

## Articles and Sermons :: 70 Weeks of Daniel

**70 Weeks of Daniel - posted by savannah, on: 2016/8/31 19:01**

The Seventy Weeks of Daniel by Rob Reid

“Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.”

Daniel 9:24

The seventy weeks of Daniel is probably the greatest prophecy ever fulfilled, for it speaks of Jesus Christ's first advent and His accomplishments through Calvary's cross. This prophecy is a remarkable testimony to the truth of Scriptures, showing that God can be fully trusted to fulfill all that He has said. No other prophecy in the Bible pinpoints the time of Messiah's appearing as Daniel chapter nine. For all these things were written down over five hundred years before they occurred. The seventy weeks of Daniel validates Jesus Christ as the true Messiah.

The Cross of Christ is the central theme of the Scriptures.

INTRODUCTION: DANIEL 9:24-27

24: Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

25: Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

26: And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27: And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

The seventy weeks of Daniel is God's timeline in dealing with the Southern Kingdom of Judah. These seventy weeks ended with the Jewish rejection of Messiah the Prince that resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D.70. Daniel received this prophecy near the end of Israel's captivity in Babylon, at which time Jerusalem and the temple were still in ruins. I believe the seventy weeks are fulfilled prophecy. This historic position has been the prevailing view of the church throughout the centuries. The “Gap Theory” that is, the sixty-ninth week being separated from the seventieth week by about 2000 years, is a recent doctrine. This modern teaching became popular a little over a century ago. Historic Christianity did not separate the seventy weeks, but considered them to be consecutive, or a unit. This view was taught by church fathers, many Protestant reformers and Bible scholars throughout the centuries. Many great men of faith held to this historic view, such as John Wycliffe, William Tyndale, John Huss, John Knox, Charles Spurgeon, Jonathan Edwards, and Matthew Henry. The prophecy of the seventy weeks of Daniel has to do with Jesus Christ and not Antichrist. This prophecy begins with a decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple and then ends with Messiah the Prince. The Church has become so far removed from God that it does not know the difference between Christ and Antichrist. The prophecy of the seventy weeks of Daniel was intended by God to confirm our faith in “Thus saith the Lord” and not to bring confusion or speculations. The modern view of this prophecy is

dangerous and leads to many misconceptions about Scriptures. For instance, it has led many into erroneous teaching such as the Antichrist will make a covenant or peace treaty with Israel for seven years, a temple will be rebuilt in Jerusalem to sacrifice animals, and in the middle of the seven years, the Antichrist will stop the sacrifices and begin to persecute the Jews: these seven years are known as the tribulation period. None of these statements can be established with Scriptures. They are simply the imaginations of men.

Most Christians are in agreement that seventy literal weeks are not intended, because that would be a time period of just a little over one year. The context must determine the designation. Without any doubt, the seventy weeks are symbolic of years, that is, each day represents a year, a total of 490 years. This same year-for-a-day principle was used in Numbers 14:34, "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my breach of promise." This is where Israel wandered forty years in the wilderness. The spies were searching out the promised land for forty days. So, each day was a prophetic scale representing one year of actual time. In like manner, the prophetic measure of the seventy weeks are 490 years. Each prophetic week in Daniel chapter nine equals seven years.

The time period of the prophecy was to begin with the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple and reaching all the way to the coming of Messiah (verse 25). It is quite clear that Cyrus, King of the Persian empire, gave the commandment to the Jews in Babylon to go back to Jerusalem to rebuild the city and temple around 450 B.C. This command is clearly stated in II Chronicles 36:22-23, "Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the LORD spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the LORD God of heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? The LORD his God be with him, and let him go up." In Ezra 1:1-4, "Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The LORD God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the LORD God of Israel, (he is the God,) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, beside the freewill offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem." Make no mistake about it, Cyrus was the king that God chose to conquer the Babylonian Kingdom and set His people free. Please note in the Scriptures that Cyrus gave the command to rebuild the city and the temple. The reason I point this out, is that, many object to this and say that Artaxerxes gave the command. We will stay with the Scripture and not be concerned with books written by men on chronology. In Persian history, Cyrus is known as Cyrus the Great. According to Isaiah 44:28, Cyrus was named by God about 150 years before he was born, "That saith 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." This would be about 100 years before Babylon destroyed Jerusalem and about 200 years before Babylon was overthrown by Cyrus. In Isaiah 45:1-13, there are certain details given about Cyrus's conquest over Babylon. These are confirmed in Daniel 5:1-31, the empire of Babylon comes to a sudden end by the Persians. The historical records support the Scriptural account of the fall of Babylon and the rise of Cyrus and the Persian Kingdom.

The seventy weeks of Daniel are divided into three sections, but are consecutive. In verse 25, there is a total of seven weeks (49 years). This is the time it took to actually rebuild the city and temple. The account of this is listed in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. These were troublous times in that, they had much opposition in their work. The second time frame is 62 weeks (434 years). This covers the time from the completion of the city and temple to the coming of Messiah. The third and last section of this prophecy is one week (7 years) according to verse 27.

Before we consider the context of Daniel 9, Daniel was in Babylon. Near the close of the seventieth year of Babylonian captivity, Daniel began seeking the Lord by prayer and fasting to determine the time when Israel would return to her land. Please keep in mind, as I have already stated, Daniel received this prophecy near the end of Israel's captivity in Babylon and at that time Jerusalem still lay in ruins. Daniel had been in Babylon since the beginning of the captivity (Daniel 1:21, 10:1). According to Daniel 9:2, Daniel understood by the book of Jeremiah that the captivity would end and the Jews could go back to their own land (Jeremiah 25:1, 8-14, 29:1, 8-20). Daniel 9:3-19, records Daniel's prayer and in verse 20-23, Gabriel gives him this great prophecy. Keep in mind, that according to verse 24, this prophecy is determined upon Daniel's people (Jews) and Daniel's city (Jerusalem). This is

confirmed by verses 2,7,11,16, and 19-20. The word "determined" in verse 24, means marked off, or divided from other years. This prophecy is centered around the nation of Israel and their Messiah

In verse 24, there is a six-fold prophecy and its fulfillment. This verse comprehends the whole prophecy, while the following verses focus more particularly on the three divisions of the greatest event in human history, the coming of Messiah and His great redemptive work. Within the seventy weeks all these things were fulfilled. This verse is a perfect description of Christ's accomplishments on Calvary's cross; for, the purpose of the seventy weeks was to accomplish salvation.

We will now consider the six-fold prophecy and its fulfillment in verse 24.

#### FIRST: "TO FINISH THE TRANSGRESSION"

At Christ's first advent, He destroyed the works of Satan, bruised his head and took away his dominion and power (Hebrews 2:14-15, Genesis 3:15 and Colossians 2:15). The Lord established the Kingdom of God in the hearts of men in joy, peace, and righteousness (Romans 14:17). At Calvary's cross, Jesus finished the transgression through His sacrifice as the Lamb of God. No future sacrifice can ever finish the transgression. Please note Hebrews 9:15, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

#### SECOND: "TO MAKE AN END OF SINS"

That is exactly what Jesus accomplished at Calvary's cross. The following Scriptures will clearly bear this out:

I Corinthians 15:3 "Christ died for our sins"

John 1:29 "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."

Matthew 1:21 "For he shall save his people from their sins."

Isaiah 53:6 "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

Hebrews 1:3 "He had by himself purged our sins."

Hebrews 9:26 "He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Hebrews 10:12 "He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever."

I Peter 2:24 "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree."

I Peter 3:18 "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins."

Romans 8:3 "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

I John 3:5 "He was manifested to take away our sins."

#### THIRD: "TO MAKE RECONCILIATION FOR INIQUITY"

This also is a present reality because of Calvary. Reconciliation was a part of His redemptive work. God and man were brought together by the cross. The Bible says in Colossians 1:20-21, "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." Also, in Ephesians 2:16, we are told that we are reconciled through His death and in Isaiah 53:6, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." In Titus 2:14, "He gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity." According to Romans 5:10, "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" even when we were enemies. Consider Hebrews 2:17, "To make reconciliation for the sins of the people," and II Corinthians 5:19, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." The Lord Jesus Christ did reconcile us to God.

#### FOURTH: "TO BRING IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS"

No one can be saved or enter into God's Kingdom without righteousness. According to Scripture, there is no one righteous, for our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. Jesus Christ has become our righteousness. Please consider the following Scriptures: II Corinthians 5:21, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" I Corinthians 1:30, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption;" Romans 5:19, "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous;" Romans 14:17 "For the Kingdom of God is . . . righteousness, and peace, and joy in

the Holy Ghost;â€ Isaiah 53:11, â€My righteous servant shall justify many;â€ Matthew 5:17, â€I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.â€ The following Scriptures speak of righteousness: Romans 3:21-26, Romans 4:3-5, 10:1-4, I Peter 2:24, I John 2:29, Jeremiah 23:5-6. Perfect righteousness is only found in Jesus Christ. Charles Spurgeon said, â€One of the main desires of Christ coming to earth was to bring in everlasting righteousness.â€

#### FIFTH: â€TO SEAL UP THE VISION AND PROPHECYâ€

The Lord Jesus sealed the Old Testament prophecies that were written about Him by fulfilling them, that is, by doing what they said He would do. Many passages bear this out to be true. In Luke 24:44 we have this statement, â€And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.â€ In John 5:39, Jesus said that the Scriptures testify of Him, â€Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.â€ Other passages that clearly state the same thing are Hebrews 1:2, Acts 3:18, II Peter 1:19, Matthew 11:13. The Lord Jesus Christ sealed up the vision and prophecy, proving Himself to be the true Messiah. To seal something is to prove it to be genuine (Jeremiah 32:10, I Kings 21:8).

#### SIXTH: â€TO ANOINT THE MOST HOLYâ€

This is Christ Himself, the Holy One of God and the Anointed, Acts 4:24, â€For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together.â€ In Acts 10:38, Jesus was anointed by God, â€How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.â€ Also, consider Hebrews 1:9 and Psalm 2:2. The Lord Jesus is called Holy many times in the Scriptures (Acts 2:27, 3:14, Luke 1:35, I John 2:20, and Revelation 3:7). This has nothing to do with some future temple to be rebuilt, but refers to Christ. The anointing of Jesus Christ (the Most Holy) took place at His baptism, immediately before He began His ministry. According to John 1:29-34, John the Baptist was a witness to Christ's anointing. John declares in verse 31, â€that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.â€ In verse 41, Andrew said to his brother Peter, â€We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.â€ The word â€Christâ€ is the Greek form of the Hebrew word Messiah, meaning the anointed one. In John 1:10-41, it is clear that people were expecting Messiah to come. The Bible says in Luke 3:15, â€And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not.â€ Jesus Christ was anointed at His baptism in Jordan when the Holy Spirit descended in bodily shape upon Him. God's approval was upon Messiah with a voice from heaven saying, â€Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased.â€ (Luke 3:22). It was here that His work began as Messiah, for Acts 10:38 says, he was anointed with the Holy Ghost and power. Jesus Christ's own words declared Himself to be the anointed one in Luke 4:18, â€The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.â€ He was baptized and anointed before He began his ministry. The phrase in Daniel 9:25, â€unto Messiah the prince,â€ signifies the time of His anointing and not the time of His birth or death; at His anointing is where He rightly assumed the title â€Messiah.â€ The Messiah was presented to Israel at the close of the sixty-ninth week or at the end of the 483 years. The sixty-ninth week terminated at His baptism when His ministry as Messiah began. So, our Lord's ministry lay entirely within the seventieth week, which is the whole focal point of the prophecy. After His baptism, He was constantly before the people fulfilling His mission as Messiah (Luke 4:18-21). He completed His work as Messiah at His first advent. The seventy weeks of Daniel as a unit glorifies and magnifies His work of redemption. This is why Satan hates the teaching that it is fulfilled prophecy. The Bible says in Acts 3:15, that they â€killed the Prince of life,â€ and in Acts 5:31, â€Him hath God exalted. . .to be a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.â€

In verse 27 of Daniel's prophecy, we are brought to a blessed climax, â€And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.â€ The seventieth week (last 7 years) is the third division or section of the prophecy. This section reveals the goodness and severity of God, for it speaks of salvation and judgment, Romans 11:22, â€Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.â€ In verse 26, we have a general overview of the last week, but verse 27, gives a detailed account of it. By the way, there is no hint of any second coming in our text nor is there any mention of the Antichrist. This last week is set off by itself because Jesus Christ's earthly ministry lay entirely within it. It is after the sixty-ninth week that Messiah is cut off (verse 26) by which the New Covenant is confirmed. The seventieth week is not separat

ed by centuries from the other sixty-nine weeks. The prophecy is a unit. The weeks are consecutive, that is, every week follows each other in sequence. There is no hint of a gap between the 69th and 70th week. There is no basis for a gap at all. There is nothing in the context that would even suggest that the seventy weeks are not consecutive. All of the seventy weeks are fulfilled, not future. Before we take a look at individual words in verse 27, may I say again that the theme of this entire prophecy is "Messiah the Prince" and the new covenant, the Antichrist does not figure at all into the prophecy. This modern interpretation that verse 27 is Antichrist, does violence to the text and robs our Lord of His Glory.

At this last point in our study, we must consider each word in verse 27 to clearly understand of whom the prophecy is speaking. The "He" of verse 27 is Messiah the Prince of verses 25-26. Messiah is the subject of the entire text. It was Messiah that was cut off, it was Messiah that confirmed the covenant and caused the sacrifices and oblation to cease. The structure of the sentence links the "He" of verse 27 to Messiah the Prince of verses 25-26. The word "He" is mentioned three times in verse 27 and all three times refer to Messiah the Prince: "He" shall confirm the covenant, "He" shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, "He" shall make desolate. In verse 25, we see the words "Messiah the Prince" and in verse 26, "the people of the Prince" are those whom He used to destroy Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Romans were not the Lord's people in the sense of them being Christians, but in the sense that they carried out His judgment. Keep in mind that it was Messiah (He) that would make it desolate (Jerusalem and the temple), but it was the Romans that actually carried out the destruction. The desolation of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 was accomplished by the Lord through Titus and the Roman armies. Many times in the Holy Scriptures we see reference to the Lord punishing a nation through heathen armies. In Jeremiah 25:8-11, God used Nebuchadnezzar to destroy Israel and even called him His servant. In Ezekiel 32:9-15, God said He would smite the land of Egypt and yet He used Nebuchadnezzar to carry it out. In Matthew 22:1-7, there is a parable of a marriage feast. This parable fits perfectly God's divine judgment upon the city of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. If the king in the parable represents God, and the Son represents Jesus Christ, then it was God's armies that destroyed and burned the city according to verse 7, "But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city." • There are many other examples in the Scriptures (Jeremiah 44:6, 52:12-14, II Chronicles 36:14-19, Nahum 1:1-2, 2:13, 3:5-7). But, suppose for a moment that the "He" of verse 27 is the Antichrist, as many teach, and the Prince of verse 26 is also the Antichrist, but the people of the "Prince" in verse 26 is the Roman army. This brings more confusion because the Prince would be separated from the people by at least 2000 years. How can the people belong to a Prince who was not to appear until 2000 years after the people had died? The text in no way says that the people were to come at one time and their Prince at a later time. We must look for harmony in Scripture and not confusion, and a text without a context is a pretext. We must rightly divide the Word of Truth and not distort its clear teaching. There are many expositors who wrongly apply these verses such as Dehaan, Ironside, and Scofield. If you have a Scofield Reference Bible please check the footnotes in Daniel 9:24-27. A quote from Dehaan says, "The Prince here mentioned is a prince who has not yet come." Again, we do harm to the text when we separate the people from the Prince by many years.

