though these examples come from narrative texts, they are highly instructive on the meaning of the word.
- 5) Of the metaphorical use of the word, we find this comment: “The Piel form (?) in Dnl. 9:24 speaks of the apocalyptic end of Israel’s sin” (*TDOT*, Vol. 7, p. 145). This interpretation is defensible, but I do not agree with it. Gaebelein is quoted by Young as an example of Dispensationalists who argue that, since “the 70th week has not yet occurred, this particular blessing also has not appeared. According to him, it will appear during the millennium which is to follow the 70th week” (Young, p. 198). Young aptly answers this point by stating that “the period of 70 sevens is decreed in order to accomplish these blessings. They are to be introduced, then, during this period, not after it” (Young, p. 198). By the time desolation comes upon Jerusalem, all the things of verse 24 will be accomplished.

b. *Transgression* is from **pasha (ending with an Ayin)**. It is defined as “rebellion, transgression.” It is true that in the original, the word has the article, but should not be taken to refer to just one transgression, but to the fact of transgression as it occurs in the lives of men.

c. Thus the point is that expressed by Paul in Romans 8:3: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.” I could not express the point any better than Whiteside: “The law of Moses could not free a person from the law of sin and death, but God did that very thing by the plan of salvation perfected by the mission of His Son into the world, including His death as a sin offering. The death of Christ procured for all who accept him release from the condemnation that rests upon all sinners. And thus in His flesh He condemned sin. Formerly sin reigned as master, and held the sinner in captivity. When a person accepts Christ, sin as his master is destroyed – blotted out” (*A New Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Saints at Rome*, p. 169).

-
2. Make an end of sin. “To make an end of sin.” **Ulchatem chatoth**. Men will be brought out of sin. An end is made of sin when it is removed; also when it is rejected from one’s lifestyle (Rom. 6).
 - a. **Ulchatem** may come from either of two words, and it is this kind of problem that makes these verses difficult.
 - 1) According to Davidson’s *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, the word comes from **thamam**, which means to be completed, to end “with I and infinitive, *to cease doing*” (Davidson, p. 763). And, of course, **ulchatem** does appear with I and is the infinitive.
 - 2) Keil says that the term comes from **chatham** (Keil & Delitzsch, Vol. 6, p. 660), which means “to seal, seal up...to make an end of, finish, Da. 9:24” (Davidson, p. 280). It seems difficult to me to pin Keil down in this passage. He argues that “shut up transgression” means to shut up in prison and that the “figure of the sealing stands here in connection with the shutting up in prison.” He goes on then and says that by this “sealing up,” the sins or transgressions mentioned in the preceding expression “may thus be guarded and held, so that they can no longer be pardoned and blotted out” (Keil & Delitzsch, *Old Testament Commentaries*, Vol. 6, pp. 660-661). Nevertheless his comments on “sealing up prophecy” sound as though he is discussing the end of sin. He quotes from Kliefoth saying: “When the sins are sealed, the prophecy is also sealed, for prophecy is needed in the war against sin; when sin is thus so placed that it can no longer operate, then prophecy also may come to a state of rest; when sin comes to an end in its place, prophecy can come to an end also by its fulfilment, there being no place for it after the setting aside of sin” (*K & D*, Vol. 6, p. 662).
 3. Make reconciliation for iniquity (to forgive iniquity). “To forgive iniquity.” **Ulkhaper avon**. Goes back to the atonement idea, to expiate, to erase and to remove iniquity (Rom. 3:25).
 - a. **Ulkhaper** is a Piel infinitive and comes from the word **khaphar**. **Khaphar** is the word used of the mercy seat of the ark of the covenant. It is used as part of the phrase, “day of atonement.” It is defined to mean, “to cover over sin, to forgive, pardon sin. To expiate an offence, to make atonement, to appease, pacify, to expiate (Davidson, p. 390).
 - b. **Avon** means “iniquity, guilt, punishment for sin” (Davidson, p. 590).
 - c. Note that in the first three phrases of verse 24 we have three different words used: transgression, sin, and iniquity. The thing we have to decide is whether the writer is making three separate points or whether he is using three synonyms for sin to say that the subject of sin will be dealt with in all its aspects.
 - 1) Young takes the position that the three different terms relating to sin are merely summing up how God will deal with the curse of sin. “To sum up; sin is here pictured as transgression, sins and iniquity. These three words well represent in its fulness the nature of that curse which has separated man from God. The first stated purpose of the decreeing of the period of 70 sevens is to abolish this curse” (p.199).
 - 2) The last three things mentioned in the verse are definitely individual topics; this leads us to think that the first three are also distinct from one another. Yet, I still think that Young is not far from the mark.
-

