

The Debate between Pastor Scott Markle & Brother Ian Day Concerning the Meaning of Daniel 9:24-27

Installment #1 – Pastor Scott Markle

The following list of questions must be considered in order to formulate a right understanding of Daniel 9:24-27 in relation to the debate between the preteristic (or, partial-preteristic) understanding and the futuristic understanding of the passage.

1. Toward whom is this prophetic utterance focused in its fulfillment?
2. What specific measurement of time do the “*seventy weeks*” represent?
3. Are the six-fold purpose statements for these “*seventy weeks*,” as presented in verse 24, to be fulfilled immediately upon the completion of these “*seventy weeks*,” or not?
4. What are the meanings for each of these six-fold purpose statements?
5. What specific event in Jesus Christ’s earthly ministry is intended to be referenced by the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” as presented in verse 25?
6. What is the specific timing for the events of verse 26 – (1) immediately at the close of the 69th “week,” (2) after the 69th “week,” but before the start of the 70th “week” (that is – between the 69th “week” and 70th “week,” creating a separation of time between the 69th “week” and 70th “week”), (3) during the 70th “week,” or (4) during and/or after the 70th “week”?
7. Who specifically are the *people* of “*the prince that shall come*”?
8. Who specifically is the *prince* who shall come?
9. Who specifically is the “*he*” of verse 27?
10. What specifically is “*the covenant*” that the “*he*” of verse 27 confirms with the “*many*”?
11. Who specifically are the “*many*” of verse 27, with whom the “*he*” of the verse will confirm this covenant?
12. What does the phrase “*for one week*” mean in relation to the confirming of this covenant that the “*he*” of the verse makes with the “*many*” of the verse?
13. What does it mean for the “*he*” of the verse to “*cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease*”?
14. What is the meaning of the phrase in verse 27, “*for the overspreading of abominations*”?
15. To what does the phrase in verse 27, “*the consummation*,” refer?

Concerning Daniel 9:24-27 –

“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. 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. 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.”

As the context of Daniel 9 reveals, this prophetic utterance was delivered unto Daniel, who had been confessing the sins of his people Israel and praying for the Lord’s mercy upon his people Israel. Indeed, when the angel Gabriel delivered this prophetic utterance unto Daniel, he specifically indicated that the focus of its revelation concerned Daniel’s people Israel and Daniel’s holy city, Jerusalem, as per the opening line of verse 24 – “*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy [that is – Daniel’s] people and upon thy [that is – Daniel’s] holy city [Jerusalem].*” Furthermore, the angel revealed that these “*seventy weeks*” were determined by the Lord God upon Daniel’s people, the Israelites, and upon Daniel’s holy city, Jerusalem, for a six-fold purpose as signaled by the six infinitive phrases that complete verse 24.

This six-fold purpose of the Lord our God concerning Daniel’s people, the Israelites, and Daniel’s holy city, Jerusalem, are as follows:

1. “*To finish the transgression*” – Herein the word “*transgression*” is singular, indicating that it refers unto the entire rebellion of the Israelites against the Lord their God as a single unit of sinful fault. Indeed, the Hebrew word that is translated by the English word “*transgression*” indicates a breaking away (or, departure) from a relationship or covenant with another. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful departure of the Israelites away from Him. As such, we could expect that after these “*seventy weeks*” are concluded, the Israelites will never again depart from the Lord.
2. “*To make an end of sins*” – Herein the word “*sins*” is plural, indicating that it refers unto the individual activities of sin that the Israelites might commit against the Lord their God. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful activities of the Israelites against Him. As such, we could expect that after these “*seventy weeks*” are concluded, the Israelites will never again commit sins against the Lord.
3. “*To make reconciliation for iniquity*” – Herein the word “*reconciliation*” indicates the ideas of atonement and forgiveness and of a resulting reconciliation thereby. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about His forgiveness upon the Israelites for their sinful departure from Him and for their sinful activities against Him, and thereby to bring about the reconciliation of the Israelites unto Himself and unto His blessed fellowship.
4. “*To bring in everlasting righteousness*” – Herein the phrase “*everlasting righteousness*” reveals the spiritual condition into which the Lord God intends to bring the Israelites through His work of reconciliation. He intends to bring them into a spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness*,” not into a condition of righteousness from which they might again fall, but into a condition of

righteousness from which they will never fall again. Indeed, this is the spiritual condition into which the Lord God will bring the Israelites at the completion of these “*seventy weeks*.”

5. “*To seal up the vision and prophecy*” – This phrase appears to indicate that all of the Lord’s prophetic utterances concerning the Israelites (especially concerning His judgments upon the Israelites) will be brought to their conclusion through the completion of these “*seventy weeks*.”

6. “*To anoint the most Holy*” – Herein the phrase “*the most Holy*” refers to the Most Holy One, the promised Messiah of Israel. According to the New Testament Scriptures, we learn that this Most Holy One, that the Messiah, is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about the acceptance and anointing of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords over all the earth. As such, we could expect that the literal return of our Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords (see Revelation 19) will occur at the completion of these “*seventy weeks*.”

Now, in this context the phrase “*seventy weeks*” may be literally understood as “seventy sevens,” wherein the English word “weeks” is employed for the idea of “sevens.” The reason that the English word “weeks” is so employed is because a week is the most natural grouping of seven when we encounter the element of time sequences. However, the Hebrew idea of “sevens” is not limited only to a group of seven days, but can refer to any grouping of sevens within the sequence of time. With this understanding in mind, we move to verse 25, wherein greater detail is revealed concerning the first sixty-nine of these “*seventy weeks*” (or, seventy sevens).

The opening portion of verse 25 reveals that the first sixty-nine of these “*seventy weeks*” will encompass the time period “*from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince.*” Thus these first sixty-nine sevens will begin for the children of Israel with “*the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem*” after their seventy years of captivity by the hand of the Babylonians (See Ezra & Nehemiah). Thus also these first sixty-nine sevens will conclude with the coming of “*the Messiah the Prince.*” Now, the distance of time between these events are known by historical record to be greater than a period of sixty-nine literal weeks. Rather, we understand by the historical record that the distance of time between these events encompassed a multitude of years (indeed, 483 years). Therefore, we are brought to understand that the “*seventy sevens*” of this context are a reference unto ***seventy groupings of seven years each.***

Now, the report of verse 25 is not presented with a simple designation of threescore (sixty) and nine “weeks” (sevens), but with the dividing of two parts, the first being “*seven weeks*” (seven sevens) and the second being “*threescore and two weeks*” (sixty-two sevens). This seems to indicate that something of significance will also occur at the completion of the first “*seven weeks*” (or, 49 years) of these sixty-nine weeks (sevens). Even so, the closing line of verse 25 appears to reveal what this “thing” of significance is – “*The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.*”

Since verse 25 has recorded the beginning and the ending for the first 69 “weeks” of the “*seventy weeks*,” we would now logically expect verse 26 to report the events of the 70th and final “week” of these “*seventy weeks*.” Indeed, *human logic* would move us to expect that the 70th and final

“week” of these “*seventy weeks*” would follow immediately after the first 69 “weeks” are completed (since the number 70 does follow immediately after the number 69). However, this 70th and final “week” of these “*seventy weeks*” is not actually and specifically mentioned until verse 27. Rather, verse 26 gives a report concerning events that occur “after” the “*threescore and two weeks*” (after the first 69 “weeks”) without making any specific reference to the 70th and final week.

What then are these events that occur after the first 69 “weeks” (483 years), without any specific indication that they fall in the 70th and final “week” (7 years)? Verse 26 appears to give report concerning three things, saying, “*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.*” Herein the preposition “*after*” does not indicate that these things occur at the end of the first 69 “weeks” (483 years), but indicates that these things occur after the first 69 “weeks” (483 years) are already concluded. Furthermore, it is worthy of notice that verse 25 did not specifically state that the first 69 “weeks” would conclude with the cutting off of the Messiah the Prince. Rather, verse 25 simply indicated that the first 69 “weeks” would extend “*unto the Messiah the Prince*” (and thereby conclude), without specifying the activity of the Messiah the Prince to which it was referring. (Personally, I believe that verse 25 is referring to the beginning of our Lord Jesus Christ’s earthly ministry as initiated by His baptism.)

So then, what are the three things which verse 26 indicates occur after the conclusion of the first 69 “weeks” (483 years)?

1. The Messiah will “*be cut off*” in death, not for His own sake, but for the sake of others. According to the New Testament Scriptures, this would prophetically refer unto the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross.

2. “*The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city [that is – Daniel’s holy city, Jerusalem, as per the contextual statement with which verse 24 began] and the sanctuary [that is – the temple in Jerusalem].*” Now, in this statement there are two elements of information that are worthy of notice in relation to the context. The first of these elements of information is that there is “*a prince that shall come*” unto the Israelites and unto the city of Jerusalem who is not referenced as their Messiah. The second of these elements of information is that this “*prince that shall come*” is not the one himself who comes against Jerusalem in the event of verse 26 to destroy the city and the sanctuary (temple) therein. Rather, it is the people of which he will be a part that come against Jerusalem in the event of verse 26 to destroy the city and the sanctuary (temple) therein.

3. “*The end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*” This statement appears to indicate that the destroying of the city Jerusalem and of the temple in Jerusalem will end with the utter desolation of the Israelites, and that the Israelites and the city of Jerusalem will continue to suffer ongoing desolations thereafter.

Finally, with verse 27 we come to the concluding verse of this prophetic utterance and to the specific reference to the 70th and final “week” (7 years) of these “*seventy weeks*.” The opening

line of this verse indicates that some specific “*he*” will “*confirm*” some specific “*covenant with many*” (apparently “*many*” among the Israelites, since that is the focus of this prophetic utterance as per the opening statement of verse 24). In fact, this “*he*” will “*confirm*” this “*covenant*” with these Israelites for a period of “*one week*” (that is – a period of one seven, or of seven years). Then this verse indicates that in the middle of this seven year period (after 3.5 years), this “*he*” will “*cause the sacrifice and oblation*” of the Israelites “*to cease*” (apparently contradicting and ending his confirmation of “*the covenant*” with the Israelites). Finally, this verse indicates that this “*he*” will bring a form of desolation upon the Israelites and the city of Jerusalem, and that this “*he*” will do so for the purpose of “*the overspreading of abominations*” upon the Israelites and the city of Jerusalem. Indeed, this verse indicates that this desolation will continue upon the Israelites and the city of Jerusalem “*until the consummation*” (until the completion) of the 70th “*week,*” and thereby of the “*seventy weeks.*”

So then, who is this “*he*” of verse 27? Grammatically, the closest antecedent to this pronoun in the context is “*the prince that shall come*” who was mentioned in verse 26. Furthermore, in the context there is no other reference to “*the prince that shall come*” of verse 26 in order to explain who he is and why he matters and was mentioned at all in verse 26. As such, I would contend according to these principles of grammar and context that the “*he*” of verse 27 is “*the prince that shall come*” of verse 26. Now, it is again worthy of note that this “*prince*” is not referenced in verse 26 as being the Messiah, but that he is in some way related to the people who would destroy the city of Jerusalem and the sanctuary (temple) therein in the destroying event that is prophesied in verse 26.

In conclusion, let us consider the grammatical and contextual gap that is presented in this passage between the conclusion of the 69 “*weeks*” and the beginning of the 70th “*week.*” Verse 25 clearly speaks concerning the beginning and conclusion of the first 69 “*weeks,*” and verse 27 clearly speaks concerning the beginning of the 70th “*week.*” However, the events of verse 26 are presented between these other two records. Indeed, as we have already noted, verse 26 does specifically indicate that the events which it records occur *after* the first 69 “*weeks.*” Yet verse 26 makes no specific reference whatsoever to the 70th “*week.*” Furthermore, verse 27 specifically makes reference to the beginning of the 70th “*week,*” and then reports concerning events that will proceed from that point. Yet verse 27 does not specifically indicate that the events which are recorded in verse 26 are included in that 70th “*week.*” As such, we may understand from the flow of the grammar and the context that there is some form of gap in time between the first 69 “*weeks*” (483 years) as recorded in verse 25 and the 70th and final “*week*” (7 years) as recorded in verse 27, and that the events of verse 26 will fall within that gap in time.

Installment #2 – Brother Ian Day

I am posting without reading Scott's opening post, although I did read & reply to it at the time of the previous discussion - which occasioned this debate. That puts me at a slight disadvantage, as I haven't got a single post to repost as an intro to the debate. Nevertheless

Dan. 9:1 In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; ²In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. ³And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: ⁴And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, ²¹*Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. ²²And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. ²³At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. ²⁴Seventy 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. ²⁵Know 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. ²⁶And 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. ²⁷And 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 believes the prophets & believes in a faithful God, a God who has called a people to honour & magnify his name on earth, & has ordained priests & prophets to instruct & rebuke the people, & generally to guide them on the path of blessing. God was just & faithful in judging the nation 70 years before, & will be just & faithful in restoring the people & returning them to the promised land. We need to learn to pray as Daniel - to claim the promises of God in his Word, while acknowledging our sin against his Word, & his righteous chastisement for our sin.

A thousand years before God promised a Messiah - like Moses, with a promise & a warning:

Deut. 18:¹⁸ I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. ¹⁹And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.

Now the LORD is very specific in this 70 weeks prophecy. All agree that that means 490 years. 70 weeks of exile have just concluded, & the people will return to rebuild Jerusalem for Messiah. In 70x7 years his work will be finished.

I will outline my understanding of the prophecy, rather than develop it at length.

Verse 24 details the saving work Messiah will accomplish - his finished work at Calvary. The old covenant prophecies will be realised in Messiah.

Verse 25 speaks of the rebuilding through times of trouble - as we read about in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Zechariah & Haggai. The 7+62 weeks takes us to the anointing of Messiah - the most Holy - which took place at his baptism.

Verse 26 speaks of things happening AFTER the 69th week, possibly, but not necessarily during the 70th week. We have the advantage of the Gospels & Acts to see how the details work out. We see the prophesied crucifixion, & the resultant destruction as prophesied by Jesus in his Olivet prophecy.

In verse 27, during the 70th week, Messiah confirms the covenant, and brings to an end sacrifice & oblation - FINISHED by his sacrifice - the crucifixion - in the midst of the week. Those who reject the covenant - now the new covenant in Messiah's blood - will suffer desolation & destruction.

The cross & resurrection of Messiah complete his work under the old covenant. He lived as the Son of man under the old covenant, keeping every detail to perfection, & all for his people & their/our salvation. He has been confirming the covenant with those who received him during the 3 years (half week) of his earthly ministry, & through his Apostles proclaiming his finished work & full salvation confirms the covenant - now the new covenant in Jesus blood - by the Gospel. Many thousands, including priests, respond to that glorious Gospel by repentance & baptism in Jesus name. Down the ages we honour that new covenant as we share the bread & wine in Jesus name.

The 70 weeks finished about 3 years after Calvary. The desolation & destruction under the invading Roman prince took place in AD 70. All that remains is the consummation - the glorious return of our Lord Jesus Christ for resurrection & judgement, & to bring about the new heaven & new earth, when all the covenant promises will be realised to perfection.

Installment #3 – Pastor Scott Markle

Often when engaged in debates such as this, I will seek quickly to acknowledge the points of agreement between my “opponent” and myself. First, I do this in order to demonstrate that my “opponent” and I are not in complete disagreement on every point. Second, I do this in order to remove these points of agreement from being an unnecessary distraction within the debate itself. Third, I do this in order to focus the debate upon the actual points of disagreement.

In addition, often I will present my understanding of my “opponent’s” position, seeking from my “opponent” for confirmation that my understanding is correct, for clarification on any points that need further detail, or for correction on any point wherein my understanding of my “opponent’s” position is incorrect. First, I do this in order to demonstrate respect unto my “opponent” as an individual, granting my “opponent” an honest hearing and consideration of his or her position. Second, I do this in order to discern the primary point (the “premise points”) of disagreement between my “opponent’s” position and my own; for these “premise points” are the foundational turning points out of which the rest of the disagreement flows. Third, I do this in order to engage the actual position of my “opponent,” rather than some misunderstanding of that position; for to engage a misunderstanding of my “opponent’s” position is not to engage my “opponent’s” actual position at all.

Even so, the following posting is present for these purposes.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Daniel believes the prophets & believes in a faithful God, a God who has called a people to honour & magnify his name on earth, & has ordained priests & prophets to instruct & rebuke the people, & generally to guide them on the path of blessing.

1. We are in full agreement concerning these introductory comments.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

God was just & faithful in judging the nation 70 years before, & will be just & faithful in restoring the people & returning them to the promised land. We need to learn to pray as Daniel - to claim the promises of God in his Word, while acknowledging our sin against his Word, & his righteous chastisement for our sin.

2. We are in full agreement concerning these introductory comments.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

A thousand years before God promised a Messiah - like Moses, with a promise & a warning:

Deut. 18:18 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. 19 And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.

3. We are in full agreement that the Lord God had promised His coming Messiah through this prophetic utterance of Moses in Deuteronomy 18:18-19.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Now the LORD is very specific in this 70 weeks prophecy. All agree that that means 490 years.

4. We are in full agreement that the “70 weeks” of Daniel 9:24-27 represent 70 groupings of 7 years each, thereby encompassing a time period of 490 years.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

70 years of exile have just concluded, & the people will return to rebuild Jerusalem for Messiah. In 70x7 years his work will be finished.

5. We are in agreement that the 70 years of punishment in exile as prophesied by Jeremiah (as per Daniel’s Biblical meditations according to Daniel 9:1-2) were drawing to a close, and that the decree to rebuild the city Jerusalem (and the temple therein) would soon go forth.

However, there are two points of disagreement that I would present concerning this statement. First, I would have disagreement with your use of the prepositional phrase, “for Messiah,” at the end of the first sentence. I am not aware of any indication throughout the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 that Jerusalem would be rebuild specifically “for Messiah.” To me this appears to be an imprecise addition concerning the purpose for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Second, I would have disagreement with the entirety of your second statement. I am not aware of any indication in the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 that these “70 weeks” (70 x 7 years) are intended to bring about the completion (the “finishing”) of the Messiah’s work.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I will outline my understanding of the prophecy, rather than develop it at length.

Verse 24 details the saving work Messiah will accomplish - his finished work at Calvary. The old covenant prophecies will be realized in Messiah.

6. Herein we find our first significant point of disagreement, about which I desire to engage through future postings.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Verse 25 speaks of the rebuilding through times of trouble - as we read about in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Zechariah & Haggai. The 7+62 weeks takes us to the anointing of Messiah - the most Holy - which took place at his baptism.

7. We are in full agreement that the “70 weeks” begin with the decree to rebuild Jerusalem, and that this rebuilding proceeds through times of trouble as recorded in the Biblical record of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, and Zechariah. Furthermore, we are in agreement that the first “69 weeks” (“7 weeks” + “62 weeks”) end with some event concerning “*the Messiah the Prince*.” Indeed, we are in agreement that this event is the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ at the hand of John the Baptist.

However, I would have disagreement with your use of the phrase, “the anointing of Messiah,” in your second statement. Daniel 9:25 does not employ the term “anointing” at all; therefore, it is imprecise to declare that the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” as employed in the verse refers to “the anointing of Messiah.” It is true that Daniel 9:24 makes reference unto the anointing of “*the most Holy*.” It is also agreed that the phrase, “*the most Holy*,” does refer in context to “*the Messiah the Prince*” (that these titles refer unto one and the same individual, who is indeed our Lord and Savior Jesus the Christ). However, that the anointing of Messiah, the most Holy, as referenced in verse 24 is the same event as that which is referenced in verse 25 concerning Messiah, the most Holy, cannot simply be assumed. It must first be demonstrated through some grammatical, contextual, or Biblical means. Indeed, I myself would contend that these two events are not the same event at all.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Verse 26 speaks of things happening AFTER the 69th week, possibly, but not necessarily during the 70th week. We have the advantage of the Gospels & Acts to see how the details work out. We see the prophesied crucifixion, & the resultant destruction as prophesied by Jesus in his Olivet prophecy.

8. We are in agreement that the prophetic events of Daniel 9:26 occur AFTER the completion of the “69th week,” and not necessarily during the “70th week.” Indeed, I myself would contend that these events occur during an unspecified period of time between the “69th week” and the “70th week.” Furthermore, we are in agreement that these prophetic events include the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ and the destruction of the city Jerusalem and of the temple therein in 70 AD by the armies of Rome. However, although I do agree that some portion of our Lord’s “Olivet Discourse” does make reference unto this destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 70 AD, I do not agree with the amount of the “Olivet Discourse” that you yourself would apply to that event (as per my understanding of your position through other discussions about it).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

In verse 27, during the 70th week, Messiah confirms the covenant, and brings to an end sacrifice & oblation - FINISHED by his sacrifice - the crucifixion - in the midst of the week. Those who reject the covenant - now the new covenant in Messiah's blood - will suffer desolation & destruction.

9. Concerning Daniel 9:27, we would stand in complete disagreement concerning every point that you expressed in the above statement. Again, it is my desire to engage the elements of this disagreement through future postings.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The cross & resurrection of Messiah complete his work under the old covenant. He lived as the Son of man under the old covenant, keeping every detail to perfection, & all for his people & their/our salvation. He has been confirming the covenant with those who received him during the 3 years (half week) of his earthly ministry, & through his Apostles proclaiming his finished work & full salvation confirms the covenant - now the new covenant in Jesus blood - by the Gospel. Many thousands, including priests, respond to that glorious Gospel by repentance & baptism in Jesus name. Down the ages we honour that new covenant as we share the bread & wine in Jesus name.

The 70 weeks finished about 3 years after Calvary. The desolation & destruction under the invading Roman prince took place in AD 70. All that remains is the consummation - the glorious return of our Lord Jesus Christ for resurrection & judgement, & to bring about the new heaven & new earth, when all the covenant promises will be realised to perfection.

10. Since we have such a significant disagreement concerning Daniel 9:27, there is much within your concluding statements (which are founded upon your understanding of Daniel 9:27) with which I would have disagreement also. Yet these are disagreements of conclusion points due to our disagreements of foundational points ("premise points"). Therefore, focusing upon these disagreements of conclusion points is of no value until we have engaged our disagreements of foundational points.

Installment #4 – Brother Ian Day

Thanks for that carefully reasoned attempt to understand my position. It's close enough to proceed, though perhaps the basic points of difference are that you focus the prophecy on the nation of Israel, whereas I focus it on Jesus and his saving work.

1. OT prophecy concerning Israel is fulfilled in and by Jesus and his saving work at Calvary. In Dan 9, you see Israel as a nation benefiting from Dan. 9:24 which necessarily requires separation of the 70th week to the future. I see the finished work of Christ at Calvary. The benefits follow as sinners respond to the Gospel. Many thousands of Israel did respond, as recorded in Acts.
2. Our understanding of covenants is different. Daniel begins his prayer by acknowledging God's faithfulness to the Covenant, and Israel's failure. (See Daniel 9:4-5) The Old Covenant was conditional on man's obedience. (See Exo. 19:5-6) The New Covenant in Jesus' blood is secured by Jesus' obedience, and is everlasting. (See Heb. 13:20-21)
3. Under the New Covenant, all the blessings of Dan. 9:24 are confirmed by Messiah in the 70th week, but do not end. The Gospel proclamation begins at Jerusalem, and progresses to the uttermost part of the earth until Jesus returns. (See Acts 1:8)
4. The New and everlasting Covenant blessings are for all mankind, conditional on repentance and faith in Christ, including Israel as a people - my people.
5. The New Heaven & New Earth will see the perfect fulfilment of all God's Covenant promises. (See Rev. 21:1-3)
6. Thus the whole prophecy concerns Jesus Christ and his saving work, but includes the subsequent consequences of his rejection. The 70 weeks comprise 490 years without a gap.

Installment #5 – Pastor Scott Markle

Indeed, the first foundational point of difference in our understanding of Daniel 9:24-27 concerns the six purpose statements of Daniel 9:24. Let us then begin the focus of our discussion-debate with these statements.

Grammatically, this verse presents a main statement of four words, and then a series of modifiers to that main statement.

1. *The main statement* – “*Seventy weeks are determined . . .*”

The subject of this main statement provides us with an established period of time for the prophetic utterance. This established period of time is “*seventy weeks*” (or, seventy “sevens”), which means 70 times 7 years (or, 490 years). (See Addendum #1) The verb for this main statement also indicates that this established period of time (490 years) is “*determined*” by the authority of the Lord God Himself, such that nothing can alter its flow and fulfillment.

2. *The first modifying phrase* – “. . . upon thy people and upon thy holy city . . .”

This modifying phrase actually encompasses two prepositional phrases that modify the verb “*are determined.*” These two prepositional phrases are joined by the coordinating conjunction “*and,*” which indicates that grammatically they stand on equal ground as modifiers for the verb. Even so, the first of these two prepositional phrases indicates that the 490 year period of time was determined by the Lord’s authority to be administered specifically “*upon [Daniel’s] people.*” (Note: The context of verses 21-23 clearly reveals that the angel Gabriel was speaking to Daniel in delivering this prophetic utterance from the Lord.) Now, in Daniel 9:20 Daniel himself defined the people for whom he had prayed as “*my people Israel;*” and in Daniel 9:7 he defined the people for whom he was praying as “the men of Judah” and “the inhabitants of Jerusalem” and “all Israel” that were near and that were afar off. Thus this modifying phrase indicates that Daniel’s people, the children of Israel as a body of people, would be a focal point for the events of this 490 year period, such that each of the events of this 490 year period, as revealed in this prophetic utterance, would be administered “*upon*” them.

In addition, the second of the two modifying prepositional phrases indicates that this 490 year period was also determined by the Lord’s authority to occur specifically “*upon [Daniel’s] holy city.*” Now Daniel’s “*holy city*” would certainly be the city of Jerusalem. Thus this modifying phrase indicates, not only that the children of Israel, but also that the city of Jerusalem would be a focal point for the events of this 490 year period. Indeed, the events of this 490 year period, as revealed in this prophetic utterance, would be administered “*upon*” the children of Israel and “*upon*” the city of Jerusalem. As such, any understanding for the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 that does not maintain the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem as a focal point for the events of this prophetic utterance misses the revealed and determined purpose of the Lord our God for this prophetic utterance concerning this 490 year period.

3. *The second modifying phrase* – “. . . to finish the transgression . . .”

This second modifying phrase is the first of six infinitive phrases that also modify the verb “*are determined.*” As such, each of these six infinitive phrases reveals either the intended purpose or the consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined to administer upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Now, at this point a question must be considered concerning these six purpose or result statements (the six infinitive phrases). Are these phrases indicating that these six purposes or results will be brought to complete fulfillment at the end of this 490 year period, through the events of this 490 year period? Or, are these phrases indicating that this 490 year period and the events of this period are simply a part of the process by which these six purposes or results will be carried forward unto their fulfillment, such that other “parts of the process of fulfillment” will follow this “490 year process”? Is this 490 year period itself the means to the fulfillment for these six purposes or results; or is this 490 year period just a necessary part of the process for their fulfillment, to which other parts must be added thereafter? I myself would contend that the grammatical flow of thought more naturally lends itself to the first of these understandings. Even so, I would also contend that any understanding for the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 that does not end with the complete fulfillment of these six purposes or results is not accurate to this more natural flow of the thought.

So then, what does this first purpose or result statement mean? Grammatically, this first infinitive clause includes two parts – first, the infinitive itself (“*to finish*”) and second, the direct object of that infinitive (“*the transgression*”). The infinitive itself indicates that this first purpose or result for the 490 year period is “*to finish*” (or, to bring about the completion) of something. The direct object reveals that the “something” that is to be finished (or, to be brought unto completion) is “*the transgression.*” So then, what does it mean for a transgression to be finished, to be brought unto a completion? It means that the given transgression is stopped, such that it does not continue forward after the stopping point.

Yet what “*transgression*” and/or whose “*transgression*” is to be finished (is to be brought to completion) through and at the end of this 490 year period? Is there anything in the context of Daniel 9 that might direct us unto an answer for this question? I myself would contend that there is a contextual answer to be found in Daniel 9:5-11, wherein Daniel confessed the transgression of his people, the children of Israel, saying, “*We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments: neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land. O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him; neither have we obeyed the voice of the LORD our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him.*”

Even so, I myself would contend that “*the transgression*” (notice that the definite article “*the*” is presented to indicate that a definite “*transgression*” is in mind) that this 490 year period will bring to a finish (to a completion) is “*the transgression*” of “*the men of Judah,*” and “*the inhabitants of Jerusalem,*” and the children of “*all Israel*” wherein they have departed from and rebelled against the authority of the Lord their God. Furthermore, we also take notice that herein the word “*transgression*” is singular, indicating that it refers unto the entire rebellion of the children of Israel against the Lord their God as a single unit of sinful fault. Indeed, the Hebrew word that is translated by the English word “transgression” indicates a “breaking away” (or, departure) from a relationship or a covenant with another. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful departure of the Israelites away from Him. As such, we can expect that after these “*seventy weeks*” are concluded, the children of Israel will never again depart from the Lord.

A directed question to Brother Ian: It is my understanding concerning your position that you would attribute this first purpose or result statement unto the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection, such that this purpose or result statement is fulfilled therein. Upon the ground of that understanding concerning your position, I would ask the following – (1) In what manner did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring about a completely stopped finish of “*the transgression*”? (2) What specific “*transgression*” did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring to such a completely stopped finish? (3) Whose specific “*transgression*” did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring to a completely stopped finish? (4) At what time did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring about this completely stopped finish to “*the transgression*”?

4. The third modifying phrase – “. . . and to make an end of sins . . .”

This third modifying phrase is the second infinite clause that modifies the verb “*are determined*” and that reveals the intended purpose or consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Grammatically, this second infinitive clause also includes two parts – first, the infinitive and its accompanying object (“*to make an end*”) and second, a modifying preposition phrase (“*of sins*”). As in the previous infinite clause, this infinitive clause also indicates that something will be brought to a point of completion. Indeed, this infinite clause indicates that this second purpose or result for the 490 year period is “*to make an end*” of something. Then the modifying prepositional phrase reveals the “something” of which the 490 year period is to bring about the completion. It is to bring about the completion “*of sins.*”

Even so, again we are brought to the question – What “*sins*” and/or whose “*sins*” are to be made to end through and at the end of this 490 year period? And again I myself would contend, from the context of Daniel 9:5-11, that it is the “*sins*” of the children of Israel. Indeed, this infinitive clause presents a parallel truth to that of the previous infinitive clause. The one significant difference between the two clauses is that the word “*transgression*” in the first clause is delivered in the singular, whereas the word “*sins*” in the second clause is delivered in the plural. This appears to indicate that the first infinitive clause concerns the overall spirit and transgression of departure and rebellion that the children Israel committed against the Lord, whereas the second infinitive clause concerns the multitude of individual sins that the children of Israel committed against the Lord within their spirit of rebellion. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful activities of the

Israelites against Him. As such, we can expect that after these “*seventy weeks*” are concluded, the children of Israel will never again commit sins against the Lord their God.

A directed question to Brother Ian: It is my understanding concerning your position that you would again attribute this second purpose or result statement unto the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection, such that this purpose or result statement is fulfilled therein. Upon the ground of that understanding concerning your position, I would ask the following – (1) In what manner did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring about a complete end “*of sins*”? (2) What “*sins*” did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring to such a complete end? (3) Whose “*sins*” did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring to a complete end? (4) At what time did or does our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work bring about this complete end “*of sins*”?

5. The fourth modifying phrase – “. . . and to make reconciliation for iniquity . . .”

This fourth modifying phrase is the third infinite clause that modifies the verb “*are determined*” and that reveals the intended purpose or consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Grammatically, this third infinitive clause also includes two parts – first, the infinitive and its accompanying object (“*to make reconciliation*”) and second, a modifying preposition phrase (“*for iniquity*”). The infinitive and its accompanying object indicate that this third purpose or result for the 490 year period is to bring about a “*reconciliation*” between two parties. Herein the Hebrew word that is translated by the English word “*reconciliation*” indicates some form of atonement for an offending party, that provides that offending party with forgiveness of the offense and thereby provides for a reconciliation between the offending party and the offended party. In addition, this infinitive clause further indicates that this “*reconciliation*” is made “*for iniquity*.” I myself would contend that this “*iniquity*” refers to the guiltiness of the offense that was created by “*the transgression*” and the “*sins*” which were mentioned in the previous two infinitive clauses.

Furthermore, I myself would contend that by this we begin to see a progression of thought emerging through the order of these infinitive clauses of purpose or result. In the first infinitive clause, we encounter “*the transgression*,” that is – the spirit of departure and rebellion against the Lord. Then in the second infinitive clause, we encounter the “*sins*,” that is – the multitude of sinful activities that occur upon the ground of this spirit of departure and rebellion. Then in the third infinitive clause, we encounter the “*iniquity*,” that is – the guiltiness that is created by this spirit of departure and rebellion and by the multitude of sins that this rebellious spirit produces. Even so, the first infinitive clause speaks concerning the finishing of this rebellious spirit. Then upon the ground of this finishing, the second infinitive clause speaks concerning the end of the sinful activities. Then upon the ground of this finishing and this ending, the third infinitive clause speaks concerning the reconciliation whereby the rebellious spirit, the sinful activities, and the resulting guiltiness are all removed, such that the offending party and the offended party will be brought back into a right relationship with one another. Finally, I would contend that according to the full context of Daniel 9, the offending party for this clause is the children of Israel; and the offended party is the Lord their God. Thus these “*seventy weeks*” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about His forgiveness upon the children of Israel for their sinful departure from Him and for their sinful activities against Him, and to bring about thereby the reconciliation of the children of Israel unto Himself and unto His blessed fellowship.

A directed question to Brother Ian: It is my understanding concerning your position that you would again attribute this third purpose or result statement unto the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection, such that this purpose or result statement is fulfilled therein. (In fact, I myself would agree that the atoning, saving, and reconciling work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection provides the grounds for this reconciliation between the children of Israel and the Lord their God.) Upon the ground of that understanding concerning your position, I would ask the following – (1) In what manner are the children of Israel fully reconciled with the Lord their God? (2) At what time are the children of Israel fully reconciled with the Lord their God?

6. The fifth modifying phrase – “. . . and to bring in everlasting righteousness . . .”

This fifth modifying phrase is the fourth infinite clause that modifies the verb “*are determined*” and that reveals the intended purpose or consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Grammatically, this fourth infinitive clause also includes two parts – first, the infinitive and its accompanying adverb (“*to bring in*”) and second, the direct object of that infinitive (“*everlasting righteousness*”). The infinitive and its accompanying adverb indicate that this fourth purpose or result for the 490 year period is “*to bring in*” a circumstantial condition that had not previously been present. (See Addendum #2) Then the direct object reveals that the circumstantial condition which is to be brought in is “*everlasting righteousness*.”