Also, in verse 27, it says that He (Messiah) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. This is the new covenant that Jesus Christ confirmed through His shed blood on Calvary's cross, Matthew 26:28, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Please notice that it is called the covenant, (testament) letting the reader know that He had already referred to it in verse 24. This verse describes perfectly the new covenant that was promised throughout Holy Scriptures. The primary reason for Christ's coming was to confirm the new covenant, for there is no salvation, forgiveness, or inheritance in the kingdom of God without it. The word "confirm" means to validate or to put into force. The Lord Jesus Christ became the mediator of the new covenant. The covenant was promised in the Old Testament according to Jeremiah 31:31-34 but was not established until Christ died on the cross, Hebrews 9:15, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Other Scriptures that are clear on this are Hebrews 8:8-13, 9:15-17, 10:4, 19-20. The King James Bible uses the word "confirm," but the New American Standard Bible says, "He shall make a firm covenant with many for one week." Many are quoting the wrong Bible and maybe that is why we hear a lot of folks say the Antichrist shall make a covenant with Israel for seven years and in the middle of the seven years, he will break the covenant. Keep in mind, the term "make" or "break" does not appear in the text. The word "covenant" is used 280 times in the Old Testament and not once does it ever speak of Antichrist making a covenant with anybody. Many take Isaiah 28:18 and say this is the Antichrist's treaty with Israel, but the text reveals that it is Hezekiah's treaty with Egypt. The entire New Testament is confirmation of the new covenant and especially the book of Hebrews.

Again, in verse 27, it says, "He shall confirm the covenant with many." The word "many" refers to those who would believe on Christ as their Lord and Savior. His disciples first believed, then many Jews in Israel believed, and later Gentiles also accepted Him as Messiah. According to Matthew 26:28, the blood of the New Testament was shed for many for the remission of sins and Matthew 20:28 says, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to

o minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.â€ The Bible says in Luke 1:16, â€And many of the children of Israel shall turn to the Lord their God,â€ and in Isaiah 53:11, â€He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.â€ Other Scriptures using the word â€manyâ€ are Luke 2:34 and Romans 5:17-21. This covenant will be made with many for â€one weekâ€ according to our text, that is, seven years. This week does not refer to the duration of the covenant but to the time when it was confirmed. It was during these seven years that the covenant was confirmed and that many Jews were brought into the kingdom of God. After this week, the gospel begins to go to the Gentile world. Now, in the midst of this week, he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. It was in the 70th week that Christ died on the cross for our sins. According to verse 26, it was after the 69th week that Messiah was cut off. After the 69th week is the 70th week. The first half of the 70th week was the length of our Lordâ€™s ministry. According to the book of John, there are four Passovers that occurred during our Lordâ€™s ministry, which helps us in understanding the length of it (John 2:13, 5:1, 6:9, and 13:1). The words â€cut offâ€ in verse 26, clearly refers to the death of Jesus Christ according to Isaiah 53:8. This expression is used in other places in the Scriptures to indicate a violent death and is used in reference to the death penalty (Psalm 37:9, Exodus 12:19, 30:33,38, Leviticus 7:20, 18:19 and 20:17).

In the midst of the week, He would cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, that is, He put an end to all the Old Testament sacrifices, Hebrews 7:27, â€Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.â€ By the perfect sacrifice of Messiah, the Levitical sacrifices came to an end. The old covenant gave way to the new covenant. Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God, offered Himself as the final sacrifice, which caused the animal sacrifice to cease (Hebrews 8:7-13, 9:11-15, 10:10-14). These sacrifices ceased to be legitimate in the eyes of God even though many of the Jews continued to offer them in the temple. Even the veil of the temple was rent from the top to bottom, signifying the end of the old and showing a new and living way (Hebrews 10:19-22). Again, the sacrifices ended at Calvary when Messiah became the final sacrifice, â€Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Mosesâ€ (Acts 13:38-39). The rest of verse 27 has to do with the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70, â€...and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consumation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.â€ Even though this did not happen during the 70th week, it is still the consequences of the rejection of Messiah during the 70th week. Even though this part of the prophecy was not dated, nor included in the 70th week, we clearly see its fulfillment in A.D. 70. It occurred later as a result of Israel's rejection of Messiah. The crucifixion of Christ is the cause of the desolation of Jerusalem and the temple. In verse 26, there is also a description of the desolation. When it speaks of the destruction of the city and the sanctuary, it says the end thereof shall be with a flood. The word â€floodâ€ is a figure often used for an invading army that would overflow the land (Isaiah 59:19, Revelation 12:15-16). The word â€warâ€ in verse 26 shows the war of the Jews with the Romans which was very long and bloody. The words â€desolations are determinedâ€ also show the destruction of the city and temple. â€The overspreading of abominationsâ€ of verse 27 is referring to the same thing, that is, the Roman armies overspreading the city to make it desolate. These armies would totally destroy it until the â€consumationâ€ or complete destruction. In other words, the Roman armies would not stop until there was a complete destruction as Jesus said, â€One stone shall not be left upon another that shall not be thrown downâ€ (Matthew 24:2).

The Lord Jesus Christ spoke also in Matthew 24:15 about the abomination of desolation, spoken by Daniel, â€When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand).â€ The abomination of desolation is the Roman army that brought the desolation upon the city, temple, and people in A.D. 70. The Lord clearly gives us the interpretation concerning these abominations that would make desolate in Daniel 9:27. It is not an idol to be placed in the Holy of Holies of a rebuilt temple by the Antichrist. The abomination was the pagan Roman armies and the desolation was the destruction of the city and temple. An idol can be an abomination but it cannot make desolate because it is powerless. According to Matthew 24:15, the abomination of desolation is the only sign given whereby the believers were to flee from the city. â€When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand).â€ Parallel passages to Matthew 24 are Mark 13 and Luke 21. In Mark 13:14, the same expression is used as in Matthew, the abomination of desolation. But, in Luke 21:20, it refers to Jerusalem being compassed with armies, then he speaks of the desolation of the city and sanctuary by this invading army, â€And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.â€ According to Luke 21:20-22, they were to flee for their lives when they saw the enemy surround the city. In Luke 19:43, it says, â€For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side.â€ This is why the Lord said in Matthew 23:38, â€Behold, your house is left unto you desolate,â€ and in verse 36, â€All these things shall come upon this generation.â€ The generation of Christâ€™s day would see these things come to pass for it was this generation that crucified the Son of God (Matthew 23:34-39). All of these verses are connected with the Olivet Discourse.

In Matthew 24:1-2, Jesus spoke of the temple and said, "There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." In verse 3, the disciples asked the question, "When shall these things be?" It was the temple that was standing in Jerusalem at that time that they asked about and not a rebuilt temple 2000 years in the future. The primary question in Matthew 24:3 is about the destruction of the temple and, in addition to that, they ask the Lord about the sign of His coming and the end of the world. Please consider all three parallel passages of the Olivet Discourse concerning the question, Matthew 24:3, "And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Mark 13:4, "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" and Luke 21:7, "And they asked him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" The words "these things," in reference to the destruction of the temple, are mentioned five times in these three verses.

Again, the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel had to do with the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the temple. This was the sign given to the believers to flee in order to escape the judgment of God. This judgment is called "great tribulation" in Matthew 24:21, "affliction" in Mark 13:19, "days of vengeance" in Luke 21:22, "great distress" and "wrath" in Luke 21:23. When they would see the abomination of desolation stand in the Holy Place, the believers were to flee according to Matthew 24:15-22. In Luke 21:20-21, it says, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies. . . flee to the mountains. . . for then ye know that the desolation thereof is nigh." The Holy place that the abomination of desolation shall stand has to do with Jerusalem and any part of the land of Israel (Matthew 27:53, Daniel 9:16). It was the Romans that planted their standard in the place that was Holy. It was the Romans that brought Jerusalem and the temple to desolation. The Romans would stand against the Jews to destroy them, Luke 19:43-44, "For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." In Luke 23:23-33, the Lord spoke of their judgment. The apostle Paul said that wrath had come upon Israel to the uttermost, I Thessalonians 2:16, "Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." When the people said in Matthew 27:25, "His blood be on us, and on our children," this literally came to pass in A.D. 70. In Matthew 24:4-14, the Lord gave a list of things that would happen before the city and temple would be destroyed. He mentions wars, rumors of wars, famines, pestilence, earthquakes, and persecutions. He also lists the fact that false christs shall come, but He says the end is not yet in verse 6. All of this is just the beginning of sorrows according to verse 8. Again, the sign to be given before the city and temple was to be destroyed was the abomination of desolation standing in the Holy place. The siege of Jerusalem was a long and bloody war. Over one million people were killed and thousands were taken captive and sold as slaves. It is said by historians that not one Christian perished in the desolation, for they heeded the Lord's warning and fled for their lives. The seventy weeks of Daniel is history. It is a great prophecy fulfilled by the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

#### Re: A question about the removing of the sacrifices at mid week - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/1 0:37

1) Why is it that when the ceasing of the sacrifices is mentioned in three other places in Daniel besides Daniel 9:27 that it is an evil personage that is doing this but when the sacrifices are stopped in Daniel it is Jesus Christ doing the stopping?

27 And he will make a firm covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will PUT A STOP TO SACRIFICE AND GRAIN OFFERING; and on the wing of abominations will come one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate. (Daniel 9:27)

According to the article,

"This covenant will be made with many for 'one week' according to our text, that is, seven years. This week does not refer to the duration of the covenant but to the time when it was confirmed. It was during these seven years that the covenant was confirmed and that many Jews were brought into the kingdom of God. After this week, the gospel begins to go to the Gentile world. Now, in the midst of this week, he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. It was in the 70th week that Christ died on the cross for our sins. According to verse 26, it was after the 69th week that Messiah was cut off. After the 69th week is the 70th week. The first half of the 70th week was the length of our Lord's ministry. According to the book of John, there are four Passovers that occurred during our Lord's ministry, which helps us in und



understanding the length of it (John 2:13, 5:1, 6:9, and 13:1). The words "cut off" in verse 26, clearly refers to the death of Jesus Christ according to Isaiah 53:8. This expression is used in other places in the Scriptures to indicate a violent death and is used in reference to the death penalty (Psalm 37:9, Exodus 12:19, 30:33,38, Leviticus 7:20, 18:19 and 20:17)."

"In the midst of the week, He would cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, that is, He put an end to all the Old Testament sacrifices, Hebrews 7:27, "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself." By the perfect sacrifice of Messiah, the Levitical sacrifices came to an end. The old covenant gave way to the new covenant. Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God, offered Himself as the final sacrifice, which caused the animal sacrifice to cease (Hebrews 8:7-13. 9:11-15, 10:10-14). These sacrifices ceased to be legitimate in the eyes of God even though many of the Jews continued to offer them in the temple. Even the veil of the temple was rent from the top to bottom, signifying the end of the old and showing a new and living way (Hebrews 10:19-22). Again, the sacrifices ended at Calvary when Messiah became the final sacrifice..."

So this author has Jesus Christ being the one who brings the former sacrifices to an end by His own death. Yet in the three other places in Daniel the sacrifices being stopped are mentioned it is an evil personage bringing the stopping.

The little horn of Daniel 8 has grown up to prominence and,

11 It even magnified itself to be equal with the commander of the host; and it REMOVED THE REGULAR SACRIFICE FROM HIM, and the place of His sanctuary was thrown down.

12 And on account of transgression the host will be given over to the horn ALONG WITH THE REGULAR SACRIFICE; and it will fling truth to the ground and perform its will and prosper.

Then I heard a holy one speaking, and another holy one said to that particular one who was speaking, "How long will the vision about the regular sacrifice apply, while the transgression causes horror, so as to allow both the holy place and the host to be trampled?"(Daniel 8:11-13).

That's not a holy Jesus Christ (praise His name) bringing an end to the regular sacrifice. But it is supposed to be Christ doing so in Daniel 9:27.

covenant, and he will take action and then return to his own land.

29 "At the appointed time he will return and come into the South, but this last time it will not turn out the way it did before.

30 For ships of Kittim will come against him; therefore he will be disheartened and will return and become enraged at the holy covenant and take action; so he will come back and show regard for those who forsake the holy covenant.

31 Forces from him will arise, desecrate the sanctuary fortress, and DO AWAY WITH THE REGULAR SACRIFICE. And they will set up the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION. (Daniel 11:29-31)

Who is this evil personage desecrating a sanctuary and fortress and stopping the sacrifice and setting up an abomination of desolation? In Daniel 8:11-12 and here it's an evil personage doing the stopping but in Daniel 9:27 it's said to be Jesus Christ.

Elsewhere,

8 As for me, I heard but could not understand; so I said, "My lord, what will be the outcome of these events?"

9 He said, "Go your way, Daniel, for these words are concealed and sealed up until the end time. 10 Many will be purged, purified and refined, but the wicked will act wickedly; and none of the wicked will understand, but those who have insight will understand.

11 From the time that THE REGULAR SACRIFICE IS ABOLISHED and the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION IS SET UP abomination of desolation is set up, there will be 1,290 days.



12 How blessed is he who keeps waiting and attains to the 1,335 days!

13 But as for you, go your way to the end; then you will enter into rest and rise again for your allotted portion at the end of the age. (Daniel 12:8-13)

Who does this stopping of the regular sacrifice? In these four passages, (Daniel 8:11-13; 9:27; 11:29-31; Daniel 12:8-11) it is customary to include the setting of a abomination of desolation. In three of these passages it is obviously an evil enemy of God and the holy people performing an end to sacrifice and bringing about the abomination of desolation. Yet in Daniel 9:27 it becomes Jesus Christ putting an end to the sacrifices and bringing the abomination of desolation because of what He has done.