- 3) Consider what is the distinction between (1) “restraining transgression,” (2) “completing sin” or “making an end of sin,” and (3) “covering iniquity.” It seems best to me for the first expression to mean to put away apostasy and rebellion, an attitude that characterizes the disobedient. The second expression means to make an end of the practice of sin, and the third, to expiate the guilt of sin.
- 4) The point is that sin, in all its aspects will be dealt with. Young adds, “How is this to be accomplished? The text does not say, but who, in the light of the NT revelation, can read these words without coming face to face with that one perfect Sacrifice which was offered by Him, who ‘appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself’ (Heb. 9:26b)?” (p. 199).
4. Bring in everlasting righteousness. (To bring in everlasting righteousness.) “To bring in everlasting righteousness.” **Uhabhi tsedek olamim**. The unfolding of the plan of salvation. Righteousness to be brought in from without. God's plan of making men righteous (Rom. 1:16-17).
- a. **Uhabhi** is the Hiphil inf. Const. of **bo’**, to enter, come or go in. The Hiphil is causative, therefore: “to cause to come in, to lead, bring in, to cause to come, to lead, bring.”
- b. **Tsedek** is the very common word for righteousness in the Old Testament, and, just as the term has different meanings in the New Testament, so it has different meanings in the Old Testament. The word here is not to be limited to just one shade of meaning, however. It means righteousness in all its aspects, but a righteousness made possible by the coming of the Messiah and by the establishment of His kingdom. One of the greatest themes of Isaiah is that the problem men have is not physical and external (Chs. 4; 11; 12; 35; 51; 52; 53). Israel was very concerned about its prosperity, feared war and captivity, but Isaiah says God is going to deliver men from his worst bondage, the bondage of sin. Only His plan for righteousness could do that, so righteousness is God’s solution to man’s problems. This righteousness is the redemptive righteousness obtained through forgiveness, but it also includes the righteousness of lifestyle to which the child of God in the Messianic kingdom must commit himself, if he is to honor his covenant with God. Israel, like we, was always preoccupied with deliverance from physical bondage, and temporal problems, but, in Isaiah, as in other prophets, God was making the point that in the Messiah, there would be no halfway measures. In Christ God would strike at the root of man’s problems and give to him the ultimate solution: righteousness in Christ. Therefore we do not have here some peculiar, localized meaning of righteousness, but righteousness in its broadest scope, the righteousness that the Messiah would “bring in.”
- c. **Olamim** is from **alam**. In the *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae*, by Solomon Mandelkern, 1962, the form **olamim** is found nine times in a similar construction as it is here (p. 880). To look at a few of these examples will be helpful. One of the most interesting is Isaiah 45:17: “But Israel shall be saved with an *everlasting* salvation: ye shall not be put to shame nor confounded world without end.” In both 1 Kings 8:13 and 2 Chron. 6:2 we find Solomon saying that he has built a house for God to dwell in *for ever*. In our copy of the Tanakh published by the Jewish Publication Society, there is no difficulty whatever in determining the meaning of **olamim** in this passage. They render it “everlasting.”
- d. Therefore the righteousness in view is not limited in meaning. It refers to the

righteousness of God revealed in the gospel (Rom. 1:16-17), the righteousness that is through the redemption and to the righteousness that the example of the Christ makes possible. Through His redemption is atonement and forgiveness; through His example is the help we need to eschew the practice of sin.

