

NINE QUESTIONS ON DANIEL 9

Answered by Thomas Ice

This is the full text from an interview at www.mydigitalseminary.com. Feel free to share this content, but please do not adjust the material or claim ownership of it.

1. *What is the overall purpose of Daniel's vision recorded in Daniel 9? As in, what is it intended to accomplish in the readers/hearers?*

The overall purpose of the book of Daniel is to show Israel's remnant that even though the nation was experiencing severe discipline for violating God's law (Deut. 28; Lev. 26), God is sovereign over all the nations, not just Israel. Therefore, the faithful remnant should trust God even though they are in Babylon as God demonstrates through the events in the personal lives of Daniel and other exiles. At the same time God demonstrates His sovereignty over Gentile leaders (Dan. 1; 3–6) and that He will shepherd the remnant through this time and they will glorify God. Also, God provides hope in the midst of despair by revealing a detailed prophetic overview of Gentile world history and its eventual failure (Dan. 2). Within the context of God's plan for the Gentiles, the Lord provides a prophetic overview of Israel's role during this time and His ultimate victory in history (Dan. 7–12).

Within this framework of God's prophetic destiny for Israel, Daniel realizes that the previously prophesied time limit of seventy years is approaching (Dan. 9:2). Daniel appears to think that when the nation returns to their land, then ultimate blessing (the millennial kingdom) will coincide with their return. Daniel's errant thinking about the timing of God's plan for Israel occasioned the Lord's sending of Gabriel "to give [him] insight with understanding" (Dan. 9:22).

God was not yet ready to bring history to its destined final climax. Thus, He told Daniel that He was going stretch out history by seventy times seven years (i.e., 490 years). David Cooper wrote a paraphrase that I think accurately captures the sense of the passage:

Daniel, you have been thinking that the final restoration will be accomplished and the full covenant blessings will be realized at the close of these seventy years of exile in Babylon. On this point you are mistaken. You are not now on the eve of the fulfillment of this wonderful prediction. Instead of its being brought to pass at this time, I am sent to inform you that there is decreed upon your people and the Holy City a period of "seventy sevens" of years before they can be realized. At the conclusion of this period of 490 years the nation of Israel will be reconciled and will be reinstated into the divine favor and will enter into the enjoyment of all the covenant blessings.¹

Daniel realized that the basis for bringing Israel back to her land after seventy years of captivity involved the nation's confession of her sin. This realization is why Daniel proceeds to engage in intercessory prayer on behalf of the nation in which he confesses the sin of Israel (Dan. 9:3–19). In the process of confession of sin, Daniel uses every Hebrew word at his disposal to express Israel's sin against God. It was in this context that God sent the angel Gabriel in order to disclose the *timing* of His plan for Israel (Dan. 9:20–23).

The Lord's intent in revealing the seventy weeks prophecy (Dan. 9:24–27) to Daniel was to provide him and his readers with certainty about God's ultimate plan for the people of Israel and Jerusalem. The prophecy is intended to show them when the Messiah would arrive in Israel and His rejection at His first coming, but the ultimate victory that will be accomplished by the time of the completion of the final week of years. However, in the intervening time, there will be the continuation of Jewish unbelief and many hardships for Jerusalem and the nation, but Messiah will ultimately triumph over His enemies.

2. *Are the seventy weeks (9:24) supposed to be read chronologically/calendrically or symbolically? If chronologically, from which date should we start counting?*

The numbers are to be read chronologically; otherwise, numbers don't count! Actually, numbers are symbols of the numerical value of an object that is counted. For example, if one has ten balls then the noun "ten" functions as a symbol for the number of balls. Thus, it would be incorrect to make a symbol out of a symbol. The object that is being quantified by a number could be a symbol, in this case a ball, but ten always refers ten objects.