Why are the explanations for the stopping of the sacrifices in Daniel usually explained this way without even a mention of the three other passages in Daniel where the very same subject is mentioned? Why is it Jesus Christ in Daniel 9:27 while in the three other places it is a person of evil doing this? Why is the switch made to Christ in Daniel 9:27 when the other passages can't refer to Christ? It seems so much is usually left hanging by making Christ the One who ends the sacrifices in Daniel 9:27 while the other three passages are usually ignored. Surely when Christ said "when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel" he wasn't referring to four different stoppages of sacrifices and abominations. Can these passages outside of Daniel 9:27 be of help in determining who is who in Daniel 9:27?

I say that because the stopping of the sacrifices and the resulting abomination of desolation is mentioned four times in Daniel and not just once in Daniel 9:27. It seems much is left hanging when only Daniel 9:27 is addressed.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 2:52**

25: Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

26: And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27: And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

Docs,  
How do you confirm a covenant?  
I think confirm means that you already had a covenant between you and the other party before, and you will secure it also for the future. For example when married couples "renew their vows" they confirm their covenant. The point is that they had a covenant before.

So who is he that confirms the covenant in verse 27?

two possibilities:

1. Antichrist
2. Christ

Did the Antichrist have a covenant with Israel before that needed to be confirmed? No

Did Christ (the alpha and omega) have a covenant with Israel before and now wants to confirm it with even better conditions? Yes

So Christ is the one that confirms the covenant in verse 27.

In verse 27 the same person who confirms the covenant also causes the sacrifices to cease.

Docs, if you believe that this person was the Antichrist, could you also explain which preexisting covenant did/will the Antichrist CONFIRM?

**Re: Thank you Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/1 4:45**

Your questions are good but at the same time I see the same pattern repeated that I mentioned in my comments. The pattern is that you made much mention to Daniel 9:27 but offered not a gleam of a thought regarding Daniel 8:11-13; Daniel 11:29-31; and Daniel 12:8-11. The ceasing of sacrifices and the abomination of desolation are mentioned in these verses also and it's not a holy person of God doing these actions but yet in Daniel 9:27 it becomes the very holy Christ Himself. Why doesn't anyone bring in the other passages to help explain their view of Daniel 9:27. These accompanying and relevant verses are never opened exegetically when Daniel 9:27 is addressed.

Meanwhile, why would Christ confirm (strengthen) a covenant say at the beginning of the 70th week by His death and put a stop to sacrifice and offering at mid-week? If He stopped temple activity and sacrifice by His death at mid-week then His new and better confirmation of the covenant could not have gone into effect until mid-week. It says "he will confirm a covenant with the many for one week." Logically that means He would have at that point died for the covenant to be confirmed but the passage reads "BUT in the middle of the week he will put a stop to sacrifice and grain offering." So if His death is the only way for the covenant to go into effect and be confirmed then it would have had to happen at the beginning of the 70th week. BUT here in Daniel 9:27 we have it going into effect at mid-week when sacrifice and offering stop. Therefore the interpretation that He already had a covenant with many at the beginning of the week and then strengthened, bettered and confirmed it by His death at the beginning of the 70th week and then stopped sacrifice and offering at mid-week supposedly by His covenant confirming death is therefore twisting on the horn of an unresolvable dilemma.

When Christ said 'when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet,' which abomination was He speaking of since it is mentioned four times in Daniel and each time sacrifice and offering are stopped it results in the abomination of desolation. Was Christ telling us to look at four abominations or was He advising us to go to Daniel and consider the four passages together perhaps with a special emphasis on Daniel 9:27.

Notable observations:

Daniel's little horn grew up and exalted himself and removed the regular sacrifice and flung truth to the ground - Daniel 8:11-13. Did Christ fling truth to the ground when He stopped sacrifice and offering?

When did Christ become enraged against the holy covenant and show regard for those who forsake the holy covenant? - Daniel 11:30. When did ships of Kittim come against Christ, portrayed as fresh off of an unsuccessful military campaign (Dan 11:20), and what does it mean that "he" will desecrate the sanctuary fortress and do away with the regular sacrifice and set up the abomination of desolation? (Dan 11:31). What sanctuary fortress did Christ desecrate?

What does Daniel 12:11 mean? Who stops this regular sacrifice and sets up the abomination of desolation in these passages?

But then we skip to Christ being the good guy in 9:27. He is a good guy of course but why is an opponent of God in three places and then be Christ in 9:27.

Maybe the AC will not make and form and confirm a covenant but rather confirm a covenant already made? He will be a deceitful fellow we know for sure. If he perhaps does not make and form this covenant ("confirm" it) why would he later confirm it?

<http://the.mysteryofisrael.org/2013/01/12/daniel-927-and-the-confirmation-of-a-covenant/>

**Re: good guy vs bad guy, on: 2016/9/1 9:09**

Jesus said this to a Jewish audience:

Matthew 3:10 King James Version (KJV)

10 And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

John 3:36 King James Version (KJV)

36 He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

John 8:24 King James Version (KJV)

24 I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.

While he was alive he promised eternal life to those that believe in him, and death to those who didn't. Some branches (who believed) were kept on the oil tree and the branched (who didn't believe) were cut off. That's how he confirmed the covenant with many even before he died but not with all. Everyone who truly believed in the Father also believed in him. Some individuals were temporarily hardened but later (in their lifetime) were given the grace to believe.

Would you say that Christ was not a good guy because he now required people to believe and promised wrath to those who didn't. Christ did not force the sacrifices to be stopped like the other guys, he gave them his love and the gospel and the truth so they could choose to believe him who was the real meaning of the sacrifices. And by the time all potential believers believed in him and no one else left, his wrath destroyed the temple and the city by a foreign army as he promised.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/1 9:31**

That's not what I'm saying or asking. My point is that in three places in Daniel the person who stops the sacrifices and offerings is an evil personage in opposition to God. But when the person in Daniel 9:27 is seen doing the same thing many identify him as being Jesus Christ. My question is why is this so and can it be justified in light of the other three passages? This "good guy bad guy" statement by you answers nothing and is basically a non answer as you haven't gone near Daniel 8:11-13, 11:29-31 or 12:8-11 which in my opinion seems to address the same stopping of sacrifice and abomination of desolation as 9:27 does.

I also offered you a answer on what covenant the AC may or may not have with Israel and when it may come about in relation to the final week but no reply from you.

Thanks though and have a good one. I enjoy speaking with you.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 11:22**

Docs,  
When I typed in the subject I accidentally submitted it, so it looked like I did not have anything else to say. But I did and I immediately wrote the Message part in the Edit mode. I am sorry that I caused confusion.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/1 11:50**

I'm doing my own study on Daniel 9 and the 70 Weeks just now. I've put together about 25 pages of notes. So, I'm digging in for myself.

About the idea that the "most holy" in Daniel 9 is Jesus:

The phrase in Hebrew is never, ever used in reference to a person in the OT. It is used quite a lot, and it always, always refers to a place or thing. The Hebrew syntax used refers to a place or thing but not a person; a different word would have been used had a person been contemplated.

The "to anoint the most holy" in Daniel 9 is not a reference to Jesus.

Docs' point makes complete sense regarding making offerings cease mentioned through three chapters of Daniel, but ONLY the one in chapter 9 is tied to Jesus where the verbiage in the other mentions singularly tie the cessation of offerings to someone who is a very bad dude. No reason exists on the face of the text to treat that mention in Daniel 9 differently and link it to Jesus. No reason exists in the overarching picture of what God is saying about the various mentions of the cessation of offerings to treat Daniel 9 as Jesus and the other mentions as someone else.

BTW, this is not just another drawing of weapons on each other. WE NEED to get this right. Because if those of us who DO understand Daniel correctly, particularly chapter 9 read in light of Matthew 24, are those who understand a yet-future fulfillment of the 70th Week and a post-70th Week harpazo, then this seems to me to be the most pressing pastoral issue in the history of the Christian church.

**Re: AC confirming God's covenant, on: 2016/9/1 12:14**

docs,

If I understood well you are saying that the AC will pretend to be Christ and confirm God's covenant instead of Christ. Well, this would be no confirmation at all, God's covenant can not be confirmed through a lie.

If the AC would really do that the Bible would say something like this: He (AC) will pretend to confirm the covenant. But the Bible speaks about real actual confirmation not a fake one, and it is referenced in the new testament many times meaning that the true Israelites, who recognized Christ are going to remain in the tree (confirmed), while those individuals who did not will be broken off. (But if they repent in their lifetime they will be grafted in again.)

As for Daniel 11, it is established by many scholars that it is a prophecy that has been fulfilled in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, who insulted the Holy Covenant that was made regarding to and centered on Jesus Christ the Messiah. He stopped the sacrifices to hinder God's will regarding the plan of salvation, while Jesus caused the sacrifices to be ceased to fulfill that plan.

The writer of the linked article thinks that in the middle of the 7 years a holy covenant was broken (Dan 9:27). Many of the Pharisees believed that Jesus insulted Israel's covenant with God but Jesus said:

Matthew 5:17 King James Version (KJV)

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

Is there any proof in the Bible that the person who caused to cease the animal sacrifices in the middle of the week (Dan 9:27) was against God's will and covenant? The NT clearly shows that it was God's will that the animal sacrifices ceased as it was not necessary after Jesus (who was the real meaning of the sacrifices) came.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/1 12:20**

I have a question and I am open to whomever would care to respond. It is squarely on the topic of the 70 Weeks. And, the question assumes a futurist view of the 70th Week AND it assumes no pretrib rapture. It assumes post-trib. So, if your answer would include, "well, you're off base because the 70th Week is already past and fulfilled", it is not going to help me find the answer. I read and re-read and pray and read and I love you guys who are preterist or partial preterist or amillennialists, etc., but we're just going to not find common ground on this issue.

Alright, so here is my question:

What is the church actually DOING during the 70th Week? (Pre-tribbers, I acknowledge that you think the church will not be on Earth and that it will be at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb during the 70th Week. My question assumes post-trib view that does not have the church leaving Earth before the end of the 70th Week. Whew.)

When I examine the six purposes given by Gabriel to Daniel for the 70 weeks (and that 70 weeks includes that 'gap' that is bracketed by the 69th and 70th weeks), I can easily identify what God is doing with Israel and I can identify how the Gentile believers are part of that. But, the purposes of the actual 70 weeks themselves, at least in Daniel 9, are quite specific.

cific to Israel.

{{Now, let me shift my weight over to this other foot for a second and say this: Pretribbers may look at my question and say, "See?! The church is not being dealt with during the tribulation! You say it yourself, Tim! That's because it is raptured before the 70th Week!" But, that is not at all what I'm saying. Revelation speaks in terms of the saints at large, not Israel only, in the descriptions of what happens there that we say are included in the 70th Week. Also, merely not finding Gabriel's description of the six purposes reaching Gentiles in the specific 70 weeks does not leap over to admit of a pre-trib rapture. Especially -- as folks like myself understand -- when the language of scripture on the whole does not describe a pre-trib rapture. Finding a pre-trib rapture inside Gabriel's six purposes for the 70 weeks in Daniel 9 would be way more than just a stretch.}}

So, again -- given all those sort of parameters -- what is the church actually DOING on earth during the future 70th Week?

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 12:21**

Dolfan,  
Have you read the OP article?

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/1 12:28**

Did Antiochus act during the middle of the 70th Week? Does that not create a gap between weeks 69 and 70 since Jesus was crucified about 35-36 years before? If Antiochus did not set up his abomination during one of Daniel's 70 weeks, Daniel 9 does not refer to him. The "shauvim" (weeks) are literal seven year periods. Gabriel clearly put the abomination that causes desolation in Daniel 9 in the middle of the 70th week.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/1 12:31**

Tozsu, yes I did. Inasmuch as the writer says that Jesus is the "most holy" referred to by Gabriel, he is wrong. It would be a monumental departure from the norm in which the phrase had always been used. That doesn't keep people from reaching the conclusion the writer reached. But, that doesn't make him right, either. His reasoning goes into much detail about how Jesus was anointed. Certainly He was. He was the Christ. But, "most holy" in Daniel 9 does not refer to a person. Not Jesus. Not anyone else.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 12:36**

Quote:

-----by dolfan on 2016/9/1 12:20:02

I have a question and I am open to whomever would care to respond.

-----

I would love to respond but as long as the moderators allow 2-3 individuals to act as brute beasts against me, I will sit on the sidelines because I am tired of the moderators closing threads because of these guys. It's not fair to all of you.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 12:56**

dolfan,

This is what I wrote in a previous thread [https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id=56641&forum=36&start=40&viewmode=flat&order=1](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=56641&forum=36&start=40&viewmode=flat&order=1)  
on this topic:

"In my understanding the prophecy in Daniel 11 was fulfilled about between the 6th and the 2nd centuries BC. The predictions accurately match the historical events that took place that time and describe among others a person named Antiochus Epiphanes.

Here you can read side by side the prophecy in Daniel 11 and the corresponding historical events. <http://www.angelfire.c>

om/nt/theology/daniel-11.html"

Daniel 11 and Daniel 9 speak about 2 completely different events. Daniel 11 took place couple hundred years before Christ and Daniel 9 took place when Jesus came and shortly after.

To my simple mind the most holy is not an object or place since we know that Christ is more holy than those and those were only the foreshadows of Christ. Before he came, God's son was not dwelling among people, so places and things were the most holy but after, not. For example the bread in the tabernacle was holy but when Jesus came he said He was as the bread.

I asked if you read the OP because it shows the the question is not pretrib vs post trib but premil vs amil. In my opinion you have to think out of the premil box if you want to fully address this problem.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/1 13:34**

There's no shred of evidence from scripture that the AC will pretend to be Christ so as to be able to confirm a covenant. He will eventually proclaim himself to be God though. No one can be entirely dogmatic about this but he will be a person full of deceit and intrigue who ends up venting his wrath against the holy covenant (Dan 11:) Perhaps he will agree to and recognize a covenant that has already been made among many that finally recognizes Israel's right to exist by the hostile Muslim nations. Just thinking out loud here. Nothing is set on stone. But eventually his hatred for the Jews and their God will be something he can no longer withhold and sit on. It will be an expression of the everlasting hatred that has always existed toward the natural seed of Abraham as a whole. The AC will gain his power by intrigue and deception, pretending to go along with a covenant but lying and only biding his time until he can come to a place to unleash His wrath against Israel and the church.

Antiochus Epiphanes ruled from 175 to 164 BC when he passed so he could not have insulted the Holy covenant centered on Jesus Christ. Christ had not come and the only way this covenant could go into effect was by the shed blood of Christ and that had not occurred. Plus Antiochus did not enter the temple and proclaim himself to be God. He was not slain at the second coming of Christ as the AC will be (II Thess 2:8).

/Is there any proof in the Bible that the person who caused to cease the animal sacrifices in the middle of the week (Dan 9:27) was against God's will and covenant? The NT clearly shows that it was God's will that the animal sacrifices ceased as it was not necessary after Jesus (who was the real meaning of the sacrifices) came./

I still don't think you have been able to ascertain the point I have been making and the resulting questions that come with it. Meaning, you have not paid an iota of attention it seems to Daniel 8:11-13 where an evil person stops the regular sacrifice and flings truth to the ground and performs his will and prospers while doing so. Who is this person WHO STOPS THE REGULAR SACRIFICE? Did Christ fling truth to the ground?