- e. Notice that in the first three phrases, we have a taking away, but God does not merely take away sin, He brings in righteousness as well. How beautifully this message fits with the message of the entire Bible. When God gave His covenant to Israel, He emphasized that what He desired from Israel was not a random, sporadic obedience, but an obedience of lifestyle (Exod. 19:5-6). In the Messianic kingdom sin is truly and finally dealt with, and only those who truly live in Zion find that freedom from sin. May God be praised!

5. Seal up vision and prophecy. “To seal visions and the prophet.” **Velachtom chazor venabhi.**

- a. **Velachtom** is the Qal inf. of **chatam**. This is one of the words disputed in the earlier phrase “making an end to sin.” Some think that “making an end of” should be translated “to seal up sin,” but it is better to think that the word there is **thamam**, to end or complete. Here there seems to be no dispute that the word means to seal up.
- b. Some take “seal” to mean “to verify vision and prophecies” as we would stamp a document to show that it is official. Young says, “This use of seal, however, does not appear to be supported from the Old Testament” (p. 200). Apparently, what Young means is, not that the word seal is never used of the idea to mark something as genuine, but that it is not used in that sense with regard to prophecy. Mandelkern gives definitions of the word that include “to close, to conclude, to mark, to stamp, to sign and seal, to seal up, as a document. It is commonly used of the engraving of a signet” (p. 434). *TDOT* provides extensive examples of the various meanings of the word. The editors point out that the idea “to close or to seal up” is a secondary meaning of the word, but there are many passages where this meaning is unmistakable (Song of Solomon 4:12; Job 24:16; Job 9:27). Of the verb in Prophetic and Apocalyptic literature, they make this comment: “Dnl. 9:24 states that at the end of the ages ‘vision and prophet’ will be sealed. This could mean simply that prophetic vision and preaching are superfluous when all is consummated. More likely, however, it means that the revelation received earlier by the prophets is confirmed by being fulfilled at the eschaton. In this sense the ministry of the prophets is past, it is ‘closed’ and no longer has any purpose” (Vol. 5, p. 269).
- c. One must be very careful in considering definitions. Many, such as the editors of *TDOT* are extremely liberal in their outlook. They believe hardly anything, but study the Bible as a grand fiction in which men did believe certain things. Their comment about Daniel illustrates this: “The entire fiction that Daniel received the message some five hundred years before the end is preserved by the notion that all was kept hidden until the period just before the end” (Vol. 5, p. 269). It may be a subjective thing to say, but very few authorities have a really accurate understanding and/or belief that prophecy, inspiration, and revelation all fit into a comprehensive, rational plan of God.
- d. One can see that even the comments above of *TDOT* wind up at the same place that Young does. *TDOT* says that the fulfillment of the prophets means that their work was genuine, and that it is over. “In this sense the ministry of the prophets is past,

it is 'closed' and no longer has any purpose." Therefore I believe that what God is telling Daniel is that when these things are accomplished, that the functions of prophecy will be finished. O.T. prophecy culminated in the Messiah. O.T. prophecy is finished and fulfilled. In Christ all Old Testament prophecy is complete (1 Pet. 1:10-12; 1 Cor. 13:8-10).