The phrase “*everlasting righteousness*” would refer to a spiritual condition of righteousness that never at any moment whatsoever into the future ceases to be in existence. Even so, whatever group of individuals unto whom this purpose or result statement is intended to apply shall experience a condition of righteousness, such that there will be righteousness only, with not even a movement back-and-forth between righteousness and unrighteousness. So then, unto what group of individuals does this purpose or result statement apply? I myself would contend that it contextually applies unto the same group as is intended for the first three infinitive phrases of purpose or result. Even so, I myself would contend that this purpose or result statement refers unto a spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness*” for the children of Israel, such as is referenced in Isaiah 1:24-27; Jeremiah 3:15-19; 31:31-37; 32:36-42; Ezekiel 36:24-38; 37:21-28; and Romans 11:26-27. This is the spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness*” into which the Lord God intends to bring the children of Israel through His work of reconciliation – not into a condition of righteousness from which they might again fall, but into a condition of righteousness from which they will never fall again. Indeed, this is the spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness*” into which the Lord God will bring the children of Israel at the completion of these “*seventy weeks*.”

A directed question to Brother Ian: It is my understanding concerning your position that you would again attribute this fourth purpose or result statement unto the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection, such that this purpose or result statement is fulfilled therein. (Indeed, I would further surmise concerning your position that you view this “*everlasting righteousness*” as being that righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ which is imputed to the spiritual account of whosoever believes on Christ as Savior from sin.) Upon the ground of that understanding concerning your position, I would ask the following – (1) Does this condition of “*everlasting righteousness*” allow for moments of unrighteous character and unrighteous conduct?

(2) In what manner is this condition of “everlasting righteousness” brought in for whomever it is to be applied? (3) At what time is this condition of “everlasting righteousness” brought in for whomever it is to be applied? (4) To what group of individuals is this promised condition of “everlasting righteousness” intended to be applied within the context of Daniel 9:24-27.

7. The sixth modifying phrase – “. . . and to seal up the vision and prophecy . . .”

This sixth modifying phrase is the fifth infinite clause that modifies the verb “*are determined*” and that reveals the intended purpose or consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Grammatically, this fifth infinitive clause also includes two parts – first, the infinitive and its accompanying adverb (“*to seal up*”) and second, the compound direct object of that infinitive (“*the vision and prophecy*”). The infinitive and its accompanying adverb indicate that this fifth purpose or result for the 490 year period is “*to seal up*” something. This phrase appears to be employed as a figure of speech to indicate the conclusion of a particular matter. Then the compound direct object of the infinitive reveals that the matter which is to be sealed up and concluded is “*the vision and prophecy.*” Since this compound direct object is encompassed under a single definite article, it appears that we are to view this compound direct object, not as two separate entities, but as a single unit that encompasses two different aspects. (I myself would contend that the two different aspects are prophetic revelations that were delivered through both visual means and verbal means.) In addition, since the two nouns of this compound direct object are both presented in the singular, it appears that we are to understand that this compound direct object refers, not to the visual and verbal prophetic utterances in the multitude of their individual deliverances, but to all of the visual and verbal prophetic utterances as a single unit of divinely revealed truth concerning the future.

So then, what particular matter of prophetic utterance is to be understood by this reference in this context. I myself would contend that the matter of prophetic utterance about which this compound direct object speaks concerns the same group of individuals about which the previous infinitive phrases were speaking. Even so, I myself would contend that this compound direct object refers to the matter of all prophetic utterances that concern the children of Israel. As such, I would contend that this 490 year period is intended by the Lord our God to bring about the conclusion of His prophetic utterances concerning the children of Israel. Furthermore, I would contend that this conclusion of the prophetic utterances concerning the children of Israel will be founded upon the progression of the previous four statements of purpose or result. First, there will be a finishing of their rebellious spirit against the Lord. Then upon the ground of this finishing, there will be an end of their sinful activities against the Lord. Then upon the ground of this finishing and this ending, there will be a reconciliation whereby their spirit of rebellion, their activities of sin, and the resulting guiltiness upon them are all removed, such that the offending party and the offended party will be brought back into a right relationship with one another. Then upon the ground of this finishing, this ending, and this reconciling, there will be a bringing in of a spiritual condition of everlasting righteousness. Then through the fulfillment of this finishing, this ending, this reconciling, and this bringing of everlasting righteousness, there will be a completion concerning the matter of prophetic utterance through the completion of these “*seventy weeks.*” Finally, this completion of prophetic utterance **will climax** with the final statement of purpose or result – the anointing “*of the most Holy.*”

8. *The seventh and final modifying phrase – “. . . to anoint the most Holy.”*

This seventh and final modifying phrase is the sixth and final infinite clause that modifies the verb “*are determined*” and that reveals the intended purpose or consequential result for the 490 year period that the Lord God had determined upon the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Grammatically, this sixth infinitive clause also includes two parts – first, the infinitive itself (“*to anoint*”) and second, the direct object of that infinitive (“*the most Holy*”). The infinitive itself indicates that this sixth and final purpose or result for the 490 year period is “*to anoint*” someone or something. The direct object reveals that the someone or something that is to be anointed is “*the most Holy.*” At this time, I myself would contend that this phrase, “*the most Holy,*” is a reference unto “*the Messiah the Prince,*” our Lord Jesus the Christ. (See Addendum #3)

Yet the question remains – What is the event of our Lord Jesus Christ’s anointing? Throughout God’s Word two events appear to present themselves as “anointing events” for our Lord Jesus Christ, wherein God the Father anointed Him for a particular role. The first of these is the event of our Lord’s baptism, wherein He was anointed with the Holy Spirit for His earthly ministry of preaching, teaching, healing, and doing good as referenced in Isaiah 61:1-3, which our Lord Jesus Christ applied unto Himself in Luke 4:17-21, and as referenced by the apostle Peter in Acts 10:34-38. (Note: Acts 4:27 might also be a reference to this “anointing event” of Christ’s baptism.) The second of these “anointing events” for our Lord Jesus Christ appears to be the event of our Lord’s ascension and exaltation to sit in full sovereignty at the right hand of God the Father, as referenced in Psalm 2:2-9, wherein the Lord God’s Anointed is revealed to be God the Son, and as referenced Psalm 45:1-8, which is applied unto our Lord Jesus Christ in Hebrews 1:8-9.

Now, of these two “anointing events” for our Lord Jesus Christ, I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is referring to the “anointing event” wherein He was anointed as King of kings and Lord of lords. I would contend for this on the ground that the “anointing event” of Daniel 9:24 is mentioned at the end of the progression of purpose or result statements as presented in Daniel 9:24. As such, I would contend that by the contextual flow of thought in this progression, the “anointing event” of Daniel 9:24 is presented as THE concluding purpose or result that brings the other purposes or results unto their point of climax. Even so, I would contend that the anointing of our Lord’s baptism was an event of beginning for His earthly ministry, not an event of conclusion and climax. On the other hand, I would further contend that the anointing of our Lord’s exaltation was an event of conclusion and climax to His earthly ministry and saving work. Finally, I would contend that the anointing of our Lord’s exaltation will have its full acknowledgement by and application to the children of Israel and to all the inhabitants of the world at our Lord’s Second Coming as King of kings and Lord of lords to rule physically and literally over all.

A directed question to Brother Ian: It is my understanding concerning your position that you would attribute this final purpose or result statement unto the event of our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism. Upon the ground of that understanding concerning your position, I would ask the following – (1) How does that understanding fit with the progression and flow of thought in the six purpose or result statements of Daniel 9:24, wherein this anointing is presented as the last of these six purpose or result statements?

Installment #6 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

The following list of questions must be considered in order to formulate a right understanding of Daniel 9:24-27 in relation to the debate between the preteristic (or, partial-preteristic) understanding and the futuristic understanding of the passage.

My understanding of Scripture is best described as "Covenant Theology" with a partial preterist interpretation of prophecy. But don't look up web sites for what I believe. I don't follow a "system."

Understanding - interpretation of Scripture requires understanding in the literal sense, bearing in mind Scripture is often clear statements, poetical, figurative, prophetic or for direct obedience. In all cases it has a context, so that we need to consider why it is written, how it applies to writer & immediate readers, & as general Scripture & Messianic Scripture. Also no Scripture stands alone - there are always related Scriptures.

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.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

1. Toward whom is this prophetic utterance focused in its fulfillment?

The immediate understanding is "thy people & thy holy city" meaning the descendants of Abraham, aka "my people Israel" & Jerusalem. The first promise to Abram included blessing as a great nation & blessing for "all families on earth." (Gen. 12:1-3) The prophecy cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.

Isaiah in his servant prophecies speaks of Messiah as "my servant Israel" and declares:

"And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Isa. 49:6

Those prophecies include Isaiah 53 when Jesus as the suffering servant is revealed, & Isaiah 52, which introduces the suffering servant, says: *"All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God."* The aspects of Messiah's saving work were spelled out in Isaiah 53, & Gabriel & Daniel were aware of those Scriptures, as they are summarised in Daniel 9:24, as they were aware of Jeremiah & his 70 years. This saving work is to be completed in 70 weeks, which we understand as 70x7 years, corresponding to the 70 years exile just completed.

Notice God often refers to "my people Israel" with the covenant relationship "I will be your God, & you will be my people" which relationship persists into the New Heaven & New Earth of Rev. 21. It is a covenant-redemption relationship.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

2. What specific measurement of time do the "seventy weeks" represent?

We agree the 70 weeks represent 490 years, so we can expect the prophecy to be completed within that period, with all the weeks contiguous. However, as the prophecy was delivered about 2,500 years ago, there has to be a period AFTER the completion of the 70 weeks for the outworking of certain details.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

3. Are the six-fold purpose statements for these "seventy weeks," as presented in verse 24, to be fulfilled immediately upon the completion of these "seventy weeks," or not?

They are, or the 70 weeks becomes meaningless. Any attempt to split the weeks nullifies the prophecy. As the prophesy concerns Messiah - Jesus - the time for fulfilment is the time of Jesus' ministry, death & resurrection. 70 weeks takes us to about 35 AD. Clearly the saving work of Messiah is detailed in verse 24, as it is in Isaiah 53, & in the New Covenant Scriptures.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

4. What are the meanings for each of these six-fold purpose statements?

These specifically concern the saving work of Jesus at Calvary. All believers can thank God for that wonderful provision for our salvation (see Isaiah 53). We do have "everlasting righteousness," and all the promises & prophecies focus on Messiah. His coming, & all his saving work was the fulfilment of prophecy, as he explained on the Emmaus road & to the Apostles in Luke 24.

"and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy."

That applies to Jesus, fulfilling & being the end of prophecy & being anointed by the Holy Spirit for his ministry.

"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."

Now Gabriel gives further details. The 69 weeks will be *troublous times* but Jerusalem will be rebuilt ready for Messiah the Prince to come.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

5. What specific event in Jesus Christ's earthly ministry is intended to be referenced by the phrase, "*unto the Messiah the Prince,*" as presented in verse 25?

That takes us to Jesus' baptism, when he was anointed by the Holy Spirit for his ministry.

"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."

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

6. What is the specific timing for the events of verse 26 – (1) immediately at the close of the 69th "week," (2) after the 69th "week," but before the start of the 70th "week" (that is – between the 69th "week" and 70th "week," creating a separation of time between the 69th "week" and 70th "week"), (3) during the 70th "week," or (4) during and/or after the 70th "week"?

That is best answered by looking at the fulfillment of the prophecy in the Gospels & Acts. "After" is not defined, but it is clear that the crucifixion is prophesied, so "cut off" is during the 70th week, as Jesus' earthly ministry lasted around 3 years. We know also from Jesus' Olivet prophecy & the warnings in Acts that the consequences of rejected Messiah were to be destruction of the city & sanctuary. That destruction did not happen during the time of Acts, so must be after the 70th week, which is also after the 69th week.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

7. Who specifically are the *people* of "*the prince that shall come*"?

8. Who specifically is the *prince* who shall come?

The consequence of rejection is the destruction, so the Roman armies are intended, the prince being either the army commander, or the emperor.

"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."

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

9. Who specifically is the "*he*" of verse 27?

10. What specifically is "*the covenant*" that the "*he*" of verse 27 confirms with the "*many*"?

11. Who specifically are the "*many*" of verse 27, with whom the "*he*" of the verse will confirm this covenant?

12. What does the phrase "*for one week*" mean in relation to the confirming of this covenant that the "*he*" of the verse makes with the "*many*" of the verse?
13. What does it mean for the "*he*" of the verse to "*cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease*"?
14. What is the meaning of the phrase in verse 27, "*for the overspreading of abominations*"?
15. To what does the phrase in verse 27, "*the consummation*," refer?

I'll take these together. The subject of the whole passage is the Messiah, & his saving work. Daniel is concerned with God's covenant & Israel's failure to keep it. (Dan. 9:4-5) Jesus was born under the old covenant in order to keep it to perfection & so redeem Israel. I recommend reading the songs of Mary, Zechariah, the angels & Simeon to see the way he was to honour the covenant for his people. (See Luke 1:68-79)

Every aspect of the old covenant required sacrifice. Jesus was the final sacrifice, in the midst of the 70th week, after which all animal sacrifices were worthless. They didn't stop, even though the temple veil was rent top to bottom. Seems they just mended it & carried on with the sacrifices, which, offered in defiance of God were abominations. (See Isaiah 1) Jesus was busy during his ministry confirming the covenant with as many as received him, and for the remainder of the 70th week his Apostles were preaching the Gospel, whereby all the blessings of Dan. 9:24 were received. Many thousands of the repentant Jews, including priests, responded to the Gospel, all round the Roman empire. They recognised the fulfilment of prophecy in Jesus. (See Acts 3:18-26)

Sadly, the Jewish leaders persistently rejected their Messiah, to the extent that they were denounced as "uncircumcised" by the Holy Spirit speaking through Stephen. (See Acts 7:51)

In the context, the "consummation" is the AD 70 destruction, when the wrath of God was poured out on those who rejected first their Messiah, then the Gospel of salvation through his saving work. That is according to many prophecies, including Deut. 18:18-19; Mal. 4:5-6; Acts 3:22-23. That destruction effectively ended (sealed up) the Old Covenant prophecies concerning Israel. Jesus gave them & us the New Covenant in his blood, which Jeremiah speaks of in Jer. 31.

Happily that dreadful consummation is not God's last word to Israel, though it was to the generation ("this generation") that rejected him. The Gospel is freely available to every repentant sinner, including the Jews & will be until Jesus returns.

⁹ *After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands;* ¹⁰ *And cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.* (Rev. 7:9-10)

¹⁶ *I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.* ¹⁷ *And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.* (Rev. 22:16-17)

Installment #7 – Pastor Scott Markle

As the prophesy concerns Messiah - Jesus - the time for fulfilment is time of Jesus' ministry, death & resurrection.

Throughout your above posting, you present many "authoritative declarations" without providing grammatical, contextual, or Biblical support for those declarations. This leaves me and the audience only with the option to accept these declarations upon the authority of your word. Yet in the realm of Bible study, the authority of a human's word is of little value in understanding God's truth. Rather, we must find our authority in the grammatical, contextual, and Biblical evidences of God's own Word.

The most significant of these "authoritative declarations" that you present concerns your underlying premise in relation to the passage, as represented in the quoted statement above. Again and again you make an "authoritative declaration" to the effect that the entire prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 primarily concerns the Messiah (our Lord Jesus Christ) and is to be fulfilled in the saving work of His crucifixion and resurrection. Indeed, this underlying premise governs every other aspect of your understanding concerning the passage. Yet you do not provide grammatical, contextual, or Biblical evidence for this underlying premise. Now, if your underlying premise is wrong, then the entire rest of your understanding that is built upon that premise would lack foundation and would also be found faulty. So then, I am presenting a challenge that you substantiate your underlying premise through grammatical, contextual, and Biblical evidence, specifically in relation to the direct statements of God's Word that are found in Daniel 9:24-27.

Now, I will grant that you appear to make some attempt at substantiating your underlying premise through your answer to my first question concerning the passage, as follows:

1. Toward whom is this prophetic utterance focused in its fulfillment?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The immediate understanding is "thy people & thy holy city" meaning the descendants of Abraham, aka "my people Israel" & Jerusalem. The first promise to Abram included blessing as a great nation & blessing for "all families on earth." (Gen. 12:1-3) The prophecy cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.

Isaiah in his servant prophecies speaks of Messiah as "my servant Israel" and declares:

“And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.” Isa. 49:6

In the answer that you have provided above to my opening question, I find it quite interesting how you made the following progression:

From the "*thy people*" phrase of Daniel 9:24 ---- to "the descendants of Abraham" ---- to "my people Israel" ---- to the Messiah as "my servant Israel."

The most interesting aspect for this presentation is that you made it without providing grammatical, contextual, or Biblical evidence for each step in your progression. Yet then you appear to take up the conclusion of this progression as the underlying premise for your entire understanding of Daniel 9:24-27.

Allow me then to focus upon the first "authoritative declaration" that you make in presenting this progression of thought –

“The immediate understanding is ‘thy people & thy holy city’ meaning the descendants of Abraham, aka ‘my people Israel’ & Jerusalem. The first promise to Abram included blessing as a great nation & blessing for "all families on earth." (Gen. 12:1-3)

You have provided no grammatical, contextual, or Biblical evidence for the statement that the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 means "the descendants of Abraham." On the other hand, the grammatical and contextual flow of thought does appear to be quite clear concerning the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24. From Daniel 9:21 we learn that "*the man*" (the angel) Gabriel was sent by the Lord God unto Daniel, and from Daniel 9:22 we learn that the purpose for the Lord God in sending Gabriel to Daniel was in order to give Daniel "*skill and understanding*." In fact, the grammar of the passage indicates that throughout Daniel 9:22-27, the angel Gabriel is the one doing the speaking. Furthermore, the context of the passage indicates that throughout Daniel 9:22-27, Daniel is the one to whom the angel Gabriel is speaking. Therefore, when the angel Gabriel employs the phrase, "*thy people*," in Daniel 9:24, while speaking directly to Daniel, the phrase must grammatically and contextually mean, "Daniel's people." In this context, the pronoun "thy" finds its antecedent in Daniel himself.

So then, who specifically were "Daniel's people"? Let us not guess. Let us find the answer in the context. In the opening half of Daniel 9:20, Daniel himself has already made the declaration, "*And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of **my people Israel** . . .*" In addition, in Daniel 9:7 Daniel himself had already made the declaration, "*O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; **to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.***" So then, the "*thy people*" of Daniel 9:24 is not contextually to be understood as "the descendants of Abraham," but as "*the men of Judah,*" and "*the inhabitants of Jerusalem,*" and all the children of Israel. This is the authority of the grammar and context of God's own Word. There is no grammatical or contextual authority for viewing the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 as being a reference to the Messiah. Rather, there is only grammatical and contextual authority for viewing the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 as being a reference to a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God.

Installment #8 – Brother Ian Day

I'm not sure where we are going in this discussion. I'm not convinced that your grammatical analysis leads to a proper understanding of the prophecy, or whether it actually obscures the clear meaning of the prophecy.

The full scope of the prophecy is verse 24, the remaining verses adding details.

“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.”

However we analyze the grammar, the arithmetic stands - 70 weeks, or 490 years to the fulfilment of the prophecy. That we agree takes us to the baptism & ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ. Your grammatical interpretation makes the prophecy relate to some yet future date, 350 weeks and counting, so in effect it destroys the prophecy. I think in this case, the 70 weeks is so clearly specific that simple arithmetic overrules complicated grammar. The timing indicates the Lord Jesus' saving ministry. I think everyone agrees that, but there are suggestions as to whether 69 weeks takes us to Jesus' baptism, his triumphant entry or the cross & resurrection.

We should judge prophecy both by its faithfulness to the Word, & by its fulfilment, not by grammatical analysis. There is a danger of being Pharisaical. Also, we have the mind of Christ - 1 Cor. 2:16 - so we can look at prophecy with an new covenant, spiritual, Spirit-aided understanding.

One point of grammar is that in a list of prophetic events, the sequence is not necessarily chronological; they may be concurrent or in order of importance, etc. Also, as they are prophesied to take place in 70 weeks, those events cannot be absolute in the sense of your grammatical analysis. Transgression, sins & iniquity continue until our Lord returns in glory to bring into being *“new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”* 2 Peter 3

The question I need to answer is: In what sense WAS Dan. 9:24 fulfilled within the 70 weeks?

The question you need to answer is: If v. 24 was not fulfilled in 70 weeks, & is not yet fulfilled in 350 weeks, what does the 70 weeks prophecy mean when Gabriel declared the prophecy so plainly?

The prophecy was fulfilled in the 70 weeks - we can see ALL the answers in Isaiah 53 - *“he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ... he bare the sin of many. 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.”* In Christ all believers are no longer transgressors, nor sinners; & our iniquities are fully reconciled. We have everlasting righteousness imputed in Christ. (See Luke 22:37; Luke 24:47; Acts 3:26; Rom 5:17) We benefit from that fulfilled prophecy.

Our most Holy Saviour was anointed at his baptism (see Luke 3:22; Luke 4:18) and again at his ascension (see Heb. 1:8-9; Also Acts 4:24-30 quoting Psalm 2:1-3)

Reference to Scripture, rather than grammar, shows that the 70 weeks prophecy was fulfilled perfectly in 490 years. Arguments to insert an indefinite "gap" between 69 & 70 are a denial of the prophecy & make 70 weeks meaningless.

Installment #9 – Pastor Scott Markle

This discussion is a debate-discussion. Therefore, we are engaging in a debate between two opposing views concerning the correct understanding of Daniel 9:24-27. Even so, the first step of such a debate would be to determine the specific areas wherein the two opposing views actually possess disagreement. The second step would be for one of the sides to take up one of the points of disagreement, presenting the position of that side and providing the evidence and support for that position. The third step would be for the other side to take up that point of disagreement, presenting the position of that side in opposition to the other side, providing the evidence and support for that position, and producing arguments against the supporting evidences of the opposing side.

In my first installment, I provided an overview of my position concerning Daniel 9:24-27. In my second installment, I engaged in a process whereby we could determine the specific areas of disagreement between our two opposing positions, and especially whereby we could determine the primary areas of disagreement of our two opposing positions (with a recognition that a disagreement at a point of foundational premise is the reason for disagreements over additional details). In my third installment, I took up one of the foundational points of disagreement between our two positions (that concerning the meaning of Daniel 9:24, with a particular focus upon the purpose statements of that verse), presenting my position and providing a significant amount of grammatical and contextual support and evidence for that position.

My expectation in the debate was that you would engage this third installment of mine by presenting your opposing position, by providing evidence and support for your opposing position, and by producing arguments against that which I provided as the evidence and support for my position. Instead, your next installment focused upon providing your answers to the 15 questions that I had presented at the beginning of my opening post. Therefore, in my fourth installment, I engaged your presentation and answers with a challenge against the evidence and support that you provided for it. In fact, I specifically confronted your presentation and answers by presenting the challenge that you made many “authoritative declarations” without providing any grammatical, contextual, or Biblical support whatsoever at all for them. Involved in this challenge, I pointed out that when you make “authoritative declarations” without providing any grammatical, contextual, or Biblical support, you found your declarations upon *your own* authority. Furthermore, I pointed out that in the realm of Bible study, your own authority is of no value for determining God’s truth. Now, in my fourth installment I did not handle the content of your previous posting in detail, revealing point-by-point wherein you did or did not provide evidence and support. Rather, I simply took up the very first of the “authoritative declarations” that you made without providing evidence and support; and I provided the grammatical and contextual evidences whereby my position on the phrase “*my people*” in Daniel 9:24 has Biblical support and foundation. Thus my argument against your position on this point was as follows:

1. You presented a position through “authoritative declaration,” but provided no support.
2. I presented an opposing position through the evidences of grammatical and contextual support.

Your position is this – “The prophecy cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.”

Your first evidence is this – “The immediate understanding is ‘thy people & thy holy city’ meaning the descendants of Abraham, aka ‘my people Israel’ & Jerusalem.” This is simply an “authoritative declaration” on your own part that the “*thy people*” phrase means “the descendants of Abraham,” an authoritative declaration that you make without providing any evidence or support. So then, are we required to accept this position simply because you said so?

Your second evidence is this – “The first promise to Abram included blessing as a great nation & blessing for ‘all families on earth.’ (Gen. 12:1-3)” Herein you do provide the evidence of Genesis 12:1-3. However, you do not then proceed to give evidence concerning whether the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 concerns “the descendants of Abraham” specifically in relation to the “great nation” aspect of the blessing (which is singular, and thereby refers only to one national group), or specifically in relation to the “all families on earth” aspect of the blessing.

Rather, you simply then proceed with the “authoritative declaration” of your conclusion – “The prophecy cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.” Indeed, this is an “authoritative declaration” that allows no room for any other option (employing the phrase, “cannot be exclusively intended”). Yet you have provided no grammatical, contextual, or Biblical evidence for each of the steps by which you came to this conclusion. So then again I ask – Are we required to accept this position simply because you said so?

Now, in your most previous intallment, you did present an opposition to the grammatical and contextual evidences and support that I have provided for my position on Daniel 9:24. Indeed, your presented opposition appears to be delivered with the following statements:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I'm not convinced that your grammatical analysis leads to a proper understanding of the prophecy, or whether it actually obscures the clear meaning of the prophecy.

Reference to Scripture, rather than grammar . . .

We should judge prophecy both by its faithfulness to the Word, & by its fulfilment, not by grammatical analysis. There is a danger of being Pharisaical. Also, we have the mind of Christ - 1 Cor. 2:16 - so we can look at prophecy with a new covenant, spiritual, Spirit-aided understanding.

I think in this case, the 70 weeks is so clearly specific that simple arithmetic overrules complicated grammar.

However we analyse the grammar . . .

Herein you appear to reveal premise against which I will have significant contention and opposition. It is the premise that the grammatical analysis of a passage is not really a help, but is actually a hindrance in Bible study, especially in relation to prophetic utterance. In opposition to this premise, I would contend that grammatical analysis is the arithmetic of communication. By definition, grammar deals with the meaning of individual words, the meaning of grouped words

by phrases and sentences, and the meaning of contextual statements within paragraphs. Grammar is the very means by which words, phrases, and sentences have precise meaning in communication.

For example, can we discern any real meaning from the following set of words –

“world whosoever Son life him he God the only his everlasting begotten should perish loved have gave believeth that that so not for but in”

On the other hand, can we discern real meaning from the following set and structuring of words –

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

No, in the first presentation for this set of words, we cannot discern any real meaning. On the other hand, in the second presentation for this set of words, we can indeed discern real meaning, and that a very precise meaning. The reason that we can do this in the second presentation is specifically due to the grammatical structuring by which the words are presented. Grammar is the very means by which word structuring provides meaning. To deny grammatical analysis is to deny the precise meaning of any given statement.

Indeed, to deny grammatical analysis for a statement of God’s Holy Word is to deny the precise meaning of that statement as inspired by God the Holy Spirit in God’s Holy Word. The Lord our God chose to communicate His truth and wisdom unto us by means of the words of His Holy Word and by means of the grammatical structuring of those words, as inspired by God the Holy Spirit. Thus God’s Holy Word is not simply inspired by God the Holy Spirit word-by-word, but also grammatical construction-by-grammatical construction. Therefore, to deny the grammatical construction of any statement in God’s Holy Word is to deny the inspired meaning and communication of God the Holy Spirit with that statement.

Furthermore, grammar is not only the very means by which word structuring provides meaning, but is also the very means by which statements are narrowed in their application. For example –

If I simply employ the word “ball,” then the application is quite broad (although the definition of the word, which is also a point of grammar, does narrow the intention from not including such things as birds, cars, pinwheels, etc.). On the hand, if I employ the grammatical phrase, “the ball,” then the application is now more narrow, not referring to any ball in general, but to one specific ball. Now, if I employ the grammatical phrase, “the ball in the car,” then the application is now even more narrow, not referring to the ball in the house, or in the field, or under the car, or beside the car, but to the ball that is to be found *in* the car. Grammatically, each modifying phrase narrows the application for the meaning of any given statement. So then, to deny a modifying phrase that God the Holy Spirit inspired for any given statement is to deny the correct understanding and application that God the Holy Spirit intended for that statement.

Grammatical analysis is not a hindrance to understanding God’s Holy Word correctly, for grammar is the means by which the Lord our God communicated to us in His Holy Word by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Indeed, grammatical analysis is the means by which we can correctly understand that which the Lord our God has communicated unto us through His Holy Word by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit.

Now, concerning the judgment of prophecies by their faithfulness and fulfillment – Yes, we should indeed judge prophetic utterances by their faithfulness to God’s Word and by the precision of their fulfillment. However, we cannot determine their faithfulness or their precise fulfillment without considering a grammatical analysis; for it is directly by grammatical analysis that we are able to determine the precise meaning of a given prophetic statement. Furthermore, there is no danger “of being Pharisaical.” There is only a danger of being *precisely correct*. Finally, I would agree that we now possess “*the mind of Christ*” through the indwelling Holy Spirit, whereby the indwelling Holy Spirit is present to guide and aid our understanding of the very Word of God that He Himself inspired. Yet God the Holy Spirit will only ever guide us and aid us to understand the Word that He Himself inspired in perfect union with the very words and grammar that He Himself inspired. On the other hand, if our understanding departs from the very words and grammar that God the Holy Spirit inspired, then we can be certain that we are not actually following the guidance and aid of God the Holy Spirit for that understanding.

Now I wish to handle your most previous installment point-by-point in detail.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I’m not convinced that your grammatical analysis leads to a proper understanding of the prophecy, or whether it actually obscures the clear meaning of the prophecy.

Actually, grammatical analysis is the very means by which we can understand “the clear meaning” for any statement of God’s Holy Word.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The full scope of the prophecy is verse 24, the remaining verses adding details.

“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.”

Indeed, grammatically this verse reveals (1) the time period for the prophetic utterance, (2) the applicational focus for the prophetic utterance, and (3) the six-fold purpose for the prophetic utterance.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

However we analyze the grammar, the arithmetic stands - 70 weeks, or 490 years to the fulfillment of the prophecy.

Actually, it is not “70 weeks,” or 490 years *to* the fulfillment of the prophecy. Rather, it is “70 weeks,” or 490 years are determined for the fulfillment of the prophecy. Daniel 9:24 does not specifically state that these 490 years must be consecutive. It just indicates that they must and

will occur by the determination of God, and that they must and will occur “*upon*” the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. If there is or is not a gap anywhere within the 490 year period, it will be revealed by the further details of Daniel 9:25-27.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That we agree takes us to the baptism & ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Actually, we do not agree that the 490 years takes us to the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ. Rather, we might agree that the first 49 + 434 years (483 years) takes us to the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ, since I do indeed believe that the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince,*” in Daniel 9:25 is a reference unto our Lord’s baptism, by which His earthly ministry began.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Your grammatical interpretation makes the prophecy relate to some yet future date, 350 weeks and counting, so in effect it destroys the prophecy.

Yes, my grammatical interpretation, not of Daniel 9:24, but specifically of Daniel 9:26-27 does indeed relate the last 7 years of the 490 years “to some yet future date.” Yet this does not destroy the prophecy. The last “week,” or 7 years is still determined by the authority of God, just as Daniel 9:24 precisely states, and will still be fulfilled “*upon*” the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem, just as Daniel 9:24 precisely states.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I think in this case, the 70 weeks is so clearly specific that simple arithmetic overrules complicated grammar.

Grammar is not complicated. Rather, it is the very means by which reading comprehension occurs. Furthermore, the grammar and the arithmetic are precisely the same. The grammar is that “*seventy weeks are determined.*” The arithmetic is that 70 x 7 equals 490 years. There is no contradiction. However, neither the grammar concerning the “*seventy weeks*” that “*are determined*” nor the arithmetic that “490 years” is what “70 x 7 equals” automatically indicate that this “*seventy weeks*” or this 490 years must be continuous and contiguous. Certainly, ***natural human logic*** would lead us to this conclusion; and without any contextual indication otherwise, we could accept this without argument. However, if the grammar and context of God’s own Word from Daniel 9:26-27 (which explains further details for Daniel 9:24) reveals something different than we would conclude with our human logic, ***then we should follow the revelation of God’s own Word instead of the conclusion of our human logic.***

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The timing indicates the Lord Jesus' saving ministry. I think everyone agrees that, but there are suggestions as to whether 69 weeks takes us to Jesus' baptism, his triumphant entry or the cross & resurrection.

Yes, the timing for the first 69 “weeks,” or 483 years, does bring us to our Lord Jesus Christ’s first coming and first earthly ministry. And yes, there is a dispute over whether the precise timing is Jesus’ birth, baptism, triumphant entry, or crucifixion and resurrection. However, you and I are in agreement that it is our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We should judge prophecy both by its faithfulness to the Word, & by its fulfilment, not by grammatical analysis. There is a danger of being Pharisaical. Also, we have the mind of Christ - 1 Cor. 2:16 - so we can look at prophecy with an new covenant, spiritual, Spirit-aided understanding.

Yes, we should indeed judge prophet utterances by their faithfulness to God’s Word and by the precision of their fulfillment. However, we cannot determine their faithfulness or their precise fulfillment without considering a grammatical analysis; for it is directly by grammatical analysis that we are able to determine the precise meaning of a given prophetic statement. Furthermore, there is no danger “of being Pharisaical.” There is only a danger of being *precisely correct*. Finally, I would agree that we now possess “*the mind of Christ*” through the indwelling Holy Spirit, whereby the indwelling Holy Spirit is present to guide and aid our understanding of the very Word of God that He Himself inspired. ***Yet God the Holy Spirit will only ever guide us and aid us to understand the Word that He Himself inspired in perfect union with the very words and grammar that He Himself inspired.*** On the other hand, if our understanding departs from the very words and grammar that God the Holy Spirit inspired, then we can be certain that we are not actually following the guidance and aid of God the Holy Spirit for that understanding.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

One point of grammar is that in a list of prophetic events, the sequence is not necessarily chronological; they may be concurrent or in order of importance, etc.

It is true that grammar does not require for a simple listing of events of any kind to be automatically presented as a listing in chronological order. However, certain grammatical and contextual structurings certainly do reveal a chronological order to a given list. Even so, in my third posting (the one concerning Daniel 9:24), I provided evidence that there does indeed appear to be an ordering (whether logical or chronological) to the six purpose or result statements that are presented in Daniel 9:24. Now by the manner of debate, it would be your responsibility, not simply to state that an ordering is not necessarily true, but further to provide arguments against my evidence and to provide evidence for your position.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Also, as they are prophesied to take place in 70 weeks, those events cannot be absolute in the sense of your grammatical analysis. Transgression, sins & iniquity continue until our Lord returns in glory to bring into being “*new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*” 2 Peter 3

So then, while you are accusing me of presenting a position wherein this prophetic utterance is not precisely fulfilled in the matter of time, you yourself are presenting a position wherein this prophetic utterance is not precisely fulfilled in the matter of content. In fact, by presenting a position wherein *“the transgression”* and *“sins”* do not actually *“finish”* and *“end”* by the end of the 490 years, but only sometime in the distant future thereafter, you present a position that is also not precisely fulfilled in the matter of time.

Actually, in my position this prophetic utterance will indeed be fulfilled precisely in the matter of content and in the matter of time. My position simply places an indefinite gap of time between the end of the first “69 weeks,” or 483 years, and the occurrence of the last “week,” or 7 years. In my position, this indefinite gap of time has nothing directly to do with the “70 weeks” that *“are determined”* specifically *“upon”* the children of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. Furthermore, in my position the six purpose or result statements of Daniel 9:24 will be fulfilled at the end of this last “week,” or 7 years, ***with absolute precision.***

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The question I need to answer is: In what sense WAS Dan. 9:24 fulfilled within the 70 weeks?

The question you need to answer is: If v. 24 was not fulfilled in 70 weeks, & is not yet fulfilled in 350 weeks, what does the 70 weeks prophecy mean when Gabriel declared the prophecy so plainly?