In Daniel 11:31q, if Antiochus Epiphanes fulfilled this then the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION he instigated (11:31) would mean the later destruction of Jerusalem by Roman armies being the abomination of desolation would be unneeded and meaningless. Why? Because it would have already been fulfilled in the days of Antiochus. This scenario sets up two abominations, one in the days of Antiochus and one in the days of 70 AD. So which abomination was Jesus referring to when he said, "When you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet?"

If the person is evil in Daniel 8:11-13 and the person is evil in Daniel 11:29-31 why is there such a complete jump and turn around that allows Christ to be the one spoken of in Daniel 9:27?

The regular sacrifice is abolished in Daniel 12:11 and this leads to an abomination of desolation seen in the same verse. And all this occurs very close to Daniel's personal bodily resurrection (Dan 12:13) which will occur at the end of the age when Christ returns. So the abomination of desolation in Daniel has close connections and close chronological proximity to the end of the age and the resurrection of the dead (including Daniel) that occurs at the end of the age.

Daniel 8:11-13

Daniel 9:27

Daniel 11:29-31

Daniel 12:11

They must be considered as a whole since they are speaking of the same thing.



**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 13:56**

Quote:  
-----Antiochus Epiphanes ruled from 175 to 164 BC when he passed so he could not have insulted the Holy covenant centered on Jesus Christ. Christ had not come and the only way this covenant could go into effect was by the shed blood of Christ and that had not occurred. Plus Antiochus did not enter the temple and proclaim himself to be God. He was not slain at the second coming of Christ as the AC will be (II Thess 2:8).  
-----

Revelation 13:8 King James Version (KJV)

8 And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

John 8:58 King James Version (KJV)

58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

The holy covenant of the OT was centered on the Messiah who now we know is called Jesus.

I have to go now, will continue later.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/1 15:58**

J, email me.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/1 20:17**

Quote:  
-----I still don't think you have been able to ascertain the point I have been making and the resulting questions that come with it. Meaning, you have not paid an iota of attention it seems to Daniel 8:11-13 where a evil person stops the regular sacrifice and flings truth to the ground and performs his will and prospers while doing so. Who is this person WHO STOPS THE REGULAR SACRIFICE? Did Christ fling truth to the ground?  
-----

I don't know who this antichrist type figure is in Daniel 8:11-13. Do you have proof that this person is the same as the person in Daniel 9:27? For Daniel 9 a specific calculable time is given, there is no time given for Daniel 8:11-13, so we can not know what it is, and when it happens unless it has already come to pass.

Stopping the animal sacrifices can be:

1 evil  
2 good  
depending on who does it and why.  
It is evil when a person other than God does it in order to hinder His salvation plan. Such as Antiochus Epiphanes.  
It is good when Jesus does it, because it is the Father's will, and serves the plan of salvation. Jesus did not break the covenant, he confirmed it.

Quote:  
-----Daniel 8;11-13  
Daniel 9;27  
Daniel 11;29-31  
Daniel 12:11  
They must be considered as a whole since they are speaking of the same thing.  
-----

Daniel prophesied about various events in his lifetime. He did not always prophesied about the 70 weeks. In Daniel 11 for example he prophesied about the time between 539 B.C. and 166 B.C. the historical events that actually happened then, fulfilled that prophecy as the following chart shows.

(I am sorry the link I gave before was wrong, here is the good one)

<http://www.angelfire.com/nt/theology/daniel-11.html>

Daniel 9:27 is about the time Jesus came, i.e. more than 100 years later than the events of Daniel 11 so Daniel 11 and Daniel 9 can not possibly describe the same events.



For Daniel 12 there is a time given and the prophecy will end when the power of the holy people (OT sacrificial system?) will be scattered.

Daniel 12:7

7 And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swore by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.

Conclusion: I do not see how it can be proven from the Bible that the person in Daniel 9:27 is not Christ.

**Re: I will attempt an opinion, here. Fasten your seatbelts., on: 2016/9/1 23:33**

Heb 1:1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in TIME PAST unto the fathers by the prophets,

The Word says that God spoke unto the "fathers" by the prophets.

Who is God speaking to us by?

Heb 1:2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us BY HIS SON whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

Have you considered that the Enemy is creating a major deception that usurps OT prophecies that are speaking of either Jesus or OT Israel, and he creates a theology that co-ops these prophecies to leap frog all the way to the end of time replacing the centrality of Christ with a worldly nation as the central focus of today's Church? What has become the focus of many, today? Christ or a worldly nation? Were the apostles so obsessed as people today are? Could someone so obsessed with an earthly nation say this?

1 Thessalonians 2:14-16

For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.

To be sure, Hebrews 1:2 does not say, "hath in these last days spoken to us by the prophets", it says, BY HIS SON.

Jesus explained that when they saw the "abomination of desolation" referred to by Daniel (Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:1), standing in the Jerusalem temple, those in Judea should flee to the mountains. The Roman army, representing idolatrous emperor worship, did indeed desecrate and destroy the Jewish temple. Not hindered by materialism, social relationships, or Sabbatarianism, most of the Christians of Judea escaped to Pella across the Jordan in the region of the Decapolis. Great tribulation and calamity then came upon the Jews of Jerusalem in the form of rape, murder, starvation, etc. Josephus laments that

"Our city was advanced to the highest felicity, and was thrust down again to the extremest misery; for if the misfortunes of all, from the beginning of the world, were compared with those of the Jews, they would appear much inferior upon the comparison."

"No other city ever suffered such things, as no other generation from the beginning of the world was ever more fruitful of wickedness."

The Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. lasted five months, and were it not for God's providential care of the Christian "elect" (Matt. 24:22,24,31), the Romans would have continued to pursue to their death even the Christians. Some of the Christian elect were indeed misled and deceived by religious impostors claiming to be prophets and the Messiah, but Jesus noted that His coming would be as obvious as the lightning which reveals in all directions (cf. Lk. 17:23). HIS COMING IN JUDGMENT would be as evident as vultures circling round the rotten carcass of Jewish religion.

See Matt. 24:29-31; Mk. 13:24-27; Lk. 21:25-28

Jesus figuratively explained that immediately after the tribulation promised to Christians prior to 70 A.D., Jesus figuratively explains (Isa. 13:10; 24:23; 34:4; Ezek. 32:7; Joel 2:10; Amos 5:20; 8:9; Zeph. 1:15; Rev. 6:12; 8:12) "the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken."

darkened, the moon will not give light, the stars will fall from the sky, and the powers of heaven will be shaken." According to C.E.B. Cranfield, "this is picture-language which we must not attempt to compress into a literal interpretation." Jesus was referring to an astronomical disruption and dissolution of the present order of things, a cosmic catastrophe to the known order of the Jewish world. Those with spiritual vision would see the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13), the Messiah, coming before God the Father in the heavenly realm to vindicate and exalt God's power, authority and glory (Matt. 16:27). All the tribes of Israel on earth would mourn (Zech 12:10-14) that Jerusalem had been trodden down by Roman Gentiles, and that their Judaic religion had been destroyed. But God would send forth Christian messengers and missionaries to trumpet (Isa. 27:13; Zech. 9:14; Rev. 8:2; 11:15), broadcast and announce the kingdom (Isa. 61:1-3), gathering together the true Israel (Gal. 6:15), the elect People of God (1 Pet. 2:10), from all nations and peoples, assembled and united to receive the promises of God in Jesus Christ. Redemption draws near (Lk. 21:28) as the old covenant priesthood and sacrifices come to an end, and mankind is restored, both individually and collectively, in Jesus Christ.

Excerpts from James Fowler

**Re: Off topic caricatures - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 3:01**

/Have you considered that the Enemy is creating a major deception that usurps OT prophecies that are speaking of either Jesus or OT Israel, and he creates a theology that co-opts these prophecies to leap frog all the way to the end of time replacing the centrality of Christ with a worldly nation as the central focus of today's Church? What has become the focus of many, today? Christ or a worldly nation? Were the apostles so obsessed as people today are? Could someone so obsessed with an earthly nation say this?/

These statements are full of untrue caricatures long voiced but never really verified in any way. They are simply the matter of the expression of a different view but nonetheless lacking accuracy. If some have gone in a wrong direction it doesn't mean the large majority have.

/and he creates a theology that co-opts these prophecies to leap frog all the way to the end of time/

What do the scriptures say?

28 However, there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries, and He has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will take place IN THE LATTER DAYS. (Daniel 2:28)

16 And I heard the voice of a man between the banks of Ulai, and he called out and said, "Gabriel, give this man an understanding of the vision."

17 So he came near to where I was standing, and when he came I was frightened and fell on my face; but he said to me, "Son of man, UNDERSTAND that the vision pertains to the TIME OF THE END." (Daniel 8:16-17)

14 Now I have come to give you UNDERSTANDING of what will happen to your people IN THE LATTER DAYS, for the vision pertains to the days yet future (the latter days). (Daniel 10:14)

27 As for both kings, their hearts will be intent on evil, and they will speak lies to each other at the same table; but it will not succeed, for THE END is still to come at the appointed time. (Daniel 11:30)

35 And some of those who have insight will fall, in order to refine, purge, and make them pure, UNTIL THE END TIME; because it (the end time) is still to come at the appointed time. (Daniel 11:36)

4 'But as for you, Daniel, conceal these words and seal up the book until THE END OF TIME; many will go back and forth, and knowledge will increase.' (Daniel 12:4)

9 And he said, "Go your way Daniel, for these words are concealed and sealed up until THE END TIME." (Daniel 12:9)

If the angelic messengers sent to give Daniel UNDERSTANDING placed these events at the time of the end, the end of time, then it seems you and the scriptures have a disagreement about your opinion that to leap frog these prophecies to the end of time is wrong. The UNDERSTANDING Daniel received was that these prophecies DO REFER to the end of time. Other prophets besides Daniel were given the same understanding regarding their prophecies.

/replacing the centrality of Christ with a worldly nation as the central focus of today's Church?/

Speak for yourself. It's a caricature to say that those interested in prophecy have replaced the centrality of Christ with a worldly nation. Any believer understands this basic difference and dichotomy and understands that Christ and His atoning work are the basis for the church and salvation. Studying prophecy and eschatology, the doctrines of last things, is but an attempt to perceive and grow in UNDERSTANDING as to how Christ is going to finish the work He began at His first advent. Prophecy is the inspired record of how Christ is going to put the crowning achievements on His work and ministry so why shouldn't believers be interested? Soteriology is the study of salvation and what it means. Ecclesiology is the study of the church and who makes it up. Eschatology and prophecy is the study of how Christ is going to finish up His work. And in that study, it is apparent that the nation He first came to and ascended from is the same nation He is going to return to to finish His work. So how for the love of Pete can trying to determine how Israel plays a role in the things of the end amount to replacing the centrality of Christ? The Christ that is so central came to Israel and will return to Israel.

The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Prophecy is Christ Himself testifying to us how He is going to complete and put the finishing touches on His work. If soteriology are vitally important along with ecclesiology why is the study of how Christ will finish things not vital for the church? Studying prophecy is far from replacing the centrality of Christ with a nation. And what nation are we speaking of?

/replacing the centrality of Christ with a worldly nation as the central focus of today's Church? What has become the focus of many, today? Christ or a worldly nation? Were the apostles so obsessed as people today are? Could someone so obsessed with an earthly nation say this?/

Where do you think the apostles believed Christ would return to? If they believed He would return to the nation He first came to and left do you think they would advocate that that nation will become totally irrelevant to God's plan in Christ?

Again, where do you think the apostles and the early church believed Christ would return to?

/1 Thessalonians 2:14-16

For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost./

Do you believe the Gentiles would have acted any differently if they had been in charge? If the Gentiles had been in charge of the religious order of the day do you think they would have welcomed Christ with open arms because they were morally more able to believe than Jews? God has concluded all under sin that He might show mercy to all.

/To be sure, Hebrews 1:2 does not say, "hath in these last days spoken to us by the prophets", it says, BY HIS SON./

Jesus was a prophet, gave the ministry and office of prophet to His church and the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Therefore, through prophecy and the prophets, God speaks to us by HIS SON who is the author and One who inspires prophecy.

22 "And so, having obtained help from God, I stand to this day testifying both to small and great, stating nothing but what THE PROPHETS AND MOSES said was going to take place. (Acts 26:22)

27 "King Agrippa, DO YOU BELIEVE THE PROPHETS? I know that you do."

28 And Agrippa replied to Paul, "In a short time you will persuade me to become a Christian." (Acts 26:27-28)

/The Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. lasted five months, and were it not for God's providential care of the Christian "elect" (Matt. 24:22,24,31), the Romans would have continued to pursue to their death even the Christians. Some of the Christian elect were indeed misled and deceived by religious impostors claiming to be prophets and the Messiah, but Jesus noted that His coming would be as obvious as the lightning which reveals in all directions (cf. Lk. 17:23). HIS COMING IN JUDGMENT would be as evident as vultures circling round the rotten carcass of Jewish religion/

Preteristic as far as HIS COMING IN JUDGMENT. Jesus said His one and only second coming would be accompanied by the resurrection of the dead. Maybe Josephus and the historians of that day somehow missed this resurrection. And no, the resurrection Jesus spoke of cannot be said to be a number of saints rising when He rose. The COMING OF JESUS

US will be accompanied by the resurrection of the dead of the ages.

/Jesus figuratively explained that immediately after the tribulation promised to Christians prior to 70 A.D., Jesus figuratively explains (Isa. 13:10; 24:23; 34:4; Ezek. 32:7; Joel 2:10; Amos 5:20; 8:9; Zeph. 1:15; Rev. 6:12; 8:12) "the sun will be darkened, the moon will not give light, the stars will fall from the sky, and the powers of heaven will be shaken." According to C.E.B. Cranfield, "this is picture-language which we must not attempt to compress into a literal interpretation." Jesus was referring to an astronomical disruption and dissolution of the present order of things, a cosmic catastrophe to the known order of the Jewish world. Those with spiritual vision would see the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13), the Messiah, coming before God the Father in the heavenly realm to vindicate and exalt God's power, authority and glory (Matt. 16:27)./

This view is basically part of the outgrowth of Roman Catholic eschatology which the Reformers kept and passed down while at the same time breaking from the Roman concept and doctrine of salvation. They did not break from Roman Catholic eschatology which you are basically repeating here.