6. Anoint most holy. "To anoint the most holy place." **Velimshoach qodesh qadashim**.
 - a. **Velimshoach** is Qal inf. of **mashach**. Davidson defines as: "to smear or rub over; with oil, to anoint."
 - b. **Qodesh qadashim** is literally *holy of holies*, meaning *the holiest*. Young gives the meaning *a most holy thing* (since the phrase has no article in it). The question is: does *holy of holies* or *holy thing* refer to a place or to a person?
 - c. Let us refresh our minds about some things. The tabernacle of Moses was anointed when it was set up (Exod. 40:9; Lev. 8:10). The text does not tell whether the Solomonic temple or the second temple was anointed. But the example we have shows that a place could be anointed. But when the tabernacle was anointed, it was not just the most holy place; it was the whole thing, with all the furniture (Lev. 8:10-11).
 - d. As Homer Hailey says in his article on Daniel 9 (see at the close of this material), even if *the most holy place* is the desired idea, that place would be "the present dwelling place of God where saints come into His presence, through the way dedicated by Christ's blood (Heb. 12:19-22)."
 - e. I think that, in keeping with the supremacy of the Messiah, and His central place in all promises and prophecy, that it is far more in keeping to think of His being the holy thing (Luke 1:35) that is anointed than of any place. The anointing of the Messiah is a prominent theme in prophecy (Ps. 2:2; 45:7; Isa. 61:1; Zech. 4:14; 6:13; Luke 4:18-19).
 - f. It also seems obvious to me that the anointing of the most holy thing is related to the anointed one who is cut off, according to verse 26, and this is the Messiah.
7. I believe that all six items are Messianic. Within the seventy weeks, all these things would be accomplished. Since Daniel is so concerned to have the holy city of Jerusalem rebuilt, God informs him that it will be rebuilt, but it will be made completely desolate later, and that its desolation would be connected with the coming and work of the Messiah.

C. Verse 25.

1. He says that from the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks.
 - a. *The anointed one* is the Hebrew **mashiach** which is the term translated the *Messiah*.
 - b. The Anointed One would show up during the 62 weeks, but the circumstances clearly show that it would be at the end of that period. See verse 26.
2. Of Jerusalem the text says it shall be built again, etc. (Dan. 9:25b). After this the seven weeks are not mentioned again. It seems clear that they are not mentioned again because they are passed.
3. The city shall be built again with street and moat in troublous times.
 - a. Street and moat.

-
- 1) Street is from the word **Rechobh**. This is the word from which the name *Rehoboth* comes from. It means room or space. Davidson defines the term: “A wide open place, a street, square, market-place” (p. 680). It might be better to take this word as signifying the court before the temple. K & D state, “It is applied to streets only in so far as they are free, unoccupied spaces in cities” (p. 674).
 - 2) Moat is from the word **charuts** defined by Davidson as: “ditch, trench, Da. 9:25” (p. 276). But the word “is of somewhat doubtful significance” (*Pulpit Commentary*, Vol. 13, p. 270). The idea of “sharpness” seems to be the common denominator of meaning among the various definitions of the word (Winer in *Pulpit Commentary*, Vol. 13, p. 270). *TDOT* sustains this idea in their discussion, but they show that “sharp” might refer to “a sharp threshing sled” or a “sharp individual” just the way we use the English word, “sharp” (Vol. 5, p. 217). They also say, “The noun **charits** means ‘moat, canal, incision,’ as it does also in 3Q15 8¹⁰ (cf. *charuts* in Dnl. 9:25) and in Old Aramaic” (*TDOT*, Vol. 5, p. 216). So, it is probably best to take it in the sense of moat. Young seems to agree with this and says, “the two words taken together present a picture of the complete restoration of the city” (Young, p. 206).
 - b. In troublesome times, or literally, “in affliction.” **tsoq** is defined: “masc. *distress, oppression, trouble*, Da. 9.25” (Davidson, p. 642). Jerusalem would be rebuilt in affliction or oppression. There is no need to look very far for circumstances that would fulfill this prophecy. The rebuilding of Jerusalem would be accomplished in the days of Nehemiah, and there would be plenty of affliction. Nehemiah faced internal problems and external problems in getting the walls of the city built. Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem did all they could to stop the work (Neh. 4:1-3, 7-8; 6:1-9, 10-14), and there were the internal problems Nehemiah faced (5:1-13; 6:17-19; 13:4-9, 10-14, 15-22, 23-27, 28).
- D. Verse 26: “And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off and shall have nothing” (9:26).
1. This cutting off of the Anointed One describes exactly what the prophets foretold and what did come to pass (Isa. 53:8; Matt. 26:56b; Mark 14:50).
 2. According to Dan. 9:26, after the 62 weeks, the anointed one shall be cut off, and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. The question is, do these two things happen between the 69th week and the 70th week, or do they happen during the 70th week? Sometimes we aim for a precision that is not possible because we do not have enough data to be more exact. However, we offer this thought. Just as there is an event of great significance that marks the transition from the 7 weeks to the 62 weeks, so we have an event of great significance that marks the transition from the 62 weeks to the last, or 70th, week, and that is the rejection and crucifixion of Christ.
 3. Then come the events of the 70th week. The description of these events begins in verse 26. Since the Anointed One is specifically said to be cut off after the 62 weeks, then His death marks the beginning of the last week. It is well noted that the passage gives us not a single detail to mark the end of the 70th week. However, I think it is important to remind us that the whole point of this vision is to inform Daniel about the fate awaiting Jerusalem, and to draw the conclusion that the event that marks the end of the 70th week is the destruction of Jerusalem. The one week does not signify that there will be no time after it. The end of the 70th week is left rather vague, other than that which is said at the
-