There are solid reasons why the numbers in Daniel's prophecy should be taken chronologically or literally. First, chapter nine opens with Daniel realizing from Jeremiah's writings that Israel's captivity would last seventy years. These were chronological years. Since the prophecy delivered by Gabriel to Daniel in 9:24–27 is related to the seventy-year captivity, it follows that the seventy weeks of years are equally chronological. Second, definite numbers are given to us in the prophecy (seven, sixty-two, and one weeks), and it would be strange indeed for such odd numbers to not have chronological meaning. Third, the seventy-year captivity in Babylon was based upon the number of times that Israel did not keep the sabbatical year (Lev. 25:2–6; 26:34–35, 43; 2 Chron. 36:20–26; Jer. 25:11; 29:10). It is clear from the context that the seventy weeks of years prophecy (Dan. 9:24–27) is a play on the seventy years Babylonian captivity. The captivity years are chronological so why would the seventy sevens not also be chronological? Leon Wood asks, "Why should definite numbers be applied to periods of indefinite lengths?"² Nothing in the context suggests that we should not take the numbers chronologically.

Daniel 9:25 provides the starting point for the chronological unfolding of the seventy weeks prophecy. But, at what point does the text tell us it was to begin? Because there are different views concerning the beginning point (sometimes know by the Latin phrase *terminus a quo*), we'll want to take a closer look at this verse, which reads, "So you are to know and discern that from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince there will be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; it will be built again, with plaza and moat, even in times of distress."³

Gabriel tells Daniel that he is "to know and discern" the message that follows. The Hebrew word for "know" is a common word for knowledge or information. However, "discern" has the notion of "to gain insight," "comprehension," or "to reach understanding." Thus, Daniel was to learn "from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem," that the seventy weeks of years would begin the countdown. Why Gabriel's exhortation to Daniel? "The history of the interpretation of these verses is confirmation of the fact that this prophecy is difficult and requires spiritual discernment."⁴

The next element of Daniel 9:25 is clear. The countdown of time will begin with “a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem.” The Hebrew word for decree is the common word “dâbâr” which means “thing,” “speak,” “word,” or “instruction.” In this context, it has the force of an urgent and assertive statement or decree. And the text specifically states the countdown will start with “a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem.” The decree involves the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, not the Temple. This is important since earlier edicts were issued in relation to the Temple (see 2 Chron. 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-4; 5:3-17; 6:3-5).

There are at least three different decrees that are considered in an attempt to “know and discern” the beginning of the seventy weeks of Daniel. First, there was the decree of Cyrus (Ezra 1:2-4; 6:3-5), issued in 537 B.C., which I will call decree one. Second, the decree of Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:11-26) given in 458 B.C., (decree two). Third was a second decree from Artaxerxes (Neh. 2:5-8, 17, 18) given in 444 B.C., at the time of Nehemiah’s return to Jerusalem, (decree three). The third decree is the only one that literally fits the exact words of Daniel 9:25. Leon Wood says, the “first stressed rebuilding the Temple; the second, the establishment and practice of the proper services at the Temple; and the third, the rebuilding of the walls, when, long before, most of the city had been rebuilt.”⁵

It is clear to me that of all the options available, the only decree that specifically fits the statements of Daniel 9:25 is the one by Artaxerxes given in 444 B.C. as recorded in Nehemiah 2:1-8. Why? Because decree one and two relate to rebuilding the Temple. Only decree three speaks specifically of Jerusalem. It is clear that Nehemiah received from King Artaxerxes a decree to “rebuild and restore Jerusalem”. The passage says, “let letters be given me” and “a letter to Asaph . . .” (Neh. 2:7-8). These were letters from King Artaxerxes to Nehemiah for permission and authority to go back to Jerusalem and rebuild it. Said another way, the letters were decrees and they granted Nehemiah the right to rebuild Jerusalem (Neh. 2:5). “The entire book of Nehemiah is proof that this godly governor built Jerusalem and its streets and walls,” declares Harry Bultema, “and that, as this prophecy says, in troublous times. According to qualified chronologists this also agrees with the needed chronology set forth in Daniel.”⁶

The third decree is clearly the beginning point for the countdown of the seventy weeks of Daniel. Harold Hoehner provides the following arguments in support of the final decree as the *terminus a quo* as recorded in Nehemiah 2:1-8:

First, there is a direct reference to the restoration of the city (2:3, 5) and of the city gates and walls (2:3, 8). Second, Artaxerxes wrote a letter to Asaph to give materials to be used specifically for the walls (2:8). Third, the book of Nehemiah and Ezra 4:7-23 indicate that certainly the restoration of the walls was done in the most distressing circumstances, as predicted by Daniel (Dan. 9:25). Fourth, no later decrees were given by the Persian kings pertaining to the rebuilding of Jerusalem.⁷

The third decree, then, is surely the starting point for the countdown of Daniel’s seventy weeks. Next, I hope to build upon the fact that the exact date of this decree can be determined as March 5, 444 B.C. when adjusted to our current solar calendar. We learn from Nehemiah 2 the year and the month of this decree and from history that such decrees were issued on the first day of the month. This provides a solid plank in developing a chronological approach to Gabriel’s great prophecy to Daniel.