Perhaps one of the real deception today, which you spoke of at the beginning, is to spiritualize most prophecy not yet fulfilled which invariably takes focus away from the nation that will be at the heart of events at the end of the age. Christ is anchored in time and history to the Jewish people and nation that were chosen to bear and relay the promises and covenants. Their story and destiny is bound up with His story and destiny into which we as Gentiles have been invited and allowed to participate. If the spirit of prophecy is the testimony of Jesus then Jesus Himself is speaking to us in prophecy. Studying how He will complete His work is really the practice of keeping Him central since all the ages so far will culminate in His second advent. Would you have us believe God prophesied to us of the first coming of Christ and yet left us completely in the dark regarding events surrounding His second advent? If that day will not overtake us like a thief might it be suggested that it may be in part because we have studied prophecy and have gained an UNDERSTANDING?

7 but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, then the mystery of God is finished, as He preached to HIS SERVANTS THE PROPHETS. (Rev 10:7)

**Re: Time of the End - posted by savannah, on: 2016/9/2 8:54**

Daniel 8

15 Then it happened, when I, Daniel, had seen the vision and was seeking the meaning, that suddenly there stood before me one having the appearance of a man. 16 And I heard a man's voice between the banks of the Ulai, who called, and said, "Gabriel, make this man understand the vision." 17 So he came near where I stood, and when he came I was afraid and fell on my face; but he said to me, "Understand, son of man, that the vision refers to the time of the end."

18 Now, as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep with my face to the ground but he touched me, and stood me upright. 19 And he said, "Look, I am making known to you what shall happen in the latter time of the indignation; for at the appointed time the end shall be. 20 The ram which you saw, having the two horns—they are the kings of Media and Persia. 21 And the male goat is the kingdom of Greece. The large horn that is between its eyes is the first king. 22 As for the broken horn and the four that stood up in its place, four kingdoms shall arise out of that nation, but not with its power.

Just as here in these verses, in chapter 12:4 of Daniel, "Time of the end" does not mean the end of time!

Once you are set free by that truth you may be better prepared to exegete the prophecy of Daniel!

"All the prophets", Jesus said, "were until John..."

**Re: beautifully explained Docs, on: 2016/9/2 9:08**

Docs,  
Just wanted to say that you are explaining the matter scripturally & historically quite accurately & beautifully. May the Lord bless you today brother!  
In Jesus,  
Jeff

**Re: off topic caricatures - posted by savannah, on: 2016/9/2 9:13**

"The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Prophecy is Christ Himself testifying to us how He is going to complete and put the finishing touches on His work. If soteriology are vitally important along with ecclesiology why is the study of how Christ will finish things not vital for the church?"

Your comments on the verse in Rev 19:10 you quote have nought to do with the verse!

"The spirit of prophecy is testimony concerning Jesus, for he is the scope and design of the whole Scripture; to him gave all the prophets witness. Take Jesus, his grace, Spirit, and religion out of the Bible, and it has neither scope, design, object, nor end."

Jesus said to the Jews,  
"You search the Scriptures, because you suppose that in them you will find eternal life; and it is those Scriptures that bear testimony concerning me. John 5:39

**Re: What Spirit inspired the prophets? - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 9:30**

10 As to this salvation, the PROPHETS WHO PROPHESED of the grace that would come to you made careful search and inquiry,

11 seeking to know what person or time THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST WITHIN THEM was indicating as HE PREDICTED the sufferings of Christ and the glories to follow. (I Peter 1:10-11)

Can we conclude that so much was prophesied of by the Spirit of Christ regarding His first coming but little or nothing about the second coming and events leading to it?

/"The spirit of prophecy is testimony concerning Jesus, for he is the scope and design of the whole Scripture; to him gave all the prophets witness. Take Jesus, his grace, Spirit, and religion out of the Bible, and it has neither scope, design, object, nor end."/

???

Is that something you think maybe only you are aware of good bro? I couldn't agree more with the statement. Why would one want to take Jesus, His grace, Spirit and religion out of the Bible? If Jesus is the scope and design of the whole of Scripture why would info and predictions about His second advent be denied or ignored? Won't His second coming be a finishing touch on the grace He began to bring at His first coming? If prophecies regarding His second coming are there then I want to try and gain understanding from them. This does nothing at all to replace the centrality of Christ because His second advent is about Christ Himself.

/Jesus said to the Jews,  
"You search the Scriptures, because you suppose that in them you will find eternal life; and it is those Scriptures that bear testimony concerning me. John 5:39/

That would have been OT scriptures the Jews were to search. Those scriptures were full of info and prophecy regarding His divinity and His first coming and His atoning work. If these scriptures bear testimony of Me (Jesus) and are so full of info about His first coming why would they not contain anything that could be understood clearly about His second coming?

**Re: About my original comments Savannah - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 10:11**

I thought the article was well written and articulated as it expressed Reid's view. He is obviously a committed believer and scripturally literate. I wish I could write in such a way as to express my views. Yet I couldn't help but notice one thing that I have noted before in articles and explanations given regarding Daniel's 70 weeks. That being, when explanations and info is presented and shared regarding Daniel 9:27 it usually is taken from that verse alone when in three other places in Daniel the same subject is addressed. Daniel 8:11-13, 11:2-31, 12:9-13 address the same subject. Stopping of sacrifices and the abomination of desolation are referred to in these verses and it made me wonder again as I read the article why these verses and passages are usually ignored to help with proper definitions in Daniel 9:27. That's all. I wonder why this focusing on the one and ignoring the other clearly relevant verses is the standard practice in so many quarters.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/9/2 10:29**

It would be helpful if someone could explain why the abomination in Daniel 9:27 is treated differently than the other mentions in Daniel outside chapter 9. I haven't seen that addressed.

I ask my earlier question again, too, with the same stipulations that the response should come from a futurist post-trib assumption: what is the church actually DOING during the 70th week?

**Re: Time of the end, on: 2016/9/2 12:04**

Quote:

-----  
Daniel 8

15 Then it happened, when I, Daniel, had seen the vision and was seeking the meaning, that suddenly there stood before me one having the appearance of a man. 16 And I heard a man's voice between the banks of the Ulai, who called, and said, "Gabriel, make this man understand the vision." 17 So he came near where I stood, and when he came I was afraid and fell on my face; but he said to me, "Understand, son of man, that the vision refers to the time of the end." 18 Now, as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep with my face to the ground but he touched me, and stood me upright. 19 And he said, "Look, I am making known to you what shall happen in the latter time of the indignation; for at the appointed time the end shall be. 20 The ram which you saw, having the two horns—they are the kings of Media and Persia. 21 And the male goat is the kingdom of Greece. The large horn that is between its eyes is the first king. 22 As for the broken horn and the four that stood up in its place, four kingdoms shall arise out of that nation, but not with its power."

Just as here in these verses, in chapter 12:4 of Daniel, "Time of the end" does not mean the end of time!

Once you are set free by that truth you may be better prepared to exegete the prophecy of Daniel!

"All the prophets", Jesus said, "were until John..."

-----  
Thanks, savannah for making the time of the end clear to me.

**Re: dolfan - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 12:15**

/It would be helpful if someone could explain why the abomination in Daniel 9:27 is treated differently than the other mentions in Daniel outside chapter 9. I haven't seen that addressed./

I've found that it's just not common practice for the four passages to be considered. The emphasis seems to be on Daniel 9:27 exclusively. I think many things are left hanging when this is the method employed.

/I ask my earlier question again, too, with the same stipulations that the response should come from a futurist post-trib assumption: what is the church actually DOING during the 70th week?/

I believe that is as good a question as might be asked today. I might try and address it a bit later. A good place to start may be Daniel 11:33.

33 And those of the people who understand shall instruct many (Daniel 11:33)

The church will be the only people during this time endowed with enough prophetic knowledge and literacy to understand what is occurring and why it is occurring. Then out of their understanding they shall be able to instruct many and hopefully point to the only sure safety there will be - JESUS CHRIST!

Yet that's just a beginning. More later hopefully.

Blessings.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/9/2 12:18**

Compare these passages from Matthew and Luke:

Then you will be handed over to be persecuted and put to death, and you will be hated by all nations because of me. 10 At that time many will turn away from the faith and will betray and hate each other, 11 and many false prophets will appear and deceive many people. 12 Because of the increase of wickedness, the love of most will grow cold, 13 but the one who stands firm to the end will be saved. 14 And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come.

15 "So when you see standing in the holy place the abomination that causes desolation, spoken of through the prophet Daniel—let the reader understand— 16 then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains. 17 Let no one on the housetop go down to take anything out of the house. 18 Let no one in the field go back to get their cloak. Mt. 24:9-18

16 You will be betrayed even by parents, brothers and sisters, relatives and friends, and they will put some of you to death. 17 Everyone will hate you because of me. 18 But not a hair of your head will perish. 19 Stand firm, and you will win life.

20 "When you see Jerusalem being surrounded by armies, you will know that its desolation is near. 21 Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains, let those in the city get out, and let those in the country not enter the city. Lk. 21: 16-21

Based on a close comparison of these verses, the Roman army surrounding Jerusalem in 70 AD **IS** the abomination that causes desolation. It seems so obvious.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/2 12:29**

Quote:

-----by Tozsu on 2016/9/2 12:04:55

Thanks, savannah for making the time of the end clear to me.

Yes, that was good.

We make simple things so complicated and convoluted.



**Re: Daniel 12:13 - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 12:29**

13 But you, go your way till THE END; for you shall rest, and will rise to your inheritance at THE END of the days. (Daniel 12:13)

Daniel is to be personally resurrected at the end of the days and times he has been shown and prophesying regarding. The resurrection will occur at the time of the end or the end of time. This happens when Christ returns. If Christ's return and Daniel's personal resurrection are coinciding events then it would seem Daniel is very well prophesying of the time of the end or the end of this present age. The destruction of the AC is to occur at the second advent of Christ (See II Thess 2:8) which coincides with and will bring about the resurrection of the dead. This would be the same time as the resurrection of Daniel at the time of the end.

44 No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him; and I will raise him up at the last day. (John 6:44)

The last day would be the time of the end. So Daniel was speaking of many things but not to the exclusion of events to occur at or near the time of the end or the end of time in this age.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/2 12:32**

Quote:

-----  
Yet I couldn't help but notice one thing that I have noted before in articles and explanations given regarding Daniel's 70 weeks. That being, when explanations and info is presented and shared regarding Daniel 9:27 it usually is taken from that verse alone when in three other places in Daniel the same subject is addressed. Daniel 8:11-13, 11:2-31, 12:9-13 address the same subject. Stopping of sacrifices and the abomination of desolation are referred to in these verses and it made me wonder again as I read the article why these verses and passages are usually ignored to help with proper definitions in Daniel 9:27. That's all. I wonder why this focusing on the one and ignoring the other clearly relevant verses is the standard practice in so many quarters.  
-----

docs, what do you think of the possible explanation I gave to this question in my previous post:

Quote:

-----  
Stopping the animal sacrifices can be:

1 evil

2 good

depending on who does it and why.

It is evil when a person other than God does it in order to hinder His salvation plan. Such as Antiochus Epiphanes.

It is good when Jesus does it, because it is the Father's will, and serves the plan of salvation. Jesus did not break the covenant, he confirmed it.

Quote:

"Daniel 8:11-13

Daniel 9:27

Daniel 11:29-31

Daniel 12:11

They must be considered as a whole since they are speaking of the same thing."

Daniel prophesied about various events in his lifetime. He did not always prophesied about the 70 weeks. In Daniel 11 for example he prophesied about the time between 539 B.C. and 166 B.C. the historical events that actually happened then, fulfilled that prophecy as the following chart shows.

(I am sorry the link I gave before was wrong, here is the good one)

<http://www.angelfire.com/nt/theology/daniel-11.html>

Daniel 9:27 is about the time Jesus came, i.e. more than 100 years later than the events of Daniel 11 so Daniel 11 and Daniel 9 can not possibly describe the same events.  
-----

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 12:47**

I've just been busy to answer others and doing things regarding work and haven't found the time to address it but will try as soon as I can.

Thank you for your participation and input.

**Re: A short answer Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 18:26**

Yes Daniel prophesied of things other than the 70 weeks. But as far as the 70 weeks ago and the appearance of a future AC near the end of time in this age he had things to say. Paul quoted Daniel almost word for word in II Thess 2:3-5,

3 Let no one in any way deceive you, for it will not come unless the apostasy comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of destruction,

4 who opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, displaying himself as being God.

5 Do you not remember that while I was still with you, I was telling you these things?

Paul's verse 4 is an almost word for word quote taken from Daniel 11:36,

36 ~~and~~ Then the king will do as he pleases, and he will exalt and magnify himself above every god and will speak monstrous things against the God of gods; and he will prosper until the indignation is finished, for that which is decreed will be done. (Daniel 11:36)

So the Day of the Lord which ends this age cannot come unless the man of sin is first revealed. Paul quotes directly from Daniel 11:36 to describe the man of sin. If the man of sin appears at the end of time and is slain by Christ when He appears then Daniel certainly was speaking of things at the end of time because Christ's second advent comes at the very end of this age as we transition into the next age to come. Daniel prophesied of the end of the age and Paul's words verify it to be so.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/2 20:29**

Ok I understand, but there is an other reading of the exact same verses (please bear with me)

We know that there is such thing as the spirit of antichrist, that could animate evil people in different ages so that they behave almost the same way towards God and his people.

One such person was Antiochus Epiphanes and another one was Nero.

In the years before 70 AD the destruction of the temple and the city were future events prophesied by Jesus and also prophesied by Daniel. The destroyer would be the Roman army and the Roman emperor.

I think there was a confusion those days among the Christians about which would come first the destruction of Jerusalem and the tribulation of the saints or the end of the world when Jesus comes back. Or maybe they thought these events were going to happen at the same time. To clarify this Paul described the then future events of 70 AD \* based on prophecy and warned (as Jesus also did) that this will happen first and taught the people how to recognize it.

There is a possible future reading of II Thess. 2:4 but then the temple should be identified as the church.

I think we can all agree that Jesus with his death on the cross made the animal sacrifices meaningless, but since he offered a better covenant, he can not be equaled with those who had the spirit of the antichrist and violently opposed God's people. God executed his judgement in 70 AD on those that he rejected because they rejected his Son and for that he used evil people, armies and emperors. So it could still be Jesus who as a judgement caused those events but he still can not be called antichrist.

edited to add note:

\* and the years of persecution that followed under Nero

**Re: Back to the main point - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/2 22:54**

I have read your reply and will hopefully get back to it with more as time permits.

But the same path has been followed here that I have seen so much in the passages in Daniel regarding the stopping of sacrifices and the abomination of desolation. One passage (9:27) is focused on to the exclusion of the other three. In sort of the same way you have not touched II Thess 2:4 in regards to it being almost being a verbatim direct quote from Daniel 11:36. As in the passages regarding the sacrifices and abomination, there are striking similarities between these two verses. The question is why would Paul reach back to Daniel 11:36 to describe specifically the one who was to enter the temple and greatly magnify himself and declare himself to be god. He used the personal pronoun "he" so he was not speaking of a spirit etc. but a real person - the MAN of sin.