beginning about what the 70 weeks are for. It seems to me that the thing that really characterizes this 70th week is that it is the period following the Jews' rejection of the Messiah until the judgment of God upon their holy city and sanctuary.

4. The people of the prince probably refers to the Romans and their leader Titus. His father, Vespasian, began the war, but it was Titus that finished the job of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. Under the leadership of these men the Romans came and destroyed the city and the sanctuary.
 - a. These events occur *after* the 62 weeks. Unless there is some unforeseen "gap," these events occur during the last week.
 - b. It is the people of the prince that shall come and destroy the city. This prince is not the same as the anointed prince of verse 25. The people of that prince would not come and destroy the city and the sanctuary.
5. *Prince* is the word **naghidh**, from the verb **naghadh**, which is defined by Davidson as: "leader, chief, or prince" (p. 533). This is the same word found in verse 25. Therefore we cannot distinguish between the prince in verse 25 and the prince in verse 26 on the basis of the words themselves. The context, however, does establish a difference. The prince in verse 25 is called the "anointed one," the Messiah. The prince in verse 26 is he whose "people" will come and destroy the city.
6. Both the city and the sanctuary will be destroyed. The word translated city is the extremely common one and holds no special significance.
7. The word translated sanctuary is **hakodhesh**, the word referring to the temple as a whole. In the Old Testament, more often, the temple is referred to simply as the "house of God," or some such. *Young's Analytical Concordance* lists 68 times the word is translated "sanctuary." It is most commonly found as the adjective "holy," 219 times (p. 37 of the Index-Lexicon to the Old Testament). The meaning is unmistakable: both the city and the temple are going to be destroyed.
8. "The end shall be with a flood." From **sheteph**, meaning "*an overflowing of water, metaph. of an effusion of anger, of the devastation of an army*" (Davidson, p. 711). In Jeremiah God says "The sea is come up upon Babylon; she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof" (51:42). In Nahum the Lord says, "But with an over-running flood [**sheteph**] he will make a full end of her place, and will pursue his enemies into darkness" (Nah. 1:8). In other words, Jerusalem will be completely over-run and swept away by the armies of the prince, as houses and cities might be scoured away by a flooded river.

E. Verse 27:

1. He shall make a firm covenant with many for one week. Though most of the Jews to whom Jesus came would reject the Messiah, yet He would cause His covenant to prevail for many of them. It is very important to note that it is *after* the 62 weeks that the Messiah is cut off.
 - a. One important question is: Who is this one who makes a covenant? Is it the Anti-Christ? Is it the Roman prince? Is it the Christ?
 - 1) I believe the answer is the Christ. It certainly was not Vespasian or Titus. The Anti-Christ is a mythological character dreamed up by the Dispensationalists.
 - 2) Note the discussion below on the significance of the expression, "He shall make a firm covenant."