3. *Should we see the “Anointed One” (v25) in Daniel 9 as referring to Jesus or is it speaking of*

someone else? If Christ, is the passage fulfilled in His first coming alone or does it await complete fulfillment in His second coming?

Yes, the “Anointed One” or “Messiah the Prince” clearly refers to Jesus and His first coming. This is usually not debated by evangelicals, certainly not by dispensationalists. Yes, Daniel 9:25 was completely fulfilled at the first coming of Jesus. However, the basis for a postponement of the seventieth week of years is found in verses 26 and 27, not in verse 25. Daniel 9:25 tells us Messiah the Prince was to arrive in Jerusalem after seven plus sixty-two weeks of years. The total time span is sixty-nine weeks of years. Hoehner has calculated the exact date of Christ’s arrival in Jerusalem fell on the day of Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem.⁸ Verse 25 provides an exact time in which Israel’s Messiah was predicted to show up in history. “And when He approached, He saw the city and wept over it, saying, ‘If you had known in this day, even you, the things which make for peace! But now they have been hidden from your eyes. . . . because you did not recognize the time of your visitation’” (Luke 19:41-42, 44). How was Israel to have known the *time* of their visitation? Israel was to have known from a chronological understanding of Daniel’s prophecy.

4. *Is there a reason to see a gap in between the 69th and 70th week?*

Yes, here are some textual reasons for a gap of time between the sixty-ninth and seventieth week of Daniel! First of all, the text says, “Then after the sixty-two weeks.” In other words, after the seven plus sixty-two weeks, which equals a total of sixty-nine weeks of years (483 years total). The Hebrew text uses a conjunction combined with a preposition, usually translated “and after,” or better in this context, “then after” (NASB) “It is the only indication given regarding the chronological relation between these sixty-two weeks and the cutting off of the Anointed One. This event will occur ‘after’ their close, but nothing is said as to how long after.”⁹

Robert Culver clearly states the implication of what this text says in the following: “There can be no honest difference of opinion about that: the cutting off of Messiah is ‘after’ the sixty-two weeks. It is not the concluding event of the series of sixty-two weeks. Neither is it said to be the opening event of the seventieth. It is simply after the seven plus sixty-two weeks.”¹⁰

Steven Miller in his Daniel commentary summarizes developments in the passage thus far as follows: “After the reconstruction of Jerusalem in the first seven sevens (forty-nine years), another ‘sixty-two sevens’ (434 years) would pass. Then two momentous events would take place. First, the ‘Anointed One’ would come (v. 25), then he would be ‘cut off.’ Apparently his coming would be immediately at the end of the sixty-nine sevens.”¹¹

There is no real debate among conservative interpreters as to who is spoken of by the phrase “the Messiah will be cut off,” as a referral to the crucifixion of Christ, which occurred four days later. Thus, it means that Jesus would be crucified after completion of the seven and 62nd week, but before the beginning of the 70th week mentioned in the next verse (9:27). For this to take place in accordance with the biblical text it requires a gap of time between the two time periods. This is not the result of an *a priori* belief like dispensationalism, as claimed by some. G. H. Lang notes, “it is here that the interval in the Seventy Sevens must fall. This is not a matter of interference, but of fact.”¹² There is no other way to put together this material into a chronological sequence than seeing a postponement in time of the 70th week.

The passage also tells us that after the death of Christ, He will “have nothing.” To what does this phrase refer? It must refer to something already mentioned in the passage. I think it must refer to the six purpose clauses in verse 24, which is said to be the goal of the prophecy for Daniel’s people and city. Therefore, if these items are to be fulfilled for Israel and Jerusalem in the same way the earlier parts of the passage were fulfilled, (they obviously have not occurred in the past), they must take place at a time future even to our own day. Such a realization requires a gap between sixty-ninth week of years and the seventieth.