No, the question that both of us need to answer is – What is the precise meaning of each phrase and statement that God the Holy Spirit inspired in Daniel 9:24-27?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The prophecy was fulfilled in the 70 weeks - we can see ALL the answers in Isaiah 53 - *“he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ... he bare the sin of many. 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.”*

No, the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24 was not precisely fulfilled in the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection. As you yourself have admitted above, transgressions, sins, and iniquity ***still continue.*** They have not come to a complete finish or end for any individual or group of individuals upon the earth.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

In Christ all believers are no longer transgressors, nor sinners; & our iniquities are fully reconciled. We have everlasting righteousness imputed in Christ. (See Luke 22:37; Luke 24:47; Acts 3:26; Rom 5:17) We benefit from that fulfilled prophecy.

Actually, believers on the earth certainly are still transgressors who commit transgressions against the Lord their God and Savior. Actually, believers on the earth certainly are still sinners who commit sins against the Lord their God and Savior. Indeed, we believers do have eternal reconciliation with

the Lord our God, such that we are and ever shall be dear children in His eternal family. Yet it is also true that when we as believers commit transgression and sin in our daily walk, we must yet experience daily reconciliation with the Lord our God in order that we might be restored unto a walk of daily fellowship with Him. Indeed again, we believers do have eternal justification from and before the Lord our God, specifically because the eternal righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ has been eternally imputed onto our account in the record of heaven. Yet it is also true that we believers do not walk in everlasting righteousness in our daily walk upon this earth, but that we do yet regularly commit transgression and sin against the Lord our God and Savior.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Our most Holy Saviour was anointed at his baptism (see Luke 3:22; Luke 4:18) and again at his ascension (see Heb. 1:8-9; Also Acts 4:24-30 quoting Psalm 2:1-3)

Indeed, God's Word presents two different events wherein our Lord Jesus Christ was baptized. In your position you have "authoritatively declared" that the anointing event of Daniel 9:24 must refer to the anointing of Jesus' baptism. Yet there are, as you have just acknowledged, *two* different possibilities. As such, before you can legitimately make such an "authoritative declaration," you must provide some form of evidence whereby one of these two options is legitimately discarded and the other is legitimately chosen. If you do not provide any such evidence, but continue to make your "authoritative declaration," then you leave me to ask the question – Are we simply to accept this on the authority of your own word?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Reference to Scripture, rather than grammar . . .

Actually, reference to the grammar is a reference to Scripture, since it is a reference to the very grammatical structuring that God the Holy Spirit inspired as the Scripture of Daniel 9:24-27.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Reference to Scripture, rather than grammar, shows that the 70 weeks prophecy was fulfilled perfectly in 490 years. Arguments to insert an indefinite "gap" between 69 & 70 are a denial of the prophecy & make 70 weeks meaningless.

This is actually one of the points under question in the debate, a point that is located, not in the general declaration of Daniel 9:24, but in the greater details of Daniel 9:26-27. As such, this point requires us precisely to understand the statements and points that precede it in the context of Daniel 9:24-25, and then precisely to understand the statements and points that govern it in the actual statements of Daniel 9:26-27.

Installment #10 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Throughout your above posting, you present many "authoritative declarations" without providing grammatical, contextual, or Biblical support for those declarations. This leaves me and the audience only with the option to accept these declarations upon the authority of your word. Yet in the realm of Bible study, the authority of a human's word is of little value in understanding God's truth. Rather, we must find our authority in the grammatical, contextual, and Biblical evidences of God's own Word.

Allow me then to focus upon the first "authoritative declaration" that you make in presenting this progression of thought –

“The immediate understanding is ‘thy people & thy holy city’ meaning the descendants of Abraham, aka ‘my people Israel’ & Jerusalem. The first promise to Abram included blessing as a great nation & blessing for "all families on earth." (Gen. 12:1-3)

You have provided no grammatical, contextual, or Biblical evidence for the statement that the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 means "the descendants of Abraham." On the other hand, the grammatical and contextual flow of thought does appear to be quite clear concerning the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24. From Daniel 9:21 we learn that "*the man*" (the angel) Gabriel was sent by the Lord God unto Daniel, and from Daniel 9:22 we learn that the purpose for the Lord God in sending Gabriel to Daniel was in order to give Daniel "*skill and understanding*." In fact, the grammar of the passage indicates that throughout Daniel 9:22-27, the angel Gabriel is the one doing the speaking. Furthermore, the context of the passage indicates that throughout Daniel 9:22-27, Daniel is the one to whom the angel Gabriel is speaking. Therefore, when the angel Gabriel employs the phrase, "*thy people*," in Daniel 9:24, while speaking directly to Daniel, the phrase must grammatically and contextually mean, "Daniel's people." In this context, the pronoun "thy" finds its antecedent in Daniel himself.

So then, who specifically were "Daniel's people"? Let us not guess. Let us find the answer in the context. In the opening half of Daniel 9:20, Daniel himself has already made the declaration, "*And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel . . .*" In addition, in Daniel 9:7 Daniel himself had already made the declaration, "*O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.*" So then, the "*thy people*" of Daniel 9:24 is not contextually to be understood as "the descendants of Abraham," but as "*the men of Judah*," and "*the inhabitants of Jerusalem*," and all the children of Israel. This is the authority of the grammar and context of God's own Word. There is no grammatical or contextual authority for viewing the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 as being a reference to the Messiah. Rather, there is only grammatical and contextual authority for viewing the phrase "*thy people*" in Daniel 9:24 as being a reference to a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God.

My "authoritative declarations" are generally statements directly based on the relevant Scriptures, with a knowledge of related Scriptures. It CANNOT be in question that Daniel's people are the people of Israel. Nor can it be in question that the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham. That's what the whole OT (the old covenant Scripture) is all about. Nor can it be in question that the history of Israel was repeated periods of apostasy followed by repentance. The captivity in Babylon was the culmination of persistent apostasy & the rejection of the warnings of the prophets. I recommend you read Nehemiah's prayer (Nehemiah 9) alongside Daniel's. Note his references to "covenant."

To assert, as a result of your own grammatical analysis that Daniel's people comprise "a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God" is not valid. Those specific people were dead - 70 years was long enough for all those corrupt leaders to die. Most of the second generation would also be dead. The third generation would be the ones who would return, but the promise to "thy people" was to apply in 70 "weeks," nearly 14 generations hence. (See Matthew 1:17)

The Gospels relate the events of the life of Jesus - the 3 1/2 years following the completion of the 69 weeks, & the last 31 years of the 69 weeks, with the conception & birth narratives of John & Jesus. They also show that there was great expectation in Israel around the time of the birth of John & Jesus. Even the chief priests & scribes were able to advise the wise men; also Simeon & Anna were prepared. It is possible that the math had been done - 69 weeks of years pointed to the year the Messiah would reach 30 & so begin his ministry, so these events 30 years before would be seen to have that significance. The prophecy of a senior priest who had had a vision in the temple before "*the whole multitude of the people*" (see Luke 1:10) was very significant. (See Luke 1:67-79) Thirty years later they flocked to Jordan to hear & be baptised by John.

No. I do not recognise the validity of your complex grammatical analysis. I believe the Scriptures, & the straightforward grammar we actually read there.

Installment #11 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

My "authoritative declarations" are generally statements directly based on the relevant Scriptures, with a knowledge of related Scriptures.

Actually, the majority of your "authoritative declarations" are presented without the support of any "relevant Scriptures," but only on the ground of your own human assumptions. (Indeed, I am capable of revealing this methodically, point-by-point in your presentations if it becomes necessary for the debate.) Grammatical and contextual evidence is of great value in Bible study and Biblical understanding, since the grammar and context are directly inspired by God the Holy Spirit in accord with *His absolutely divine authority*. Human assumptions may or may not be found to be accurate in relation to the grammatical and contextual evidence; however, human assumption carries *no weight of authority* whatsoever in the realm of Bible study and Biblical understanding.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

It CANNOT be in question that Daniel's people are the people of Israel.

Certainly, we are in definite agreement with this Biblical truth. Indeed, I myself have not presented anything thus far in my postings that would stand in conflict with this truth. In fact, I have even presented grammatical and contextual evidences from Daniel 9 in order to support this truth in relation to our understanding of Daniel 9:24. On the other hand, you yourself have presented at least one statement in conflict with this truth, as per your "authoritative declaration" – "The prophecy cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram." On the one hand, you declare that Daniel's people, for whom the "seventy weeks" are "determined" according to Daniel 9:24, must be without question "the people of Israel." On the other hand, you declare that the prophecy of Daniel 9:24 "cannot be exclusively intended for Israel." Is there a self-contradiction here in your position?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Nor can it be in question that the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham.

Actually, this statement *can* be brought into question. The phrase, "the descendants of Abraham" (which is not actually a phrase found in the King James translation, since the word "descendants" is not even found in the King James translation), refers the those who have descended from Abraham through physical biology. Certainly, it is accurate to assert that "the children of Israel" are "descendants of Abraham" through physical biology, as through the line of Isaac and then of Jacob (whose name was changed by the Lord God unto Israel). However, it is not accurate to assert that the phrase, "the descendants of Abraham," and the phrase, "the children of Israel," are strictly equivalent phrases. In the mathematics of the case, the phrase, "the children of Israel," only presents a sub-set of the greater set that is presented by the phrase, "the descendants of Abraham." In fact, the greater set of the phrase, "the descendants of Abraham," also at least includes the following:

1. The Ishmaelites – the descendants of Abraham through his son Ishmael (by Hagar).
2. The Midianites – the descendants of Abraham through his son Midian (by Keturah).
3. The Edomites – the descendants of Abraham through his grandson Esau (the son of Isaac).
4. The Israelites – the descendants of Abraham through his grandson Jacob (the son of Isaac).

In the mathematics of the case, the sub-set of “the children of Israel” can be described legitimately as a part of the greater set of “the descendants of Abraham;” but the sub-set of “the children of Israel” cannot be made wholly equivalent to the greater set of “the descendants of Abraham.”

So then, is Daniel 9:24, in referencing *Daniel's* people through the phrase, “*thy people*,” speaking concerning the whole of the greater set of “the descendants of Abraham” (as you have asserted with your unsupported “authoritative declaration”)? Or, is Daniel 9:24, in referencing *Daniel's* people through the phrase, “*thy people*,” speaking concerning only of the sub-set of “the children of Israel”? The answer between these two options appears fairly clear, since *Daniel's* people do not include the other sub-sets of the greater set, “the descendants of Abraham.” Indeed, the context appears to grant evidence to this fairly clear answer, since *Daniel himself* in the very context of Daniel 9 defined *his* people in Daniel 9:7 and Daniel 9:20.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That's what the whole OT (the old covenant Scripture) is all about.

Indeed, the majority of the Old Testament Scriptures is about the Lord God's dealings with the sub-set of “the descendants of Abraham” that is to be defined as “the children of Israel.”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Nor can it be in question that the history of Israel was repeated periods of apostasy followed by repentance. The captivity in Babylon was the culmination of persistent apostasy & the rejection of the warnings of the prophets.

I am not aware of anything that I have presented that would be in dispute or disagreement with this.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I recommend you read Nehemiah's prayer (Nehemiah 9) alongside Daniel's. Note his references to "covenant."

I am not sure why you presented this passage, unless it was simply to give evidence for your statements concerning “the history of Israel.” If that was the reason, then again I pronounce that we are not in any dispute or disagreement concerning this matter. Concerning the “covenant” references in Nehemiah 9, we find three – Nehemiah 9:8, 32, 38. Nehemiah 9:8 references the covenant that the Lord God made with Abraham, with a very specific focus upon the land-promise aspects of that covenant. Nehemiah 9:32 references the Lord God as a God “*who keepeth covenant and mercy*,” thus revealing the character of the Lord our God as being faithful in keeping the covenants that He makes. Nehemiah 9:38 references the renewed covenant that the children of Israel under the leadership of Nehemiah were making with the Lord their God. Again, concerning how you intended this passage to inform our understanding of Daniel 9:24-27, I remain uncertain.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

To assert, as a result of your own grammatical analysis that Daniel's people comprise "a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God" is not valid.

Apparently, Daniel himself and the Holy Spirit of God who inspired Daniel to include Daniel 9 in the Holy Scriptures do not agree with you. (Or, maybe it would be better to say that you do not agree with Daniel and with the Holy Spirit of God who inspired Daniel.) Indeed, the Holy Spirit inspired Scriptures, as communicated through Daniel in Daniel 9:3-20, state –

*“And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: and I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments; **we have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments: neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets,** which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land. O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but **unto us** confusion of faces, **as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.** O Lord, to **us** belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because **we have sinned against thee.** To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though **we have rebelled against him; neither have we obeyed the voice of the LORD our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets.** Yea, **all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us,** and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because **we have sinned against him.** And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against **us,** and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon **us** a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon **us: yet made we not our prayer before the LORD our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.** Therefore hath the LORD watched upon the evil, and brought it upon **us:** for the LORD our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: **for we obeyed not his voice.** And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day; **we have sinned, we have done wickedly.** O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: **because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers,** Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord’s sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy*

*city and thy people are called by thy name. And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing **my sin and the sin of my people Israel**, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God for the holy mountain of my God . . .”*

I am not sure how much more straightforwardly I can present the straightforward grammar of the passage than actually and directly to quote the straightforward, Holy Spirit inspired grammar, emboldening the relevant grammatical structures. Apparently, Daniel (and the Holy Spirit of God who inspired Daniel) was not at all averse to including the generation of the children of Israel who were alive at that very time in his prayer of confession for the sinful wickedness of the children of Israel. Indeed, Daniel was not even at all averse to including himself in that confession of sin. (See the specific declaration of Daniel in Daniel 9:20) In fact, Daniel did recognize the difference between his present generation and the past generations of “the fathers;” yet he still included both in his prayer of confession. (See the specific declaration of Daniel in Daniel 9:16).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

To assert, as a result of your own grammatical analysis that Daniel's people comprise "a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God" is not valid. Those specific people were dead - 70 years was long enough for all those corrupt leaders to die. Most of the second generation would also be dead. The third generation would be the ones who would return, but the promise to "thy people" was to apply in 70 "weeks," nearly 14 generations hence. (See Matthew 1:17)

Furthermore, these statements reveal that you have a misunderstanding concerning my position. My position is not that Daniel's people comprise a specific **generational** body of people. Rather, my position is that Daniel's people comprise a specific **national** body of people. The “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 is not to be defined as one specific generation of the children of Israel. Rather, the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 is to be defined as **the nation** of the children of Israel throughout **all generations**. (Indeed, it is worthy of notice that Nehemiah 9, the very passage that you instructed me to consider and to compare unto Daniel 9, actually references the ongoing generations of the children of Israel, from the time of their deliverance from Egypt unto the time that was present for Nehemiah in Nehemiah 9.)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The Gospels relate the events of the life of Jesus - the 3 1/2 years following the completion of the 69 weeks, & the last 31 years of the 69 weeks, with the conception & birth narratives of John & Jesus. They also show that there was great expectation in Israel around the time of the birth of John & Jesus. Even the chief priests & scribes were able to advise the wise men; also Simeon & Anna were prepared. It is possible that the math had been done - 69 weeks of years pointed to the year the Messiah would reach 30 & so begin his ministry, so these events 30 years before would be seen to have that significance. The prophecy of a senior priest who had had a vision in the temple before “*the whole multitude of the people*” (see Luke 1:10) was very significant. (See Luke 1:67-79) Thirty years later they flocked to Jordan to hear & be baptised by John.

Not much disagreement between us here.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

No. I do not recognise the validity of your complex grammatical analysis. I believe the Scriptures, & the straightforward grammar we actually read there.

So then, are you acknowledging that the actual, "straightforward" grammar of any given statement in God's Holy Word is of significance to a correct understanding for that statement? If so, then that is good; for my supposedly "complex grammatical analysis" of Daniel 9:24 actually is "the straightforward grammar" that God the Holy Spirit inspired for the sentence structure of that statement in God's Holy Word. Even so, allow me to attempt yet again in a slightly different format to present the "straightforward grammar" for Daniel 9:24 –

“*Seventy* [an adjective that modifies the word “weeks”] *weeks* [a noun that serves as the subject for the main/independent clause of the sentence] *are determined* [a present, passive verb that serves as the verb for the main/independent clause of the sentence] *upon* [a preposition that initiates a prepositional phrase that modifies the verb “are determined”] *thy* [an adjective that modifies the word “people”] *people* [a noun that serves as the object for the preposition “upon”] *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two prepositional phrases] *upon* [a preposition that initiates a prepositional phrase that modifies the verb “are determined”] *thy* [an adjective that modifies the word “city”] *holy* [an adjective that modifies the word “city”] *city* [a noun that serves as the object for the second preposition “upon”], *to finish* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *the* [the definite article used as an adjective that modifies the word “transgression” and makes it definite in its scope] *transgression* [a noun that serves as the direct object for the infinitive “to finish”], *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two infinitive phrases] *to make* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *an* [an indefinite article used as an adjective to modify the word “end”] *end* [a noun that serves as the direct object for the infinitive “to make”] *of* [a preposition that initiates a prepositional phrase that modifies the noun “end”] *sins* [a noun that serves as the object for the preposition “of”], *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two infinitive phrases] *to make* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *reconciliation* [a noun that serves as the direct object for the infinitive “to make”] *for* [a preposition that initiates a prepositional phrase that modifies the infinitive “to make”] *iniquity* [a noun that serves as the object for the preposition “for”], *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two infinitive phrases] *to bring* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *in* [a preposition that initiates a prepositional phrase that modifies the infinitive “to bring”] *everlasting* [an adjective that modifies the noun “righteousness”] *righteousness* [a noun that serves as the object for the preposition “in”], *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two infinitive phrases] *to seal* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *up* [an adverb that modifies the infinitive “to seal”] *the* [the definite article used as an adjective that modifies the words “vision” and “prophecy” and makes them definite in their scope] *vision* [a noun that serves as the first of a compound direct object for the infinitive “to seal”] *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins the two nouns “vision” and “prophecy”] *prophecy* [a noun that serves as the second of a compound direct object for the infinitive “to seal”], *and* [a coordinating conjunction that joins two infinitive phrases] *to anoint* [an infinitive that initiates a infinitive phrase] *the* [the definite article used as an adjective that modifies the word “Holy” and makes it definite in its scope] *most* [an adjective that modifies the word “Holy”] *Holy* [an adjective that is used as a substantive and is thus to be grammatically handled as a noun].”

In the grammatical structure of any given sentence, *every word* in that sentence has a specific place and a specific usage in that sentence. Even so, understanding the specific place and specific usage for each word in any given sentence is “the straightforward grammar” for that sentence.

In the first portion of this installment, I presented my response to your previous posting. In the latter portion of this installment, I intend to proceed with the truths of Daniel 9:25 and with our point of disagreement concerning the statement of that verse. Since we actually have little disagreement concerning this verse, I will not break down the statement of this verse with quite as much grammatical detail.

We are in agreement concerning the teaching of this verse that from the decree of the Persians to rebuild Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity unto “*the Messiah the Prince*” would be 7 “weeks,” or 49 years, plus 62 “weeks,” or 434 years, which equals a total of 69 “weeks,” or 483 years.

We are in agreement that this first 69 “weeks” of the 70 “weeks,” or 483 years, is a continuous and contiguous period of time. In fact, I myself would even provide grammatical evidence for this position, in that the main verb of the first sentence of the verse, “*shall be*,” is modified by the two prepositional phrases, “*from the going forth*” and “*unto the Messiah the Prince*.” Indeed, the prepositional phrase, “*from the going forth*,” grammatically indicates the exact starting point for this period of time; and the prepositional phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” indicates the exact ending point for this period of time. Furthermore, the grammatical use of both of the prepositional phrases to modify the same verb indicates that there will be no break anywhere throughout this period of time.

We (you and I specifically) are in agreement that the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” as employed in Daniel 9:25, is a reference unto our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism, by which His earthly preaching ministry was initiated.

We are in agreement that the rebuilding of Jerusalem occurred during a time of trouble for the children of Israel who were engaged in that rebuilding process, as recorded in such Old Testament books as Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah.

However, we are in disagreement over one specific point concerning Daniel 9:25. Actually, it is a disagreement concerning the relationship between a phrase in Daniel 9:24 and a phrase in Daniel 9:25. With your position you have asserted that the phrase, “*to anoint the most Holy*,” in Daniel 9:24 is to be viewed as referring unto the same event in our Lord Jesus Christ’s ministry as is referenced in the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” in Daniel 9:25. Now, you and I do agree that both the phrase, “*the most Holy*,” and the phrase, “*the Messiah the Prince*,” refer unto the same person, that is – our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet I would contend that viewing both of these two phrases as referring to the same *event* is not accurate to the mathematics of the context. On the one hand, the phrase, “*to anoint the most Holy*,” is grammatically presented as a purpose or result for the entire 70 “weeks,” or 490 years. On the other hand, the phrase, “*unto the Messiah the Prince*,” is grammatically presented as the event by which the first 69 “weeks” is brought to a conclusion. Thus the mathematics of the context would be as follows:

1. The anointing event for “*the most Holy*” in Daniel 9:24 is fulfilled at the end of 70 “weeks.”
2. The event for “*the Messiah the Prince*” in Daniel 9:25 occurs at the end of 69 “weeks.”

Even so, it appears fairly clear from the mathematics of the context that these two events cannot be the same event, but must be different events, since their timing is separated by one whole “week,” or 7 years. Now, you and I agree that the event for “*the Messiah the Prince*” that is presented in Daniel 9:25 is the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ, “*the most Holy*,” “*the Messiah the Prince*.” Furthermore, you and I agree that our Lord’s baptism is described in God’s Holy Word as an anointing event for our Lord Jesus Christ, wherein He was anointed by the Holy Spirit for His preaching, teaching, healing, and saving-work ministry. However, we also agree that God’s Holy Word also presents a second anointing event for our Lord Jesus Christ, that is – at His ascension and exaltation to the throne of heaven to sit at the right hand of God the Father, wherein He was anointed by God the Father for His sovereign kingship ministry. So then, since the mathematics of the context does not appear to allow the anointing event for “*the most Holy*” in Daniel 9:24 to be the same event as that for “*the Messiah the Prince*” in Daniel 9:25, and since we agree that the event for “*the Messiah the Prince*” in Daniel 9:25 is the anointing event of our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism, then I would contend that the anointing event of Daniel 9:24 must be the anointing event of His exaltation, whereby He was anointed for His sovereign kingship ministry.

Installment #12 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

I am not sure why you presented this passage, unless it was simply to give evidence for your statements concerning “the history of Israel.” If that was the reason, then again I pronounce that we are not in any dispute or disagreement concerning this matter. Concerning the “covenant” references in Nehemiah 9, we find three – Nehemiah 9:8, 32, 38. Nehemiah 9:8 references the covenant that the Lord God made with Abraham, with a very specific focus upon the land-promise aspects of that covenant. Nehemiah 9:32 references the Lord God as a God “*who keepeth covenant and mercy*,” thus revealing the character of the Lord our God as being faithful in keeping the covenants that He makes. Nehemiah 9:38 references the renewed covenant that the children of Israel under the leadership of Nehemiah were making with the Lord their God. Again, concerning how you intended this passage to inform our understanding of Daniel 9:24-27, I remain uncertain.

I referred to Nehemiah 9 as a prayer similar in scope & purpose to Daniel 9, somewhat later, but we agree that Nehemiah & others record the *troubulous times* prophesied by Gabriel. He appeals to the LORD who chose Abram, & made a covenant with him. The prophets & other leaders do not stand alone, but constantly refer back to the LORD, the God of Abraham & his promises to his people, descended through Isaac & Jacob.

Daniel could only pray - he was a very old man after 70 years exile. Nehemiah's concern was to prayerfully do all in his power & authority to guide the restoration into godly ways. Presumably he knew Daniel's prophecy. He certainly trusted the LORD & led the people into a renewed covenant for the provision, service & maintenance of the temple.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Furthermore, these statements reveal that you have a misunderstanding concerning my position. My position is not that Daniel’s people comprise a specific *generational* body of people. Rather, my position is that Daniel’s people comprise a specific *national* body of people. The “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 is not to be defined as one specific generation of the children of Israel. Rather, the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 is to be defined as *the nation* of the children of Israel throughout *all generations*. (Indeed, it is worthy of notice that Nehemiah 9, the very passage that you instructed me to consider and to compare unto Daniel 9, actually references the ongoing generations of the children of Israel, from the time of their deliverance from Egypt unto the time that was present for Nehemiah in Nehemiah 9.)

I hope you can see why I misunderstood your position when you wrote: "a specific body of people, people who had committed sinful wickedness and rebellion against the Lord their God." I read that as a statement that those who had caused the exile were the specific body in question, rather than the nation as a whole.

No significant disagreement regarding this aspect of the prophecy.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

So then, are you acknowledging that the actual, "straightforward" grammar of any given statement in God's Holy Word is of significance to a correct understanding for that statement?

Of course!

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

However, we are in disagreement over one specific point concerning Daniel 9:25. Actually, it is a disagreement concerning the relationship between a phrase in Daniel 9:24 and a phrase in Daniel 9:25. With your position you have asserted that the phrase, "*to anoint the most Holy*," in Daniel 9:24 is to be viewed as referring unto the same event in our Lord Jesus Christ's ministry as is referenced in the phrase, "*unto the Messiah the Prince*," in Daniel 9:25. Now, you and I do agree that both the phrase, "*the most Holy*," and the phrase, "*the Messiah the Prince*," refer unto the same person, that is – our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet I would contend that viewing both of these two phrases as referring to the same *event* is not accurate to the mathematics of the context. On the one hand, the phrase, "*to anoint the most Holy*," is grammatically presented as a purpose or result for the entire 70 "weeks," or 490 years. On the other hand, the phrase, "*unto the Messiah the Prince*," is grammatically presented as the event by which the first 69 "weeks" is brought to a conclusion. Thus the mathematics of the context would be as follows:

1. The anointing event for "*the most Holy*" in Daniel 9:24 is fulfilled at the end of 70 "weeks."
2. The event for "*the Messiah the Prince*" in Daniel 9:25 occurs at the end of 69 "weeks."

Even so, it appears fairly clear from the mathematics of the context that these two events cannot be the same event, but must be different events, since their timing is separated by one whole "week," or 7 years. Now, you and I agree that the event for "*the Messiah the Prince*" that is presented in Daniel 9:25 is the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ, "*the most Holy*," "*the Messiah the Prince*." Furthermore, you and I agree that our Lord's baptism is described in God's Holy Word as an anointing event for our Lord Jesus Christ, wherein He was anointed by the Holy Spirit for His preaching, teaching, healing, and saving-work ministry. However, we also agree that God's Holy Word also presents a second anointing event for our Lord Jesus Christ, that is – at His ascension and exaltation to the throne of heaven to sit at the right hand of God the Father, wherein He was anointed by God the Father for His sovereign kingship ministry. So then, since the mathematics of the context does not appear to allow the anointing event for "*the most Holy*" in Daniel 9:24 to be the same event as that for "*the Messiah the Prince*" in Daniel 9:25, and since we agree that the event for "*the Messiah the Prince*" in Daniel 9:25 is the anointing event of our Lord Jesus Christ's baptism, then I would contend that the anointing event of Daniel 9:24 must be the anointing event of His exaltation, whereby He was anointed for His sovereign kingship ministry.

Dan. 9:24-25 – “*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. 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.*”

I understand & appreciate your point about the two anointings at Jesus' baptism & at his ascension to his heavenly throne. As Jesus' baptism & ascension took place within the 70 weeks, & 69 weeks is within the 70, it's not a point we need argue. We agree both anointings took place, & that Jesus is now seated on the heavenly throne at God's right hand. (See Acts 2:29-39; Hebrews 1:8; 8:1; 12:2)

That appears to bring us to full agreement, that the v. 24 anointing took place within 7 years of Jesus' baptism, prophesied in v. 25.

Quote from Pastor Scott Markle

. . . since we agree that the event for “*the Messiah the Prince*” in Daniel 9:25 is the anointing event of our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism, then I would contend that the anointing event of Daniel 9:24 must be the anointing event of His exaltation, whereby He was anointed for His sovereign kingship ministry.

Yet I understand you to believe that the 70th week is still to come, even though you affirm that the anointing has taken place.

We have further agreed (in an external thread) that the events of Calvary are the basis for the blessings of v. 24, as per the following:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Regardless of how the debate proceeds, my present understanding is that the blessings listed in Dan. 9:24 correspond to Isaiah 53, the full salvation accomplished at Calvary. Whatever our thoughts on prophecy, Jesus' atoning sufferings are the basis for the eternal blessings for Israel & all the redeemed.

To which Bro. Scott replied, quoting only the second sentence:

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Amen! I certainly would agree that our Lord Jesus Christ's atoning and saving work in His shed blood, sacrificial death, and bodily resurrection are **THE** foundational basis for the blessings of eternal atonement and eternal salvation unto any and all believers, whether they be Israelite or Gentile, whether they are converted as individual persons or as a national group.

I would like to think that brings the debate to a close with virtually complete agreement, but somehow I think that may not be the case.

From your first installment:

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (bold added by Brother Ian Day)

1. *“To finish the transgression”* – Herein the word *“transgression”* is singular, indicating that it refers unto the entire rebellion of the Israelites against the Lord their God as a single unit of sinful fault. Indeed, the Hebrew word that is translated by the English word *“transgression”* indicates a breaking away (or, departure) from a relationship or covenant with another. Thus these *“seventy weeks”* are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful departure of the Israelites away from Him. **As such, we could expect that after these “seventy weeks” are concluded, the Israelites will never again depart from the Lord.**
2. *“To make an end of sins”* – Herein the word *“sins”* is plural, indicating that it refers unto the individual activities of sin that the Israelites might commit against the Lord their God. Thus these *“seventy weeks”* are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about a completion to the sinful activities of the Israelites against Him. **As such, we could expect that after these “seventy weeks” are concluded, the Israelites will never again commit sins against the Lord.**
3. *“To make reconciliation for iniquity”* – Herein the word *“reconciliation”* indicates the ideas of atonement and forgiveness and of a resulting reconciliation thereby. **Thus these “seventy weeks” are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about His forgiveness upon the Israelites for their sinful departure from Him and for their sinful activities against Him, and thereby to bring about the reconciliation of the Israelites unto Himself and unto His blessed fellowship.**
4. *“To bring in everlasting righteousness”* – Herein the phrase *“everlasting righteousness”* reveals the spiritual condition into which the Lord God intends to bring the Israelites through His work of reconciliation. **He intends to bring them into a spiritual condition of “everlasting righteousness,” not into a condition of righteousness from which they might again fall, but into a condition of righteousness from which they will never fall again. Indeed, this is the spiritual condition into which the Lord God will bring the Israelites at the completion of these “seventy weeks.”**
5. *“To seal up the vision and prophecy”* – This phrase appears to indicate that all of the Lord’s prophetic utterances concerning the Israelites (especially concerning His judgments upon the Israelites) will be brought to their conclusion through the completion of these *“seventy weeks.”*
6. *“To anoint the most Holy”* – Herein the phrase *“the most Holy”* refers to the Most Holy One, the promised Messiah of Israel. According to the New Testament Scriptures, we learn that this Most Holy One, that the Messiah, is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Thus these *“seventy weeks”* are determined by the Lord God in order to bring about the acceptance and anointing of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords over all the earth. **As such, we could expect that the literal return of our Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords (see Revelation 19) will occur at the completion of these “seventy weeks.”**

Can we understand – “to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness”- as accomplished - FINISHED - at Calvary, within the 70 weeks, or are we still waiting (as you assert) for the 70th week to arrive, 350 weeks or more after the prophecy? We all (I hope) understand Isaiah 53 as referring to Calvary, & that chapter describes Jesus' suffering to redeem sinners to God.

Do the new covenant writers see the declared purpose of v. 24 as fulfilled at Calvary?

Finish the transgression:

“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.” Hebrews 9:15

Make an end of sins:

“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.” Hebrews 9:28

Bring in everlasting righteousness: (John shows that our present state before God & in practice is righteousness.)

*“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. ² Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. ³ And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure. ⁴ **Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.** ⁵ And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. ⁶ **Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.** ⁷ Little children, let no man deceive you: **he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.** ⁸ He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. ⁹ **Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.** ¹⁰ **In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.**”* 1 John 3:1-10

John makes amazing statements - present tense statements that show that as believers in Christ, as children of God, we do not transgress, nor sin, but are righteous. We look at ourselves & disagree, but God sees us as redeemed in & by the Lord Jesus Christ. We live by faith as children of our Father God, we walk with our Saviour God who has redeemed us, guided by the indwelling Holy Spirit.

No, we are not waiting for week 70 to arrive - our Saviour came as promised. Like the Emmaus road disciples we may wonder if “*it had been he which should have redeemed Israel.*” Jesus answer was to open the Scriptures ... and to open their understanding. (See Luke 24)

Installment #13 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I cannot compete with Bro. Scott with grammatical analysis, but I do read & understand. My replies may appear simplistic, but they are carefully considered & reasoned before writing. With a debate/discussion of this nature it is easy to make statements that I consider self-evident, but can be questioned as inaccurate by detailed analysis. e.g. When I wrote "the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham" I was challenged, as other races were descended from Abraham.

Would anyone be confused by what I wrote? Does the extra "the" change the reasoning?

In an “external” thread, Brother Day made the above statements and asked the above questions of the general audience. To begin this installment, I desire to make a response.

Within a general context of general communication, your statement that “the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham” would not have generated any conflict from me (even with the inclusion of the definite article “the” in front of the word “descendants”). However, within the specific context of this debate, I was definitely moved to express a conflict with your statement. The reason that I was moved to express conflict is because you employed the idea that “the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham” as an open door in order to move unto the blessings of the Lord’s covenant with Abraham. Then from that ground you presented your conclusion that the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 “cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.” By this means you created the following set of equivalencies –

The “*thy people*” phrase in Daniel 9:24 = the children of Israel = the descendants of Abraham = the blessings of the Lord’s covenant with Abraham = a wider scope than just the children of Israel.

Certainly then, I am moved to contend against this set of equivalencies; for they are not accurate, especially in relation to the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27. Rather than follow your proposed set of equivalencies, I believe that it would be far better to remain with the actual, straightforward terminology that God the Holy Spirit inspired Daniel to include in Daniel 9. On the one hand, God the Holy Spirit did *not* inspire Daniel to include any reference whatsoever at all unto Abraham. On the other hand, God the Holy Spirit *did* inspire Daniel, in defining his (Daniel's) people, to include the phrase in Daniel 9:20, “*my people, Israel.*” Furthermore, God the Holy Spirit *did* inspire Daniel to include the phrase in Daniel 9:7, “*to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off.*” Brother Day, if you continue to put me into a position where I must choose between God the Holy Spirit’s terminology and your own terminology, I will certainly choose and contend for God the Holy Spirit’s terminology.