-
- 3) The most obvious covenant in view is the covenant of Christ.
 - 4) We are looking at the sweeping away of the debris of the Old Covenant at this point (Heb. 8:13), so it would be logical to consider the establishing (in the sense of strengthening, demonstrating the permanence) of the New Covenant at this point.
- b. Another question: Why a covenant for one week? The covenant of the Messiah will last forever. The point is that we are focusing upon this period, the period that will see the fall of Jerusalem and of the temple. This period will see the judgment of God upon the Jews, making clear His rejection of them. This vision does not look beyond the destruction of Jerusalem. This is all that is meant by the words, "For one week." The covenant will not be limited to one week, but this is all the time in view in this vision.
- c. Christ shall make a covenant with many.
- 1) Young has aptly pointed out that the expression, "He shall *make a firm covenant* with many for one week" does not use the ordinary phraseology for making a covenant. Literally, the Hebrew would mean, "To cut a covenant," **karath berith** (Gen. 15:18; Exod. 34:10). There can be no doubt that there is significance in the words the writer has chosen to use. The verb is the hiphil form, thus causative. It means "to cause to prevail or to be strong." Thus the point is not the *making* of a covenant but to cause a covenant that has been made to prevail.
 - 2) "The many" is not equivalent to a generic "lot of people." It is more specific than that. The many is best taken in contrast with the group that is under consideration as a whole, and that is the Jews. This prophecy is about the Jewish nation and their holy city and sanctuary.
2. His causing sacrifice and oblation to cease is open to two good explanations:
- a. Christ made sacrifices of the Old Testament vain as is taught so clearly in Hebrews (10:1-18, e.g.). I would feel better about this explanation if the text said, "He causes sacrifice and oblation to be null and void. The verb *to cause to cease* is **yashbith**, the Hiphil form of the verb **shabhath** which is of course the word from which *rest* and *sabbath* come. Davidson gives these definitions of the word in the Hiphil: "I. *To make or let rest* from labor; of work, *to intermit*. – II. *To restrain, still*, Ps. 8.3. – III. *To cause to cease* from doing any thing... – IV. *To make to cease, to interrupt, put an end to*. – V. *to put away, remove*. The idea of "making to cease," of "interrupting," of "putting an end to" seems to require a more direct application.
 - b. The sacrificial system of the Jews was forever disrupted at the destruction of Jerusalem. The idea of causing these offerings to cease is a negative idea that fits well with the ideas of destruction of Jerusalem and of the sanctuary. All of these things were signs of judgment and of the displeasure of God. Therefore I think this idea is preferable. Josephus reports that it was on the seventeenth day of Panemus, or Tamuz [Tammuz], which was the fourth month, corresponding to our June/July, that the "sacrifice called 'the Daily Sacrifice' had failed" (Josephus, *Wars*, Book vi, ii, 1).
3. Upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate.
- a. The word translated *wing* is **kenaph**. The word means "I. *wing* of a bird...II. *wing* of an army, Is. 8.8.–III. *extremity, extreme part, corner*, as of the earth.– IV. *skirt* of

the loose flowing upper garment.—V. perhaps *pinnacle*, Da. 9.28 [27], *upon the pinnacle of abomination*, i.e. the temple filled with abomination” (Davidson, p. 385). Brown, Driver, and Briggs has this to say: “Dn 9²⁷ is obscure; Meinh. [J. Meinhold] reads, after Vrss. [Old Versions], *on the corner (of the altar) is a devastating abomination*” (*Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 489).