Verse 26 then goes on to describe the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, which took place in A.D. 70. No matter how anyone figures it, these events cannot fit into the remaining seven years of verse 27. There were at least thirty-seven years between the death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem. How does that fit chronologically? Well, it does not fit! However, our literal postponement view allows things to fit very nicely since both Christ’s death and the A.D. 70 destruction of Jerusalem occur after the end of the 483-year period as the passage states. Randall Price, when speaking of the events in verse 26 notes the following:

“the cutting off of Messiah,” and of “the people of the prince,” are stated to occur after the sixty-nine weeks. If this was intended to occur in the seventieth week, the text would have read here “during” or “in the midst of” (cf. Daniel’s use of *hetzi*, “in the middle of,” verse 27). This language implies that these events precede the seventieth week, but do not immediately follow the sixty-ninth. Therefore, a temporal interval separates the two.”¹³

Only the literal, futurist understanding of the seventy weeks of Daniel can harmonize in a precise manner the interpretation of this passage.

A further problem with the continuous fulfillment view is that they have to ram, cram and jam the events of verse 26 and 27 into the single week of years, or a seven-year period. However, verse 27 speaks specifically about what will occur during the 70th week of years and it does not include anything from verse 26. This is another textual basis for a postponement of the 70th week into the future.

Reasons why verse 27 supports a gap between the 69th week and 70th week is that none of the events specifically said to occur during the 70th week have taken place. Continuous fulfillment advocates must make the seven-year covenant mentioned in verse 27 between Christ and the church, while in reality it will be made between Antichrist (who was introduced as the fourth beast in Dan. 7) and the nation of Israel. Since this covenant is broken in the middle of the week (i. e., after three and a half years) their view means that Christ made a covenant that He then breaks. Not only is there no covenant mentioned that Christ made at His first coming; what biblically thinking Christian could conceive of a covenant that Jesus would break at any time? The language of verse 27 just does not fit what we know of Christ’s first coming as clearly recorded in the Gospels.

Since the week of years is a seven-year period, the middle of a week of years would be three and a half years into the seven-year period. Interestingly, Daniel 7:25 and 12:7 both refer to a three and a half-year period (time, times, and half a time). The contexts of both Daniel passages identify a future time involving the beast or the antichrist. This would support a futurist understanding of the seventieth week. Daniel 7:25 says, “And he will speak out against the Most High and wear down the saints of the Highest One, and he will intend to make alterations in times and in law; and they will be given into

his hand for a time, times, and half a time." While this passage was given to Daniel before he received the revelation of chapter nine, it seems clear that the logic for the chronology of Daniel 7:25 is drawn from the seventy weeks prophecy of chapter nine. Daniel 12:7 reads as follows: "And I heard the man dressed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, as he raised his right hand and his left toward heaven, and swore by Him who lives forever that it would be for a time, times, and half a time; and as soon as they finish shattering the power of the holy people, all these events will be completed." Both Daniel 9:27 and 12:7 speak of the antichrist's rule coming to an end at the conclusion of the same three and a half year period. This supports the notion that they both refer to a yet future time that we often call the Great Tribulation.

Further, it is clear that the overall career of the Messiah involves two comings separated by an interval of years, about 2,000 thus far. It is likely that the chronological elements of the Daniel's seventy weeks of years prophecy foresees both phases of Messiah's career. As noted above, verse 26 says "the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing." All agree Jesus was cut off or killed at His first coming and He had not accomplished what was decreed to provide for Israel in verse 24. Since verse 24 includes the promise to Israel and Jerusalem "everlasting righteousness," this is clearly something that has yet to occur and will be implemented at the second coming during the millennium.

5. *When is the Messiah "cut off"? In between the 69th and 70th weeks, in the middle of the 70th, or at another time? If the Messiah is cut off in the middle of the 70th week, then what happens to the remaining 3.5 years?*

Messiah is "cut off" AFTER the sixty-ninth week of years, which places it between the sixty-ninth and seventieth week of years.