Even so, according to the terminology of God the Holy Spirit, the “*seventy weeks*” of Daniel 9:24-27 have been authoritatively determined by the Lord God specifically “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel as a national group. As such, the six-fold purposes and results for which the Lord God has determined these “*seventy weeks*” will occur for the specific benefit of Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I understand & appreciate your point about the two anointings at Jesus' baptism & at his ascension to his heavenly throne. As Jesus' baptism & ascension took place within the 70 weeks, & 69 weeks is within the 70, it's not a point we need argue. We agree both anointings took place, & that Jesus is now seated on the heavenly throne at God's right hand. (See Acts 2:29-39; Hebrews 1:8; 8:1; 12:2)

That appears to bring us to full agreement, that the v. 24 anointing took place within 7 years of Jesus' baptism, prophesied in v. 25.

Yet I understand you to believe that the 70th week is still to come, even though you affirm that the anointing has taken place.

We have further agreed (in an external thread) that the events of Calvary are the basis for the blessings of v. 24.

I would like to think that brings the debate to a close with virtually complete agreement, but somehow I think that may not be the case.

You are correct; we are *not* now in “virtually complete agreement” concerning the truth and details of Daniel 9:24-27.

First, although I certainly agree that our Lord Jesus Christ's saving work in His crucifixion and resurrection are the foundational basis for any and all blessings of eternal atonement and eternal salvation (including those of Daniel 9:24). However, I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is not speaking concerning the foundational *provision* of those blessings, but concerning the actual *application* of those blessings. I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is not speaking concerning the event whereby those blessings were foundationally provided in the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Rather, I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is speaking concerning the event wherein those blessings shall be actually applied unto and upon the specific group of Daniel's people, the children of Israel as a body of people.

Allow me to illustrate, through the testimony of my own case, my understanding concerning the difference between this provision and this application. At our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, He foundationally provided for my personal and eternal salvation, justification, regeneration, etc. However, my salvation, justification, regeneration, etc. was not actually applied unto me personally until 1975, when I placed my heart-faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as my personal Savior from my sinfulness. Even so, the two events occurred at a different time. The foundational provision occurred approximately 2000 years ago. The actual application in my own case occurred only 39 years ago.

In like manner, I would contend that there is a difference for Daniel's people, the children of Israel, concerning the *foundational provision* of the Daniel 9:24 blessings and concerning the *actual application* of those Daniel 9:24 blessings. Furthermore, I would contend that the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 are speaking concerning the event of the *actual application* of those blessings “upon” Daniel's people, the children of Israel. Indeed, I would contend that the event of this actual application of those blessings has not yet occurred “upon” Daniel's people, the children of Israel, but is yet to occur “upon” them sometime in the future.

Second, concerning the second anointing of our Lord Jesus Christ at His exaltation to the right of God the Father, I would contend that while this anointing is indeed a heavenly reality, it will not have its *earthly application* until His Second Coming as King of kings and Lord of lords over the whole earth. Throughout God's Word anointing is for the purpose of some service and ministry unto God. At our Lord Jesus Christ's baptism, He was anointed with the Holy Spirit for a ministry of preaching, teaching, healing, and helping (as per Isaiah 61:1-3; Luke 4:17-21; Acts 10:34-38). Biblically, this could be understood to be our Lord Jesus Christ's ministry as a Prophet.

At our Lord Jesus Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He experienced a second anointing (as per Psalm 2:2-9; Psalm 45:1-8; Hebrews 1:8-9). According to these passages, it appears that this anointing was for our Lord Jesus Christ's ministry as King. Even so, Psalm 2:7-9 appears to reveal that this kingship ministry will have its fulfilled application as follows – *"I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."*

However, at our Lord's exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He did not immediately engage in the administration of His kingship ministry upon and over the whole earth. Rather, according to the teaching of the book of Hebrews, our Lord Jesus Christ is presently engaged in His ministry as High Priest. Indeed, Hebrews 10:12-13 appears to indicate that our Lord Jesus Christ is *yet waiting* for the earthly application of His kingship ministry, saying, *"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool."*

So then, when will the earthly application of our Lord Jesus Christ's kingship ministry occur? Revelation 19:11-16 gives answer, saying, *"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. **And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron:** and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."*

To this Revelation 20:1-4 adds, *"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."*

Even so, I would contend that the phrase, “*to anoint the most Holy,*” in Daniel 9:24 is a reference unto the event of the earthly application of our Lord Jesus Christ’s kingship ministry, wherein the children of Israel and all the nations of the world will recognize Him as King of kings and Lord of lords. Yea, I would contend that this phrase is a reference unto the event of our Lord Jesus Christ’s Second Coming as King of kings and Lord of lords literally and bodily over the whole earth.

However, I will acknowledge that this particular point of my position is a point of weakness in my position, since I do not possess any portion of Scripture wherein the word “anoint” (or any of its cognates) is employed in relation to the event of our Lord’s Second Coming. As such, I would further acknowledge that in the context of this discussion-debate, it would be unto your advantage for you to exploit this particular point of weakness in my position.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Can we understand – “*to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness*” - as accomplished - FINISHED - at Calvary, within the 70 weeks, or are we still waiting (as you assert) for the 70th week to arrive, 350 weeks or more after the prophecy? We all (I hope) understand Isaiah 53 as referring to Calvary, & that chapter describes Jesus' suffering to redeem sinners to God.

I have noticed that on a number of occasions, both in this debate and in “external” threads, that you have proposed Isaiah 53 as a companion passage of Scripture to the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24. Certainly, I would agree that Isaiah 53 refers to the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection. Certainly also, I would agree that the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ (as presented in Isaiah 53, or in any other passage of Scripture) is the foundational basis for the blessings of eternal atonement and eternal salvation, including those of Daniel 9:24 (even as I have presented above). However, I would contend that the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24 and the declarations of Isaiah 53 are *not* specifically parallel or equivalent *to one another*.

With the first four purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24, we have the following:

1. “*To finish the transgression*”
2. “*To make an end of sins*”
3. “*To make reconciliation for iniquity*”
4. “*To bring in everlasting righteousness*”

In relation to the first of these points, concerning transgression, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. “*But he was wounded for our transgressions*” (v. 5)
2. “*For the transgress of my people was he stricken*” (v. 8)
3. “*He . . . made intercession for the transgressors*” (v. 12)

Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete finishing* of transgression, Isaiah 53 only speaks concerning a wounding and a being struck for transgressions and an intercession for transgressors. These truths are not strictly parallel or equivalent.

In relation to the second of these points, concerning sins, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. “*When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin*” (v. 10)
2. “*And he bare the sin of many*” (v. 12)

Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the ***complete ending*** of sins, Isaiah 53 only speaks concerning an offering for sin and a bearing of sin. Again these truths are not strictly parallel or equivalent.

In relation to the third of these points, concerning iniquity, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. “*And the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all*” (v. 6)

Wherein Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning a reconciliation (through atonement) for iniquity, Isaiah 53 speaks concerning iniquity being laid upon another who was given in sacrifice. Thus on this point Daniel 9:24 and Isaiah 53 are closer in parallel, at least concerning a sacrifice of atonement whereby the possibility of reconciliation is provided. However, the actual reconciliation between the Lord God and any given sinner does not occur until the specific moment wherein the atoning sacrifice is ***specifically applied*** (not just provided) unto that sinner. Even so, I would contend that whereas Isaiah 53 is speaking concerning the provision for reconciliation, Daniel 9:24 is speaking concerning the actual application and experience of reconciliation.

In relation to the fourth of these points, concerning everlasting righteousness, Isaiah 53 does not employ either the word “everlasting” or the word “righteousness” at all whatsoever.

On the other hand, if we recognize that the intent of the Lord our God is for the “*seventy weeks*” of Daniel 9:24-27 to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, then we would expect the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 to occur in relation to the children of Israel. Even so, if we expect the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 to occur in relation to the children of Israel as a national group, then the following passages would provide a better correspondence to Daniel 9:24 – Isaiah 1:24-27; Jeremiah 3:15-19; 31:31-37; 32:36-42; Ezekiel 36:24-38; 37:21-28.

Indeed, in these passages we find such declarations as the following:

“*And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called, The city of righteousness, the faithful city.*” (Isaiah 1:26)

“*At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart.*” (Jeremiah 3:17)

“*But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.*” (Jeremiah 31:33)

“*And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*” (Jeremiah 32:39-40)

“A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.” (Ezekiel 36:26-27)

*“Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: **they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them.**”* (Ezekiel 37:23-24)

In each of the passages listed above (Isaiah 1:24-27; Jeremiah 3:15-19; 31:31-37; 32:36-42; Ezekiel 36:24-38; 37:21-28), we find a prophetic utterance that specifically concerns the children of Israel, even as the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 is to be fulfilled specifically “upon” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Furthermore, in each of these passages, we find a prophetic promise that the Lord God will bring the children of Israel as a national group into a spiritual condition of righteousness and obedience, *wherein they will never again depart from Him or defile themselves in transgression and sins*. Even so, these passages provide a significant correspondence to the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Do the new covenant writers see the declared purpose of v. 24 as fulfilled at Calvary?

Finish the transgression:

“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.” Hebrews 9:15

Again we find two statements that are not strictly parallel and equivalent. Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete finishing* of transgression, Hebrews 9:15 only speaks concerning the death of Christ whereby He paid the redemption price of transgressions.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Make an end of sins:

“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.” Hebrews 9:28

Yet again we find two statements that are not strictly parallel or equivalent. Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete ending* of sins, Hebrews 9:28 only speaks concerning a bearing of sins.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Bring in everlasting righteousness: (John shows that our present state before God & in practice is righteousness.)

*“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. ² Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. ³ And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure. ⁴ **Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.** ⁵ And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. ⁶ **Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.** ⁷ Little children, let no man deceive you: **he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.** ⁸ He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. ⁹ **Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.** ¹⁰ **In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.**” 1 John 3:1-10*

John makes amazing statements - present tense statements that show that as believers in Christ, as children of God, we do not transgress, nor sin, but are righteous. We look at ourselves & disagree, but God sees us as redeemed in & by the Lord Jesus Christ. We live by faith as children of our Father God, we walk with our Saviour God who has redeemed us, guided by the indwelling Holy Spirit.

Certainly, John reveals in 1 John 3:9, under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, that that part of us believers which has been “*born of God*” does not ever engage in the commission of sin. Before an individual’s salvation, that individual’s spirit was spiritually “*dead in trespasses and sins*” (see Ephesians 2:1-3), being completely “*alienated from the life of God*” (see Ephesians 5:18) and from any walk of fellowship with God. However, at the moment of faith in Christ as Savior, that individual’s spiritually dead spirit was crucified with Christ and thereby eradicated (see Romans 6:6). In addition, that individual was raised up with Christ unto “*newness of life*” (see Romans 4), having his spirit regenerated (spiritually born again) as a new creature in Christ Jesus (see 2 Corinthians 5:15), such that his regenerate spirit is now created after God’s own nature in “*righteousness and true holiness*” (see Ephesians 4:24). In this manner, the regenerate spirit of the believer has indeed entered a spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness.*”

However, the believer as a whole person has not yet entered a spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness.*” Indeed, the character of the believer’s soul (that is – the character of the believer’s inner man, including the thoughts of his mind, the attitudes of his emotion, the priorities of his heart-motivation, the determinations of his will, etc.) are yet in need of spiritual transformation unto the perfectly righteous image of Christ (see Romans 12:2; 2 Corinthians 3:18). In fact, one particular aspect of the believer’s soul (of the believer’s inner man), which is entitled the “*flesh*” in Romans 7-8 and Galatians 5-6, is completely without even the smallest characteristic of righteousness (see Romans 7:18). For this very reason, if a believer upon the earth claims to be without any sin in his or her character, then that believer is self-deceived and does not possess an understanding of the truth (see 1 John 1:8). Yes, the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion

and resurrection has indeed provided for our complete and future glorification in spirit, soul, and body unto “*everlasting righteousness*.” However, no single individual or group of individuals upon the earth is yet living in that complete spiritual condition of “*everlasting righteousness*.”

Quote from Brother Ian Day

No, we are not waiting for week 70 to arrive - our Saviour came as promised.

Yes, I would continue to contend that we are yet waiting for the 70th and final “week” to be fulfilled, although I certainly do agree that our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, God the Son in the flesh, did indeed come in His first coming just as promised. However, I would again contend (even as I have above) that our Lord’s first coming as the Savior of the world is *not* that coming about which Daniel 9:24 is speaking.

Installment #14 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Within a general context of general communication, your statement that “the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham” would not have generated any conflict from me (even with the inclusion of the definite article “the” in front of the word “descendants”). However, within the specific context of this debate, I was definitely moved to express a conflict with your statement. The reason that I was moved to express conflict is because you employed the idea that “the people of Israel are the descendants of Abraham” as an open door in order to move onto the blessings of the Lord’s covenant with Abraham. Then from that ground you presented your conclusion that the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 “cannot be exclusively intended for Israel, but as wide in scope as the promise to Abram.” By this means you created the following set of equivalencies –

The “*thy people*” phrase in Daniel 9:24 = the children of Israel = the descendants of Abraham = the blessings of the Lord’s covenant with Abraham = a wider scope than just the children of Israel.

That is my understanding, based on a range of Scriptures beginning with Gen. 12:1-3. God makes his redemptive purposes very clear in Isaiah 49:1-8. Please read & re-read that inspired passage. It was written before the captivity & Gabriel would certainly have been aware of it, & its implications when he explained to Daniel the future God had determined for Israel.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Certainly then, I am moved to contend against this set of equivalencies; for they are not accurate, especially in relation to the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27. Rather than follow your proposed set of equivalencies, I believe that it would be far better to remain with the actual, straightforward terminology that God the Holy Spirit inspired Daniel to include in Daniel 9. On the one hand, God the Holy Spirit did *not* inspire Daniel to include any reference whatsoever at all unto Abraham. On the other hand, God the Holy Spirit *did* inspire Daniel, in defining his (Daniel's) people, to include the phrase in Daniel 9:20, “*my people, Israel.*” Furthermore, God the Holy Spirit *did* inspire Daniel to include the phrase in Daniel 9:7, “*to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off.*” Brother Day, if you continue to put me into a position where I must choose between God the Holy Spirit’s terminology and your own terminology, I will certainly choose and contend for God the Holy Spirit’s terminology.

Even so, according to the terminology of God the Holy Spirit, the “*seventy weeks*” of Daniel 9:24-27 have been authoritatively determined by the Lord God specifically **“upon” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel as a national group.** As such, the six-fold purposes and results for which the Lord God has determined these “*seventy weeks*” will occur for the specific benefit of Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. (emboldening & underlining added by Brother Ian Day)

I recommend a search on blueletterbible.org for “nation Israel” - 13 verses, only one in the NT – Rom. 10:19 – and none in Daniel. And for “people Israel” - 270 verses including 59 exact phrases, including 2 in the birth narratives – Mat. 2:6 Luke 2:29-32. There is also the reference to “thy people” (see Luke 1:62) in Zechariah's prophecy.

Israel as a nation has relevant references – (1) Exo. 19:6, which is quoted by Peter & applied to the church (see 1 Peter 2:9) & (2) Jer. 31:31-36, which relates to the new covenant promise in Hebrews 8, & (3) Eze. 37:22, where the tribes are gathered as one nation & so they become “*my people & I will be their God.*” Note Jer. 31:34 which relates to Dan. 9:24

It is adding & wrongly interpreting what the Holy Spirit has inspired when you assert that the prophecy relates specifically to “Daniel’s people, the children of Israel **as a national group.**” especially in the light of Isaiah 49 quoted by Simeon & Paul. (See Isa. 42:6; Acts 13:47; Acts 26:23) The teaching of Scripture overrides your grammatical analysis.

Scripture makes it very clear that God's blessings are for *all the nations of the earth* (see Gen. 22:18, repeated to Isaac in Gen. 26:4 & to Jacob in Gen. 28:14). So when Gabriel answers Daniel's prayer with the words – “*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.*” – he is stating prophecy relating to God’s eternal declared purposes. The **people** of Israel will be blessed according to God's declared prophecy, as they respond in faith & obedience. The nations & families of the earth will also be blessed as they respond to God & the message of the Messiah.

Gabriel is declaring the completion of God's redemptive purposes by the Messiah, with specific details of the outworking of the prophecy. I will focus later in this post on one aspect that is spelled out in the epistles: “*to bring in everlasting righteousness.*”

Daniel was obviously familiar with Jeremiah's prophecies. Note Jer. 23:5-8 & Jer. 33:14-18 Now, those prophecies were delivered during the captivity. Is Israel still waiting, waiting, waiting, for a Davidic king to reign (see Acts 2:29-31) & for Levitical priests to offer sacrifices? Sacrifices *which can NEVER take away sins?* (See Heb. 10:11)

The question that worries Paul is that Israel as a nation rejected their Messiah. (See Romans 9-11) He asserts that they are welcomed by the Gospel “*if they abide not still in unbelief.*” Salvation is on a personal basis by faith, & believers become a “*holy nation.*”

God may yet have plans for the salvation of Israelites on a massive scale, and of course in the New Heaven & New Earth the number of them will be as the stars & the sand. God's promises & prophecies will certainly be fulfilled. Gabriel says nothing about a future millennium fulfilment. He speaks of 70 weeks & that timescale takes us to about 3 1/2 years after Calvary, after Jesus' saving work was **FINISHED** and the Gospel of salvation proclaimed to Israel.

The leaders of the nation of Israel rejected their Messiah, but did Israel as a people, the people of God, reject him? They did not, as Acts records. 3,000 on the day of Pentecost, 5,000 a few days later, a great company of priests (see Acts 6:7). Those who did respond to the preaching of the Apostles & those who returned to the homes after Pentecost, & were scattered by persecution. In spite of persecution, the Jerusalem church leaders reported *many thousands*. Believing Israel comprised many thousands – many more than the 7,000 the LORD reported to Elijah when he thought he was alone.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

You are correct; we are *not* now in “virtually complete agreement” concerning the truth and details of Daniel 9:24-27.

First, although I certainly agree that our Lord Jesus Christ’s saving work in His crucifixion and resurrection are the foundational basis for any and all blessings of eternal atonement and eternal salvation (including those of Daniel 9:24). However, I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is not speaking concerning the foundational *provision* of those blessings, but concerning the actual *application* of those blessings. I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is not speaking concerning the event whereby those blessings were foundationally provided in the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Rather, I would contend that Daniel 9:24 is speaking concerning the event wherein those blessings shall be actually applied unto and upon the specific group of Daniel’s people, the children of Israel as a body of people.

Allow me to illustrate, through the testimony of my own case, my understanding concerning the difference between this provision and this application. At our Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection, He foundationally provided for my personal and eternal salvation, justification, regeneration, etc. However, my salvation, justification, regeneration, etc. was not actually applied unto me personally until 1975, when I placed my heart-faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as my personal Savior from my sinfulness. Even so, the two events occurred at a different time. The foundational provision occurred approximately 2000 years ago. The actual application in my own case occurred only 39 years ago.

In like manner, I would contend that there is a difference for Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, concerning the *foundational provision* of the Daniel 9:24 blessings and concerning the *actual application* of those Daniel 9:24 blessings. Furthermore, I would contend that the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 are speaking concerning the event of the *actual application* of those blessings “upon” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Indeed, I would contend that the event of this actual application of those blessings has not yet occurred “upon” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, but is yet to occur “upon” them sometime in the future

The saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ was FINISHED at Calvary, with his death & resurrection, followed by his ascension. That was in the middle of week 70, assuming that 70 follows 69. Did Jesus then *bring in everlasting righteousness*? Paul discusses this in great detail in Romans. You are contending that the actual application of those blessings is yet future as it must be absolute, perfectly realised, so that week 70 is totally separated from week 69. That is an assumption imposed by your grammatical interpretation, not a straightforward reading of Scripture.

When *Abraham believed in the LORD, & he counted it to him for righteousness*, did Abraham immediately become sinless? No, but he did become righteous. We also become righteous by faith, as Paul explains in Romans 3 & 4. The righteousness we have by faith in Christ is everlasting righteousness. I don't think you will dispute that Jesus at Calvary made *reconciliation for iniquity*, so did he not also *finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins*? Yes! See Rom. 6:22-23; Micah 7:18-20; Isa. 44:22-23; Acts 3:19.

Every believer, both in the OT & the NT, possess everlasting righteousness, because we have the righteousness of faith in Christ. (See Rom. 9:30; Phil. 3:9; Hab. 2:4)

Personal salvation takes place in time, but Jesus' saving work was FINISHED during the 70th week. And many thousands of Israel believed in their Messiah within the 70 weeks.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Second, concerning the second anointing of our Lord Jesus Christ at His exaltation to the right of God the Father, I would contend that while this anointing is indeed a heavenly reality, it will not have its **earthly application** until His Second Coming as King of kings and Lord of lords over the whole earth. Throughout God's Word anointing is for the purpose of some service and ministry unto God. At our Lord Jesus Christ's baptism, He was anointed with the Holy Spirit for a ministry of preaching, teaching, healing, and helping (as per Isaiah 61:1-3; Luke 4:17-21; Acts 10:34-38). Biblically, this could be understood to be our Lord Jesus Christ's ministry as a Prophet.

At our Lord Jesus Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He experienced a second anointing (as per Psalm 2:2-9; Psalm 45:1-8; Hebrews 1:8-9). According to these passages, it appears that this anointing was for our Lord Jesus Christ's ministry as King. Even so, Psalm 2:7-9 appears to reveal that this kingship ministry will have its fulfilled application as follows – *"I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."*

When was Psalm 2:7 fulfilled? Paul tells us it was at the resurrection. (See Rom. 1:4) Peter alludes to this in Acts 2:30-32. Peter also applies Psalm 2 to those who crucified the Messiah, both Jewish leaders & Gentiles in his prayer. (See Acts 4:24-31) He is ascended to his heavenly throne as the anointed One. (See Heb. 1:1-14)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

However, at our Lord's exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He did not immediately engage in the administration of His kingship ministry upon and over the whole earth. Rather, according to the teaching of the book of Hebrews, our Lord Jesus Christ is presently engaged in His ministry as High Priest. Indeed, Hebrews 10:12-13 appears to indicate that our Lord Jesus Christ is **yet waiting** for the earthly application of His kingship ministry, saying, *"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool."*

Not at all. Read Heb. 1 before you read Heb. 10. Peter explains what is happening & why there appears to be a slowness to God fulfilling his promises. (See 2 Peter 3:3-9) Note Mat. 28:18-20 – **"ALL power."**

Hebrews, in Heb. 7:1-3 explains Jesus' status as great high Priest & King in his teaching about Melchisedec who was the only Priest-King in the OT, not only a type of Christ, but Christ himself, ***the LORD, the most high God.*** (See Gen. 14:18-22)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

So then, when will the earthly application of our Lord Jesus Christ's kingship ministry occur? Revelation 19:11-16 gives answer, saying, "*And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. **And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron:** and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."*

To this Revelation 20:1-4 adds, "*And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."*

I don't propose to get involved with the interpretation of Revelation in this thread. Certainly Jesus will at his coming "***gather out of his kingdom all things that offend ... Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.***" (See Mat. 13:36-43)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Even so, I would contend that the phrase, "*to anoint the most Holy,*" in Daniel 9:24 is a reference unto the event of the earthly application of our Lord Jesus Christ's kingship ministry, wherein the children of Israel and all the nations of the world will recognize Him as King of kings and Lord of lords. Yea, I would contend that this phrase is a reference unto the event of our Lord Jesus Christ's Second Coming as King of kings and Lord of lords literally and bodily over the whole earth.

However, I will acknowledge that this particular point of my position is a point of weakness in my position, since I do not possess any portion of Scripture wherein the word "anoint" (or any of its cognates) is employed in relation to the event of our Lord's Second Coming. As such, I would further acknowledge that in the context of this discussion-debate, it would be unto your advantage for you to exploit this particular point of weakness in my position.

I'll just accept it as a weakness in your position.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

I have noticed that on a number of occasions, both in this debate and in “external” threads, that you have proposed Isaiah 53 as a companion passage of Scripture to the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24. Certainly, I would agree that Isaiah 53 refers to the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection. Certainly also, I would agree that the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ (as presented in Isaiah 53, or in any other passage of Scripture) is the foundational basis for the blessings of eternal atonement and eternal salvation, including those of Daniel 9:24 (even as I have presented above). However, I would contend that the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24 and the declarations of Isaiah 53 are *not* specifically parallel or equivalent *to one another*.

With the first four purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24, we have the following:

1. *“To finish the transgression”*
2. *“To make an end of sins”*
3. *“To make reconciliation for iniquity”*
4. *“To bring in everlasting righteousness”*

In relation to the first of these points, concerning transgression, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. *“But he was wounded for our transgressions”* (v. 5)
2. *“For the transgress of my people was he stricken”* (v. 8)
3. *“He . . . made intercession for the transgressors”* (v. 12)

Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete finishing* of transgression, Isaiah 53 only speaks concerning a wounding and a being struck for transgressions and an intercession for transgressors. These truths are not strictly parallel or equivalent.

In relation to the second of these points, concerning sins, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. *“When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin”* (v. 10)
2. *“And he bare the sin of many”* (v. 12)

Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete ending* of sins, Isaiah 53 only speaks concerning an offering for sin and a bearing of sin. Again these truths are not strictly parallel or equivalent.

In relation to the third of these points, concerning iniquity, Isaiah 53 presents the following:

1. *“And the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all”* (v. 6)

Wherein Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning a reconciliation (through atonement) for iniquity, Isaiah 53 speaks concerning iniquity being laid upon another who was given in sacrifice. Thus on this point Daniel 9:24 and Isaiah 53 are closer in parallel, at least concerning a sacrifice of atonement whereby the possibility of reconciliation is provided. However, the actual reconciliation between the Lord God and any given sinner does not occur until the specific moment wherein the atoning sacrifice is *specifically applied* (not just provided) unto that sinner. Even so, I would contend

that whereas Isaiah 53 is speaking concerning the provision for reconciliation, Daniel 9:24 is speaking concerning the actual application and experience of reconciliation.

In relation to the fourth of these points, concerning everlasting righteousness, Isaiah 53 does not employ either the word “everlasting” or the word “righteousness” at all whatsoever.

So, when did Isaiah 53 occur? Certainly at Calvary, where Jesus saving work was FINISHED. Your attempt to divide Scripture is not “right dividing” but detracts from Jesus' glorious saving work, FINISHED at Calvary. Isaiah 53 is not an isolated Scripture - read Isa. 51:1-7 to see further teaching about personal righteousness – for ever.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

On the other hand, if we recognize that the intent of the Lord our God is for the “*seventy weeks*” of Daniel 9:24-27 to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, then we would expect the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 to occur in relation to the children of Israel. Even so, if we expect the six-fold purpose and result statements of Daniel 9:24 to occur in relation to **the children of Israel as a national group**, then the following passages would provide a better correspondence to Daniel 9:24 – Isaiah 1:24-27; Jeremiah 3:15-19; 31:31-37; 32:36-42; Ezekiel 36:24-38; 37:21-28. (emboldening & underlining added by Brother Ian Day)

A national group – again you are adding to Scripture.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Indeed, in these passages we find such declarations as the following:

*“And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called, **The city of righteousness, the faithful city.**”* (Isaiah 1:26)

*“At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: **neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart.**”* (Jeremiah 3:17)

*“But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, **I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.**”* (Jeremiah 31:33)

*“And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; **but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.**”* (Jeremiah 32:39-40)

“A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit

within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.” (Ezekiel 36:26-27)

“Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them.” (Ezekiel 37:23-24)

These are New Covenant blessings, as Paul explains, for citizens of Jerusalem above. (See Gal. 4) At present, true Jerusalem is a heavenly city, not the present earthly Jerusalem, still in bondage. (See Gal. 4:21-31; Heb. 11:9-16; Heb. 12:22-24; not forgetting John 4:21-24)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

In each of the passages listed above (Isaiah 1:24-27; Jeremiah 3:15-19; 31:31-37; 32:36-42; Ezekiel 36:24-38; 37:21-28), we find a prophetic utterance that specifically concerns the children of Israel, even as the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 is to be fulfilled specifically “upon” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Furthermore, in each of these passages, we find a prophetic promise that the Lord God will bring the children of Israel as a national group into a spiritual condition of righteousness and obedience, ***wherein they will never again depart from Him or defile themselves in transgression and sins.*** Even so, these passages provide a significant correspondence to the purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24.

Your focus on “Israel as a national group” rather than Israel as God's people is a serious division between us. I take the guidance for understanding OT prophecy from the NT writers. The prophecies have a fulfilment in Christ, as Jesus himself explained on the Emmaus road & to the eleven.

The OT prophecies are given in terms of Israel, as descendants of Abraham, through Isaac & Jacob, & the promises to the patriarchs include the nations. When Jesus explained his fulfilment of ***“the Law of Moses, & in the Prophets, & in the Psalms, concerning me”*** he stated that ***“repentance & remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”*** Restoring *the kingdom to Israel* may have been in his disciples thoughts, but he immediately assured them he had other priorities - ***“unto the uttermost parts of the earth.”*** We never hear again of the kingdom of Israel. What we do read of is the kingdom of God, & of Christ.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Again we find two statements that are not strictly parallel and equivalent. Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete finishing* of transgression, Hebrews 9:15 only speaks concerning the death of Christ whereby He paid the redemption price of transgressions.

Yet again we find two statements that are not strictly parallel or equivalent. Whereas Daniel 9:24 speaks concerning the *complete ending* of sins, Hebrews 9:28 only speaks concerning a bearing of sins.

Again you are adding “complete” to the Scripture to make your argument. Note that just before Heb. 9:28 comes Heb. 9:26 – *once in the end of the world he appeared to put away sin*. Compare that with Dan. 9:24 – *make an end of sins*.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Bring in everlasting righteousness: (John shows that our present state before God & in practice is righteousness.)

*“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. ² Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. ³ And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure. ⁴ Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law. ⁵ And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. ⁶ Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him. ⁷ Little children, let no man deceive you: **he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.** ⁸ He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. ⁹ **Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.** ¹⁰ **In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.”** 1 John 3:1-10*

John makes amazing statements - present tense statements that show that as believers in Christ, as children of God, we do not transgress, nor sin, but are righteous. We look at ourselves & disagree, but God sees us as redeemed in & by the Lord Jesus Christ. We live by faith as children of our Father God, we walk with our Saviour God who has redeemed us, guided by the indwelling Holy Spirit.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

Certainly, John reveals in 1 John 3:9, under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, that that part of us believers which has been “*born of God*” does not ever engage in the commission of sin. Before an individual’s salvation, that individual’s spirit was spiritually “*dead in trespasses and sins*” (see Ephesians 2:1-3), being completed “*alienated from the life of God*” (see Ephesians 5:18) and from any walk of fellowship with God. However, at the moment of faith in Christ as Savior, that

individual's spiritually dead spirit was crucified with Christ and thereby eradicated (see Romans 6:6). In addition, that individual was raised up with Christ unto "*newness of life*" (see Romans 4), having his spirit regenerated (spiritually born again) as a new creature in Christ Jesus (see 2 Corinthians 5:15), such that his regenerate spirit is now created after God's own nature in "*righteousness and true holiness*" (see Ephesians 4:24). In this manner, the regenerate spirit of the believer has indeed entered a spiritual condition of "*everlasting righteousness*."

Again you are adding to the Scripture to make your argument. Where in Rom. 6:6 do we read that our (previously) spiritually dead spirit is eradicated? The body of sin (aka the flesh) is indeed destroyed but our spirit is regenerated. We have new life freed from sin.

I think that last sentence is actually saying that "the regenerated believer is in the spiritual condition of everlasting righteousness." I hope that means we are in agreement, but again I fear that may not be the case.

That last point may bring us to Romans 7 for a further disagreement. What is wonderful is that in this whole discussion we have to cover a wide range of Scripture just to focus on 4 verses.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

However, the believer as a whole person has not yet entered a spiritual condition of "*everlasting righteousness*." Indeed, the character of the believer's soul (that is – the character of the believer's inner man, including the thoughts of his mind, the attitudes of his emotion, the priorities of his heart-motivation, the determinations of his will, etc.) are yet in need of spiritual transformation unto the perfectly righteous image of Christ (see Romans 12:2; 2 Corinthians 3:18). In fact, one particular aspect of the believer's soul (of the believer's inner man), which is entitled the "*flesh*" in Romans 7-8 and Galatians 5-6, is completely without even the smallest characteristic of righteousness (see Romans 7:18). For this very reason, if a believer upon the earth claims to be without any sin in his or her character, then that believer is self-deceived and does not possess an understanding of the truth (see 1 John 1:8). Yes, the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ in His crucifixion and resurrection has indeed provided for our complete and future glorification in spirit, soul, and body unto "*everlasting righteousness*." However, no single individual or group of individuals upon the earth is yet living in that complete spiritual condition of "*everlasting righteousness*."

I understand what you are saying, & of course agree that in this life we continue to sin, unwillingly, as we are being conformed to the image of Christ. (See Rom. 8:29) We are growing in grace. But that does not mean that our present redeemed status in Christ is not "everlasting righteousness." We are righteous in God's sight by faith in Christ.

Is Romans 7 describing the ongoing spiritual condition of the believer? Paul appears to write as if it is his personal condition, unable to comply with the Law. We need to read the whole chapter, & read on into Rom. 8. If we try to live by the Law, we fail & are condemned as sinners, dead in sin. Happily, as believers in Christ, we are dead to the law & married to Christ, serving in newness of spirit. "*The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin & death.*" (See Rom. 8:1-4)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Yes, I would continue to contend that we are yet waiting for the 70th and final “week” to be fulfilled, although I certainly do agree that our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, God the Son in the flesh, did indeed come in His first coming just as promised. However, I would again contend (even as I have above) that our Lord’s first coming as the Savior of the world is *not* that coming about which Daniel 9:24 is speaking.

I have shown that your arguments against a straightforward 70 continuous weeks understanding require additions to Scripture, & imposed interpretations that take us beyond the basic meaning as we read it. We need better reasons than you have advanced so far to separate the 69 & 70 weeks. I repeat, we agree that 69 weeks takes us to the baptism/anointing of Christ at the commencement of his ministry on earth. We disagree concerning the saving work detailed in v. 24. I maintain, & have shown from Scripture, that that was FINISHED at Calvary. That every believer is in that happy spiritual status, secure in Christ, as we live by faith, possessing the righteousness that is by faith in Christ.

Coming to verse 26...

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.”

I believe we should understand prophecy, as far as possible, by its fulfilment, OT prophecy may be fulfilled in the OT (or in inter-testamental history), but in this case, as it concerns Messiah, we should look in the NT. We know Jesus' ministry continued for about 3 years, which is after the 69th week, but in the middle of the 70th week. That agrees perfectly with: *“after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.”*

We know also that the city & the sanctuary were not destroyed within that 70th week, but about 35 years later. That, of course, is also *“after threescore and two weeks.”* Jesus prophesied that dreadful event in his Olivet prophecy. (See Mat. 24, Mark 13 & Luke 21, & at other times towards the end of his ministry) Also *“the people of the prince that shall come”* did *“destroy the city and the sanctuary”* in AD 70. Titus & his Roman legions. “Flood” does not necessarily mean a watery deluge, but an overwhelming army. (See Isa. 59:19) History records the desolations.

Installment #15 – Pastor Scott Markle

Brother Day,

One quick question – To whom was the angel Gabriel speaking when he delivered the message of Daniel 9:24?