- b. All confess the difficulty of the passage. Some say *wing*, though singular, must be taken in the sense of the plural, *wings* (*Keil & Delitzsch*, Vol. 6, p. 684). This would be that the “one that maketh desolate” would be coming on the wings of abomination. This view is possible, and, if true, would refer to Titus, who destroys the city and the sanctuary. Another view is that espoused by Young. He says that the reference is to the pinnacle, or extremity of the temple. He says that *abominations* “must be used figuratively to describe the worship of the Temple after the veil had been rent in twain. No longer was this the house of the Lord, but a house of abominations, for the true worship of Jehovah had ceased” (p. 218). The years since the death and resurrection of Christ had seen the abominations of the Jews increase. This view would argue that the idea is of total desolation. “The *one making desolate* is said to be over or upon the wing of abominations, i.e., he comes over the summit or highest pinnacle of the Temple, thus signifying its utter destruction” (Young, p. 218).
- c. Alternate readings are suggested, both Hebrew and Greek, that suggest that, instead of *pinnacle* of the temple, the wording should be simply *sanctuary*, from **qodesh**, a word we have already noted in v. 26. This rendering has much to recommend it. When the Lord referred to this verse, He said, “When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place” (Matt. 24:15). “The abomination that maketh desolate” is found in Daniel 11:31 and in 12:11, but in neither of those verses is there anything that could be translated “standing in the holy place.” But a literal rendering of the LXX is, “and on the temple shall be the abomination of desolations.” The Vulgate rendering is, “and in the temple shall be the abomination of desolations” (given in *Pulpit Commentary*, Vol. 13, p. 274). J. E. H. Thomson, in the volume on Daniel in the *Pulpit Commentary*, presents a wealth of evidence on this point and says, “Our Lord in this case must have had the Hebrew before him, as he does not render as the Greek versions do, *epi to hieron*, but *en topo hagio*. We must thus hold **qodesh** to have been the original text,” (Vol. 13, p. 274).
- d. In either case, the point is that abominations shall be associated with the end of the sanctuary. Exactly what these abominations are may be determined by comparing Matt. 24:15-16 with Luke 21:20-21. In Matthew Jesus says, “When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation...standing in the holy place.” In Luke He says, “But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand.” In both passages He makes the point that this situation occurs, flee to the mountains. Of course, by the time Roman armies were standing in the temple, it would be a little late to run, but if holy place refers to Jerusalem itself and to its environs, then the Roman army’s approach would have signaled time to flee.
- e. Let us seek to simplify the possibilities.
- 1) One is that he who will make Jerusalem and the sanctuary desolate comes riding upon the wings of abominations, abominations which will be experienced in the desolating of the city and the temple.
 - 2) One is that upon the temple, now filled to the pinnacle with abominations, comes one who will make it desolate.

-
- 3) The other view that abomination shall be in the temple, even the abomination that makes desolate, namely those that come to destroy the temple, Titus and his Roman army.
 - 4) The thing to observe is that often there is not a great deal of difference between various possibilities we pose, and there is a great deal of truth in all of these possibilities.
4. "And even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate."
 - a. "And even unto the full end." *Full end* is one word in Hebrew, **kalah**, the fem. noun of the verb **kalah**, which means to complete, to finish, to end. The adverbial use of the word means *entirely, wholly*. Therefore the word itself means a complete end.
 - b. "And that determined." It is interesting that a form of this word is translated *moat* in verse 25. In the Niphal it means *decided, determined, decreed*. The basic idea of *sharp* is preserved, because the decree that Jerusalem be destroyed is sharp, decisive. So the idea is that the end of Jerusalem will not be an accident. Its destruction will be the result of a decision emphatically determined.
 - c. "Shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate." *Wrath* is not in the original. Young argues that the subject of "poured out" is a determined end (p. 219). Thomson says that the verb **tittakh**, translated "poured out," is not correct and that it should be **tultan**, "is given," or "appointed" (*Pulpit Commentary*, Vol. 13, p. 273). The latter accords with the LXX, but not with the Massoretic text. Thomson's translation would be, "Until an end and a limit be set to the desolation." I see nothing, however, in the context of Daniel 9, or in the context of the statements of Jesus concerning the fate of Jerusalem, to indicate that there would be an end to its desolation. I believe, therefore, that the correct idea is the full and final desolation of Jerusalem, confirming the words of Jesus shortly before His death when He told the Jews, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. 23:38), and immediately afterward spoke at length of the destruction of Jerusalem and the sanctuary.

Bob Waldron
 108 French Way
 Athens, AL 35611
 (256) 232-4666
 bwaldron@hiwaay.net