6. *Is the "prince who is to come" the same prince in v25 (the Messiah)? Or is he an antagonist/antichrist figure? And what is the "covenant" in v27?*

"The prince who is to come" in verse 26 is a reference to the beast or as he is more popularly known throughout Christendom, the antichrist. The full statement says, "the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary." Perhaps the best way to determine the identity of this prince is to first look at what he is prophesied to do at his arrival upon the stage of history. The people of this coming prince will destroy the city, clearly a reference to Jerusalem because of the overall context, and also the sanctuary. What sanctuary was there in Jerusalem? It could be nothing else other than the Jewish Temple. Has the city and the Temple been destroyed? Yes! Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed in A. D. 70 by the Romans. This cannot be a reference to a future time since, as Walvoord notes, "there is no complete destruction of Jerusalem at the end of the age as Zechariah 14:1-3 indicates that the city is in existence although overtaken by war at the very moment that Christ comes back in power and glory. Accordingly, it is probably better to consider all of verse 26 fulfilled historically."¹⁴

The subject of this sentence is "the people," not "the prince who is to come." Thus, it is the *people* of the prince who is to come that destroys the city and the sanctuary. The people who destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70 under the leadership of Titus were clearly the Romans. Yet, I believe that the prince who is to come is a reference to the yet to come Antichrist. J. Dwight Pentecost explains,

The ruler who will come is that final head of the Roman Empire, the little horn of 7:8. It is significant that the *people* of the ruler, not the ruler himself, will destroy Jerusalem. Since he will be the final Roman ruler, the people of that ruler must be the Romans themselves.¹⁵

The coming prince cannot be a reference to Christ, since He is said to be “cut off” in the prior sentence. This prince has to be someone who comes after Christ. The only two viable possibilities are that it could either refer to a Roman prince who destroyed Jerusalem in A.D. 70, or to a future Antichrist.

Why should we not see the prince who is to come as a reference to Titus who led the Roman conquest in A.D. 70? Because the emphasis of this verse is upon “the people,” not the subordinate clause “the prince who is to come.” Apparently this passage is stated this way so that this prophecy would link the Roman destruction with the A.D. 70 event, but at the same time, set up the Antichrist to be linked to the final week of years to the first “he” in verse 27. The Hebrew grammar of the passage is not described as the prince coming with the people, but instead, as one who *is coming*. This suggests that the people and the prince will not arrive in history together. Miller adds, “but v. 27 makes clear that this ‘ruler’ will be the future persecutor of Israel during the seventieth seven. ‘The people of the ruler’ does not mean that the people ‘belong to’ the ruler but rather that the ruler will come from these people.”¹⁶ Interestingly our amillennial friends agree that this is a reference to the Antichrist as noted by Culver: “Neither is there any difficulty with our amillennial friends over the identity of ‘the coming prince,’ . . . Keil and Leupold recognize him as the final Antichrist, said to be ‘coming’ because already selected for prophecy in *direct language* in chapter 7 as ‘the little horn,’ and in *type* in chapter 8 as ‘the little horn.’ Young thinks otherwise but is outweighed on his own ‘team.’”¹⁷

The covenant in verse 27 is the one made between the antichrist and the nation of Israel. The following is why I believe the text teaches such a view.

The first question that arises in verse 27 is this: To whom does the pronoun “he” refer to? I believe that “he” must refer to “the prince who is to come” in verse 26. However, others believe that it refers to a covenant made by Jesus at His first coming. Yet, such an interpretation violates the grammar and syntax of the Hebrew text.

In Hebrew grammar, as with most languages, a pronoun refers to the nearest antecedent unless there is a contextual reason to think otherwise. In this instance, the nearest antecedent in agreement with “he” is “the prince who is to come” in verse 26. This is recognized by a majority of scholars,¹⁸ including a number of amillennialists such as Kiel¹⁹ and Leupold.²⁰ Only *a priori* theological bias could lead a trained interpreter of Scripture to any other conclusion. Culver explains the correct meaning of this text as follows:

The ordinary rules of grammar establish that the leading actor of this verse is the Antichrist, the great evil man of the end time. . . . If the pronoun “he” were present in the Hebrew, a case might possibly be made for the introduction of an entirely new personality into the story at this point. However, there is no pronoun; only the third masculine singular form of the verb indicates that an antecedent is to be sought, and that of necessity in the preceding context. Usually, the last preceding noun that agrees in gender

and number and agrees with the sense is the antecedent. This is unquestionably . . . “the coming prince” of verse 26. He is a “coming” prince, that is, one whom the reader would already know as a prince to come, because he is the same as the “little horn” on the fourth beast of chapter 7.²¹