Installment #16 – Brother Ian Day

See Dan. 9:21-23

Installment #17 – Pastor Scott Markle

Indeed, Daniel 9:21-23 reads as follows:

*"Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched **me** about the time of the evening oblation. And he **informed me**, and talked **with me**, and said, **O Daniel**, I am now come forth to give **thee** skill and understanding. At the beginning of **thy** supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew **thee**; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision."*

It appears from those portions of Daniel 9:21-23 which I have emboldened that the angel Gabriel was speaking to Daniel himself when he (the angel) delivered the message of Daniel 9:24.

Brother Day, would you agree with this conclusion?

Installment #18 – Brother Ian Day

The simple answer is that Gabriel is speaking to Daniel, but any message to a prophet is also for the people he serves, & as the product is Scripture, it is for all God's people to read & understand, & also to apply as appropriate.

Installment #19 – Pastor Scott Markle

The word "thy" is a second person, singular personal pronoun of possession. While delivering his message to Daniel (the simple, contextually straightforward truth), the angel Gabriel uses this pronoun twice in Daniel 9:24, once in the phrase, "*upon thy people*," and once in the phrase, "*upon thy holy city*."

Considering that the simple (contextually straightforward) truth is that the angel Gabriel was speaking to Daniel when he delivered the message of Daniel 9:24, when the angel Gabriel used the pronoun "thy" in this message, to what specific, singular individual was the angel Gabriel making reference?

Installment #20 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

The word "thy" is a second person, singular personal pronoun of possession. While delivering his message to Daniel (the simple, contextually straightforward truth), the angel Gabriel uses this pronoun twice in Daniel 9:24, once in the phrase, "*upon thy people*," and once in the phrase, "*upon thy holy city*."

Considering that the simple (contextually straightforward) truth is that the angel Gabriel was speaking to Daniel when he delivered the message of Daniel 9:24, when the angel Gabriel used the pronoun "thy" in this message, to what specific, singular individual was the angel Gabriel making reference?

I have answered your question twice. I presume you are making some grammatical point that was not answered by quoting the relevant Scripture, nor by the answer I gave:

“The simple answer is that Gabriel is speaking to Daniel, but any message to a prophet is also for the people he serves, & as the product is Scripture, it is for all God's people to read & understand, & also to apply as appropriate.”

Time to move on. I will begin by reposting my understanding of v.26 & continue with v. 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.”

I believe we should understand prophecy, as far as possible, by its fulfilment, OT prophecy may be fulfilled in the OT (or in inter-testamental history), but in this case, as it concerns Messiah, we should look in the NT. We know Jesus' ministry continued for about 3 years, which is after the 69th week, but in the middle of the 70th week. That agrees perfectly with: “*after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”

We know also that the city & the sanctuary were not destroyed within that 70th week, but about 35 years later. That, of course, is also “*after threescore and two weeks.*” Jesus prophesied that dreadful event in his Olivet prophecy. (See Mat. 24, Mark 13 & Luke 21, & at other times towards the end of his ministry) Also “*the people of the prince that shall come*” did “*destroy the city and the sanctuary*” in AD 70. Titus & his Roman legions. “Flood” does not necessarily mean a watery deluge, but an overwhelming army. (See Isa. 59:19) History records the desolations.

Before I leave v. 26 I will point out that the “the” occurring twice in “*the people of the prince that shall come*” is the definite article, indicating specific people & a specific prince, identified as “shall come” & recognised by their actions. Further, “*the city and the sanctuary*” are previously identified & prayed for – Jerusalem & the temple. (See Dan. 9:16-19)

An extraordinary aspect of the prophecy is the despite Daniel's wonderful & faithful prayer, the answer includes destruction of the city & the sanctuary, NOT the everlasting political blessings prophesied by other prophets. (e.g. Isa. 1:24-28) Yet Gabriel declares:

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.

Once Messiah has completed his reconciliatory work, the city & the sanctuary are no longer included in God's prophetic purposes. As he shouted from the cross “*It is FINISHED!*”

Judgement of those who rejected their Messiah was included in God's prophecy of the Messiah in Deut. 18:18-19. It was also stated in the closing chapter of the OT. (See Mal.4:4-6)

In Acts 3, when Messiah has come & fulfilled his saving work “*to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,*” Peter repeats Moses' warning:

22 For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. 23 And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. 24 Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. 25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. 26 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.

Peter speaks of “these days.” God graciously allowed time for repentance, before that destruction would take place. Jesus warned “*this generation*” while Hebrews, quoting Psalm 95, warns of 40 years. 40 days was more than enough for Nineveh.

So to verse 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.

Note Dan. 9:4:

And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments;

It is God who keeps the covenant. He makes the covenant, for the mercy & blessing of those who love him & keep his commandments. The word “covenant” occurs about 300 times in Scripture, often the synonym “testament” is used in the Gospels & Epistles. The concept of God's covenant relationship with the believer is a theme that runs throughout Scripture. A special aspect of the covenant is detailed in Lev. 26:

9 For I will have respect unto you, and make you fruitful, and multiply you, and establish my covenant with you. 10 And ye shall eat old store, and bring forth the old because of the new. 11 And I will set my tabernacle among you: and my soul shall not abhor you. 12 And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.

Note vs.11-12. That promise is repeated many times in Scripture, & is to be perfectly fulfilled in the New Heaven & New Earth:

Rev. 21:3 And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

In the Daniel 9 context, Messiah is the primary subject, who will complete God's purposes ***upon thy people and upon thy holy city***. Messiah – God the Son – confirms the covenant. He does this by becoming the surety for God's people, by his incarnation under the covenant strictures, & fulfilling every detail of God's requirements for man under the covenant. The old covenant was based on laws that demanded perfect obedience. (See Deu. 27:26) While God provided sacrifices for sin, & accepted imperfect obedience, the perfect sacrifice of Christ was needed to fulfil the terms of the covenant from man's side.

Daniel 9 begins with reference to Jeremiah's 70 year prophecy (see Jer. 29). In Jer. 31 we see prophecy concerning 2 covenants, including the glorious prophecy of a new covenant – Jer. 31:31-34

31 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: 32 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: 33 But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. 34 And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

It is worthwhile quoting that old covenant from Exodus 19:

5 Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: 6 And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. 7 And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the LORD commanded him. 8 And all the people answered together, and said, All that the LORD hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the LORD.

That covenant was ratified with blood:

Exo. 24:6-8 – And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. 7 And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient. 8 And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.

Jesus makes the new covenant/testament in his own blood at Calvary. Hebrews takes up the prophecy in Jer. 31 in Heb. 8, showing how under the new covenant, the law is within & affected by God the Holy Spirit in the hearts of his people. (See Heb. 8:10) The old covenant was confirmed by Jesus' perfect obedience, & ended at Calvary. During the final, 70th “week”, from Jesus' baptism to 3 1/2 years after Calvary, Jesus was confirming the old covenant with those who received him, & making the new & everlasting covenant in his own blood. The Apostolic Gospel was indeed confirmed with many during that 70th week, 3,000 on the day of Pentecost, & 5,000 a few days later. Before the martyrdom of Stephen, ***“the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.”*** The old covenant was powerless, because it required the obedience of man, whereas the new covenant is effective, as it is based on Jesus' perfect obedience. The covenant was confirmed & superseded at Calvary.

Once Jesus finished his saving work, the old covenant was ready to vanish away. (See Heb. 8:13) The focus of the old covenant, the temple with all its rituals & sacrifices was redundant. It did indeed vanish away before the generation that rejected their Messiah had passed. (See Mat. 24:34)

I'll give Paul the last word:

Gal. 3:13-18 – Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: 14 That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. 15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. 16 Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. 17 And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. 18 For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

Surely Paul was aware of Dan. 9:27 when he wrote: “*The covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.*”

All that remained for those who rejected their Messiah was the prophesied desolation.

Installment #21 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I have answered your question twice. I presume you are making some grammatical point that was not answered by quoting the relevant Scripture, nor by the answer I gave:

“The simple answer is that Gabriel is speaking to Daniel, but any message to a prophet is also for the people he serves, & as the product is Scripture, it is for all God's people to read & understand, & also to apply as appropriate.”

Since you appear to acknowledge that the pronoun "thy" in Daniel 9:24 is a reference to Daniel himself, would you agree that it is legitimate to explain the "*thy people*" phrase of Daniel 9:24 as being a reference to *Daniel's* people?

Installment #22 – Brother Ian Day

Daniel 9:20 – *And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God for the holy mountain of my God;*

Consider the grammar carefully, & God is Daniel's God, & Israel comprises Daniel's people.

Daniel 9:24 – *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.*

As the prophecy proceeds, "thy holy city" is Jerusalem, but "thy people" are not further identified, though we can recognise the "many" with whom the covenant is confirmed as "my people Israel", aka "thy people," these being the many thousands converted during Jesus' earthly ministry, & during the first few years after Pentecost. That's within the 70 weeks. Further conversion of Jews has continued down the ages.

To what extent are they Daniel's people & city? He acknowledges them as his people - he is an Israelite & he does not disassociate himself from those who were disobedient & caused the exile. Jerusalem is his city, presumably of birth, & certainly as a Jew in exile he considered Jerusalem as his city.

Are disobedient, rebellious Israel "my people?" See Hosea, written over 100 years before Daniel.

Hosea 1:9 – *Then said God, Call his name Loammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God.*

Happily their disobedience does not annul the promises to the Patriarchs, nor the purposes of God for his people which are fulfilled in Christ by the Gospel.

Installment #23 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Daniel 9:20 – *And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God for the holy mountain of my God;*

Consider the grammar carefully, & God is Daniel's God, & **Israel comprises Daniel's people.** (emphasis added by Pastor Scott Markle)

Brother Day, thank you for your answer.

Indeed, the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 can be legitimately understood as a reference unto **Daniel's** people; and indeed, Daniel's people are the people of Israel, as per your reference to the contextual information in Daniel 9:20 (to which might also be added Daniel 9:7 & Daniel 9:11).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Daniel 9:24 – *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.*

As the prophecy proceeds, “thy holy city” is Jerusalem, but “thy people” are not further identified, . . .

Although the “*thy people*” have already been identified in the previous context of Daniel 9.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

. . . though we can recognise the “many” with whom the covenant is confirmed as “my people Israel”, aka “thy people,” . . .

Herein we are agreed – In this context the “*many*” of Daniel 9:27, with whom the “*he*” of the verse confirms “*the covenant*” of the verse, would be a reference to Daniel's people Israel.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

. . . these being the many thousands converted during Jesus' earthly ministry, & during the first few years after Pentecost. That's within the 70 weeks. Further conversion of Jews has continued down the ages.

Herein we are not agreed – due to a number of disagreements that we have over various of the details in Daniel 9:27.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Are disobedient, rebellious Israel "my people?" See Hosea, written over 100 years before Daniel.

Hosea 1:9 – *Then said God, Call his name Loammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God.*

With which we should also consider the two verses that immediately follow Hosea 1:9, that is – Hosea 1:10-11:

“Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God. Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel.”

(It is also worthy of notice that within the immediate context of Hosea 1, as per Hosea 1:4-7, the statement of Hosea 1:9 only applied specifically to “*the house of Israel*” in contrast to “*the house of Judah*.”)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That is my understanding, based on a range of Scriptures beginning with Gen. 12:1-3. God makes his redemptive purposes very clear in Isaiah 49:1-8. Please read & re-read that inspired passage. It was written before the captivity & Gabriel would certainly have been aware of it, & its implications when he explained to Daniel the future God had determined for Israel.

Since you have brought Genesis 12:1-3 forward on a number of occasions in relation to the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24, let us consider the correspondence of that passage to Daniel 9:24. In Genesis 12:1-3 the Lord God delivered his promise of blessing unto Abraham as follows:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

Herein the Lord God presented five different blessing statements:

1. *“And I will make of thee a great nation.”*
2. *“And I will bless thee, and make thy name great.”*
3. *“And thou shalt be a blessing.”*
4. *“And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.”*
5. *“And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”*

The first of these blessing statements reveals the Lord God's promise to make *one, single great nation* (as per the *singular* word "nation") out of Abraham. As such, *this one singular nation* (one singular national people group) would be the promised descendants out of Abraham. On the other hand, the last of these blessing statement reveals the Lord God's promise to cause the multitude of all the families (people groups) throughout the earth to be blessed in and through Abraham (and his descendants, specifically in and through the Lord Jesus Christ, the Savior for all the world). Now, in accord with the mathematics of the case, these two promises cannot be made equivalent to one another; for the first promise speaks *concerning one singular national people group*, whereas the last promise speaks *concerning the multitude of all the familial people groups throughout the whole earth*.

So then, which of these two blessing statements and promises speaks concerning and corresponds with Daniel's people Israel from the context of Daniel 9:24? Are Daniel's people Israel equivalent to the one singular nation (national people group) that the Lord God promised to make out of Abraham as his descendants? Or, are Daniel's people Israel equivalent to all the families (people groups) throughout the whole earth? To me the answer seems fairly clear.

Now, (1) if the one singular nation (national people group) that the Lord God promised to make out of Abraham as his descendants *cannot legitimately be seen as equivalent* to all the families throughout the whole earth, and (2) if Daniel's people Israel *can legitimately be seen as equivalent* to the one singular nation (national people group) that the Lord God promised to make out of Abraham as his descendants, then we may conclude that the prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 can legitimately be narrowed in focus unto *Daniel's people Israel, the one singular national people group that the Lord God promised to make out of Abraham as his descendants*. Even so, the teaching of Genesis 12:1-3 does not actually support, but actually counters your position that Daniel 9:24-27 should be viewed as having "a wider scope than just the children of Israel."

(Concerning Isaiah 49:1-8, I am not at all understanding your intent in presenting this passage as having a correspondence to Daniel 9:24-27. Could you provide a more extensive explanation concerning your intentions with this passage?)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I recommend a search on blueletterbible.org for "nation Israel" - 13 verses, only one in the NT - Rom. 10:19 - and none in Daniel. And for "people Israel" - 270 verses including 59 exact phrases, including 2 in the birth narratives - Mat. 2:6 Luke 2:29-32. There is also the reference to "thy people" (see Luke 1:62) in Zechariah's prophecy.

Israel as a nation has relevant references - (1) Exo. 19:6, which is quoted by Peter & applied to the church (see 1 Peter 2:9) & (2) Jer. 31:31-36, which relates to the new covenant promise in Hebrews 8, & (3) Eze. 37:22, where the tribes are gathered as one nation & so they become "my people & I will be their God." Note Jer. 31:34 which relates to Dan. 9:24

It is adding & wrongly interpreting what the Holy Spirit has inspired when you assert that the prophecy relates specifically to "Daniel's people, the children of Israel **as a national group**," especially in the light of Isaiah 49 quoted by Simeon & Paul. (See Isa. 42:6; Acts 13:47; Acts 26:23) The teaching of Scripture overrides your grammatical analysis.

Referring to Daniel's people Israel as "a national group" (or, as a national people group) is supported first by the Lord God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:2 – "***And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing.***" Furthermore, it is supported by the Lord God's reiteration of that promise unto Jacob (whose name the Lord God had changed to Israel) in Genesis 28:14 – "***And he said, I am God, the God of thy father: fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation.***" Indeed, it is supported by various passages throughout the Old Testament, including such passages as Exodus 19:6; Deuteronomy 4:6-8; Deuteronomy 26:5; 2 Samuel 7:23; 1 Chronicles 17:21; Psalm 147:19-20; Isaiah 1:4; Isaiah 26:1-2; Jeremiah 31:35-37; Ezekiel 2:3; Ezekiel 37:22. Finally, it would be of value for us directly to consider one of these passages, Jeremiah 31:35-37 –

*"Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the LORD of hosts is his name: **If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.** Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD."*

So then, have the ordinances of "*the sun for a light by day*" and "*of the moon and of the stars for a light by night*" departed from before the Lord? As best as I could tell last night and this morning, they have not. Therefore, I am brought to the conclusion, based upon the absolute faithfulness of God's Word, that "the seed of Israel" has also not "*ceased from being a nation*" before the Lord "*for ever.*"

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Scripture makes it very clear that God's blessings are for ***all the nations of the earth*** (see Gen. 22:18, repeated to Isaac in Gen. 26:4 & to Jacob in Gen. 28:14).

Actually, Scripture does not indicate this at all. In your statement you have applied a plural number of "God's blessings" unto "all the nations of the earth." (By this statement, you may even be implying that the plural number of *all* "God's blessings" are for and unto "all the nations of the earth.") Yet not a single one of the references that you have provided in support of your assertion actually speaks concerning a plural number of "God's blessings" being administered unto "all the nations of the earth." What these passages actually do say is as follows:

Genesis 22:18 – "*And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.*" (That is – in and through Abraham's seed "all the nations of the earth" would be blessed with some form of blessing from the Lord God. Yet what that form of blessing would be is not at all specified. Nor are we even informed that that form of blessing would be plural.)

Genesis 26:4 – "*And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*" (That is – in and through Isaac's seed "all the nations of the earth" would be blessed with some form of blessing from the Lord God. Yet what that form of blessing would be is not at all specified. Nor are we even informed that that form of blessing would be plural.)

Genesis 28:14 – “*And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*” (That is – in and through Jacob’s seed “all the families of the earth” would be blessed with some form of blessing from the Lord God. Yet what that form of blessing would be is not at all specified. Nor are we even informed that that form of blessing would be plural.)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

. . . So when Gabriel answers Daniel's prayer with the words – “***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.***” – he is stating prophecy relating to God’s eternal declared purposes. The **people** of Israel will be blessed according to God's declared prophecy, as they respond in faith & obedience. The nations & families of the earth will also be blessed as they respond to God & the message of the Messiah.

Your above conclusion is built upon your previous foundational premise. Yet since your previous foundation premise stands faulty, so the conclusion that you have built upon that faulty foundation also stands faulty. Indeed, “the nations & families of the earth” are not anywhere whatsoever at all mentioned in Daniel 9:24. Although you continually contend that you are simply following the simple reading of the passage (in opposition to my “complicated grammatical analysis” of the passage), you are the one who is herein adding something to the passage that is not at all present therein.

Installment #22 – Brother Ian Day

Why “thy people”? Gabriel the archangel is speaking, so he refers to the people in question as “thy people” whereas if the LORD were speaking, he would have said “my people.” So they are Daniel's people because Daniel is a Jew who identifies himself with God's people Israel.

The question of your previous post comes down to:

Is God keeping his promise to Israel as a believing people in the present Gospel age through the redeeming work of the Lord Jesus Christ, or is Israel still waiting to become a godly nation under Jesus as King & David as co-regent?

Is God punishing 60 or more generations of the children of Israel when he said “this generation?” (See Mat. 24:34) Is that the way a faithful God keeps his promises?

In Hosea 3:1-5 God tells Israel (as distinct from Judah):

*4 For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim:
5 Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days.*

Israel did not return when Judah returned. They remained scattered 600 years, not only without a king (like Judah) but without the temple worship. Those who believed were gathered by the Apostolic preaching.

The force of the Gospels, and the Apostolic preaching, is that Jesus was born King in David's line (see Mat. 1:1; Luke 1:32-33; Luke 1:68-79), was crucified as “King of the Jews” and ascended to David's throne at his Father's right hand (see Acts 2:30-36).

Peter clearly understands the kingdom of priests & the holy nation of Exo. 19:6 to be the church of believers in Jesus (see 1 Peter 2:9), & not the unbelievers (see 1 Peter 2:7-8). Note that the believers become the prophesied “holy nation.”

Hosea saw the disobedient “not my people” of Israel as people to be gathered as “my people” together with Gentiles (see 1 Peter 1:1; 1 Peter 2:10). The description of Peter's readers in 1 Peter 4:3 is hardly that of children of Israel waiting for the Messiah. Paul uses Hosea to show that the Gentiles (never “my people”) become my people, beloved, children of the living God. (See Rom. 9:22-26) Don't forget that Romans continues to 16 chapters & includes Rom. 15:8-13, showing that Jesus “*confirm(ed) the promises made unto the fathers.*” Isn't that what Gabriel prophesied? “*He shall confirm the covenant ...*”

God's purposes for his people Israel are fulfilled in & by the Lord Jesus Christ. When they come as sinners to Jesus they are welcomed into the full relationship as redeemed children of Abraham & children of God. (See Gal. 3:26-29) But they must repent & come, & “*abide not still in unbelief.*” There is a glorious new covenant in Jesus' blood.

There are 60 generations of Jews who have lived & died in rejection of their Messiah, Jesus. However, during that period countless Jews, beginning with the many thousands recorded in Acts, have believed in their Messiah, Jesus, & been numbered with the strangers & pilgrims rejected by their nation. The church is the continuing children of Israel, children of God. Note that wonderful prophecy of Isaiah 49 (see Isa. 42:6 echoed by Simeon & Paul – Luke 2:29-32; Acts 13:47; Acts 26:23):

Isa. 49:6 – *And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.*

The prophecy of Gabriel was gloriously fulfilled by Jesus within the 70 weeks.

Those who rejected their Messiah could not annul the prophecy – that rejection & its consequences – destruction & desolation - were also according Gabriel's prophecy. (See also Deu. 18:18-19 quoted by Peter in Acts 3:22-26)

The Gospel is still open, & vast numbers of Jews may yet repent & trust in their presently despised & rejected Messiah.

Installment #23 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Why “thy people”? Gabriel the archangel is speaking, so he refers to the people in question as “thy people” . . .

Because, indeed, Gabriel is speaking to Daniel about Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, and because the Lord God Himself had determined that the “*seventy weeks*” would be specifically administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

. . . whereas if the LORD were speaking, he would have said “my people.”

I myself prefer not to presume on what the all-wise Lord God might have said, especially since that is not what actually happened, and was not what actually was said. If the all-wise Lord God had desired to speak directly to Daniel, He certainly could have. Since He chose to send the angel Gabriel, I must believe that this was the wisest course of action in that instance. Furthermore, since the angel Gabriel used the phrase, “*thy people,*” I must believe that “*thy people*” was the exact phrase that the all-wise Lord God instructed and intended for Gabriel to use.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The question of your previous post comes down to:

Is God keeping his promise to Israel as a believing people in the present Gospel age through the redeeming work of the Lord Jesus Christ, or is Israel still waiting to become a godly nation under Jesus as King & David as co-regent?

No, the purpose of my previous posting was as follows:

1. To emphasize the truth that the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 truly is a reference unto Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.
2. To demonstrate that the Lord God’s promise unto Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3 corresponds to the “*thy people*” phrase of Daniel 9:24 through the phrase, “*And I will make of thee a great nation,*” not through the phrase, “*And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*”
3. To demonstrate that it is Biblically legitimate to make reference unto the children of Israel as a national people group, as per the Lord God’s own usage of the term “nation” for them, beginning with the Lord God’s promise in Genesis 12:2 to make out of Abraham’s descendants “*a great nation.*”
4. To express a corrective concerning your statement, “Scripture makes it very clear that God’s blessings are for all the nations of the earth Gen. 22:18, repeated to Isaac Gen. 26:4 & Jacob Gen. 28:14 . . .”

Now, since the remainder of your previous posting is based upon your misunderstanding concerning the primary points of my previous posting, I do not feel any relevant need to engage any further with it. Rather, I believe that we should return our focus to the details of Daniel 9:24-27, since that is the actual purpose for this debate.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ was FINISHED at Calvary, with his death & resurrection, followed by his ascension.

Throughout your postings you continue to emphasize this point. Certainly, it is a worthy Biblical and doctrinal point for emphasis. However, in the context of this debate, it is not greatly needed. There is **NO** disagreement between us concerning this point itself. The disagreement is *not* whether, or not, “the saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ was FINISHED at Calvary, with His death and resurrection, followed by His ascension.” Rather, the disagreement is whether, or not, Daniel 9:24 is speaking concerning this saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ. You say that it is, and I say that it is not. So then, in the context of this debate, it is our respective responsibility to give evidence for our opposing positions.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That was in the middle of week 70, assuming that 70 follows 69.

Yes, making that *human assumption* is necessary for your position. Indeed, this *is* a matter of disagreement between us. We both agree that “week” 70 follows after the first 69 “weeks.” However, you make the *human assumption*, based upon the natural manner of counting, that “week” 70 follows immediately consecutive after the first 69 “weeks,” whereas I would contend that “week” 70 follows after the first 69 “weeks,” but with a gap of time between them, rather than immediately consecutive. Now, if there is nothing in the Biblical revelation of Daniel 9:26-27 to indicate otherwise, then the human assumption of natural counting would certainly be valid. However, if there is something in the Biblical revelation of Daniel 9:26-27 to indicate otherwise, *then the authority of God’s word would cancel any human assumption.*

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Did Jesus then bring in everlasting righteousness? Paul discusses this in great detail in Romans. You are contending that the actual application of those blessings is yet future as it must be absolute, perfectly realised, so that week 70 is totally separated from week 69. That is an assumption imposed by your grammatical interpretation, not a straightforward reading of Scripture.

You continue to place my grammatical analysis in contrast to a straightforward reading. The fact is that if a grammatical analysis is accurate to a given text, then it is *equivalent* to a straightforward reading, simply with a more detailed understanding for the specific ways in which the words and phrases of the text are being used and are modifying other words and phrases in the text. As such, a correct grammatical analysis, by definition, does not assume or impose anything on the given

text. It only reveals what is actually, straightforwardly being stated in the given text. Now, with regard to the debate itself, I am actually the only one of us who has done any significant grammatical analysis of the passage. I have to wonder why that might be? I have to wonder why you yourself do not engage in grammatical analysis?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Did Jesus then bring in everlasting righteousness? Paul discusses this in great detail in Romans

When *Abraham believed in the LORD, & he counted it to him for righteousness*, did Abraham immediately become sinless? No, but he did become righteous. We also become righteous by faith, as Paul explains in Romans 3 & 4. The righteousness we have by faith in Christ is everlasting righteousness. I don't think you will dispute that Jesus at Calvary made *reconciliation for iniquity*, so did he not also *finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins*? Yes! See Rom. 6:22-23; Micah 7:18-20; Isa. 44:22-23; Acts 3:19.

Every believer, both in the OT & the NT, possess everlasting righteousness, because we have the righteousness of faith in Christ. (See Rom. 9:30; Phil. 3:9; Hab. 2:4)

Personal salvation takes place in time, but Jesus' saving work was FINISHED during the 70th week. And many thousands of Israel believed in their Messiah within the 70 weeks.

Concerning “everlasting righteousness.”

Throughout God’s Holy Word we encounter various aspects of “everlasting righteousness,” as follows:

1. Forgiveness & Imputation. Forgiveness is the work of God wherein, at the moment of an individual’s faith in Christ for salvation, God completely forgives that individual’s account of all unrighteousness, such that that individual believer’s account in heaven is eternally without even the smallest speck of unrighteousness. In addition, imputation is the work of God wherein, at the moment of an individual’s faith in Christ for salvation, God records the perfect righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself on that individual’s account, such that that individual believer’s account in heaven is eternally filled with the record of absolutely perfect righteousness. This then provides a *heavenly record* of “everlasting righteousness.” (See Acts 2:38; 10:43; 13:38-39; 26:18; Colossians 1:14; 2:13; Romans 3:21-26; 4:1-25; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Philippians 3:8-9)

2. Justification. Justification is the work of God, based upon His work of forgiveness and imputation, wherein, at the moment of an individual’s faith in Christ for salvation, God judicially declares that individual believer to have a judicial standing before Him as completely without any unrighteousness and as completely possessing perfect righteousness. This then provides a *judicial standing* of “everlasting righteousness.” (See Romans 3:24-31; 4:5, 25; 5:1, 9, 15-21; 8:29-33; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Galatians 2:16; 3:7-11; Titus 3:7)

3. Regeneration. Regeneration is the work of God wherein, at the moment of an individual’s faith in Christ for salvation, God spiritually begets that individual as one of His own dear children, joining that individual believer’s old spirit, which was spiritually dead in trespasses and sins, with Christ spiritually in His crucifixion, so as to remove that old spirit from that individual

believer, and joining that individual believer with Christ spiritually in His resurrection, so as to create a new spirit by the power of God the Holy Spirit within that individual believer, which is created after the likeness of God's own perfect righteousness and true holiness. This then provides a *partial* (spirit) *condition* of "everlasting righteousness. (See John 1:12-13; 3:3-8; 5:24; 2 Corinthians 5:17; Romans 6:3-11; Ephesians 2:1-10; 4:24; Titus 3:5-6; 1 Peter 1:3-5, 23)

4. Glorification. Glorification is the work of God wherein He shall, at the future resurrection, change each individual believer's soul from corruptible to incorruptible and each individual believer's body from mortal to immortality, thereby fashioning each individual believer in spirit, soul, and body after the glorious image of our Lord Jesus Christ. This then provides a *perfect condition* of "everlasting righteousness." (See John 6:39-40; Romans 8:16-23, 29-30; 1 Corinthians 15:42-57; Ephesians 1:13-14; Colossians 3:4; Philippians 3:20-21; 1 Peter 1:3-5; 1 John 3:1-2)

5. Israel's Restoration. Israel's restoration is the work of God wherein He shall save and convert all of the children of Israel by putting a new heart and a new spirit in every one of them, such that He will cause His Law and His fear to be in their hearts, such that He will cause them to obey His Word and His will, and such that He will cause them never to defile themselves or depart from Him again. This then provides a *perfect condition* of "everlasting righteousness" *for the children of Israel.* (See Jeremiah 3:17-29; 31:31-34; 32:37-40; Ezekiel 36:25-28; 37:21-23; Romans 11:26-27)

So then, to which one of these aspects of "everlasting righteousness" does Daniel 9:24 refer when it presents the purpose statement, "*to bring in everlasting righteousness*"?

First, as we seek to answer this question, we can legitimately combine points #1-3 above for this question, since they all occur in the same event, that is – the event of an individual's faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior. Thus we are able to consider three possible options for our question – (1) the event of a believer's salvation, (2) the event of a believer's glorification, (3) the event of Israel's restoration.

Second, in considering the phrase itself from Daniel 9:24, we find that in itself it does not reveal the answer, since it does not include any further modifiers of explanation. Therefore, it becomes necessary for us to consider other matters in the context in order to help discern the answer to our question.

Even so, we take notice that this purpose statement is joined with two other purpose statements that seem to present "the other side of the coin." These are the two phrases, "*to finish the transgression*" and "*to make an end of sins.*" On the one hand, we have transgression and sins being brought to a complete finishing and a complete ending. (Note: By definition the words "finish" and "end" indicate that which is concluded and completed, such that it no longer continues. Thus the explanatory phrases "complete finishing" and "complete ending" are actually grammatical redundancies, which have been purposefully chosen for the sake of emphasis.) On the other hand, we have a condition of "everlasting righteous" being brought into being. So then, of our three possible options, which ones combine a complete finishing and ending of transgression and sins with an ongoing condition of "everlasting righteousness"? Actually, two options allow for this – the event of a believer's glorification and the event of Israel's restoration.

So then, is there any other matter of context that might help us to discern the answer to our question above? Yes, we take notice that the “*seventy weeks*” about which Daniel 9:24 speaks is specifically determined by the Lord God to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Now, since the purpose statements of Daniel 9:24 present the Lord God’s purpose for the “*seventy weeks*,” these purpose statements must be an integral part of the “*seventy weeks*.” Furthermore, since the “*seventy weeks*” are specifically to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, then in this context we should view the purpose statements for those “*seventy weeks*” as also being specifically for Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. So then, of our three possible options, which one combines a complete finishing and ending of transgression and sins with an ongoing condition of “everlasting righteousness” and applies this specifically to the children of Israel? The one and only answer is – the event of Israel’s restoration.

Yet why cannot the event of a believer’s salvation, including forgiveness and imputation, justification, and regeneration, be the aspect of “everlasting righteousness” that is being referenced in Daniel 9:24? The answer is because this aspect of “everlasting righteousness” did need to be brought in since it was already being experienced even in the time of the Old Testament. Forgiveness and imputation as a unit is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of this “everlasting righteousness,” even as the apostle Paul’s use of the Abraham’s example would reveal. Furthermore, justification is an aspect of this “everlasting righteousness;” and Old Testament believers also experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the apostle Paul’s use of Abraham’s example would reveal. Finally, regeneration is also an aspect of this “everlasting righteousness;” and I would contend that Old Testament believers even experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness” (as per the example of Lot in 2 Peter 2:7-9).

(Note: It is likely that Brother Day will discard “the event of Israel’s restoration” as a non-legitimate option for the phrase “everlasting righteousness.” First, it is likely that he will do so by continuing to disregard the truth that the “*seventy weeks*” were determined by the Lord God to be administered *specifically* “*upon*” *Daniel’s people, the children of Israel*. Furthermore, it is likely that he will do so by denying that “the event of Israel’s restoration” has any application unto this present earth, but only an application unto the new earth to come. As such, it is likely that Brother Day will continue to press “the event of a believer’s salvation,” which includes the “everlasting righteousness” aspects of forgiveness and imputation, justification, and regeneration. However, if he does continue to press this, he runs into a “timing” problem of his own.)

Brother Day, you have previously pressed “the event of a believer’s salvation,” including forgiveness and imputation, justification, and even regeneration, as the only legitimate option for the case of “everlasting righteousness” in Daniel 9:24. In so doing, you have presented the apostle Paul’s usage of Abraham as an example for this aspect of “everlasting righteousness.” Indeed, it is Biblically accurate to use the case of Abraham as an Old Testament example for this aspect of “everlasting righteousness.”

Forgiveness and imputation as a unit is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would reveal. Furthermore, justification is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would

reveal. Finally, regeneration is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and you and I would both agree (although some on my side of this debate would not agree with me on this point) that Old Testament believers even experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness.”

Now, since these aspects of “everlasting righteousness” were *already* available and experienced by Old Testament believers thousands of years *before* Daniel, how would they need to be “brought in” hundreds of years after Daniel, as per the phrase, “*to bring in everlasting righteousness*”? The phrase “*to bring in*” indicates something that was not previously present, for there is no need “*to bring in*” something that is already present and is already being experienced. As such, the phrase “*to bring in*” would reveal that the aspects of forgiveness and imputation, justification, and regeneration are specifically *not* the aspects of “everlasting righteousness” about which the phrase in Daniel 9:24 is speaking, since those aspects of “everlasting righteousness” *had already been brought in to be experienced from the very first Old Testament believer onward.*

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

At our Lord Jesus Christ’s exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He experienced a second anointing (as per Psalm 2:2-9; Psalm 45:1-8; Hebrews 1:8-9). According to these passages, it appears that this anointing was for our Lord Jesus Christ’s ministry as King. Even so, Psalm 2:7-9 appears to reveal that this kingship ministry will have its fulfilled application as follows – *“I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.”*

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

When was Psalm 2:7 fulfilled? Paul tells us it was at the resurrection. (See Rom. 1:4) Peter alludes to this in Acts 2:30-32. Peter also applies Psalm 2 to those who crucified the Messiah, both Jewish leaders & Gentiles in his prayer. (See Acts 4:24-31) He is ascended to his heavenly throne as the anointed One. (See Heb. 1:1-14)

Indeed, Psalm 2:7 was fulfilled at our Lord Jesus Christ’s resurrection. In fact, I would contend that Acts 13:32-33 substantiates that even better than the verses which you have presented, as follows:

“And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.”