3 Let no one in any way deceive you, for it will not come unless the apostasy comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of destruction,

4 who opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, displaying himself as being God. (II Thess 2:2-3)

36 ¶ Then the king will do as he pleases, and he will exalt and magnify himself above every god and will speak monstrous things against the God of gods; and he will prosper until the indignation is finished, for that which is decreed will be done. (Daniel 11:36)

who exalts himself - II Thessalonians 2:4  
he will exalt and magnify himself - Daniel 11:36

exalts himself above every so called god - II Thess 2:4  
he will exalt and magnify himself above every god - Daniel 11:36

The Day of the Lord Paul speaks of in II Thess 2:2-3 is the day when Christ returns (the last day of this age) and Paul says it won't happen until the MAN of sin is revealed. So why did Paul describe this man by quoting directly from Daniel 11:36? If the Day of the Lord brings the end of this age then Daniel had to be speaking of things at the end of this age when the man of sin makes a fierce appearance.

Under the infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit Paul connected II Thess 2:4 with Daniel 11:36. Why?

Thank you for every bit of time you have taken to reply and comment. More later.

Blessings.

**Re: A peculiar characteristic of biblical prophecy - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/3 4:09**

Quoting,

Preterist  
Historical  
Idealist

Futurist: This method interprets Revelation largely as a prophecy of future events depicted in symbolic terms which lead up to and accompany the end of the world. The futurist view has taken two forms which we may call the moderate and the extreme futurist views. The latter is also known as Dispensationalism. The seven letters are seen as seven successive ages of church history symbolically portrayed. The character of the seven churches depicts the chief characteristics of the seven periods of church history, the last of which will be a period of decline and apostasy (Laodicea). The rapture of John symbolizes the rapture of the church at the end of the age. Chapters 6-18 depict the period of the great tribulation - the last short but terrible period of church history when the Antichrist will all but destroy God's people. In the dispensational view God's people are Israel, restored to Jerusalem, protected by a divine sealing (Rev 7:1-8, with a rebuilt temple (Rev 11:1-3), who suffer the wrath of Antichrist. The church is no longer on earth, for it has been caught up to be with the Lord in the air.

A modified futurist view differs from the extreme futurist view at several points. It finds no reason, as does the latter, to di

stinguish between Israel and the church. The people of God who face fearful persecution are the church. Again, there is no reason to see in the seven letters a forecast of seven ages of church history. There is no internal evidence whatsoever for such an interpretation; there are bona fide letters to seven historical churches. However, this view agrees that the primary purpose of the book is to describe the consummation of God's redemptive purposes at the end of the age.

The objection again seems valid that if the book is conceived to deal primarily with events which lie in the distant future, its message had little relevance for the first-century churches to which it was addressed. This is an argument which cannot be pressed too far, or else it will empty many of the Old Testament prophecies of any relevance. The prophets spoke not only of contemporary events; they constantly related contemporary historical events to the last great event at the end of history: the Day of the Lord when God will visit his people and establish his kingdom.

This brings us to a characteristic of Old Testament prophecy which is also a characteristic of the Revelation and which solves this problem of distance and relevance. As we have just pointed out, the prophets had two foci in their prophetic perspective: the events of the present and the immediate future and the ultimate eschatological event. These two are held in a dynamic tension often without chronological distinction, for the main purpose of prophecy is not to give a program or chart of the future, but to let the light of the eschatological consummation fall on the present (2Pet 1:19). Thus in Amos's prophecy the impending historical judgment on Israel at the hands of Assyria was called the Day of the Lord (Amos 5:18, 27), and the eschatological salvation of Israel will also occur in that day (9:11). Isaiah pictured the overthrow of Babylon in apocalyptic colors as though it were the end of the world (Isa 13:1-22). Zephaniah described some (to us) unknown historical visitation as the Day of the Lord which would consume the earth and its inhabitants (Isa 1:2-18) as though with fire (Isa 1:18, 3:8). Joel moved imperceptibly from historical plagues of locust and drought into the eschatological judgments of the Day of the Lord.

In other words, the imminent historical judgment is seen as a type of, or a prelude to, the eschatological judgment. The two are often blended together in apparent disregard for chronology, for the same God who acts in the imminent historical judgment will also act in the final eschatological judgment to further his one redemptive purpose. Thus, Daniel viewed the great eschatological enemy of God's people as the historical king of Greece (Antiochus Epiphanes of the Seleucid Kingdom - Dan 11:3), who yet took on the coloration of the eschatological Antichrist (Dan 12:36-39). In the same way, our Lord's Olivet Discourse was concerned with both the historical judgment of Jerusalem at the hands of the Roman armies (Luke 21:20ff.) and the eschatological appearance of Antichrist (Matt 24:15ff.). Rome was a historical forerunner of Antichrist.

Thus, while the Revelation was primarily concerned to assure the churches of Asia of the final eschatological salvation at the end of the age, together with the judgment of the evil world powers, this had immediate relevance to the first century. For the demonic powers which will be manifested at the end in the great tribulation were also to be seen in the historical hatred of Rome for God's people and the persecution they were to suffer at Rome's hands.

Therefore, we conclude that the correct method of interpreting the Revelation is a blending of the preterist and futuristic methods. The beast is both Rome and the eschatological Antichrist - and, we might add, any demonic power which the church must face in her entire history. The great tribulation is primarily an eschatological event, but it includes all tribulation which the church may experience at the hands of the world, whether by first century Rome or by later evil powers.

This interpretation is borne out by several objective facts. First: it is the nature of apocalyptic writings to be primarily concerned with the consummation of God's redemptive purpose and the eschatological end of the age. This is the theme of the Revelation: "Behold, he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him" (1:7). Second: it is the nature of apocalyptic symbolism, whether canonical or non-canonical, to refer to events in history leading up to, and associated with, this eschatological consummation. Third: as already noted, the book claims to be a prophecy. We have already seen that the nature of prophecy is to let light shine from the future upon the present.

(George Eldon Ladd: "A Commentary on the Revelation of John" Intro - p 12-14. William B. Erdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Copyright 1972.)

Me: I believe this unique characteristic of biblical prophecy includes figures such as Antiochus Epiphanes and Nero etc. Yes, they were part of the fulfillment of the prophecy in the near or immediate life of the prophet yet at the same time they represented the far future eschatological enemies of God and His people. Antiochus and Nero etc. fulfilled parts of prophecy yet the exhaustive and complete fulfillment of many prophecies lie far in the future and will only be complete when they find an exhaustive eschatological fulfillment. Nero was a type and figure of the ultimate Antichrist and man of sin to come at the end of the age. It's a widely acknowledged and long accepted characteristic of bible prophecy and can be determined

cted in the book of Daniel also. The overcoming and defeat of the eschatological enemies of God and Israel are always predicted in close proximity to and in close association with the resurrection of the dead. The answer to the question have many prophecies been fulfilled is has the resurrection of the dead occurred.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/3 11:34**

Here are some keys to consider an other interpretation of prophesy:

1. time of the end is not the end of the time

The "time of the end" when it is prophesied is not the end of time as savannah pointed out.

When we read prophecies of the time of the end, we should consider that the OT prophecies were written to the Jews and "the end" could mean the end of their nation, their religion, their system. If we see it this way there is no reason to think that those prophecies are about the end of our time, and the whole futurist interpretation is questionable. Many prophesied events were future to the Jews of that time, but are not necessarily future to us.

2. When was the book of Revelation written?

Many scholars agree that the book of revelation was written before 70 AD. This allows for a view that some events have already happened and not in the distant future.

3. Coming Judgement or second coming

In the letters to the 7 churches a certain judgement is promised. If we interpret these as literal historical churches, their judgement is also historical and has already happened. (ie. some of these churches were wiped out as prophesied)

Revelation 2:5 King James Version (KJV)

5 Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.

Jesus here says that he comes quickly (meaning that in the lifetime of those believers) so we should consider that Jesus did not refer to his second coming at the end of time but to his coming judgement apparently not only on the temple and the city but also on everyone that did not truly believe such as some Christians in these 7 churches. (He said before that everyone that did not bear fruit will be cut out and burned) It would be not fair if his judgement was only on those Jews who didn't recognize him but not on those Christians who left their first love. (the grafted in branches could also be broken off)

I am thinking of more keys for consideration but now I have to go.

God bless everyone,

Zsuzsanna

**Re: small contribution to consider, on: 2016/9/3 12:02**

The phrase "the Last Days" refers to the days between Christ's 1st & 2nd advent (or more specifically his ascension & return). We know this from other passages of scripture which make this clear in the NT & an original languages word study. However, the phrase we see in Daniel 12 for "sealed up until the time of the end" is different in the original Hebrew. It indicates, for a lack of a better way to put it, at the very end of the end. And it's put in context starting at 12:1-3 with clear indications of the VERY END describing the great tribulation (such as never has been, nor ever will be), the 1st resurrection, names written in books & judgements handed out at the Day of the Lord, etc.

That is the original Hebrew wording intention & the immediate surrounding context

**Re: , on: 2016/9/3 13:52**

[http://biblehub.com/hebrew/ketz\\_7093.htm](http://biblehub.com/hebrew/ketz_7093.htm)

Here is the list of the 22 occurrences of the word "end" in the bible as it is used in Daniel 12 "sealed up until the time of the end". Please check it out to decide whether it means the end at the end of the time or the very end of something that ends at a certain point of history.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/3 14:26**

An other reading that we may consider:

The prophecy in Daniel 12 lists the main events of redemptive history:

first he mentions the end of the OT system and then he talks about the resurrection that happens at the end of time at the second coming.

So putting a gap between the 69th and the 70th week is less likely than putting a gap after the 70th week and before the second coming and the resurrection. The fact that we can not know the time of the second coming but the early believers were taught how to calculate and recognize the end of the OT system by judgement, also points to the gap between the end of OT and the end of the time.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/3 14:55**

There's a host of contextual issues with all that when you look at the full context of the Day of the Lord in all of the related parallel accounts in Daniel (& the other relevant prophets/prophecies), but to keep it simple, let's just look at 1 verse in Daniel 12:

Daniel 12:13

"But go your way till the end. And you shall rest and shall stand in your allotted place at the end of the days."

So the Lord is speaking this to Daniel. So if Daniel shall stand in his allotted place "at the end of the days" and that just means "the last days" & not eschaton (THE END), then how will Daniel stand? Is he standing now? Has the first resurrection already happened? These are the simple, but tough to answer, questions simple context faces as challenges to such preteristic hermeneutics. This is why some scholars who want to be true to the text in context have to either conclude its still future and end here in original Hebrew reading means what it says ("end of the end") or must reject all of that and push forward harder to even more explaining away preteristic allegorizing hermeneutics & say the resurrection already happened (how else could Daniel be standing in the allotted place NOW "at the end of days"?).

**Re: , on: 2016/9/4 2:04**

Dear Jeff,

Every view has its strength and weaknesses. I think nobody can say for sure that he understands everything right. I believed in futurist eschatology most of my christian life. I did not even know that other view existed (well, I knew that they existed, but the teachers described them so absolutely impossible that I did not even give time to investigate them). Paul said that we have to prove everything and keep what's good. I think that if people are presented with all views as possible explanations of a text they can examine those views for themselves prayerfully and can use their own judgement and the counsel of the holy Spirit to make up their mind. What teachers should do is to present all views faithfully without bias and showing the scriptural strength and weaknesses of all views. For example when I was a futurist, no one showed me the major weaknesses of that view, only the strength.

Here are two examples of those weaknesses:

1. When God says that something will happen in 490 years it means that it will happen in 490 years and not in 2500+ years.

Daniel 9:24-26 King James Version (KJV)

24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

25 Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

26 And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

2. When Jesus says that a destruction and a terrible time comes in the lifetime of the disciples it doesn't mean that it will come 2000+ years later.

Matthew 24:34 King James Version (KJV)

34 Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.  
(talking about the destruction of the temple)

Likewise you pointed out a weakness in my view. I like these discussions (when they are allowed to flow freely) because we can learn from each other and get inspired by each other's thinking.

I don't know the answer to your question, It got me thinking, I read those verses again. I attempt an explanation that is up for examination by all who reads this. I believe that if we allow other views to exist we will be more motivated to find the truth, and actually we will be getting closer to the truth more than when we passively accept ideas from others omitting all thinking bible reading and prayer.

Daniel 12:13

"But go your way till the end. And you shall rest and shall stand in your allotted place at the end of the days."

I think this verse says that Daniel's life, death, resurrection and final destination will not be effected by the things that were prophesied by him. He will die and rest in the earth and he will be resurrected at the end of days (which means I think end of time and not last days), and after that he will go to the place God decided him to go (heaven?) and stand there.

God bless you ,  
Zsuzsanna

#### Re: Futurist eschatology - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/4 8:12

/Every view has its strength and weaknesses. I think nobody can say for sure that he understands everything right. I believed in futurist eschatology most of my christian life. I did not even know that other view existed (well, I knew that they existed, but the teachers described them so absolutely impossible that I did not even give time to investigate them). Paul said that we have to prove everything and keep what's good. I think that if people are presented with all views as possible explanations of a text they can examine those views for themselves prayerfully and can use their own judgement and the counsel of the holy Spirit to make up their mind. What teachers should do is to present all views faithfully without bias and showing the scriptural strength and weaknesses of all views. For example when I was a futurist, no one showed me the major weaknesses of that view, only the strength./

Help me here if you can Tozsu. What I don't understand is why futurist eschatology is criticized when Christ has not returned yet and His return is still a FUTURE event. This can be said about the Olivet Discourse and that can be said about the Olivet Discourse yet it can not be denied that it ends in a still FUTURE personal bodily return of Christ. This can be said about the book of Revelation and that can be said about the book of Revelation yet it can not be denied that the book ends in the still FUTURE personal bodily return of Christ.

/I did not even know that other view existed/

How can another view get around the fact that Christ's return is still FUTURE?

Why would the prophets make voluminous forecasts and predictions regarding Christ's first coming yet leave everyone virtually in the dark regarding His second coming. I see a large disconnect here that is somewhat confusing.

That's all. Not trying to pick a fight yet Christ's return is obviously still FUTURE. The Olivet Discourse and the book of Revelation end with His yet FUTURE return yet we are told to shy away from FUTURIST eschatology. This truly confuses me.



**Re: futurism, on: 2016/9/4 8:36**

Definition from wikipedia

"Futurism is a Christian eschatological view that interprets portions of the Book of Revelation and the Book of Daniel as future events in a literal, physical, apocalyptic, and global context.