Leon Wood provides a list of additional reasons for taking the “he” in verse 27 as a reference to “the prince who is to come”:

Second, as noted above, the unusual manner of mention in verse twenty-six regarding that prince calls for just such a further reference as this. There is no reason for the earlier notice unless something further is to be said regarding him, for he does nothing nor plays any part in activities there described. Third, several matters show that what is now said regarding the one in reference does not suit if that reference is to Christ. (a) This person makes a “firm covenant” with people, but Christ made no covenant. God made a Covenant of Grace with people, and Christ fulfilled requirements under it, but this is quite different from Christ's making a covenant. (b) Even if Christ had made a covenant with people during His lifetime, the idea of mentioning it only here in the overall thought of the passage would be unusual, when the subjects of His death and even the destruction of Jerusalem have already been set forth. (c) The idea of the seventieth week, here closely associated with this one, does not fit the life or ministry of Christ, as will be shown presently. (d) The idea that this one causes “sacrifice and offering to cease” does not fit in reference to Christ in this context. The amillennial view holds that these words refer to Christ's supreme sacrifice in death, which made all other sacrifices and offerings of no further use, thus making them to cease in principle. But, if so, what would be the reason for such a statement (true as it is) in view of the purpose of the overall prediction? One could understand a direct statement concerning Christ's providing atonement for sin—though its placing at this point in the general thought order the passage would be strange—because that would be important to sin-bondaged Israelites. But why, if that is the basic thought, should it be expressed so indirectly, in terms of sacrificing and offering being made to cease?²²

It is safe to conclude that the immediate context of this passage and the book as a whole supports the word “he” as referring to the antichrist. This interpretation would also support a futurist understanding of verse 27.

What is it that “he” will do? The antichrist will “make a firm covenant with the many for one week,” that is seven years. Those interpreters who see a continuous fulfillment view of Daniel's seventy-week prophecy usually attempt to make this covenant a reference to Christ's covenant to save His people, usually known as the covenant of grace. Those advocating such a view must resort to a non-textual, theological interpretation at this point since there was no seven-year covenant made by Christ with the Jewish people at the time of His first coming. They must back off from the specifics of the text in verse 27 and import in a theological interpretation, thus providing us with a classic example of spiritualization or allegorical interpretation.

If this is supposed to be a reference to the covenant of grace, then “it may be observed first that this would be a strange way to express such a thought,”²³ notes Wood. Christ's salvation covenant is not limited to seven years; rather, it is an eternal

covenant. Daniel 9:27 says the covenant is to be made with “the many.” This term always refers in some way to Israel throughout the book of Daniel (Daniel 11:33, 39; 12:3). Thus it is a narrow term, a technical term for Israel or the remnant of Israel every time it is used in a specific context. It is not a broad term, synonymous with the language of global salvation. Further, “it is evident that the covenant is subsequent to the cutting off of Messiah and the destruction of the City and the Sanctuary, in the twenty-sixth verse; therefore, it could not have been confirmed at the First Advent,”²⁴ says G. H. Pember. Such an interpretation does not fit this text and it does not account for the seven years that Gabriel says this covenant will be in place. Wood further explains: “Since the word for ‘covenant’ . . . does not carry the article (contrary to the KJV translation), this covenant likely is made at this time for the first time (not a reaffirmation of an old one, then) and probably will concern some type of nonaggression treaty, recognizing mutual rights. Israel’s interest in such a treaty is easy to understand in the light of her desire today for allies to help withstand foes such as Russia and the Arab bloc of nations.”²⁵

There is absolutely no historical evidence of the covenant described in verse 27 having become a reality in reference to the nation of Israel. Thus, this covenant is yet another still-to-come future event. This, then, demands a postponement of the seventieth week, with a gap of time between the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks of years.

7. What difference does your view make practically to your own Christian life? What difference does your understanding of Daniel 9 make to your overall eschatological/theological views?