However, the point of my statements above were not only about Psalm 2:7, but were also about Psalm 2:8-9. In these three verses, a progression of three things is presented, as follows:

1. The day that God the Father “begot” God the Son, which according to Acts 13:32-33 occurred at the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. The day that God the Father gave “*the heathen*” and “*the uttermost parts of the earth*” unto God the Son for His inheritance and possession.
3. The day when God the Son would break the heathen “*with a rod of iron*” and dash the heathen “*in pieces like a potter’s vessel.*”

So then, when was Psalm 2:8-9 fulfilled; or when shall Psalm 2:8-9 yet be fulfilled? It was in answer to this point that I presented Hebrews 10:12-13 & Revelation 19:11-16; 20:1-4.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

However, at our Lord’s exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He did not immediately engage in the administration of His kingship ministry upon and over the whole earth. Rather, according to the teaching of the book of Hebrews, our Lord Jesus Christ is presently engaged in His ministry as High Priest. Indeed, Hebrews 10:12-13 appears to indicate that our Lord Jesus Christ is ***yet waiting*** for the earthly application of His kingship ministry, saying, “*But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

Not at all. Read Heb. 1 before you read Heb. 10. Peter explains what is happening & why there appears to be a slowness to God fulfilling his promises. (See 2 Peter 3:3-9) Note Mat. 28:18-20 – “***ALL power.***”

Hebrews, in Heb. 7:1-3 explains Jesus' status as great high Priest & King in his teaching about Melchisedec who was the only Priest-King in the OT, not only a type of Christ, but Christ himself, ***the LORD, the most high God.*** (See Gen. 14:18-22)

Please understand that I did not at all deny that our Lord Jesus Christ *is* both Priest and King. In fact, I fully acknowledged that He was anointed for His ministry as King at His exaltation to the right hand of God the Father. However, I presented that our Lord Jesus Christ is presently engaged in the administration of His ministry ***as Priest, and not as King.*** Indeed, I presented that our Lord Jesus Christ shall engage in the administration of His ministry as King in the future when the prophetic events of Revelation 19:11-16 & Revelation 20:1-4 are fulfilled; for then He shall rule over the heathen and the whole earth “*with a rod of iron*” (see Revelation 19:15) in fulfillment of Psalm 2:8-9.

Now, let us consider Hebrews 10:12-13 in comparison with Hebrews 1. In Hebrews 10:12-13 we find a number of truths concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, as follows:

1. He “*offered one sacrifice*” (of Himself) “*for sins for ever.*”
2. Then He “*sat down on the right hand of God.*”
3. “*Henceforth*” (that is – from that time forward) He is sitting at God’s right hand “*expecting*” (that is – in a spirit of expectation, of expecting anticipation).
4. He will continue “*henceforth*” in this spirit of “*expecting*” anticipation “*till his enemies be made his footstool.*”

So then, what do we find in Hebrews 1?

Hebrews 1:3 – “*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 . . .*” This corresponds perfectly with point #1 above.

Hebrews 1:3-4 – “. . . *sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.*” This corresponds perfectly with point #2 above.

Hebrews 1:8-9 – “*But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.*” This continues the correspondence with point #2 above, and reveals the truth that at God the Son’s exaltation to the right hand of God the Father, He was anointed for His ministry as King.

Hebrews 1:13a – “*But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand . . .*” This also corresponds perfectly with point #2 above.

Hebrews 1:13b – “. . . *until I make thine enemies thy footstool?*” This corresponds perfectly with points #3-4 above.

So then, by reading Hebrews 1 before reading Hebrews 10:12-13, I find that my understand of Hebrews 10:12-13 is correct and even has a perfect correspondence with Hebrews 1 (which was certainly as I would expect, since God’s Word does not contradict itself).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Your focus on “Israel as a national group” rather than Israel as God’s people is a serious division between us.

Is it also a serious division between you and the Lord God?

Genesis 12:2 – “*And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing.*”

Jeremiah 31:35-37 – “*Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the LORD of hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then **the seed of Israel** also shall cease from being **a nation before me for ever**. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off **all the seed of Israel** for all that they have done, saith the LORD.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The OT prophecies are given in terms of Israel, as descendants of Abraham, through Isaac & Jacob, & the promises to the patriarchs include the nations. (underline and bold added by Pastor Scott Markle)

Actually, as I have presented in a previous posting, the Lord God presented five *different* promise statements with His message unto Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3. To these the Lord God then added a sixth promise statement in Genesis 12:7; and of these six promise statements, *only one of them* is a promise of blessing specifically for all the families and nations of the earth. These promise statements are as follows:

1. “*And I will make of thee a great nation.*” (v. 2) This is a promise only to Abraham and his physical descendants, the children of Israel.
2. “*And I will bless thee, and make thy name great.*” (v. 2) This is a promise only to Abraham himself.
3. “*And thou shalt be a blessing.*” (v. 2) This is a promise only concerning Abraham himself.
4. “*And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.*” (v. 3) This is a promise and a curse specifically concerning how others relate to Abraham and his physical descendants, the children of Israel.
5. “*And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*” (v. 3) ***This is the one and only promise that is specifically for all the families and nations of the earth***, a blessing that is promised in and through Abraham and his physical descendants, the children of Israel.
6. “*Unto thy seed will I give this land.*” (v. 7) This is a promise only to Abraham and his physical descendants, the children of Israel.

So then, why is it that the one who continually claims the principle of a “straightforward reading” as the ground for his position is not actually following the straightforward reading concerning this matter – that “the promises [plural] to the patriarchs include the nations”?

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Certainly, John reveals in 1 John 3:9, under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, that that part of us believers which has been “*born of God*” does not ever engage in the commission of sin. Before an individual’s salvation, that individual’s spirit was spiritually “*dead in trespasses and sins*” (see Ephesians 2:1-3), being completely “*alienated from the life of God*” (see Ephesians 5:18) and from any walk of fellowship with God. However, at the moment of faith in Christ as Savior, that individual’s spiritually dead spirit was crucified with Christ and thereby eradicated (see Romans 6:6). In addition, that individual was raised up with Christ unto “*newness of life*” (see Romans 4),

having his spirit regenerated (spiritually born again) as a new creature in Christ Jesus (see 2 Corinthians 5:15), such that his regenerate spirit is now created after God's own nature in "*righteousness and true holiness*" (see Ephesians 4:24). In this manner, the regenerate spirit of the believer has indeed entered a spiritual condition of "*everlasting righteousness*."

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle

Again you are adding to the Scripture to make your argument. Where in Rom. 6:6 do we read that our (previously) spiritually dead spirit is **eradicated**? The body of sin (aka the flesh) is indeed destroyed but our spirit is regenerated. We have new life freed from sin.

I think that last sentence is actually saying that "the regenerated believer is in the spiritual condition of everlasting righteousness." I hope that means we are in agreement, but again I fear that may not be the case.

I suppose that you can think whatever you want to think about my last statement above. I suppose that you can even change it however you wish to change it. However, you cannot change my last statement above and then put it back into my mouth as if your change is what I said or is what I meant to say. ***I said precisely what I intended*** to say in the statement that I myself made – "In this manner, the ***regenerate spirit*** of the believer has indeed entered a spiritual condition of "*everlasting righteousness*" (not the entire person of the believer, that is – not the soul or body of the believer).

Installment #24 – Brother Ian Day

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.

That is what the prophecy is about, & we agree (I think) that it relates to the saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ in his earthly life; at Calvary; & by his ascension.

We also agree that the 69 weeks bring us to the baptism of the Lord Jesus at the beginning of his ministry. We also agree that all believers possess the righteousness of faith.

That being so, it should be clear on a straightforward reading of Scripture to see the 70th week immediately following the 69th week, relating to the 3 years of Jesus' earthly ministry, & the 3-4 years following Pentecost. You have used a lot of words & arguments to try to refute the straightforward reading, but they are not convincing. In fact you make the prophecy to fail, as vastly more than 70 weeks have passed.

You argue that the prophecy solely relates to national Israel whereas the prophecy is given for Daniel's (thy) people. Nations include people, but only people can respond to the Gospel. Godly prophets & kings (like Samuel, David & Hezekiah) influenced the nation they ruled over, so that national blessings ensued, but many wicked people lived in those times.

Let's relate it to national Israel during that 70th week. Jesus ministered to the people during 3 years or so, teaching, healing, forgiving sin, casting out demons, & generally living a perfect life under the Law. As such he was the surety of the new & better testament/covenant, redeeming his people by his blood. He instituted the communion, or Lord's supper, with the wine representing the blood of the new testament/covenant. He suffered in the midst of the 70th week, rose from the dead, taught his disciples about the kingdom of God, & gave them the commission to be witnesses to all, beginning at Jerusalem.

At Pentecost they witnessed in the power of the Holy Ghost, & 3,000 Jews out of every nation under heaven were converted & baptised in the name of Jesus. A few days later, after a lame man was raised, 5,000 believed. Not long after, when the church had grown to the extent that additional administrators were needed, *“the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.”*

One of those, Stephen, was accosted by the mob, & brought before the council, where he made his defense in the power of the Holy Ghost. After giving them a history lesson he rebuked them & declared them "uncircumcised." So they stoned him. Subsequently Saul was converted. Peter was given a special vision giving him confidence to preach the Gospel to Gentiles, who were saved, & filled with the Holy Ghost, without circumcision; without becoming Jews. God's exclusive dealing with the physical descendants of Abraham was ended - the Gospel was open to all.

We can assume Gabriel & Daniel were familiar with the books of Moses, & particularly the promise of the Messiah:

Deut. 18:18— *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.* ¹⁹ *And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.*

Peter quotes that prophecy in Acts 3:18-26:

¹⁸ *But those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* ¹⁹ *Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;* ²⁰ *and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you:* ²¹ *whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.* ²² ***For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.*** ²³ ***And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.*** ²⁴ *Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.* ²⁵ *Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.* ²⁶ *Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*

The Apostles preached full & free forgiveness in the name of Jesus. Those who heard & believed would indeed be blessed as “*children of ... the covenant.*” Those who would not hear, who rejected the Gospel, would “*be destroyed from among the people.*” Before that generation passed, within 40 years, that prophesied destruction happened.

Now you argue:

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Forgiveness and imputation as a unit is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would reveal. Furthermore, justification is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would reveal. Finally, regeneration is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and you and I would both agree (although some on my side of this debate would not agree with me on this point) that Old Testament believers even experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness.”

Now, since these aspects of “everlasting righteousness” were *already* available and experienced by Old Testament believers thousands of years *before* Daniel, how would they need to be “brought in” hundreds of years after Daniel, as per the phrase, “*to bring in everlasting righteousness*”?

The phrase “*to bring in*” indicates something that was not previously present, for there is no need “*to bring in*” something that is already present and is already being experienced. As such, the phrase “*to bring in*” would reveal that the aspects of forgiveness and imputation, justification, and regeneration are specifically *not* the aspects of “everlasting righteousness” about which the phrase in Daniel 9:24 is speaking, since those aspects of “everlasting righteousness” *had already been brought in to be experienced from the very first Old Testament believer onward*.

Certainly such forgiveness & everlasting righteousness was available & experienced by the OT believers, BUT the basis for that was not established until Jesus completed his saving work. They had examples & shadows of the heavenly things. As we read in Hebrews 11:39-40 – “*And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: ⁴⁰ God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.*”

The 70 weeks prophecy was completed within the 490 years. All that remained was the prophesied destruction, & despite the scoffers, it was God's gracious longsuffering that it did not immediately occur.

2 Peter 3:9 – *The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*

That is a warning to all of us, to make full use of this age of grace. “¹⁰ *But the day of the Lord will come ...*”

And yes, we do look forward to experiencing perfect righteousness:

¹¹ *Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, ¹² looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? ¹³ Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*

Installment #25 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

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.

That is what the prophecy is about, & we agree (I think) that it relates to the saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ in his earthly life; at Calvary; & by his ascension.

I have continually argued throughout this debate that Daniel 9:24 *is not* speaking concerning the event of our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion, resurrection, and exaltation. Furthermore, there is *not one single* reference to our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion, resurrection, or exaltation in the entire portion of my posting that you quoted above. So then, how did you come to the conclusion that we agree on this point? You could only do so *by reading into* my statements something that I did not say, rather than reading out from my statements that which I actually presented.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We also agree that the 69 weeks bring us to the baptism of the Lord Jesus at the beginning of his ministry.

We do agree on this point.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We also agree that all believers possess the righteousness of faith.

We would agree that all believers possess the elements of “*everlasting righteousness*” which I have listed in my previous post as (1) forgiveness and imputation, (2) justification, and (3) regeneration. However, this agreement *does not have any relevancy* to any agreement on our part concerning Daniel 9:24, since I have specifically contended above that these are the very aspects of “*everlasting righteousness*” that *cannot be intended* in the context of Daniel 9:24.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That being so, it should be clear on a straightforward reading of Scripture to see the 70th week immediately following the 69th week, relating to the 3 years of Jesus' earthly ministry, & the 3-4 years following Pentecost.

Since your above listing of “agreements between us” is not accurate, your proposed conclusion is also not so clear.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You have used a lot of words & arguments to try to refute the straightforward reading, but they are not convincing. In fact you make the prophecy to fail, as vastly more than 70 weeks have passed.

Actually, I have not even engaged very much concerning the grammatical and contextual reasons that the 70th “week” (of years) does not follow immediately consecutive to the end of the first 69 “weeks” (of years). These grammatical and contextual reasons are found in Daniel 9:26-27, and I have not yet focused upon these two verses in their details. In fact, I intend to set my focus upon Daniel 9:26 later in this very installment.

However, in order to demonstrate that having a gap of time between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years) is *not* necessarily to cause the prophecy to fail, allow me to present a couple of illustrations.

1. Let us suppose that I declare my determination to pay you \$70. Then let us suppose that I count out sixty-nine \$1 bills to you. Then let us suppose that in one week from today, I count out the last and final \$1 bill to you. Did I fulfill or fail my declared determination to pay you \$70, even though I put a gap of time between my payments? Now, let us also suppose that during the days between my two payments to you, I used various other monies to pay bills and to buy merchandise. Did I then fulfill or fail my declared determination to pay you the \$70? The fact is that I fulfilled my declared determination regardless of the intervening time and regardless of the usage of other monies for other purposes.

2. Let us suppose that I declare my determination to work for you for seven days. Then let us suppose that I engage in working for you for six consecutive days. Yet let us suppose that I then do not work for you for the next six days. Then let us suppose that after this six day break, I then work for you for one day. Did I fulfill or fail my declared determination to work for you for seven days, even though I put a gap of time between the first six days of work and the seventh day of work? Now, let us also suppose that during the time period wherein I did not work for you, I worked for someone else. Did I then fulfill or fail my declared determination to work for you for seven days? The fact is that I fulfilled my declared determination regardless of the intervening time and regardless of my usage of that intervening time.

If the Lord God determined (as He did) to administer 70 “weeks” (of years) upon Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, for a specific set of purposes, and if the Lord God administered the first 69 of those “weeks” (of years), but then placed a gap of time until the administration of the 70th “week” (of years), would He have failed in His declared determination and purpose? He would not, as long as He did not specifically declare that the 70 “weeks” (of years) would be consecutive, and as long as the intervening period of time had no direct relationship to the fulfillment of His declared purposes for the 70 “weeks” (of years) that He had determined.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Forgiveness and imputation as a unit is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would reveal. Furthermore, justification is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and we would both agree that Old Testament believers experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness,” even as the example of Abraham would reveal. Finally, regeneration is indeed an aspect of “everlasting righteousness;” and you and I would both agree (although some on my side of this debate would not agree with me on this point) that Old Testament believers even experienced this aspect of “everlasting righteousness.”

Now, since these aspects of “everlasting righteousness” were *already* available and experienced by Old Testament believers thousands of years *before* Daniel, how would they need to be “brought in” hundreds of years after Daniel, as per the phrase, “*to bring in everlasting righteousness*”? The phrase “*to bring in*” indicates something that was not previously present, for there is no need “*to bring in*” something that is already present and is already being experienced. As such, the phrase “*to bring in*” would reveal that the aspects of forgiveness and imputation, justification, and regeneration are specifically *not* the aspects of “everlasting righteousness” about which the phrase in Daniel 9:24 is speaking, since those aspects of “everlasting righteousness” *had already been brought in to be experienced from the very first Old Testament believer onward*.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

Certainly such forgiveness & everlasting righteousness was available & experienced by the OT believers, BUT the basis for that was not established until Jesus completed his saving work. They had examples & shadows of the heavenly things. As we read in Hebrews 11:39-40 – “*And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: ⁴⁰ God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.*”

By definition the phrase, “*to bring in,*” indicates the bringing in to existence and/or experience something *that was previously not in* such existence and/or experience. Since, as you yourself acknowledge, the elements of “*everlasting righteousness*” that are related to the event of a believer’s salvation (that is – (1) forgiveness and imputation, (2) justification, and (3) regeneration) *were already in* existence and experience thousands of years before the prophetic utterance unto Daniel, then these elements of “*everlasting righteousness*” *had no need to be brought in. They already were in.* Even so, the phrase, “*to bring in everlasting righteousness,*” must then refer to some other element of “*everlasting righteousness*” than these.

Making the argument that “the basis for” these elements of “*everlasting righteousness*” had not yet occurred in history until our Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion, resurrection, and exaltation is not really relevant, since Daniel 9:24 *does not* use the phrase, “*to bring in the basis for everlasting righteousness.*” Rather, Daniel 9:24 uses the phrase, “*to bring in everlasting righteousness,*” which is a grammatical reference to the bringing of the “*everlasting righteousness*” *itself*.

Concerning Daniel 9:26

Grammatically, this verse presents four independent statements (clauses), as follows:

1. “*And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”
2. “*And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.*”
3. “*And the end thereof shall be with a flood.*”
4. “*And unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*”

Concerning the first of these independent clauses, we are agreed that it refers to and was fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion, “*not for himself,*” but the salvation of us sinners. Concerning the second of these independent clauses, we are agreed that it refers to and was fulfilled in 70 AD with the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the armies of Rome. Concerning the third of these independent clauses, we are agreed that it refers to and was fulfilled in the “overwhelming armies” of Rome (acknowledging that the word “flood” is a common figure of speech in the Old Testament Scriptures for a multitude of people) that were sent against the children of Israel at that time. Concerning the fourth of these independent clauses, we are agreed that it refers to the “*desolations*” that the Lord God has “*determined*” to administer against the children of Israel throughout and unto the end of the war (conflict) between Rome and the children of Israel.

(Note: The word “war” in this context simply refers to a matter of conflict between two opposing parties. It may refer to a single battle. It may refer to a war with an established beginning and ending. It may also refer to an ongoing conflict over a lengthy period of time that may include periods of intensity and periods of inactivity. I myself believe that the conflict between Rome, both in its “iron” form as an empire and in its “iron and clay mixed” form as a religious force, and the children of Israel has not ceased unto this very day. As such, I myself also believe that the “*desolations*” which the Lord God “*determined*” to administer against the children of Israel are still in force unto this day. However, this is not a point over which I care to make any specific argument one way or the other.)

Now, concerning “*the prince that shall come,*” there are four characteristics that we can discern from this verse about him, as follows:

1. He shall be a “*prince,*” that is – a political leader of some kind.
2. He shall be characterized by “*coming,*” whether this means coming into existence or coming specifically to Jerusalem is not specified. (Note: I myself believe that this is a reference to his coming unto Jerusalem and the children of Israel.)
3. His “*coming*” would be in the future to Daniel’s time.
4. This “*prince*” will have a direct relationship to Rome (the “*people*” who would destroy Jerusalem and the temple). Herein we should note that the verse does not state that this prince would be personally responsible in any way for that destruction. Rather, it only indicates that this prince would be “*of*” (that is – would have some form of relationship with) the people who would destroy Jerusalem and the temple.

Concerning the revealed time elements in Daniel 9:26, we find only one at the beginning of the verse – “*And after threescore and two weeks . . .*” Now, this 62 “weeks” of years is that which concludes the first 69 “weeks” of years of the “*seventy weeks*” that the Lord God “*determined*” to administer “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Therefore, this time element at the beginning of Daniel 9:24 clearly indicates that all of the events that are prophesied in this verse will occur after the first 69 “weeks” of years are completed. However, this verse does not make any direct reference at all to the 70th and final “week” of years. This verse does not specifically indicate whether the prophesied events of this verse are all to be contained within that 70th “week” of years, whether they are to occur after the 70th “week” of years, whether they are to occur through and beyond that 70th “week” of years, or whether they are to occur in a period of time between the end of the 69th “week” of years and the beginning of the 70th “week” of years. Again, this verse states nothing whatsoever at all concerning the 70th “week” of years.

On the other hand, Daniel 9:27 does make specific reference unto the 70th and final “week” of years. In fact, Daniel 9:27 makes specific reference to the beginning of that “week” of years, to the middle of that “week” of years, and to the “*consummation*” (or, end) of that “week” of years. So then, if we consider the Holy Spirit inspired layout of Daniel 9:24-27, we find the following:

(v. 24) 70 “weeks” of years are determined upon Daniel’s people, the children of Israel

(v. 25) The first 69 “weeks” of years, from the decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah

+ (v. 26) --- After the first 69 “weeks” of years, but no reference to the 70th “week” of years ---

+ (v. 27) The beginning, middle, and end of the 70th “week” of years

Or, to put this equation in an easier format:

(v. 24) 70 “weeks” = (v. 25) 69 “weeks” + (v. 26) ---no “weeks”--- + (v. 27) 1 “week,” the 70th

So then, by the Holy Spirit inspired layout of this passage, we find a gap in the layout between the end of the 69th “week” of years and the beginning of the 70th “week” of years. This “gap” is revealed through the Holy Spirit inspired and arranged “betweenness” of the timing in the passage – in that God the Holy Spirit arranged for the first 69 “weeks” to be directly mentioned in Daniel 9:25, in that God the Holy Spirit arranged for the 70th and final week to be directly mention in Daniel 9:27, and in that God the Holy Spirit arranged for Daniel 9:26 and all of its prophesied events to be *between* the two. Even so, upon the divine authority of God the Holy Spirit, we should accept that “gap” in the layout just as the Holy Spirit inspired it and should expect this prophetic utterance to be fulfilled in exactly the same manner as it was presented under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, with the “gap” included.

Installment #26 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

However, in order to demonstrate that having a gap of time between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years) is *not* necessarily to cause the prophecy to fail, allow me to present a couple of illustrations.

1. Let us suppose that I declare my determination to pay you \$70. Then let us suppose that I count out sixty-nine \$1 bills to you. Then let us suppose that in one week from today, I count out the last and final \$1 bill to you. Did I fulfill or fail my declared determination to pay you \$70, even though I put a gap of time between my payments? Now, let us also suppose that during the days between my two payments to you, I used various other monies to pay bills and to buy merchandise. Did I then fulfill or fail my declared determination to pay you the \$70? The fact is that I fulfilled my declared determination regardless of the intervening time and regardless of the usage of other monies for other purposes.

2. Let us suppose that I declare my determination to work for you for seven days. Then let us suppose that I engage in working for you for six consecutive days. Yet let us suppose that I then do not work for you for the next six days. Then let us suppose that after this six day break, I then work for you for one day. Did I fulfill or fail my declared determination to work for you for seven days, even though I put a gap of time between the first six days of work and the seventh day of work? Now, let us also suppose that during the time period wherein I did not work for you, I worked for someone else. Did I then fulfill or fail my declared determination to work for you for seven days? The fact is that I fulfilled my declared determination regardless of the intervening time and regardless of my usage of that intervening time.

If the Lord God determined (as He did) to administer 70 “weeks” (of years) upon Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, for a specific set of purposes, and if the Lord God administered the first 69 of those “weeks” (of years), but then placed a gap of time until the administration of the 70th “week” (of years), would He have failed in His declared determination and purpose? He would not, as long as He did not specifically declare that the 70 “weeks” (of years) would be consecutive, and as long as the intervening period of time had no direct relationship to the fulfillment of His declared purposes for the 70 “weeks” (of years) that He had determined.

You are working hard to falsify the promises of God.

OK. You promise to pay me £70, & pay me £69 - Then you say, "I'll pay the £1 to your Great 70x grandson." You die in debt, with your promise broken.

You promise to build me a house - we agree it will take 70 weeks. After 69 weeks all is ready for the final week's work, so I can take possession. Then you tell me, "Yes, there is only one more week before I finish, but I've got a contract to build for someone else, so I am leaving your building indefinitely. That final week could be many years away."

That is not how God keeps his promises.

Installment #27 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You are working hard to falsify the promises of God.

Actually, no effort at all has been put forth with any intention whatsoever “to falsify the promises of God.” Rather, some effort was put forth in order to illustrate a single point, the point being that a “gap” of time between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years) would not cause the failure and the falsifying of our Lord God’s prophetic utterance in Daniel 9:24-27. Furthermore, a great deal of effort has been put forth throughout the entirety of this discussion-debate in order to demonstrate the inaccuracies of *your position* concerning the details of Daniel 9:24-27.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

OK. You promise to pay me £70, & pay me £69 - Then you say, "I'll pay the £1 to your Great 70x grandson. You die in debt, with your promise broken.

Except that the Lord God of heaven and earth, God the Father, does not die; therefore, He can never “die in debt with a promise broken.”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You promise to build me a house - we agree it will take 70 weeks. After 69 weeks all is ready for the final week's work, so I can take possession. Then you tell me, "Yes, there is only one more week before I finish, but I've got a contract to build for someone else, so I am leaving your building indefinitely. That final week could be many years away."

Except that the Lord God did not wait until after the 69th “week” was completed before He gave report concerning the “gap” in time between the end of the 69th “week” and the beginning of the 70th “week.” Actually, He gave this report even before the entire process of the 70 “weeks” began.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That is not how God keeps his promises.

How does the Lord God keep His promises? He keeps them *precisely* according to the details with which He gave them. Now, (as I stated with the conclusion of my previous installment) since God the Holy Spirit through inspiration arranged for a gap in the layout between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years), I myself expect this prophetic utterance to be fulfilled precisely in the same manner as it was presented under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, with the “gap” included.

Concerning Daniel 9:27

Grammatically, this verse presents four independent statements (clauses), as follows:

1. *“And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.”*
2. *“And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.”*
3. *“And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.”*
4. *“And that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”*

The first of these independent statements makes a specific reference to *“one week.”* In this context this would be a reference unto the 70th and final *“week”* of years of the 70 *“weeks”* of years that the Lord God had determined to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Even so, this verse begins with a statement concerning the initiation of that final *“week”* of years by indicating that some specific *“he”* will *“confirm”* some specific (*“the”*) *“covenant”* with a group of *“many”* for a time period of *“one week”* (or, 7 years). Within the context of this prophetic utterance concerning that which the Lord God had determined to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, it would appear that the *“many”* of this statement are a group of *“many”* from among the children of Israel.

The second independent statement of this verse then begins with the phrase, *“and in the midst of the week.”* This phrase indicates that this statement concerns the middle point of that *“one week”* period (the 3.5 year point of the 70th and final *“week”*). As such, this statement reveals that the same specific *“he”* of the first independent statement will *“cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.”* Again within the context of this prophetic utterance concerning that which the Lord God had determine to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s holy city, the city of Jerusalem, it would appear that this statement is referring to *“the sacrifice and the oblation”* of the temple in Jerusalem, which will be caused *“to cease”* occurring by this specific *“he.”*

The third independent statement of this verse indicates that this same specific *“he,”* at this middle point of this *“one week”* (the 3.5 year point of the 70th and final *“week”*), will *“make it desolate.”* Yet again within the context of this prophetic utterance, it would appear that the *“it”* which is made *“desolate”* is the temple in Jerusalem and its sacrificial system (as well as, possibly, the city of Jerusalem and Israelite inhabitants of Jerusalem). Furthermore, this statement indicates that this specific *“he”* will bring about this desolation *“for”* the purpose of *“the overspreading of abominations,”* that is – for the purpose of abundantly spreading abominations in and upon the temple in Jerusalem. Finally, this statement indicates that this specific *“he”* will maintain this *“overspreading of abominations”* and this desolation *“even until the consummation,”* that is – until the *“consummation”* (or, completion) of the *“one week”* period (the 70th and final *“week”* of years), which will also be the *“consummation”* (or, completion) for the entire *“seventy weeks”* of years.

The fourth and final independent statement of this verse indicates that those desolations which were *“determined”* as per the concluding statement of Daniel 9:26 will be *“poured upon the desolate.”* Yet again within the context of this prophetic utterance, it would appear that *“the desolate”* upon which these will be poured out are the children of Israel. Even so, we are able to observe that Daniel 9:27 presents details concerning the beginning, the middle, and the conclusion of the 70th and final *“week”* of years.

However, this general overview of the verse does raise a number of questions concerning certain details, as follows:

1. To whom does the pronoun “*he*” make reference?

Grammatically and contextually, there are two possible antecedents for the pronoun “*he*” in Daniel 9:27. The first of these is “*the Messiah the Prince.*” The second is “*the prince that shall come.*” Three times throughout the context of Daniel 9:24-26 the Messiah is referenced, and each time He is referenced with an exalted title, as follows: (1) “*the Most Holy*” in verse 24, (2) “*the Messiah the Prince*” in verse 25, and (3) “*Messiah*” in verse 26. Considering that such exalted titles are used for Him in every one of these prior cases, it seems out of contextual character then to reference Him in verse 27 simply with the pronoun “*he*” for all three uses. Furthermore, when the pronoun “*he*” could have been used for the Messiah in verse 26 without any ambiguity from the context of verse 25 (since the other “*he*,” “*the prince that shall come*,” had not even been mentioned yet in the context), still the exalted title “*Messiah*” was employed. As such, this seems to emphasize the characteristic of this context to reference the Messiah only with exalted terminology.

On the other hand, by referring to “*the prince that shall come*” with such a more general and less exalted phrasing, it would fit the character of the context quite well then to reference him in verse 27 with the simple pronoun “*he*.” Furthermore, it is a common principle of communication (although not a universal principle) to arrange the antecedent for a pronoun as the closest possibility, which “*the prince that shall come*” would be in the contextual flow of thought from verse 26 unto verse 27. As such, the grammatical and contextual evidence seems to point unto “*the prince that shall come*” as the correct antecedent for the pronoun “*he*” in Daniel 9:27, rather than “*the Messiah the Prince.*”

Even so, I would contend that the “*he*” of Daniel 9:27 refers to some political leader of the Roman kingdom (within the context of its “*iron and clay mixed*” form as a religious force – see Daniel 2:40-43) who “*shall come*” unto Jerusalem and “*shall confirm*” some specific “*covenant*” with some group of “*many*” from among the children of Israel. Furthermore, I would contend that this “*prince*” from the Roman kingdom “*shall confirm*” this specific “*covenant*” only and specifically for a period of “*one week*” (that is – for a period of 7 years), even as the modifying prepositional phrase, “*for one week*,” directly indicates. Finally, I would contend that this confirming of this specific “*covenant*” will initiate the beginning of the 70th and final “*week*” of years of the “*seventy weeks*” that the Lord God “*determined*” to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.

2. What is the meaning of the phrase “*shall confirm*” in this context?

The verb “*to confirm*” indicates the strengthening of something that had previously been or become weak and/or ineffective. In relation to a covenant, the verb “*to confirm*” indicates the affirming, or establishing, or engaging of a covenant that was or had become previously weak and/or ineffective. As such, the phrase “*shall confirm*” in this context seems to imply a specific covenant that had previously existed, but that had also previously become ineffective.

3. To what specific covenant does the phrase “*the covenant*” make reference?

Indeed, the use of the definite article “*the*” in the phrase “*the covenant*” indicates that this “*covenant*” is some definitely specific covenant. However, no further description is given in Daniel 9:27 concerning this “*covenant*,” or even in the full context of Daniel 9:24-27, by which to specifically define this “*covenant*.” Therefore, we must consider the broader context of the entire chapter of Daniel 9 and of the entire book of Daniel. In so doing, we find one other reference to a covenant with the definite article “*the*” in Daniel 9, that is – in Daniel 9:4. Furthermore, we find five other references to a covenant with the definite article “*the*” in Daniel 11, that is – in Daniel 11:22, 28, 30 (twice), 32.

In Daniel 9:4 Daniel indicated that the Lord God was keeping (in the present tense of Daniel’s time) “*the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments.*” So then, what “*the covenant*” was the Lord God keeping with His people at that present time? It would seem most likely that Daniel was referring to the covenant that the Lord God had made with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai during Moses’ time. This understanding would be supported when we consider the similarity in terminology, as per Moses’ declaration unto the children of Israel in Deuteronomy 7:12-13, saying, “*Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the LORD thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: and he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee.*”

Furthermore, this understanding would be supported when we consider Daniel’s own reference unto “*the law of Moses*” in Daniel 9:11-13, saying, “*Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the LORD our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.*”

Finally, within their individual contexts every one of the five references to “*the covenant*” or “*the holy covenant*” in Daniel 11 also appears to be a reference unto the covenant that the Lord God had made with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai.

So then, in what way will the “*he*” of Daniel 9:27 “*confirm*” the Lord God’s covenant with the children of Israel that He had made with them at Mount Sinai? In order to answer this question, it might be of value to consider the opposite behavior as presented in Daniel 11:30-31. Therein we learn of a foreign ruler who would “*have indignation against the holy covenant*,” which he would demonstrate by polluting “*the sanctuary of strength*” (that is – the temple in Jerusalem) and by taking away “*the daily sacrifice*” from being engaged. Even so, if having indignation against “*the holy covenant*” is to pollute the temple and to take away the sacrificial system from the temple, then it would seem reasonable to conclude that confirming “*the covenant*” would be to support the temple and the engagement of the sacrificial system in the temple.

Even so, I would contend that some political leader of the Roman kingdom (within the context of its “iron and clay mixed” form as a religious force – see Daniel 2:40-43) “shall come” unto Jerusalem and “shall confirm the covenant with many” among the children of Israel for “one week” (that is – for a seven year period), such that there shall be an agreement that those “many” among the children of Israel will be permitted to engage in the sacrificial system of the temple for that period of time.

4. What does it mean that this “he” will “cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease”?

The second independent statement of Daniel 9:27 states, “And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.” This statement clearly indicates that this event will occur “in the midst of the week,” that is – at the 3.5 year point of the 7 years for which “the covenant” had originally been confirmed. What then will this “he” do at this time? He personally “shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.” He will cause the sacrificial system of the temple in Jerusalem to cease being engaged. He will no longer permit sacrifices and oblations to continue. Now, if it is correct that the confirming of “the covenant” would be an agreement to permit the engagement of the sacrificial system in the temple, then this act would be a direct violation of the agreement in that confirming of “the covenant.”

5. What does it mean that this “he” shall “make it desolate”?

The third independent statement (clause) of Daniel 9:27 states, “And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.” Having caused the sacrificial system of the temple to cease at the 3.5 year point of the 7 years, the “he” of this verse will make something to be “desolate.” In a context concerning the confirming of “the covenant” of the sacrificial system in the temple at Jerusalem and concerning the cessation of that sacrificial system, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the temple in Jerusalem and its sacrificial system, at the least, is that which is “made desolate.” It is even possible that this work of desolation by the “he” of the verse will also encompass the city of Jerusalem and the Israelite inhabitants of Jerusalem. Furthermore, this work of desolation by this “he” will occur “for the overspreading of abominations,” that is – for the purpose of abundantly spreading abominations in and upon the temple in Jerusalem. Finally, this work of desolation by this “he” will continue “even until the consummation,” that is – until the completion of the seven year (“one week”) period, which will also be the completion for the entire 70 “week” period.