By comparison, other Christian eschatological views interpret these passages as past events in a symbolic, historic context (Preterism and Historicism), or as present-day events in a non-literal and spiritual context (Idealism). Futurist beliefs usually have a close association with Premillennialism and Dispensationalism."

docs, as you can derive from my posts I believe that the second coming of Christ happens in the future at the end of time. As per the above definition this alone doesn't make me a futurist. Most futurists hold the view of Premillennialism or Dispensationalism which are I do not hold.

My views are closest to partial preterism (which is not the same as full preterism neither is "gateway view" to full preterism) and amillennialism.

Both these views say that the second coming of Christ is future to us.

**Re: The disconnect remains - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/4 9:01**

Thank you but the disconnect remains.

/"Futurism is a Christian eschatological view that interprets portions of the Book of Revelation and the Book of Daniel as future events in a literal, physical, apocalyptic, and global context."/

Why do these events in Revelation and Daniel end in the second bodily coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead which is yet future? Daniel's time of trouble is presented in very close time and proximity to the resurrection which will occur simultaneously with the second coming.

/By comparison, other Christian eschatological views interpret these passages as past events in a symbolic, historic context (Preterism and Historicism), or as present-day events in a non-literal and spiritual context (Idealism). Futurist beliefs usually have a close association with Premillennialism and Dispensationalism."/

In the books they are portrayed in, why do these "past symbolic historic non-literal spiritual" events always end up with the literal second coming of Christ?

/docs, as you can derive from my posts I believe that the second coming of Christ happens in the future at the end of time. As per the above definition this alone doesn't make me a futurist./

How does it not make you a futurist? You believe He will come in the future at the end of time (obviously future) but then you say I am not a futurist. Scratching my head here.

/My views are closest to partial preterism (which is not the same as full preterism neither is "gateway view" to full preterism) and amillennialism.

Both these views say that the second coming of Christ is future to us./

"Both these views say that the second coming of Christ is future to us." But you're not a FUTURIST!

!!!

???

I'm not trying to be a smart aleck but am truly without understanding. I am trying to grow in respect to understanding other views but you say I am not a futurist but you believe Christ will come again in the FUTURE at the END OF TIME (future).

The Olivet Discourse and the book of Revelation end with the literal bodily second coming in the future. You say you believe in this literal second coming in the future but are not a FUTURIST. I don't quite get it.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/4 9:07**

Futurism is a theological/eschatological belief system. You don't have to believe in everything that belief system encompasses to believe Jesus is coming back. Just not according to the events that Futurism teaches.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/4 9:36**

Quote:  
-----Why would the prophets make voluminous forecasts and predictions regarding Christ's first coming yet leave everyone virtually in the dark regarding His second coming. I see a large disconnect here that is somewhat confusing.  
-----

1. God speaks to us through Christ

Hebrews 1:1-3 King James Version (KJV)

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:

2. Believing in the first coming is the prerequisite of believing in the second.

God's redemption plan was for the restoration of relationship between humans and God and the restoration of obedience to God. This was planned the way that Jesus Christ came (first coming) died for us, took away our sins, set us free from the rule of Satan. He rose from the dead (bodily and literally) and now is seated at the right hand of God as our King. The Holy Spirit was given into the heart of those that believed in him whereby obedience was made possible for the believers. The separation from God ended and God promises eternal life to those that believe and remain faithful to the end. It is crucial for an individual to believe (and obey) Christ in his lifetime on Earth before he dies.

Hebrews 9:26-28

26 For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

27 And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:

28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

I think the phrase "unto them that look for him" means that to those that believe in him and looking forward to his return. So the second coming becomes important only after we believed that he came first. That's why (I believe) did most of the OT prophecies speak about the first coming.

**Re: I hope there has no disconnect remained, on: 2016/9/4 9:43**

By docs definition:

I AM A FUTURIST

By the common definition of the theological category "futurism" also explained by wikipedia:

I AM NOT A FUTURIST

The key to understanding my post is to go by the general definition of "futurism" as a theological view.

Edit to explain more:

Everyone who is a futurist believes in a future second coming, but not everyone who believes in a future second coming is a futurist. (according to the general definition not docs')

**Re: I hear you - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/4 10:16**

I guess I do.

I still say it is somewhat baffling when the prophetic and apocalyptic books pointed to as already fulfilled historic symbolic non literal writings all end up in the literal second bodily coming of Christ which is still future. Why then place them in the category of having nothing to say regarding the culmination of events in this age? It's as if the large bulk of prophetic writings were presented in a symbolic and allegorical form so as to end up detailing a literal physical return of Christ. It's a disconnect.

**Re: portions of the Book of Revelation and the Book of Daniel, on: 2016/9/4 10:26**

"Futurism is a Christian eschatological view that interprets portions of the Book of Revelation and the Book of Daniel as future events in a literal, physical, apocalyptic, and global context."

This part of the wikipedia definition is not accurate since it doesn't make it clear which portions it refers to but later it associates futurism with premillennialism or dispensationalism which both interpret much bigger and more "portions" as future than just the event of the return of Christ, such as:

- 1 the coming of the Antichrist as a distinct significant person
- 2 the 7 year tribulation
- 3 the building of the Temple according to prophesy
- 4 certain prophesied wars
- 5 the literal physical mark of the beast
- 6 a beginning of a thousand year rule on earth
- 7 the leading role of the current state of Israel as prophesied
- 8 literal physical apocalyptic events prophesied such as natural disasters right before the 2nd coming

So while I believe that the second coming of Christ is future, I do not believe the above points 1-8.

I believe that the 1000 year rule will end when He returns, and at the same time the resurrection of the dead will happen and after the judgement.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/4 19:31**

Quote:  
-----"I still say it is somewhat baffling when the prophetic and apocalyptic books pointed to as already fulfilled historic symbolic non literal writings all end up in the literal second bodily coming of Christ which is still future. Why then place them in the category of having nothing to say regarding the culmination of events in this age?"  
-----

The books end up in the literal second bodily coming of Christ which is still future because it is the last event in the plan of salvation.

They are placed in the category of having nothing to say regarding the culmination of events in this age because if they could tell us what exactly happens just before the second coming then we could calculate the time of it, but Jesus said we can not know the time, we should be ready every moment.

**Re: Not quite comprehending - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/4 21:00**

/The books end up in the literal second bodily coming of Christ which is still future because it is the last event in the plan of salvation.

They are placed in the category of having nothing to say regarding the culmination of events in this age.../

So these books describe things and end up in the literal second coming but none of what they addressed beforehand in the same book has anything to do with the second coming? I'm not used to being presented with the notion that none of the apocalyptic and prophetic books give no information regarding events at the end of the age. Not trying to be funny but this a new one for me.

/if they could tell us what exactly happens just before the second coming then we could calculate the time of it, but Jesus said we can not know the time, we should be ready every moment./

No one is advocating that we can know the exact day or hour etc. Rather, as certain events happen and occur from these events we can know that His coming is very near, right at the door. At that time we will not know the exact hour or day but we can know it is near. If that day will not overtake us like a thief how will that come about? It seems the church would be informed and ready and able to recognize certain signs and events. That doesn't seem a stretch. If the day will not overtake us like a thief as it will the rest of the world how and what will have occurred to educate the church so as to not be caught unawares?

Where do you believe Christ will return to Tozsu when He does return? Where will He touch down on terra-firma as they say. Do you have an opinion on this?

Thank you.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/4 23:45**

Dear docs, I understand your confusion about the things I've said. The prophecies are difficult to understand. We create theories and test them on the scriptures trying to harmonize all verses with the theory.

In order to make sense of everything you add a huge gap between the 69th and the 70th week of Daniel, that is not acceptable for me, I on the other hand theorize a huge gap between the end of the 70th week and the second coming of Christ which is completely new to you.

Quote:  
-----So these books describe things and end up in the literal second coming but none of what they addressed beforehand in the same book has anything to do with the second coming?  
-----

Exactly. I'll explain.

Quote:  
-----this a new one for me  
-----

I know.

Quote:  
-----No one is advocating that we can know the exact day or hour etc. Rather, as certain events happen and occur from these events we can know that His coming is very near, right at the door. At that time we will not know the exact hour or day but we can know it is near. If that day will not overtake us like a thief how will that come about? It seems the church would be informed and ready and able to recognize certain signs and events. That doesn't seem a stretch. If the day will not overtake us like a thief as it will the rest of the world how and what will have occurred to educate the church so as to not be caught unawares?  
-----

This looks like a contradiction, because on one hand we don't know the hour day and year and on the other hand we should recognize the signs of times. But it is not a contradiction if we suppose that there are two distinct events here:

1. The destruction of the temple and the city, as well as judgement on the 7 churches and the following tribulation under Nero.

The judgement is referred by Jesus like this: "I come shortly and if you don't repent I'll remove your lampstand etc." Don't worry I am sure that Jesus did not mean his second coming but by saying "I come" he meant his judgement will come. For these horrible events God wanted to prepare the saints and Jesus as well as the Apostles taught them how to recog

nize them beforehand and save themselves ("run to the hills, etc.) so THEY WERE SUPPOSED TO KNOW THE TIME of these events.

2. The other event is the second coming of Christ for which THEY WERE NOT SUPPOSED TO KNOW THE TIME not even approximately. (no one knows only the Father) The only thing Jesus and the apostles told them that the 2nd coming will not happen before the events I described under No 1 come to pass. That is, Jesus will not come back (second coming) and the world will not end before the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem and before the great tribulation of the saints under Nero.

docs,

let's compare both theories to the scriptures and see which theory will result in less contradiction. I think we would learn a lot through the process, but it requires much work.

For the first scriptural proof of my theory I quote my post from a previous thread. Please consider.

Quote:

----- Matthew 24.

The disciples asked three questions to Jesus, not long after He prophesied about the destruction of the temple.

1. When shall these things be? (Is it reasonable to assume that they meant: when will the temple be destroyed?)

2 - 3 What will be the sign of His coming and the end of the world.

It seems to me that they might have thought all three would happen at the same time.

Now we know the time when the temple was destroyed (it's 70 AD). We also know that his second coming and the end of the world has not yet come. (Nobody has seen him coming back and the world remained sort of the same.)

In the first part of the chapter Jesus talks about the destruction of the temple and the fearful times surrounding that event, the early forming of the church in the midst of persecution, occasionally gives outlook to the future of the church (verse 14), and gives lots of signs that the disciples should watch for, and also assures them that these troublous times do not signify his second coming. This part ends with verse 34.

Starting with verse 36 he talks about his second coming which can happen literally any time without any sign, that's why we have to be always ready.

It is my impression from reading this chapter that Jesus was telling the disciples that all those "troubles" have to happen before his coming back. For us this information is not as important as it was for the disciples since we already know that "these things" happened (in the disciples' lifetime) and we would not think by mistake that "these things" signify the second coming that we still are expectantly looking forward to."

**Re: , on: 2016/9/5 0:48**

The most frequently quoted passage in the Bible used to justify the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple is Daniel 9:26-27.

This is what the passage says:

Daniel 9:26-27

Quote:

-----And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. (Daniel 9:26-27)

Now, don't get hung up over the number "seven" (week). Many assume "seven" refers to a period of seven years. I am willing to concede this for the moment. What you need to focus on instead is the fact that in verse 26 Daniel says a powerful ruler will come and "destroy the city and the sanctuary" and then in verse 27 Daniel says "he will put an end to sacrifice" and "set up an abomination".

Between the two you have a hint of a time scale "War will continue until the end". Authors like Hal Lindsey and David Brickner believe Daniel is speaking chronologically and that "the end" literally means "the end of the world". Brickner puts it this way in his book "Future":

"Obviously the Temple has been rebuilt because Daniel tells us this ruler puts an end to sacrifice and sets up some kind of abomination (a loathsome horror that would be anathema to Jewish worship) right inside the Temple in Jerusalem. Ultimately this ruler is destroyed in a final fire of enormous proportions."

Now you may need to make a strong coffee at this point and read the passage a few more times to understand the logic. Put simply, the question is - How can Daniel refer to sacrifices coming to an end in verse 27 when the Temple has apparently already been destroyed in verse 26? Simple - Daniel must be talking about two different Temples! So verse 26 must be describing what happened in 70 AD when the Romans destroyed Herod's Temple and verse 27 must refer to a future Temple. To justify this interpretation, however, they must place a 2000 year gap or "parenthesis" between verses 26 and 27 and argue that the prophetic clock stopped during what they call "Church Age" or the "Times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24).

The fact that Hezekiah's Temple was desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 BC and then Herod's Temple between 67-70 AD, first by Jewish Zealots then again by Titus and his Roman army during the Jewish Revolt, doesn't apparently count. It has got to happen all over again. The argument falls to the ground, however, if you don't believe Daniel's vision is describing two separate events separated by thousands of years.

excerpt from Gary Burge

**Re: Thanks again Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/9/5 7:59**

I'm not able to get back to you right now and have a busy week coming. A real busy week. But I'll get around to making a reply I just don't know quite when.

Not as a gotcha question but so I can know a little more about your view, when do you believe the 70th week ended? More on this later.

You opened your post to me by saying, "Dear docs." Thank you for that spirit and attitude?

**Re: , on: 2016/9/5 13:28**

docs, thank you for your warm answer, I understand that it takes a lot of time to learn about an other view. Gotcha questions are impossible anyway because we both aim for the same thing: God's truth. I agree with the OP article about the 70th week.

Quote:

-----  
The seventy weeks of Daniel are divided into three sections, but are consecutive. In verse 25, there is a total of seven weeks (49 years). This is the time it took to actually rebuild the city and temple. The account of this is listed in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. These were troublous times in that, they had much opposition in their work. The second time frame is 62 weeks (434 years). This covers the time from the completion of the city and temple to the coming of Messiah. The third and last section of this prophecy is one week (7 years) according to verse 27...

In verse 24, there is a six-fold prophecy and its fulfillment. This verse comprehends the whole prophecy, while the following verses focus more particularly on the three divisions of the greatest event in human history, the coming of Messiah and His great redemptive work. Within the seventy weeks all these things were fulfilled. This verse is a perfect description of Christ's accomplishments on Calvary's cross; for, the purpose of the seventy weeks was to accomplish salvation."  
-----

According to my theory the 70th week started when Christ started his earthly ministry, the middle of the 70th week was when he died on the cross and rose from the dead, and the end of the 70th week has to be 3.5 years after that.

I don't know what event signifies that, can it be the inclusion of the gentiles in the church (to finish salvation), we need to search the bible/history to find the answer. As to the destruction of the temple and the city it is not defined in specific number of years but went on until the end.

All these theories need to be refined and if necessary corrected by the way of comparing them to the scriptures. And I think each of us need to do it individually taking the teacher's ideas as human advice only until they have the proof of the scriptures and the confirmation of the Holy Spirit in us. Fruitful discussions can greatly help this process.