First, it is important that a faithful steward handles accurately the Word of God. One must properly interpret Scripture in order to know what it teaches in order to then apply it practically to one’s life. Different and wrong interpretations of the Bible lead to wrong practical application. If the seventieth week of Daniel is already past and not future in one’s thinking, then it leads to a totally different view of the past and the future, which should lead to practical differences in the outworking of the Christian life. For example, are current events setting the stage for the seventieth week of Daniel after the rapture or is the world just moving toward global governance for not particular reason? Knowing that God has provided a prophetic outline and timetable for many future events gives me confidence that even though things appear to be “going to hell in a hand-basket” God is still in control of history and is calling His elect through the preaching of the Gospel no matter what may happen in history. This gives me the optimistic confidence to preach the Gospel knowing that our Lord is calling many to faith in Christ, just as He worked in the days of Daniel, even though in captivity.

The seventieth week of Daniel as a future time is provides the basis and support upon which much of my eschatological views are based. It supports a future for national Israel and helps me realize that God is working with the modern state of Israel in a way that will include things like a rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem that will accommodate the abomination of desolation at a future time. This passage provides the basis for a future seven-year tribulation as reflected in Revelation 11 and 12. It provides the basis for understanding the tribulation as expounded upon by other passages such as Zechariah 12—14; Matthew 24; 2 Thessalonians 2; Revelation 4—19. A great deal is at stake involving one’s view of this passage.

It is interesting to know that the earliest views of the post-apostolic fathers on Daniel 9:24–27 separated the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks and saw a future seven-year

tribulation period. These include Irenaeus (130-200) and Hippolytus (170-236). One can read of this in my chapter on the seventy weeks of Daniel in *The End Times Controversy* (pp. 349–52). Many opponents of our view wrongly claim that our view is of recent origin.

8. *Do you have any books or resources you can recommend for further study of your position?*

I have a 25,000-word chapter entitled “The 70 Weeks of Daniel” in Tim LaHaye and Thomas Ice, editors, *The End Times Controversy: The Second Coming Under Attack* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2003), pp. 307–53. Also, my www.pre-trib.org website has many articles that deal with, touch on, and relate to the seventy weeks of Daniel prophecy.

9. *What projects are you working on at the moment?*

I am writing a book with Ed Hindson for Harvest House Publishers to be entitled *Charting the Bible Chronologically*. It will be released some time in 2016. I am also working on a book on the history of the rapture and contemplating a book defending Christian Zionism as biblical.

ENDNOTES

¹ David L. Cooper, *Messiah: His First Coming Scheduled*, (Los Angeles: Biblical Research Society, 1939), p. 369.

² Leon Wood, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973), p. 247.

³ All Scripture quotations are from the New American Standard Version.

⁴ John F. Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), p. 224.

⁵ Wood, *Daniel*, p. 252.

⁶ Harry Bultema, *Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1988), p. 285.

⁷ Harold W. Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977), p. 126.

⁸ See Hoehner, *Chronological*, pp. 138-39.

⁹ Wood, *Daniel*, p. 255.

¹⁰ Robert Culver, *Daniel and the Latter Days* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), p. 157.

¹¹ Steven R. Miller, *Daniel*, Vol. 18 of *The New American Commentary* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), p. 267.

¹² G. H. Lang, *The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel* (Miami Springs, FL: Conley & Schoettle Publishing Co., 1985), p. 135.

¹³ Randall Price, *Prophecy of Daniel 9:27* (San Marcos, TX: World of the Bible, n.d.), p. 22.

¹⁴ Walvoord, *Daniel*, p. 231.

¹⁵ J. Dwight Pentecost, “Daniel,” in John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament* (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1985), p. 1364.

¹⁶ Miller, *Daniel*, p. 268.

¹⁷ Culver, *Daniel*, p. 157.

¹⁸ According to Miller, *Daniel*, p. 268.

¹⁹ C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament, Daniel*, 10 vols., (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), Vol. IX, p. 367.

²⁰ H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 431.

²¹ Culver, *Daniel*, pp. 161-62.

²² Wood, *Daniel*, p. 257.

²³ Wood, *Daniel*, p. 259.

²⁴ G. H. Pember, *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles*, (Miami Springs, FL: Conley & Schoettle Publishing Co., [1909] 1984), p. 351.

²⁵ Wood, *Daniel*, p. 259.