Installment #28 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Actually, no effort at all has been put forth with any intention whatsoever “to falsify the promises of God.” Rather, some effort was put forth in order to illustrate a single point, the point being that a “gap” of time between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years) would not cause the failure and the falsifying of our Lord God’s prophetic utterance in Daniel 9:24-27. Furthermore, a great deal of effort has been put forth throughout the entirety of this discussion-debate in order to demonstrate the inaccuracies of *your position* concerning the details of Daniel 9:24-27.

I'll modify my response **in bold** to your previous illustrations, to allow for your response to my response.

OK. You promise to pay me £70, & pay me £69 - Then you say, "I'll pay the £1 to your Great 70x grandson. ~~You die in debt, with your promise broken.~~ **I & my heirs for many generations die without receiving the promise.**

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Except that the Lord God of heaven and earth, God the Father, does not die; therefore, He can never “die in debt with a promise broken.”

God cannot die, but he can tell the time, & he does know the times & seasons. If an interval between promise/warning & fulfilment is intended, he indicates it. See Gen. 6:3 (120 years); Gen. 15:13-21 (400 years); Deu. 18:18-19 (indefinite future); Jonah 3:4 (40 days).

There is no such warning in Dan. 9 – Gabriel gives him the information that seventy weeks are determined Daniel's people can expect the fulfilment of the prophecy in 490 years – within 7 years from the baptismal anointing of Messiah the Prince.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You promise to build me a house - we agree it will take 70 weeks. After 69 weeks all is ready for the final week's work, so I can take possession. Then you tell me, "Yes, there is only one more week before I finish, but I've got a contract to build for someone else, so I am leaving your building indefinitely. That final week could be many years away."

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

Except that the Lord God did not wait until after the 69th “week” was completed before He gave report concerning the “gap” in time between the end of the 69th “week” and the beginning of the 70th “week.” Actually, He gave this report even before the entire process of the 70 “weeks” began.

You are reading a “gap” between weeks 69 & 70 into the passage. A gap of 350 weeks & counting makes nonsense of the actual duration of the prophecy - 70 weeks, 490 years – that God reveals.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

That is not how God keeps his promises.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

How does the Lord God keep His promises? He keeps them *precisely* according to the details with which He gave them. Now, (as I stated with the conclusion of my previous posting) since God the Holy Spirit through inspiration arranged for a gap in the layout between the end of the 69th “week” (of years) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (of years), I myself expect this prophetic utterance to be fulfilled precisely in the same manner as it was presented under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, with the “gap” included.

Yes & No. He keeps them according to his eternal purposes that were progressively revealed until Christ himself was revealed to the nation, the people for whom the promises were made. Abraham had his son Isaac according to the promise, but it was 400 years before his descendants became a great nation, & nearly another hundred before they could say: “... *ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the LORD your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof.*” Josh. 23:14 – but read on. Whatever happened thereafter, God had kept his promise to Abraham concerning the nation & the land. Daniel acknowledges God's covenant-keeping in Dan. 9:4, & Israel's failure in Dan. 9:5-6

There was a spiritual, eternal aspect to those promises, given in conditional covenant terms in Exo. 19:4-6 & Exo. 24:3-8 because, sadly, their obedience would fail, so God made provision for that failure, first by ordaining sacrificial worship & then by promising the Messiah & a new covenant.

If we consider the inspired record in the Gospels & Acts for the 7 years following the baptism of Christ (week 70), we can see how the 70 weeks prophecy was completed in the prophesied time.

Your analysis of the 70 weeks prophecy is seriously lacking in your failure to relate the prophecy to its fulfilment as recorded in the NT – the New Covenant Scriptures.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning Daniel 9:27

Grammatically, this verse presents four independent statements (clauses), as follows:

1. *“And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.”*
2. *“And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.”*
3. *“And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.”*
4. *“And that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”*

The first of these independent statements makes a specific reference to *“one week.”* In this context this would be a reference unto the 70th and final *“week”* of years of the 70 *“weeks”* of years that the Lord God had determined to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.

There we fully agree.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Even so, this verse begins with a statement concerning the initiation of that final *“week”* of years by indicating that some specific *“he”* will *“confirm”* some specific (*“the”*) *“covenant”* with a group of *“many”* for a time period of *“one week”* (or, 7 years). Within the context of this prophetic utterance concerning that which the Lord God had determined to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, it would appear that the *“many”* of this statement are a group of *“many”* from among the children of Israel.

The second independent statement of this verse then begins with the phrase, *“and in the midst of the week.”* This phrase indicates that this statement concerns the middle point of that *“one week”* period (the 3.5 year point of the 70th and final *“week”*). As such, this statement reveals that the same specific *“he”* of the first independent statement will *“cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.”* Again within the context of this prophetic utterance concerning that which the Lord God had determine to administer *“upon”* Daniel’s holy city, the city of Jerusalem, it would appear that this statement is referring to *“the sacrifice and the oblation”* of the temple in Jerusalem, which will be caused *“to cease”* occurring by this specific *“he.”*

The third independent statement of this verse indicates that this same specific *“he,”* at this middle point of this *“one week”* (the 3.5 year point of the 70th and final *“week”*), will *“make it desolate.”* Yet again within the context of this prophetic utterance, it would appear that the *“it”* which is made *“desolate”* is the temple in Jerusalem and its sacrificial system (as well as, possibly, the city of Jerusalem and Israelite inhabitants of Jerusalem). Furthermore, this statement indicates that this specific *“he”* will bring about this desolation *“for”* the purpose of *“the overspreading of abominations,”* that is – for the purpose of abundantly spreading abominations in and upon the temple in Jerusalem. Finally, this statement indicates that this specific *“he”* will maintain this *“overspreading of abominations”* and this desolation *“even until the consummation,”* that is – until

the “*consummation*” (or, completion) of the “*one week*” period (the 70th and final “week” of years), which will also be the “*consummation*” (or, completion) for the entire “*seventy weeks*” of years.

The fourth and final independent statement of this verse indicates that those desolations which were “*determined*” as per the concluding statement of Daniel 9:26 will be “*poured upon the desolate.*” Yet again within the context of this prophetic utterance, it would appear that “*the desolate*” upon which these will be poured out are the children of Israel. Even so, we are able to observe that Daniel 9:27 presents details concerning the beginning, the middle, and the conclusion of the 70th and final “week” of years.

However, this general overview of the verse does raise a number of questions concerning certain details, as follows:

1. To whom does the pronoun “*he*” make reference?

Grammatically and contextually, there are two possible antecedents for the pronoun “*he*” in Daniel 9:27. The first of these is “*the Messiah the Prince.*” The second is “*the prince that shall come.*”

When we consider the whole prophecy it is evident that God is answering Daniel's prayer for God's rebellious people by the 70 weeks prophecy by sending Messiah to deal with Israel's transgression, sins & iniquity, & bring in everlasting righteousness. That was accomplished at Calvary.

Thus when Gabriel says, “he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week,” we should expect the “he” to be the one who is fulfilling the prophecies & promises made to Israel, i.e. The Messiah. Israel certainly needs God himself to fulfil the Covenant promises he made to Abraham, the Patriarchs & Moses, because Israel has failed. Moreover, if the city & sanctuary that were to be rebuilt unto Messiah the Prince, why should they be so completely destroyed? (v. 26) After all, God has made the old covenant promises, & promised a new covenant. God's eternal plans did not require an earthly city & sanctuary. (See John 4)

The old covenant promises required Israel's obedience, so they failed. How could THE covenant be confirmed? Only by the one who made it becoming obedient under the covenant.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

2. What is the meaning of the phrase “*shall confirm*” in this context?

The verb “to confirm” indicates the strengthening of something that had previously been or become weak and/or ineffective. In relation to a covenant, the verb “to confirm” indicates the affirming, or establishing, or engaging of a covenant that was or had become previously weak and/or ineffective. As such, the phrase “*shall confirm*” in this context seems to imply a specific covenant that had previously existed, but that had also previously become ineffective.

God had made many covenant promises both conditional & everlasting. All were summed by the wonderful relationship: “You will be my people, I will be your God.” The conditional covenant promises depended on Israel's obedience. The everlasting Covenants depended on God being

faithful to his promises, but how could disobedient & unfaithful Israel benefit from those everlasting covenant promises? Only by God himself – as the Messiah entering that covenant from Israel's position, born under the covenant, living a life of perfect obedience under the covenant, yet suffering for the breaking of the covenant by those he was surety for. (See Heb. 7:22)

As Jesus said at the last supper: “26 *And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. 27 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; 28 **for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.***” (Mat. 26:26-28)

The old covenant was confirmed by the blood of animals. (See Exodus 24) The new covenant is confirmed by the blood of Jesus, shed at Calvary for many. As Paul wrote in Romans 15:8 – “*Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:*”

That was at the mid point of the 70th week.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

3. To what specific covenant does the phrase “*the covenant*” make reference?

I've answered that.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

4. What does it mean that this “*he*” will “*cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease*”?

The purpose of the sacrifices & oblations under the old covenant was a covering for sin, but by its repetition, was evidently ineffective. “11 *And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: 12 but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; 13 from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. 14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. 15 Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, 16 This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; 17 and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. 18 Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.*” (Heb. 10:11-18)

That is confirmation of the covenant. The repair of the temple veil, & resumption of sacrifices was in direct defiance of Messiah & his saving sacrifice. The fact that sacrifices continued for 40 years only adds to the guilt of those who rejected their Messiah & rejected the Gospel in the blood of Jesus preached in Jesus' name by the Apostles. The sacrifices became “abominations.” See Isaiah 1.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

5. What does it mean that this “he” shall “make it desolate”?

Jesus cleansed the temple twice. (See John 2:13-21 & Mat. 21:12-13) There were instructions concerning leprosy in a house (see Lev. 14:33-ff) – Cleanse it once, destroy it the second time. There would be no third time.

Jesus' prophecies of the AD 70 destruction of Jerusalem & the temple are in view.

*Mat. 23:37-38 – “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! **38 Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.**”*

*Mat. 24:1-2 – “And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to shew him the buildings of the temple. **2** And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.”*

Gabriel is not actually saying that the desolation will take place at the end of the 70th week. The abominations will continue until the consummation, while the covenant would be confirmed with the Jews during the final week before being opened to the Gentiles. Many received the preaching of John, & followed Jesus. Jesus thus confirmed the covenant promises both in his ministry & by his Apostles preaching at Pentecost & beyond. Many thousands of Jews, including priests, believed & were baptised, but sadly the Jewish leaders rejected both Jesus & the Gospel of salvation. They persisted in trying to keep a law that condemned them, & offering sacrifices that could NEVER take away sin. The Apostles were imprisoned & beaten, Stephen was stoned, & so the unbelieving Jews were declared “uncircumcised.” For them the covenant was utterly broken. Desolation & destruction followed. Happily, even those who condemned Stephen included at least one who welcomed the Gospel.

In Acts 3, after a undeniable miracle, Peter reminded his hearers of the dreadful consequences of rejecting the promised one. (See Deu. 18:18-19; Acts 3:22-23) He also reminds them of the scope of the first covenant with Abraham, taking in “*all the kindreds of the earth.*”

Notice Acts 3:24 – Peter is counting in “all the prophets” foretelling “these days” so Daniel is not relegated to some future dispensation.

I'll end with a further quotation from Acts 3:24-26

***24** Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. **25** Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. **26** Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*

Installment from External Discussion #1 – Brother Ian Day

Surely in any other context you would understand "the covenant" as referring to God's covenant relationship with his people Israel. Confirming the covenant would be the work of God, not an enemy of Israel. See the prophecy of Zechariah in Luke 1:68-79.

Installment from External Discussion #2 – Pastor Scott Markle

No, in no context would I assume that the phrase "the covenant" was "referring to God's covenant relationship with His people Israel" simply because the word "covenant" was employed. Rather, I would study the grammatical and contextual flow of thought of the given passage in order to discern (1) what specific covenant was being referenced in that given context, (2) who specifically was the one making the covenant in that given context, (3) with whom he or she was making the covenant in that given context, etc. Furthermore, if a form of the word "confirm" was used in that given context in relation to the covenant of that given context, I would study the grammatical and contextual flow of thought of that given context in order to discern who specifically was doing the confirming and in what way he or she was doing that confirming.

You see, in your above comment you reveal that you have a preconceived assumption when you approach the phrase "the covenant" (which has affected your understanding of Daniel 9:24-27).

Installment #29 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

God cannot die, but he can tell the time, & he does know the times & seasons. If an interval between promise/warning & fulfilment is intended, he indicates it. See Gen. 6:3 (120 years); Gen. 15:13-21 (400 years); Deu. 18:18-19 (indefinite future); Jonah 3:4 (40 days).

Yes, when an interval of time is intended, the Lord God reveals that through His Word; and He did just that through the Holy Spirit inspired layout of Daniel 9:25-27, which reveals the details concerning the “*seventy weeks*” (of years) that are announced in Daniel 9:24.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

There is no such warning in Dan. 9 – Gabriel gives him the information that seventy weeks are determined Daniel's people can expect the fulfilment of the prophecy in 490 years – within 7 years from the baptismal anointing of Messiah the Prince.

Except that the Lord God actually did provide information concerning a “gap” of time. Yes, Daniel 9:24 does announce the promise of “seventy week” (of years). Yet Daniel 9:25-27 reveals further details concerning that promise of “seventy weeks” (of years); and through the Holy Spirit inspired layout of those details, a “gap” of time was revealed.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Except that the Lord God did not wait until after the 69th “week” was completed before He gave report concerning the “gap” in time between the end of the 69th “week” and the beginning of the 70th “week.” Actually, He gave this report even before the entire process of the 70 “weeks” began.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

You are reading a “gap” between weeks 69 & 70 into the passage. A gap of 350 weeks & counting makes nonsense of the actual duration of the prophecy - 70 weeks, 490 years – that God reveals.

No, I am not reading a “gap” of time *into* the passage. Rather, I am reading a “gap” of time **directly out of** the Holy Spirit inspired layout of the details of the 70 “weeks” (of years), as presented in Daniel 9:25-27. Again, I present that layout just as God the Holy Spirit inspired it, as follows:

1. Daniel 9:24 – The “seventy weeks” (of years) are announced.
2. Daniel 9:25 – Details concerning the entire first 69 “weeks” are revealed.
3. Daniel 9:26 – Events that follow “after” the first 69 “weeks,” but with no mention whatsoever at all concerning the 70th and final “week.”
4. Daniel 9:27 – Details concerning the beginning, middle, and end of the 70th and final “week.”

Or, to put this equation in an easier format:

(v. 24) 70 “weeks” = (v. 25) 69 “weeks” + (v. 26) --no “weeks”-- + (v. 27) 1 “week,” the 70th

Since verse 25 specifies the first 69 “weeks” and verse 27 specifies the 70th “week,” and since verse 26 is located directly *between* these two specifications, I am reading *directly out of* the Holy Spirit inspired layout of the passage and of the promised 70 “weeks” a “gap” *between* verse 25 and verse 27 (that is – verse 26 and its events), and thus a “gap” in time *between* the end of the 69th “week” (which is specified in verse 25) and the beginning of the 70th “week” (which is specified at the beginning of verse 27).

Therefore, as I have stated in a previous posting, so say I now again – I myself did not arrange for that gap in the layout. God the Holy Spirit arranged for that gap in the layout. However, I myself intend to accept that gap in the layout just as God the Holy Spirit inspired it; and I myself also expect this prophetic utterance to be fulfilled in exactly the same manner as it was presented under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, with the “gap” included.

Concerning the grammatical and contextual usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of each and every independent statement (clause) in Daniel 9:26-27.

As we consider the sequence of the independent statements in Daniel 9:25-27, we observe the following:

1. *“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.”*
2. *“The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.”*
3. *“**And** after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.”*
4. *“**And** the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.”*
5. *“**And** the end thereof shall be with a flood.”*
6. *“**And** unto the end of the war desolations are determined.”*
7. *“**And** he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.”*
8. *“**And** in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.”*
9. *“**And** for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.”*
10. *“**And** that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”*

When considering the two independent statements of Daniel 9:25, we notice that the coordinating conjunction “and” is not employed before either statement. Furthermore, we recognize that the second statement of this verse does not present an event that would occur sequentially after the event of the first statement. Rather, the event of the second statement of this verse would occur as an event within the time period of the first statement.

On the other hand, the first independent statement of Daniel 9:26 does begin with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Furthermore, in accord with the phrase “*after threescore and two weeks,*” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the events of verse 25. Again, the second independent statement of Daniel 9:26 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Again, through the historical record, we understand that the event of this statement occurred sequentially after the event of the statement before it. Yet again, the third independent statement of Daniel 9:26 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Yet again, by the reference to “*the end*” of the destruction of “*the city and the sanctuary,*” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the event of the statement before it. And yet again, the fourth independent statement of Daniel 9:26 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” And yet again, by the reference to “*the end of the war,*” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the event of the statement before it.

Now, the first independent statement of Daniel 9:27 also begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Yet we shall save our consideration of the sequential or non-sequential nature of this statement until the end, since it is the matter of controversy. Again, the second independent statement of Daniel 9:27 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Again, since this statement makes reference to the middle of the 70th “week,” whereas the statement before it made reference to the beginning of the 70th “week,” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the event of the statement before it. Yet again, the third independent statement of Daniel 9:27 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” Yet again, since this statement makes reference to that which will occur from the middle of the 70th “week” until the “*consummation*” of the 70th “week,” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the event of the statement before it. And yet again, the fourth independent statement of Daniel 9:27 begins with the coordinating conjunction “and.” And yet again, since this statement makes reference to the complete fulfillment of that judgment which was previously “*determined,*” we understand that the event of this statement would occur sequentially after the event of the statement before it.

So then, what about the first independent statement of Daniel 9:27? Well, what is the lay out of that which we understand thus far? It is as follows:

1. “*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.*”
2. “*The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.*”
3. “**And** [sequential after statement #2] *after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”

4. “**And** [sequential after statement #3] *the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.*”
5. “**And** [sequential after statement #4] *the end thereof shall be with a flood.*”
6. “**And** [sequential after statement #5] *unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*”
7. “**And** [????????????????????] *he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.*”
8. “**And** [sequential after statement #7] *in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*”
9. “**And** [sequential after statement #8] *for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.*”
10. “**And** [sequential after statement #9] *that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.*”

Certainly, it must be recognized that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does not automatically indicate that that given statement must be sequential to the statement before it. However, in the contextual flow of thought of Daniel 9:25-27, every other usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does seem to signal grammatically and contextually that that statement is sequential to the statement before it. Even so, it only seems reasonable within this particular context to recognize that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of the independent statement (clause) with which Daniel 9:27 begins also signals that that statement is sequential to the statement before it (which is the statement with which Daniel 9:26 ends). As such, we find further grammatical and contextual evidence that the events of Daniel 9:26 are to occur within a “gap” of time *between* the events of verse 25 (wherein the 69th “week” of years ends) and the events of verse 27 (with which the 70th “week” of years both begins and ends).

Installment #30 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Certainly, it must be recognized that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does not automatically indicate that that given statement must be sequential to the statement before it. However, in the contextual flow of thought of Daniel 9:25-27, every other usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does seem to signal grammatically and contextually that that statement is sequential to the statement before it. Even so, it only seems reasonable within this particular context to recognize that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of the independent statement (clause) with which Daniel 9:27 begins also signals that that statement is sequential to the statement before it (which is the statement with which Daniel 9:26 ends). As such, we find further grammatical and contextual evidence that the events of Daniel 9:26 are to occur within a “gap” of time *between* the events of verse 25 (wherein the 69th “week” of years ends) and the events of verse 27 (with which the 70th “week” of years both begins and ends).

“And” does not imply a sequence of events, but normally refers to related events which may be sequential or concurrent.

For an example of the uses of "and" note the sequence of “ands” in Mark 10:32-36 - beginning with a new paragraph -

***32 And** they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; **and** Jesus went before them: **and** they were amazed; **and** as they followed, they were afraid. **And** he took again the twelve, **and** began to tell them what things should happen unto him, **33** Saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; **and** the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, **and** unto the scribes; **and** they shall condemn him to death, **and** shall deliver him to the Gentiles: **34 And** they shall mock him, **and** shall scourge him, **and** shall spit upon him, **and** shall kill him: **and** the third day he shall rise again. **35 And** James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. **36 And** he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?*

I'm not sure that the Holy Spirit follows the same rules of grammar that you & I were taught. My school was founded in 1553, 58 years before the KJV was completed. I would have been in trouble for all those “ands” especially beginning paragraphs & sentences with “and.” Some are concurrent, some sequential, &, in v. 35, “and” bears no relation to what Jesus has been saying.

Now we can consider the “ands” in Daniel 9.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning the grammatical and contextual usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of each and every independent statement (clause) in Daniel 9:26-27.

As we consider the sequence of the independent statements in Daniel 9:25-27, we observe the following:

1. “*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.*” (bold added by Brother Ian Day)
2. “*The street shall be built again, **and** the wall, even in troublous times.*” (bold added by Brother Ian Day)
3. “***And** after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”
4. “***And** the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.*”
5. “***And** the end thereof shall be with a flood.*”
6. “***And** unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*”
7. “***And** he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.*”
8. “***And** in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*”
9. “***And** for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.*”
10. “***And** that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.*”

1. The first two 'ands' imply concurrency, while the third 'and' events are sequential.
2. The 'and' events are concurrent.
3. 'And' is redundant, beginning a paragraph. v. 26 is surprising, as the expectation from v. 24 is that all Israel's problems will be solved by the coming of Messiah. Instead, Messiah is cut off, & the city & sanctuary destroyed as the direct consequence of that cutting off.
4. The end is the consequence of the cutting off of Messiah. It's not explained in the passage, but Jesus makes it very clear in his teaching about the consequences for the generation that rejected him. Moses in Deut. 18:18-19 and Peter in Acts 3:22-23 warned them also.
5. The destruction of city & sanctuary are the end after invasion like a 'flood'
6. With war & desolations determined until the end.

7. The 'and' begins a new thought, back to the 70th week, immediately following the 69th, and Messiah's saving work, confirming the covenant with those many who receive him during his earthly ministry & by the Gospel preached by the Apostles. Note specifically Acts 3:24-26 & Rom. 15:8.
8. The final covenant sacrifice will be made, securing the new covenant/testament in Jesus' blood. All the old covenant sacrifices & oblations were finished at Calvary, according to Jesus' last triumphant shout.
9. Continued sacrifices in defiance of Christ became abominations, as the prophets had warned. (e.g. Isaiah 1; Micah 6; Pro. 15:8; Luke 16:15-16)
10. The end of city & sanctuary – as No. 4.

Gap? There is no inspired gap, unless you think Scofield was inspired. God, by Gabriel, prophesies 70 weeks (or 490 years) and that prophecy is readily understood by the events recorded in Scripture.

Jesus taught the blessings he came to bring in his sermon on the mount, as he fulfilled the Law & Prophets (see Mat. 5:17-18), but prophesied the destruction in Mat. 21:33-46; Mat. 22:1-7; Mat. 24:2.

The big problem with your interpretation is the change of emphasis from Messiah to antichrist, leaving Daniel's people with only destruction & desolation ahead of them, rather than becoming “*the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers.*”

I'll let Zacharias have the last word from Luke 1:67-79:

67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 68 Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, 69 And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; 70 As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71 That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72 To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; 73 The oath which he swore to our father Abraham, 74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, 75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. 76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; 77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, 78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, 79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Installment #31 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Certainly, it must be recognized that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does not automatically indicate that that given statement must be sequential to the statement before it. However, in the contextual flow of thought of Daniel 9:25-27, every other usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does seem to signal grammatically and contextually that that statement is sequential to the statement before it. Even so, it only seems reasonable within this particular context to recognize that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of the independent statement (clause) with which Daniel 9:27 begins also signals that that statement is sequential to the statement before it (which is the statement with which Daniel 9:26 ends). As such, we find further grammatical and contextual evidence that the events of Daniel 9:26 are to occur within a “gap” of time *between* the events of verse 25 (wherein the 69th “week” of years ends) and the events of verse 27 (with which the 70th “week” of years both begins and ends).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

“And” does not imply a sequence of events, but normally refers to related events which may be sequential or concurrent.

You are correct that the coordinating conjunction “and” does not automatically indicate sequence of events, which I myself acknowledged in the opening statement of my above quote. Indeed, as a coordinating conjunction, the conjunction “and” indicates a coordinating relationship between two or more grammatical elements in communication. This coordinating relationship may be intended to communicate something “sequential or concurrent” (even as you yourself presented in your above quotation). So then, how do we know in any given case whether the coordinating conjunction is intended to communicate a sequential idea or a concurrent idea? We discern this through a consideration of the context (which is the very reason that I put forth so much effort in my above installment to engage the contextual flow of thought in Daniel 9:25-27 and the contextual usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of each and every independent statement in Daniel 9:26-27).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I’m not sure that the Holy Spirit follows the same rules of grammar that you & I were taught. My school was founded in 1553, 58 years before the KJV was completed. I would have been in trouble for all those “ands” especially beginning paragraphs & sentences with “and.” Some are concurrent, some sequential, &, in v. 35, “and” bears no relation to what Jesus has been saying.

It is true that the rules of English grammar forbid the use of common conjunctions at the beginning of sentences in formal writing. However, the language in which God the Holy Spirit inspired the Holy Scriptures was not English. Rather, the original languages of Holy Spirit inspiration were Hebrew (for the Old Testament) and Greek (for the New Testament). Now, in both Hebrew and Greek it is grammatically acceptable and common to use a common conjunction at the beginning

of sentences. Even so, out of reverence for Holy Spirit inspiration and for the sake of translational accuracy, the translators of the King James translation included these conjunctions at the beginning of sentences (and even paragraphs) in their translation.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (with additions by Brother Ian Day)

Concerning the grammatical and contextual usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” **at the beginning of** each and every independent statement (clause) in Daniel 9:26-27. (emboldening, underlining, and italics added by Pastor Scott Markle)

As we consider the sequence of the independent statements in Daniel 9:25-27, we observe the following:

1. *“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.”* (bold added by Brother Ian Day)
2. *“The street shall be built again, **and** the wall, even in troublous times.”* (bold added by Brother Ian Day)

The three uses of the conjunction “and” that you emphasized in addition to those that I emphasized in my original installment are not actually relevant to the matter under discussion. In fact, in my original posting I specifically stated that my analysis concerned “the coordinating conjunction ‘and’ **at the beginning of** each and every independent statement (clause) in Daniel 9:26-27.” The reason for narrowing our focus only upon these usages of the coordinating conjunction at the beginning of each independent statement (clause) is because only these usages can reveal the coordinating relationship between the independent statements (clauses) with each other. All of the other usages of the coordinating conjunction “and” in Daniel 9:25-27 (of which there are a total of eight) indicate the grammatical coordination between subjects, verbs, verbals, direct objects, and adjectives, but not the grammatical coordination between the independent statements (clauses) with each other. As such, a consideration of these additional usages of the coordinating conjunction “and” are not at all relevant to discern whether or not the independent statements (clauses) are sequential to one another.

So then, with this understanding in mind, let us return to our consideration of the coordinating conjunction “and” **at the beginning of** the independent statements (clauses) in Daniel 9:25-27. That consideration is as follows (even as I presented it in my original posting on the matter):

1. *“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.”*
2. *“The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.”*

3. “**And** [sequential after statement #2] *after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”
4. “**And** [sequential after statement #3] *the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.*”
5. “**And** [sequential after statement #4] *the end thereof shall be with a flood.*”
6. “**And** [sequential after statement #5] *unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*”
7. “**And** [????????????????????] *he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.*”
8. “**And** [sequential after statement #7] *in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*”
9. “**And** [sequential after statement #8] *for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.*”
10. “**And** [sequential after statement #9] *that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.*”

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

1. “*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.*”
2. “*The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

1. The first two 'ands' imply concurrency, while the third 'and' events are sequential.
2. The 'and' events are concurrent.

As I have indicated above, these usages of the coordinating conjunction “and” are not relevant to the matter under discussion because they are not at the beginning of an independent statement..

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

3. “**And** [sequential after statement #2] *after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

3. 'And' is redundant, beginning a paragraph. v. 26 is surprising, as the expectation from v. 24 is that all Israel's problems will be solved by the coming of Messiah. Instead, Messiah is cut off, & the city & sanctuary destroyed as the direct consequence of that cutting off.

The coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of the opening independent statement (clause) in Daniel 9:26 is not at all “redundant” because that statement *does not actually* begin a new paragraph. Daniel 9:24-27 is a singular paragraph that covers a singular matter, that is – the “*seventy weeks*” that the Lord God determined to administer upon Daniel’s people, the children of Israel. Yet even if Daniel 9:26 did begin a new paragraph, the coordinating conjunction at the beginning of that paragraph would not be grammatically redundant (as if God the Holy Spirit inspired redundancy simply for the sake of redundancy). Rather, that usage of the coordinating conjunction would help to reveal the coordinating relationship between the new paragraph and the paragraph that preceded it. Even so, whether this statement is simply an extension of the paragraph or is the beginning of a new paragraph, since the coordinating conjunction “and” *at the beginning of* this statement is joined with *the sequential* prepositional phrase, “*after threescore and two weeks,*” this usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” is clearly intended to signal the sequential relationship between this statement and the statement (or even paragraph) before it.

(Note: The idea that some words in God’s Holy Word are redundant simply for the sake of redundancy is foolish and somewhat offensive in relation to the truth of Holy Spirit inspiration. Every single word that God the Holy Spirit inspired in God’s Holy Word is absolutely pure and is significantly important. As such, I would challenge all to develop a greater respect for every single word that God the Holy Spirit inspired and for the grammatical structuring of those words in each sentence that God the Holy Spirit inspired in each given context.)

Furthermore, Daniel 9:26 is not at all surprising in relation to the declaration of Daniel 9:24, since Daniel 9:24 revealed the six-fold results that would come to pass *at the conclusion* of the “seventy weeks,” whereas Daniel 9:26 is revealing events that will occur *prior to the conclusion* of the “seventy weeks.” As such, the revelation of Daniel 9:24-26 concerning the Messiah (according to the three specific references to the Messiah) would be chronologically presented as follows:

1. Messiah would come – “*unto the Messiah the Prince*” (at the end of the first 69 “weeks”)
2. Messiah would be cut off – “*And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off.*” (after the end of the first 69 “weeks”)
3. Messiah would be anointed – “*and to anoint the most Holy*” (at the end of the 70 “weeks”)

Yes, to those who had no grasp concerning the suffering and death of the Messiah, the truth that the Messiah will be cut off at all would be surprising. However, the ordering of these events concerning the Messiah is not surprising, since these events do not conclude with the cutting off of the Messiah, but with the anointing of the Messiah.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

4. “**And** [sequential after statement #3] *the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

4. The end is the consequence of the cutting off of Messiah. It's not explained in the passage, but Jesus makes it very clear in his teaching about the consequences for the generation that rejected him. Moses in Deut. 18:18-19 and Peter in Acts 3:22-23 warned them also.

First, God the Holy Spirit in His work of inspiration did not include the word “end” anywhere in this statement. Rather, God the Holy Spirit in His work of inspiration indicated that there would be a destroying, that “*the people of the prince that shall come*” would do the destroying, and that “*the city and the sanctuary*” would be that which is destroyed. Furthermore, since (as you have indicated) the New Testament reveals that this destruction upon the city and temple of Jerusalem would be the consequence of the Israelites rejection of the Messiah, the coordinating conjunction “and” *at the beginning of* this statement must also signal a sequential relationship between this statement and the one before it; for *a consequence by definition is sequential to the cause.*

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

5. “**And** [sequential after statement #4] *the end thereof shall be with a flood.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

5. The destruction of city & sanctuary are the end after invasion like a 'flood'

Herein you have made two grammatical changes to that which God the Holy Spirit inspired. First, in your explanation you made the word “end” a grammatical predicate nominative; whereas God the Holy Spirit inspired the word “end” to be the grammatical subject of the statement. As such, it is **not** that “the destruction of city & sanctuary” would **be** “the end.” Rather, it is that **the end of the city and the sanctuary** would be **with** a certain means. Second, in your explanation above you employed the preposition “after” in relation to the “flood,” which is a preposition that indicates sequence of time; whereas God the Holy Spirit inspired the preposition “with” in relation to the “flood,” which is a preposition that indicates a tool of means. As such, it is **not** that the end of the city and the sanctuary would come “**after** invasion like a ‘flood’.” Rather, it is that the end of the city and the sanctuary would come “**with**” (this is – by the means of) an invasion like the overflowing of a “flood.” Nevertheless, this Holy Spirit inspired statement concerns the **end** of the city and the sanctuary, which is sequential to the statement before it. Thus the coordinating conjunction “and” *at the beginning of* this statement again signals a sequential relationship between this statement and the one before it.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

6. “**And** [sequential after statement #5] *unto the end of the war desolations are determined.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

6. with war & desolations determined until the end.

Again herein you have made two grammatical changes to that which God the Holy Spirit inspired. First, in your explanation you made the word “desolations” a part of a compound object of a preposition; whereas God the Holy Spirit inspired the word “desolations” to be the grammatical subject of the sentence. As such, it is not “with war & desolations determined.” Rather, it is “*desolations are determined.*” Second, in your explanation you change the Holy Spirit inspired prepositional phrase, “*of the war,*” to the prepositional phrase, “with war & desolations.” As such, you have changed the possessive preposition “*of*” to the relational preposition “with;” you have changed the object of the preposition “*war*” to the compound object of the preposition “war & desolations;” and you have removed the prepositional phrase, “*of the war,*” from being a modifier for the noun “*end.*” To your explanation I might ask the question – Until the end of what is war and desolation determine? To which question your explanation would provide no answer. However, to the Holy Spirit inspired statement I might ask the question – Unto the end of what are desolations determined? To which question the Holy Spirit inspired statement would provide the answer – “*Unto the end of the war.*”

(Note: Whenever an individual changes the grammatical structure that God the Holy Spirit inspired in any given statement of God’s Holy Word, that individual changes the meaning from that which God the Holy Spirit communicated to some other meaning. Such changing of the meaning from that which God the Holy Spirit communicated by inspiration *is not* right dividing of God’s Word of truth. Again, I would challenge all to develop a greater respect for every single word that God the Holy Spirit inspired and for the grammatical structuring of those words in each sentence that God the Holy Spirit inspired in each given context.)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

7. “**And** [????????????????????] *he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

7. The 'and' begins a new thought, back to the 70th week, immediately following the 69th, and Messiah's saving work, confirming the covenant with those many who receive him during his earthly ministry & by the Gospel preached by the Apostles. Note specifically Acts 3:24-26 & Rom. 15:8

Now, in my above presentation of this statement from Daniel 9:27, I included the “[????????]” in order to signal my recognition (as I indicated in my above installment) that this usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” *at the beginning of* this independent statement (clause) in this context would be the one of controversy. In considering the intended usage for this controversial conjunction “and,” we must again ask the question -- How do we discern the intended usage for

the coordinating conjunction “and” in any given case? Again we recognize the answer – We do so through a consideration of the immediate context. Even so, in my above posting I presented the following contextual consideration:

Certainly, it must be recognized that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does not automatically indicate that that given statement must be sequential to the statement before it. However, in the contextual flow of thought of Daniel 9:25-27, every other usage of the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of an independent statement (clause) does seem to signal grammatically and contextually that that statement is sequential to the statement before it. Even so, it only seems reasonable within this particular context to recognize that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of the independent statement (clause) with which Daniel 9:27 begins also signals that that statement is sequential to the statement before it (which is the statement with which Daniel 9:26 ends). As such, we find further grammatical and contextual evidence that the events of Daniel 9:26 are to occur within a “gap” of time *between* the events of verse 25 (wherein the 69th “week” of years ends) and the events of verse 27 (with which the 70th “week” of years both begins and ends).