Re: , on: 2016/9/5 14:38

Quote:

-----by Tozsu on 2016/9/5 13:28:18

According to my theory the 70th week started when Christ started his earthly ministry, the middle of the 70th week was when he died on the cross and rose from the dead, and the end of the 70th week has to be 3.5 years after that.

I don't know what event signifies that, can it be the inclusion of the gentiles in the church (to finish salvation), we need to search the bible/history to find the answer. As to the destruction of the temple and the city it is not defined in specific number of years but went on until the end.

Hi Tozsu,

I may be wrong, but I thought the early church was made up of entirely Jewish believers for about the first 10 years until Cornelius and Peter's vision.

For about the first 10 years the Gentiles viewed the church as just another sect or offshoot of Judaism. The church was actually in danger of becoming just that. Every Christian was a Jew and did everything the average Jew did. Many still practiced circumcision and observed all the other precepts of the Mosaic Law (Acts 21: 20; 26:11). Even the apostles continued to observe the customs and laws of the Jews (Acts 3:1; 10:9-16; Gal. 2:11-13). It doesn't seem to have occurred to them that the death of Christ meant that they were no longer obligated to observe the Mosaic Law. They gave up none of their Jewish heritage. They were simply Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah. They saw no incompatibility between professing obedience to Moses and obedience to Christ.

In addition, they expected any Gentile who wanted to become a member of the church to first become a Jewish proselyte. Of course, now we know this is not what the Lord planned for His church. His Church, the first 10 years was becoming an exclusivistic, Judaistic sect rather than the universal Body of Christ, that welcomed every nation, kindred and tongue that it was intended to be. (Mt. 28:19; Mk. 16:15).

It was always in God's plan to bring in the Gentiles. We can see these prophecies in the OT. The stoning of Stephen precipitated the first large scale persecution of the church (Acts 8:1-4). Ironically, it was Stephen who seemed to have the spiritual insight for the demise of the Mosaic law and institutions and he was very accepting of Gentiles into the church, judging from the accusations brought against him in Acts 6:13-14 and the defense he made for himself in Acts 7.

As I said, his death was the beginning of a widespread persecution against the church which scattered it beyond the confines of Jerusalem and Judea. At first, the gospel was preached only to Jews, but a step away from Jerusalem seemed to be a step away from Judaism. This Judaistic hold on the church was loosened somewhat in the conversions of the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch. (Acts 8). This took the church half the way to the Gentiles, but something else had to occur before they were admitted: the conversion of Saul (Acts 9). This was necessary because Saul (Paul) was to be God's special apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 9:15; Rom. 11:13; Gal. 2:7, S). Saul's conversion is usually placed around 35 A.D. Then about 40 A.D. the apostle Peter was sent under the influence of Holy Spirit revelation and direct commandment from God to preach to the household of Cornelius, a Gentile (Acts 10). This is when the Lord saw fit to bless openly and publicly, giving the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles. This factor later figured heavily in the church's decision that the Gentiles did not have to become Jews to become Christians (Acts 11:1-18; 15:7-11).

Excerpts taken from <http://www.bible.ca/history/eubanks/history-eubanks-4.htm>

Re: - posted by Jeremy221, on: 2016/9/5 15:04

Quote:

-----Now, don't get hung up over the number "seven". Advocates assume "seven" refers to a period of seven years. Let's concede this for the moment. What you need to focus on instead is the fact that in verse 26 Daniel says a powerful ruler will come and "destroy the city and the sanctuary" and then in verse 27 Daniel says "he will put an end to sacrifice" and "set up an abomination". Between the two you have a hint of a time scale "War will continue until the end". Authors like Hal Lindsey and David Brickner believe Daniel is speaking chronologically and that "the end" literally means "the end of the world". Brickner puts it this way:

<http://www.stephensizer.com/2014/02/will-the-jewish-temple-be-rebuilt/>



Hi Stephen Sizer! I didn't know we had someone so accomplished among us here on SI. Wow!

EDIT:

Quote:

-----Jesus figuratively explained that immediately after the tribulation promised to Christians prior to 70 A.D., Jesus figuratively explains (Isa. 13:10; 24:23; 34:4; Ezek. 32:7; Joel 2:10; Amos 5:20; 8:9; Zeph. 1:15; Rev. 6:12; 8:12) "the sun will be darkened, the moon will not give light, the stars will fall from the sky, and the powers of heaven will be shaken." According to C.E.B. Cranfield, "this is picture-language which we must not attempt to compress into a literal interpretation." Jesus was referring to an astronomical disruption and dissolution of the present order of things, a cosmic catastrophe to the known order of the Jewish world. Those with spiritual vision would see the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13), the Messiah, coming before God the Father in the heavenly realm to vindicate and exalt God's power, authority and glory (Matt. 16:27). All the tribes of Israel on earth would mourn (Zech. 12:10-14) that Jerusalem had been trodden down by Roman Gentiles, and that their Judaic religion had been destroyed. But God would send forth Christian messengers and missionaries to trumpet (Isa. 27:13; Zech. 9:14; Rev. 8:2; 11:15), broadcast and announce the kingdom (Isa. 61:1-3), gathering together the true Israel (Gal. 6:15), the elect People of God (I Pet. 2:10), from all nations and peoples, assembled and united to receive the promises of God in Jesus Christ. Redemption draws near (Lk. 21:28) as the old covenant priesthood and sacrifices come to an end, and mankind is restored, both individually and collectively, in Jesus Christ.

-----

<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/fnlinst.html>

Greetings to you too James A. Fowler!

**Re: , on: 2016/9/5 15:24**

I gave credit to Gary Burge for that. My mistake. No, I don't know Mr. Burge. But truth is truth. I quote James Fowler a lot, many people know that. Probably a miniscule amount of times I have forgotten to credit him. But, I have gone back and rectified that.

I am wondering if you are going to answer my question? Whether you support the rebuilding of the Temple for the purposes of OT sacrifices? That was the subject of the OP, after all.

**Re: 70 Weeks of Daniel, on: 2016/9/5 19:35**

The OP here is about the 70 weeks of Daniel and not about the rebuilding of the temple. The topic is similar but that is another thread in "Current events".

**Re: , on: 2016/9/5 19:59**

Thanks for the correction, My apologies, Tozsu.

**Re: , on: 2016/9/5 20:17**

Jeremy221

I posted weeks ago that this Julious21 was James/Jim Fowler and he denied it. That's called lying.

**Re: prophetic history - posted by savannah, on: 2017/1/23 7:01**

In this thread from last year on 9/1/2016 dolfan wrote:

"...if those of us who DO understand Daniel correctly, particularly chapter 9 read in light of Matthew 24, are those who understand a yet-future fulfillment of the 70th Week and a post-70th Week harpazo, then this seems to me to be the most pressing pastoral issue in the history of the Christian church."

Since a new thread began a few days ago on when the great tribulation would begin, with Daniel 9:27 being referred to, I thought I would bump this thread which has an excellent article by Rob Reid exegeting Daniel 9:24-27. It's the OP of this

thread.

Please read it! It brings clarity to the prophecy, keeping it in the context it belongs, not some two millenia in the future.

**Re: One question - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/23 10:07**

1) The abomination spoken of in Daniel 9:27 is also spoken of in four other places - Daniel 8:11; 11:31; 12:11, Matthew 24:15

In these four other places, the abomination of desolation is spoken of as being performed by a evil personage. Then why all of a sudden is the person performing the abomination in 9:27 said to be Christ? If it's an evil personage in Daniel 8:11 , 11:31; 12:11; and Matt 24:15, then why is it is Christ in 9:27 as the author proposes? Why the significant and dramatic change?

**Re: one question, one answer - posted by savannah, on: 2017/1/23 10:32**

docs asks,

"...why...is the person performing the abomination in 9:27 said to be Christ?"

From the article;

Before we take a look at individual words in verse 27, may I say again that the theme of this entire prophecy is *“Messiah the Prince”* and the new covenant, the Antichrist does not figure at all into the prophecy. This modern interpretation on that verse 27 is Antichrist, does violence to the text and robs our Lord of His Glory.

At this last point in our study, we must consider each word in verse 27 to clearly understand of whom the prophecy is speaking. The *“He”* of verse 27 is Messiah the Prince of verses 25-26. Messiah is the subject of the entire text. It was Messiah that was cut off, it was Messiah that confirmed the covenant and caused the sacrifices and oblation to cease. The structure of the sentence links the *“He”* of verse 27 to Messiah the Prince of verses 25-26. The word *“He”* is mentioned three times in verse 27 and all three times refer to Messiah the Prince: *“He”* shall confirm the covenant, *“He”* shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, *“He”* shall make desolate. In verse 25, we see the words *“Messiah the Prince”* and in verse 26, *“the people of the Prince”* are those whom He used to destroy Jerusalem in A.D.70. The Romans were not the Lord’s people in the sense of them being Christians, but in the sense that they carried out His judgment. Keep in mind that it was Messiah (He) that would make it desolate (Jerusalem and the temple), but it was the Romans that actually carried out the destruction. The desolation of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 was accomplished by the Lord through Titus and the Roman armies. Many times in the Holy Scriptures we see reference to the Lord punishing a nation through heathen armies. In Jeremiah 25:8-11, God used Nebuchadnezzar to destroy Israel and even called him His servant. In Ezekiel 32:9-15, God said He would smite the land of Egypt and yet He used Nebuchadnezzar to carry it out. In Matthew 22:1-7, there is a parable of a marriage feast. This parable fits perfectly God’s divine judgment upon the city of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. If the king in the parable represents God, and the Son represents Jesus Christ, then it was God’s armies that destroyed and burned the city according to verse 7, *“But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city.”* • There are many other examples in the Scriptures (Jeremiah 44:6, 52:12-14, II Chronicles 36:14-19, Nahum 1:1-2, 2:13, 3:5-7).

**Re: one question, one answer - posted by savannah, on: 2017/1/23 10:37**

Continuing from the article;

BUT , suppose for a moment that the *“He”* of verse 27 is the Antichrist, as many teach, and the Prince of verse 26 is also the Antichrist, but the people of the *“Prince”* in verse 26 is the Roman army. This brings more confusion because the Prince would be separated from the people by at least 2000 years. How can the people belong to a Prince who was not to appear until 2000 years after the people had died? The text in no way says that the people were to come at one time and their Prince at a later time. We must look for harmony in Scripture and not confusion, and a text without a context is a pretext. We must rightly divide the Word of Truth and not distort its clear teaching. There are many expositors

who wrongly apply these verses such as Dehaan, Ironside, and Scofield. If you have a Scofield Reference Bible please check the footnotes in Daniel 9:24-27. A quote from Dehann says, "The Prince here mentioned is a prince who has not yet come." Again, we do harm to the text when we separate the people from the Prince by many years.

**Re: one question, one answer - posted by savannah, on: 2017/1/23 10:42**

For more clarity, one more quote from the article in the OP;

The Lord Jesus Christ spoke also in Mathew 24:15 about the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand)." The abomination of desolation is the Roman army that brought the desolation upon the city, temple, and people in A.D. 70. The Lord clearly gives us the interpretation concerning these abominations that would make desolate in Daniel 9:27. It is not an idol to be placed in the Holy of Holies of a rebuilt temple by the Antichrist. The abomination was the pagan Roman armies and the desolation was the destruction of the city and temple. An idol can be an abomination but it cannot make desolate because it is powerless. According to Matthew 24:15, the abomination of desolation is the only sign given whereby the believers were to flee from the city. "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand)." Parallel passages to Matthew 24 are Mark 13 and Luke 21. In Mark 13:14, the same expression is used as in Matthew, the abomination of desolation. But, in Luke 21:20, it refers to Jerusalem being compassed with armies, then he speaks of the desolation of the city and sanctuary by this invading army, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." According to Luke 21:20-22, they were to flee for their lives when they saw the enemy surround the city. In Luke 19:43, it says, "For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side." This is why the Lord said in Matthew 23:38, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate," and in verse 36, "All these things shall come upon this generation." The generation of Christ's day would see these things come to pass for it was this generation that crucified the Son of God (Matthew 23:34-39). All of these verses are connected with the Olivet Discourse.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/23 11:13**

I commend for your interest in these things savannah. I believe they are important to work thorough and try to understand if simply for no other reason than they are part of the revealed word of God. I don't believe therefore that you are overly concerned with things that don't really matter. Far from it. It is possible to discuss these things with rancor. I'm in the process right now of refinishing the tub where I reside and will be busy off and on with a few breaks here and there. So when my time permits, I will try and get back to you with at least a reasonable answer.

Meanwhile, for now, I understand your view of Daniel 9:27 being about Christ. Yet the author has nothing to say about the desolation spoken of and the taking away of the regular sacrifice spoken of in Daniel 8:11; 11:31; 12:11. Then there's Matthew 24:15. Every commentary I have ever seen that speaks of Christ being the desolator in Daniel 9:27 never mentions the other four places it is spoken of. Is it wise to approach it in this way if Daniel 8:11; 11:31; 12:13 and Matt 24:15 might possibly shed light on Daniel 9:27?

The taking away of the regular sacrifice is spoken of in Daniel 8:11; 9:27; 11:31; and Daniel 12:13. So how can these other verses speaking of the taking away of the regular sacrifice as part of the desolation not have something to do with Daniel 9:27 which speaks of the taking away of the regular sacrifice? In the other places, a evil personage does the taking away yet in Daniel 9:27 it is said to be Christ who does the taking away. Why are the other verses ignored in most commentaries on Daniel 9:27? That is my question. Is it possible the other verses (always ignored and neglected) can shed light on Dan 9:27?

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/23 12:00**

10 It even grew up to the host of heaven and caused some of the host and some off the stars to fall to the earth, and it trampled them down.

11 It even magnified itself to be equal with the commander of the host; and it REMOVED THE REGULAR SACRIFICE FROM HIM, and the place of His sanctuary was thrown down.(Daniel 8:10-11)

27 And he will make a firm covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will PUT A STOP TO SACRIFICE AND GRAIN OFFERING; and on the WING OF ABOMINATIONS will come one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate.â€• (Daniel 9:27)

31 And forces from him will arise, desecrate the sanctuary fortress, and DO AWAY WITH THE REGULAR SACRIFICE. And they will set up the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION. (Daniel 11:31)

11 And from the time that THE REGULAR SACRIFICE IS ABOLISHED, and the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION is set up, there will be 1,290 days. (Daniel 12:13)

15 Therefore, when you see the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (let the reader understand). (Matthew 24:15)

The taking away of sacrifices is always spoken of in the same context as the abomination of desolation. The two are related obviously. Yet, in commenting on Daniel 9:27, the other verses obviously pertaining to the very same thing are almost always ignored. That is my point - is it wise to approach this matter in this way? Bottom line question - if a evil personage is spoken of in four places in regard to the abomination of desolation, why is Christ spoken of in Daniel 9:27? Why such a dramatic and sudden change while at the same time ignoring the other verses?