Even so, I am contending that this usage for the coordinating conjunction “and” *at the beginning of this independent statement (clause)* is intended to be sequential. However, in your explanation above you are contending something different, as per your opening declaration, “The 'and' begins a new thought.” So then, what contextual evidence do you provide for this authoritative declaration? Actually, you provide no contextual evidence whatsoever at all – unless you intended the following statement to be that evidence, “back to the 70th week, immediately following the 69th.” However, this statement in itself has contextual problems. First, God the Holy Spirit nowhere in this context inspired the phrase, “immediately following the 69th week,” or even anything similar to that phrase. Therefore, the source for that “evidence” cannot be the Holy Spirit inspired context, but can only be your personally assumed position. Second, concerning the phrase, “back to the 70th week,” we understand that by definition in order to go “back to” something, we had to have been there previously and had to have departed from it, in order that we might now return “back to” it. However, God the Holy Spirit nowhere in the previous context made any direct reference whatsoever at all to the 70th “week.” Therefore, by definition it is not possible for us to return “back to” it. Again this point of “evidence” is found to be rooted, not in the Holy Spirit inspired context, but in your personally assumed position.

No, there is no contextual evidence from the Holy Spirit inspired context of Daniel 9:24-27 that the coordinating conjunction “and” at the beginning of this statement that begins verse 27 is intended to signal the beginning of a new flow of thought or even to return us back to a previous flow of thought. Rather, the contextual evidence from the Holy Spirit inspired context simply indicates a sequence of events from the beginning of Daniel 9:26 to the end of Daniel 9:27.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

8. “**And** [sequential after statement #7] *in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

8. The final covenant sacrifice will be been made, securing the new covenant/testament in Jesus' blood. All the old covenant sacrifices & oblations were finished at Calvary, according to Jesus' last triumphant shout.

This Holy Spirit inspired statement in Daniel 9:27 **does not** say **anything** about “the final **covenant** sacrifice.” In fact, **the word “covenant” is not employed anywhere** in this Holy Spirit inspired statement. As such, this Holy Spirit inspired statement also **does not** say anything about “securing **the new covenant**/testament in Jesus’ blood.”

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

9. “**And** [sequential after statement #8] *for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

9. Continued sacrifices in defiance of Christ became abominations, as the prophets had warned. (e.g. Isaiah 1, Micah 6, Pro. 15:8 Luke 16:15-16)

This Holy Spirit inspired statement in Daniel 9:27 **does not** say **anything** about the continuance of sacrifices being an abomination. In fact, **the word “sacrifice(s)” is not employed anywhere** in this Holy Spirit inspired statement. Furthermore, I did research on every reference to the word “abomination(s)” in the New Testament (of which there are only six); and I was unable to find a single reference that defined sacrifices of any kind as being an abomination. So then, let us consider the reference to the Old Testament prophets that you presented as evidence for your assertion. In their immediate context, both Isaiah in Isaiah 1 and Micah in Micah 6 were speaking against the sacrificial practices of the children of Israel in their day, which in both cases was hundreds of years before the sacrificial death of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross. Thus these references also provide no evidence whatsoever at all that sacrifices continuing after Christ’s crucifixion were an abomination. Finally, although Proverbs 15:8 does define certain sacrifices as being an abomination, it does not make any reference to sacrifices continuing after Christ’s crucifixion. Rather, this verse teaches that the heart-character of the one making the sacrifice determines the acceptance or abomination of that sacrifice. Religious conduct, even when it is commanded conduct (which would have been the case when Solomon wrote Proverbs 15:8), is not acceptable unless it is motivated by righteous character. Such has always been true and shall always be true in relation to the Lord our God.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

10. “**And** [sequential after statement #9] *that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

10. The end of city & sanctuary – as No. 4.

This Holy Spirit inspired statement in Daniel 9:27 **does not** say **anything** about the end of the city and sanctuary. In fact, **both the words “city” and “sanctuary” are not employed anywhere** in this Holy Spirit inspired statement. Furthermore, the phrase “*that determined*” in this Holy Spirit inspired statement would refer back to the concluding statement of Daniel 9:26, as per the phrase therein, “*desolations are determined*” (which would be point #6 in our study, not point #4). Finally, that concluding statement of Daniel 9:26 (point #6 in our study) does not refer to the end of the city and the sanctuary, but refers to “*the end of the war.*”

Brother Day, throughout this immediate discussion above, your inaccuracies both grammatical and contextual to that which God the Holy Spirit actually inspired seem to abound in number. Such inaccuracies place a great deal of doubt upon your credibility as an accurate Bible student.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Gap? There is no inspired gap, unless you think Scofield was inspired. God, by Gabriel, prophesies 70 weeks (or 490 years) and that prophecy is readily understood by the events recorded in Scripture.

Scofield??? Have I made any reference to Scofield anywhere throughout this debate, or even throughout any of my presentations in any of the external discussions? Have I even once employed Scofield as a point of evidence for that which I have presented and contended? NO!!! I have not. Every point that I have made, I have supported with actual evidence from the Holy Spirit inspired grammar and context.

Concerning your question of the “gap,” I will repeat myself yet again – **God the Holy Spirit Himself** inspired this passage to place all of Daniel 9:26 **as a gap between** the end of Daniel 9:25 wherein we find the end of the 69th “week” and the beginning of Daniel 9:27 wherein we find the beginning of the 70th “week.” I myself did not arrange for that gap in the layout. **God the Holy Spirit** arranged for that gap in the layout. However, I myself intend to accept that gap in the layout **just as God the Holy Spirit inspired it**; and I myself also expect this prophetic utterance to be fulfilled in exactly the same manner as it was presented **under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit**, with the “gap” included.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The big problem with your interpretation is the change of emphasis from Messiah to antichrist, leaving Daniel's people with only destruction & desolation ahead of them, rather than becoming the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers.

This assessment of my position reveals your misunderstanding of my position. My position does not change the emphasis "from Messiah to antichrist." Rather, my position acknowledges the work that both the Messiah and the antichrist will perform, as revealed by this Holy Spirit inspired passage. Furthermore, my position does not end the 70th "week" with the antichrist in power and with Daniel's people, the children of Israel, in destruction and desolation. Rather, my position ends the 70th "week" with the fulfillment of the six-fold purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24, wherein all of the children of Israel who are alive at that time shall place heart-faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior and shall be saved (in unity with Romans 11:25-27), wherein all of the children of Israel who are alive at that time shall experience such a transformation of heart that they will never again commit transgression or sins, but shall conduct themselves in perfect righteousness with the Lord (in unity with Isaiah 1:26; Jeremiah 3:17; 31:33; 32:39-40; Ezekiel 36:26-27; 37:23-24), wherein all of the children of Israel that are alive at that time shall be fully reconciled unto the Lord their God as a nation and shall enter into an enjoyment of all the New Covenant promises in every detail, including all of the land blessings (in unity with Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28), and wherein the Lord Jesus Christ shall administrate His kingship ministry bodily upon the earth from Jerusalem as King of kings and Lord of lords over the all the nations of the world (in unity with Revelation 19:11 – 20:4). It does not at all appear to me that my position concludes and climaxes with an emphasis upon the antichrist. Rather, it appears to me that my position concludes and climaxes with an emphasis upon the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I'll let Zacharias have the last word from Luke 1:67-79:

*67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 68 Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, 69 And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; 70 As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71 **That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72 To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; 73 The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, 74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, 75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. 76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; 77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, 78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, 79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.***

So then, at the time of the Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, did the Lord God fulfill His holy covenant concerning the children of Israel, which He made with Abraham, such that they were delivered out of the hand of their enemies and all that hated them? Are the children of Israel now serving the Lord their God "*without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,*" all the days of their lives? It appears to me that we must still be looking to the future for the fulfillment of these New Covenant promises unto the children of Israel as a national people group (as per Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28).

A response from an external discussion:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

For an example of the uses of "and" note the sequence of "ands" in Mark 10:32-36 - beginning with a new paragraph -

*32 **And** they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; **and** Jesus went before them: **and** they were amazed; **and** as they followed, they were afraid. **And** he took again the twelve, **and** began to tell them what things should happen unto him, **33** Saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; **and** the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, **and** unto the scribes; **and** they shall condemn him to death, **and** shall deliver him to the Gentiles: **34** **And** they shall mock him, **and** shall scourge him, **and** shall spit upon him, **and** shall kill him: **and** the third day he shall rise again. **35** **And** James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. **36** **And** he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?*

Viewing this passage by a listing of the individual independent statements (clauses) in Mark 10:32-36, we find the following:

1. **And** [sequential after the previous paragraph] they were in the way going up to Jerusalem;
2. **And** [sequential after statement #2] Jesus went before them:
3. **And** [sequential after statement #3] they were amazed;
4. **And** [sequential after statement #4] as they followed, they were afraid.
5. **And** [sequential after statement #5] he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him, saying,
6. Behold, we go up to Jerusalem;
7. **And** [sequential after statement #6, within Jesus' report] the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes;

8. **And** [sequential after statement #7, within Jesus' report] they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles:
9. **And** [sequential after statement #8, within Jesus' report] they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him:
10. **And** [sequential after statement #9, within Jesus' report] the third day he shall rise again.
11. **And** [sequential after statement #5 and the previous paragraph] James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire.
12. **And** [sequential after statement #11] he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?

According to the earlier context of Mark 10:17, the Lord Jesus began a journey (apparently, as per Mark 10:32, unto Jerusalem), but was stopped by the one whom we call "the rich young ruler." Then Jesus engaged in a conversation with this "rich young ruler." (See Mark 10:17-22) Following that, Jesus engaged in a conversation with his disciples about the rich entering into the kingdom of God. (See Mark 10:23-27) Following that, Jesus answered a question that Peter presented unto Him. (See Mark 10:28-31) Following that, Jesus reengaged his journey unto Jerusalem; therefore, the conjunction "and" at the beginning of the sentence that begins the new paragraph (at the beginning of Mark 10:32) signals a sequential progression from the events of the paragraph before it.

The next independent statement (clause) of Mark 10:32 then indicates that as the Lord Jesus and the disciples began the journey, Jesus walked more vigorously out ahead of the disciples. Thus the conjunction "and" at the beginning of this independent statement signals a sequential progression in the events. The next independent statement (clause) of Mark 10:32 then indicates that in response to the Lord's more vigorous walking out ahead of them, the disciples began to be "amazed." Thus the conjunction "and" at the beginning of this independent statement also signals a sequential progression in the events. The next independent statement (clause) of Mark 10:32 then indicates that as the disciples continued to follow after the Lord's vigorous travel pace, they transitioned from being "amazed" to being "afraid." Thus the conjunction "and" at the beginning of this independent statement also signals a sequential progression in the events. The next independent statement (clause) of Mark 10:32 then indicates that the Lord responded to the disciples fear by stopping to present a revelation concerning what was about to "happen unto Him." (See also Matthew 20:17) Thus the conjunction "and" at the beginning of this independent statement also signals a sequential progression in the events.

In Mark 10:33-34 we then find the Biblical record of our Lord Jesus' revelation and report unto the disciple, presented grammatical as a quotation of the Lord. The first independent statement (clause) of this quotation does not begin with the conjunction "and," but with the verb "behold." However, every other independent statement (clause) of our Lord's quoted revelation and report does begin with the conjunction "and" (#7-10 on our listing above of the individual independent statements). Furthermore, for each of these four independent statements (clauses) of our Lord's quoted revelation and report, the conjunction "and" at the beginning of the statement (clause) signals a sequential progression concerning the events that the Lord was revealing and reporting.

Then Mark 10:35 begins a new paragraph, wherein James and John seek to ask a favor of the Lord for themselves. Thus the conjunction “and” at the beginning of the first independent statement (clause) of this new paragraph, as presented in Mark 10:35, signals a sequential progression from the events of the previous paragraph. Mark 10:36 then records that after James and John made their request for a favor, the Lord asked them concerning what favor they would desire Him to do for them. Thus the conjunction “and” at the beginning of this independent statement (clause) of Mark 10:36 also signals a sequential progression in the events.

In fact, throughout this passage every time that the coordinating conjunction “and” is found at the beginning of an independent statement (clause), it actually signals a *sequential progression* in the events. Even so, whereas Brother Day sought to provide this example as an argument against my understanding for the use of the conjunction “and” at the beginning of the independent statements (clauses) in Daniel 9:26-27, this example actually supports my position, rather than opposes it.

Installment #32 – Brother Ian Day

Just to refresh our memories:

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.

Bro Scott, Your extreme grammatical analysis makes it difficult to appreciate what you are actually trying to say.

You complain about me rearranging the words of Scripture, but we need to understand what the Scripture is saying before we interpret. Interpreting is seeking to understand & explain the Scripture, so needs additional words or in this case, emphasis of the actual words. The Scripture is saying "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city..." However many words you write, you cannot change that statement. Seventy weeks (of years) corresponding to the seventy years of exile just being completed. Inserting a gap of thousands of years or hundreds of "weeks" denies the actual words of the prophecy.

I have repeatedly referred to the teaching of Jesus & his Apostles, & the fulfilment of the 70 weeks prophecy as recorded in Scripture, ending about 3 years after Calvary. By contrast, you have insisted on staying in the OT, quoting the land prophecies & promises. We have the inspired record of the fulfilment of the prophecy in the NT Scriptures, so should study the related NT Scriptures.

We should look at verse 24 being fulfilled by the saving work of the Lord Jesus. Obviously he considered he had finished the work the Father had given him. (See John 17:4; John 19:30)

He explained to his disciples:

Luke 24:25-26 – "Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: 26 Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"

Luke 24:44 – *“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.”*

As Gabriel prophesied:

Dan. 9:24 – *“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.”*

Those 70 weeks contrast with the 70 years of exile, the people would be in their homeland for seven times the period of the exile, & by the end of that period Messiah would have come & completed his prophesied saving work.

I can't think why you want to deny the simple words of Scripture with your elaborate scheme of distant future interpretation. You deny quoting Scofield, (I agree you haven't referred to him) but you cannot deny his influence on the line of interpretation you follow. His one-volume commentary influenced fundamentalist thinking in the Bible colleges & helped popularise dispensationalism in the last century.

As we agree that week 69 brings us to the baptism of Jesus & his earthly ministry, we should expect the key events of the other verses to take place during the following 7 years - week 70. Scripture records these prophesied events as occurring during that final week, while consequential events take place after the completion of the seventy weeks.

Verse 25 prophesies the rebuilding, as recorded by Ezra & Nehemiah & the troublous times experienced as recorded by Esther. We agree that the total of 69 weeks takes us to the baptism of Jesus.

Verse 26 speaks of events after the 69 weeks, but not necessarily during the 70th week. We know that Messiah was cut off after about 3 1/2 years of ministry, or half a week - 3 1/2 years of the "week" immediately following his baptism. He was cut off, not for himself, but to redeem his people (many), and to ratify the new covenant/testament in his blood. (See Mat. 26:36-28) Those who would reject the saving new covenant would suffer the consequences prophesied – the city & sanctuary would be destroyed.

Verse 27 speaks of events during “one week” which obviously is the seventieth week. The 70th week naturally immediately follows the 69th week, so runs from the baptism of Jesus, through his death, resurrection & ascension in the middle of the seven years until 3 1/2 years after his saving work at Calvary & his ascension to David's throne.

These events are recorded in Scripture:

“And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week:”

Jesus inaugurated the new covenant in his own blood at the last supper, the new covenant fulfilling & ratifying the everlasting covenant relationship of God with his people. We commemorate the new covenant as we drink the 'wine' at every communion service.

As the second half of the 70th week began, Peter assured the Jews :

“Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.” (Acts 3:25)

Paul wrote to the Romans:

“Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers” (Rom. 15:8)

The promises made unto the fathers were covenant promises, and were confirmed by Jesus' personal ministry & the Apostolic Gospel. Many thousands of Jews responded to the Gospel – 3,000 at Pentecost; 5,000 after the healing of the lame man at the temple gate; that number was soon multiplied greatly

“And a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.” (Acts 6:7)

The Gospel was progressing so rapidly through Israel that the Jewish leaders became desperate to stop the progress. Imprisonment, beatings & stoning of believers in Lord Jesus Christ followed. Certainly Messiah was confirming the covenant with many through the Apostolic Gospel – the prophesied new covenant ratified by his own blood as the covenant surety.

Peter in his first letter takes up the Sinai covenant dependent on obedience of the Israelites (see Exo. 19:5-6) and shows it to be fulfilled in Christian believers. (See 1 Peter 2:9) The obedience of Christ secures the covenant promises. Everlasting covenants can only be fulfilled through Christ.

Note that Peter says in his letter what he preached in Jerusalem:

Acts 3:24-26 – *“Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. **25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers,** saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. **26** Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.”*

1 Peter 1:9-12 – *“Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. **10 Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: 11** Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. **12** Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.*

There is absolutely no suggestion of a future dispensation when the covenant promises would apply. Take them NOW by repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, or

“every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.”

But take heart:

“Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.”

“and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease,”

At Calvary Jesus shouted out, *“It is finished!”* All the sacrifices & oblations of the Law pointed forward to the one perfect sacrifice of Jesus. Jesus would:

“finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,”

In the midst of week 70 as prophesied. The temple veil was rent from top to bottom to show the way into the holiest place was open. (See Heb. 9:1-15)

“and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate,”

The sacrifices that continued to be offered in the temple were the sacrifices of the wicked – an abomination. (See Prov. 15:8) They were offered in defiance of the sacrifice of Christ. They were sacrifices that can *“never take away sins.”* (See Heb. 10:11) Isaiah 1:10-20 warns against such sacrifices offered by an earlier generation before the 70 years exile & the destruction of Jerusalem & Solomon's temple.

Jesus warned the Scribes & Pharises, hypocrites, the leaders in Jerusalem:

“Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.”

“even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”

The wrath of God against the people of Israel who rejected their Messiah was limited to *“this generation.”* (See Mat. 12:41-42; Mat. 23:36; Mat. 24:34; Luke 11:50-51; 1 Thes. 2:14-16) They had the testimony of Moses & the prophets, Luke 16:31 John 5:44-47 That wrath would be complete:

“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.” (1 Thes. 2:16)

“That determined” was described in verse 26

“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.”

So we see the wonderful blessings of verse 24 realised through Jesus' saving work at Calvary, covenant blessings promised to the Patriarchs realised in time by Abraham's Seed, & received by faith in Jesus as Lord & Saviour. The consequences of rejecting the Messiah, Jesus Christ, are also prophesied.

To answer your other points:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The big problem with your interpretation is the change of emphasis from Messiah to antichrist, leaving Daniel's people with only destruction & desolation ahead of them, rather than becoming the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

This assessment of my position reveals your misunderstanding of my position. My position does not change the emphasis “from Messiah to antichrist.” Rather, my position acknowledges the work that both the Messiah and the antichrist will perform, as revealed by this Holy Spirit inspired passage. Furthermore, my position does not end the 70th “week” with the antichrist in power and with Daniel’s people, the children of Israel, in destruction and desolation. Rather, my position ends the 70th “week” with the fulfillment of the six-fold purpose-result statements of Daniel 9:24, wherein all of the children of Israel who are alive at that time shall place heart-faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior and shall be saved (in unity with Romans 11:25-27), wherein all of the children of Israel who are alive at that time shall experience such a transformation of heart that they will never again commit transgression or sins, but shall conduct themselves in perfect righteousness with the Lord (in unity with Isaiah 1:26; Jeremiah 3:17; 31:33; 32:39-40; Ezekiel 36:26-27; 37:23-24), wherein all of the children of Israel that are alive at that time shall be fully reconciled unto the Lord their God as a nation and shall enter into an enjoyment of all the New Covenant promises in every detail, including all of the land blessings (in unity with Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28), and wherein the Lord Jesus Christ shall administrate His kingship ministry bodily upon the earth from Jerusalem as King of kings and Lord of lords over the all the nations of the world (in unity with Revelation 19:11 – 20:4). It does not at all appear to me that my position concludes and climaxes with an emphasis upon the antichrist. Rather, it appears to me that my position concludes and climaxes with an emphasis upon the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

I'm glad I have misunderstood your position – you have taken the opportunity to explain more clearly, in a single paragraph.

Please note that all those OT prophecies concerning the complete restoration of Israel are stated by Peter to be actually directed towards believers in Jesus - “you” - 1 Peter 1:10-12 to which Hebrews agrees. (See Heb. 11:39-40) These are experienced by faith in Christ now, in our mortal life, but experienced to perfection in the New Heaven & New Earth where the promised land will truly & perfectly be experienced. There is no future temporary millennium taught in the Gospels nor the Epistles, and there is no salvation for those who reject the Messiah. When he comes again it will be too late -

*“(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the **day of salvation** have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the **day of salvation.**)”*

The Gospel is for all, Jew & Gentile now, in this present age of grace. It's not a promise for the remnant of a future generation of Israelites after Jesus returns, God having abandoned many generations of his chosen people between his first & second comings.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I'll let Zacharias have the last word from Luke 1:67-79:

67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 68 Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, 69 And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; 70 As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71 That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72 To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; 73 The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, 74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, 75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. 76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; 77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, 78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, 79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

So then, at the time of the Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, did the Lord God fulfill His holy covenant concerning the children of Israel, which He made with Abraham, such that they were delivered out of the hand of their enemies and all that hated them? Are the children of Israel now serving the Lord their God “*without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,*” all the days of their lives? It appears to me that we must still be looking to the future for the fulfillment of these New Covenant promises unto the children of Israel as a national people group (as per Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28).

We should look to Scripture for the answer, not to rhetoric.

John 16:33 – *“These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.”*

Romans 8:28-39 – “*And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. 29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. 30 Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. 31 What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? 32 He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? 33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. 34 Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. 35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? 36 As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. 37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. 38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, 39 Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*”

The answer of Scripture is a resounding “**YES!**”

Sadly those calling themselves “Israel” but who reject the Lord Jesus Christ are NOT “now serving the Lord their God “without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,” all the days of their lives?” They are NOT serving the Lord their God at all. They have good reason to live in fear. As Hebrews warns:

Heb. 10:28-31 – “*He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: 29 Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? 30 For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. 31 It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.*”

Installment from External Discussion #3 – Brother Ian Day

The problem is not that I do not recognise grammatical considerations that you do, but you are using your grammar to challenge & change what is obvious from a simple reading of the inspired grammar of Scripture.

We should not need ANY analysis to prove that 70 follows 69, and if we impose grammatical analysis to "prove" that the 70th week may come hundreds of weeks after the 69th week then the inspired Word becomes meaningless.

"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" is a precise statement of time, contextually understood as 70x7 years, following the 70 years of exile, and of course including Messiah's saving ministry.

If seventy could actually mean 70, or 100, or 350, or 1,000 weeks, then we have no basis for understanding Scripture. The Holy Spirit inspired seventy weeks which takes us to 3 1/2 years after Calvary, when Jesus completed the atoning work prophesied in verse 24. During those 3 1/2 years, the covenant was confirmed by the Apostolic Gospel. There may be other times when numbers are indefinite, but not here.

It is you who reveals your disregard and disrespect for the Holy Spirit inspired grammar. You are using "grammar" to change the clear meaning. Daniel was confident that 70 years meant 70 years, & prayed accordingly. The Jews did return from Babylon, & rebuild Jerusalem. And Messiah came as prophesied.

Installment from External Discussion #4 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We should not need ANY analysis to prove that 70 follows 69, and if we impose grammatical analysis to "prove" that the 70th week may come hundreds of weeks after the 69th week then the inspired Word becomes meaningless.

69 + 1 = 70 is not a meaningless equation.

Question #1 – In what verse did God the Holy Spirit specifically reference the first 69 "weeks" of years?

Answer #1 -- Daniel 9:25.

Question #2 – In what verse did God the Holy Spirit specifically reference the 70th and final "week" of years?

Answer #2 -- Daniel 9:27.

Question #3 – So then, what about the verse in between those two, that is -- Daniel 9:26; are the events revealed in this verse a part of the first 69 "weeks" of years?

Answer #3 – No, for God the Holy Spirit specifically inspired the phrase, "And after threescore and two weeks," (which according to Daniel 9:24 is the latter 62 "weeks" of years of the first 69 "weeks" of years) to begin this verse.

Question #4 – So then, are the events of Daniel 9:26 a part of the 70th and final "week" of years?

Answer #4 – God the Holy Spirit did not inspire in Daniel 9:26 any specific indication that this is so (although Brother Ian Day does indicate this upon human assumption, regardless of the fact that God the Holy Spirit did not inspire any indication so).

Question #5 -- So then, do the events of Daniel 9:26 fall between the end of the first 69 "weeks" of years and the beginning of the 70th and final "week" of years?

Answer #5 – God the Holy Spirit did specifically reference the end of the first 69 "weeks" of years in Daniel 9:25, and did specifically reference the beginning, middle, and end of the 70th and final "week" of years in Daniel 9:27, and did specifically arrange for Daniel 9:26 and its revealed events to be placed between verse 25 and verse 27.

Installment from External Discussion #5 – Brother Ian Day

Does the fact that verse 26 comes between 25 & 27 **require** all the events, including the destruction, to occur before week 70, thus forcing a gap of at least 5 weeks or 35 years? Or are we returning to the events **immediately** following week 69. The simple positioning of the verses does not imply a gap. Words are necessarily sequential, but the ideas expressed may not be. We must not forget verse 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.

That is a wonderful prophecy of our Lord Jesus Christ & his saving work at Calvary. Notice the word **FINISH**. What was Jesus' final great shout from the cross?

All that remained was for Jesus to confirm the covenant with many of his people Israel all who repented at the preaching of his saving work. As Peter proclaimed in Acts 3:22-26:

*22 For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. 23 And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. 24 Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. 25 **Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers**, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. 26 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*

Those who will not hear, but reject the covenant, will be destroyed - as Gabriel prophesied. The blessings of the saving work of Messiah are spelled out in Dan. 9:24, as are the consequences for rejecting the Messiah in vs. 26 & 27, & in Jesus' Olivet prophecy.

Installment from External Discussion #6 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Does the fact that verse 26 comes between 25 & 27 **require** all the events, including the destruction, to occur before week 70, thus forcing a gap of at least 5 weeks or 35 years?

Yes – specifically (1) because God the Holy Spirit arranged for Daniel 9:25 specifically to mention **the ending** of the first 69 "weeks" of years, and (2) because God the Holy Spirit arranged for Daniel 9:27 specifically to mention **the beginning** of the 70th and final "week" of years, and (3) because God the Holy Spirit specifically arranged for Daniel 9:26 and all of its prophetic utterances to be placed **between** verse 25 and verse 27, and (4) because God the Holy Spirit arranged for verse 26 **not** to make any specific reference whatsoever at all unto the 70th and final "week" of years. Since God the Holy Spirit specifically arranged for Daniel 9:27 specifically to mention **the beginning** of the 70th and final "week" of years, then that which He arranged **to precede** that mention must necessarily **come before the beginning** of that 70th and final "week" of years.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Or are we returning to the events **immediately** following week 69. The simple positioning of the verses does not imply a gap.

Except that my argument is not based on the "simple positioning of the verses." Rather, it is based upon (1) the specific **revelation** of those verses **in union with** (2) the specific **arrangement** of those verses (as per my comments above).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I seek to prove what I believe & teach with reference to Scripture, both the passage under discussion & passages related to its fulfilment as recorded in the Gospel, Acts & Epistles. I have waited patiently for a response to my posting of Peter's sermon to the people of Israel:

*Acts 3:24-26 Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. **25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. 26 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.***

Notice Peter refers to **these days** and **the covenant**.

Indeed, you have presented this passage a number of times throughout our discussions. However, maybe I am simply dense; for to this day I am still unable to discern exactly the point that you are seeking to make with this passage. If you might express more clearly and more precisely how this passage relates to the Biblical information in Daniel 9:24-27, I would be in a better position to respond with understanding.

1. Do you believe that this passage is teaching that every single prophetic utterance of the Old Testament from Samuel forward was about those days and was to be fulfilled in those days?
2. Do you believe that this passage is teaching that every single prophetic utterance of Daniel was about those days and was to be fulfilled in those days?
3. Do you believe that this passage is teaching that every single prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 was about those days and was to be fulfilled in those days?
4. Which specific "the covenant" do you believe that Peter was referencing in Acts 3:25?
5. In what way do you believe that this "the covenant" reference relates precisely to that which is presented in Daniel 9:24-27?
6. What specific "the covenant" do you believe that Daniel 9:27 is referencing?

Installment from External Discussion #7 – Brother Ian Day

Basically we can think of God & Abraham's seed (Israel) being in a covenant relationship through Abraham's Seed, Christ. That relationship is frequently expressed in the form: *"I will be their God, and they shall be my people."* We see that (for example) in 2 Cor. 6 where Paul quotes Lev. 26 as applying to the Corinthians & of course to all believers.

Ultimately the perfect fulfilment of every covenant expression will be realised for all the redeemed in the New Heaven & New Earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. (See 2 Peter 3:13; Rev. 21)

Q1: No. Many prophecies applied close to their time, & were fulfilled – e.g. by David becoming king, by the Babylonian captivity, the return from captivity, Elijah's drought, & many others.

Q.2 No. It is clear that many of his prophecies are concerned with a succession of kingdoms & empires, & warfare & persecutions involving Israel.

Q3. Basically "Yes." Dan. 9:24 is a prophecy of Jesus' saving work finished at Calvary, by his death, resurrection & ascension, his shed New Covenant blood, and the full forgiveness of the great commission, the eternally secure Covenant relationship of Christ with his redeemed people.

All the clauses of 9:24 were indeed fulfilled at Calvary, so that all believers are, in God's sight, in Christ, in that wonderful state as prophesied. There is, of course, a working out in time as the Gospel is preached & sinners saved, & there is the ultimate perfect fulfilment in the New Heaven & New Earth.

The consequences of rejection of the Messiah were included in Gabriel's prophecy. "These days" run up to the prophesied destruction (AD 70). Thereafter Jesus return for resurrection & judgement is the next item on the prophetic agenda, already prophesied but not yet fulfilled.

Q4. The basic Covenant relationship of God with his people - the IF clause (See Exo. 19:5; Lev. 26:3,14,15), requiring Israel's obedience being replaced by Jesus' perfect obedience. Jesus was born under the old covenant, fulfilled every requirement to perfection, yet suffered the penalty for disobedience on the cross.

No need to study every detail of the promises concerning the restoration of Israel, nor to propose a future millennial fulfilment. We have a New Covenant relationship now, secured by Jesus, our covenant surety & the promise of the eternal blessed relationship in glory, in the New Heaven & New Earth.

Jesus thus confirmed the covenant. No need to ask for a specific covenant - it's the whole relationship of God with his people.

Q5. Daniel in his prayer confessed to a wholesale breach of covenant by the people - trespass, sin, rebellion, disobedience, transgression, etc, deserving the Divine curse, under the Old Covenant. All the covenant promises that called for obedience were utterly flouted. Yet Daniel prays for mercy & forgiveness - and receives the promise.

Q6. It is superfluous to ask which covenant? All are broken by Israel, & all are secured by Christ, & all will find their perfection in the New Heaven & New Earth.

Installment from External Discussion #8 – Pastor Scott Markle

I wish herein to express an agreement, to express a disagreement, to ask a further question, to express greater Biblical precision, and to express a form of reproof.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Q1: No. Many prophecies applied close to their time, & were fulfilled e.g. by David becoming king, by the Babylonian captivity, the return from captivity, Elijah's drought, & many others.

Q.2 No. It is clear that many of his prophecies are concerned with a succession of kingdoms & empires, & warfare & persecutions involving Israel.

Concerning the expression of agreement – With these two answers I would be in full agreement. I would only add that some of those Old Testament prophetic utterances also speak concerning events that would occur *after* the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25, such as those prophetic utterances concerning our Lord Jesus Christ's second coming, such as those prophetic utterances concerning the final resurrection, etc.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Q3. Basically "Yes." Dan. 9:24 is a prophecy of Jesus' saving work finished at Calvary, by his death, resurrection & ascension, his shed New Covenant blood, and the full forgiveness of the great commission, the eternally secure Covenant relationship of Christ with his redeemed people.

All the clauses of 9:24 were indeed fulfilled at Calvary, so that all believers are, in God's sight, in Christ, in that wonderful state as prophesied. There is, of course, a working out in time as the Gospel is preached & sinners saved, & there is the ultimate perfect fulfilment in the New Heaven & New Earth.

The consequences of rejection of the Messiah were included in Gabriel's prophecy. "These days" run up to the prophesied destruction (AD 70). Thereafter Jesus return for resurrection & judgement is the next item on the prophetic agenda, already prophesied but not yet fulfilled.

Concerning the expression of disagreement – I cannot agree that every single prophetic utterance in Daniel 9:24-27 was about the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25. Daniel 9:25 speaks prophetically concerning the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and concerning troublous times of that rebuilding. These things actually were fulfilled hundreds of years before the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25. Even so, not every prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 was to be fulfilled in those days. Now, if it is possible that some of the prophetic utterances in the passage concerned matters that were to be fulfilled hundreds of years before the "these days" about which Peter spoke, then it is also possible that some of the prophetic utterances in the passage might concern matters that were to be fulfilled hundreds of years after the "these days" about which Peter spoke. As such, Peter's declaration in Acts 3:25 is no precise evidence at all that all of Daniel 9:24-27 was being fulfilled at that time in those days.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Q4. The basic Covenant relationship of God with his people - the IF clause (See Exo. 19:5; Lev. 26:3,14,15), requiring Israel's obedience being replaced by Jesus' perfect obedience. Jesus was born under the old covenant, fulfilled every requirement to perfection, yet suffered the penalty for disobedience on the cross.

No need to study every detail of the promises concerning the restoration of Israel, nor to propose a future millennial fulfilment. We have a New Covenant relationship now, secured by Jesus, our covenant surety & the promise of the eternal blessed relationship in glory, in the New Heaven & New Earth.

Jesus thus confirmed the covenant. No need to ask for a specific covenant - it's the whole relationship of God with his people.

Concerning my further question – It appears from the above answer and explanation that you believe that all of the individual covenants that God made along with all of their precise, individual details (such as with Abraham, with the children of Israel at Sinai, with David, and in His promise of a new covenant with the children of Israel) are really just parts and pieces of a single over-arching covenant (which you appear to entitle, "The Covenant Relationship of God with His People"). Am I correct in this understanding concerning your position on the covenants?

Furthermore, it appears from your above statement, "No need to study every detail of the promises concerning the restoration of Israel, nor to propose a future millennial fulfilment. We have a New Covenant relationship now," that you believe that the precise, individual details of God's promises concerning Israel's restoration are no longer relevant because they have been replaced by the New Covenant in Christ. Am I correct in this understanding concerning your position?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Q5. Daniel in his prayer confessed to a wholesale breach of covenant by the people - trespass, sin, rebellion, disobedience, transgression, etc, deserving the Divine curse, under the Old Covenant. All the covenant promises that called for obedience were utterly flouted. Yet Daniel prays for mercy & forgiveness - and receives the promise.

Concerning the expression of greater Biblical precision -- Precisely that for which Daniel prayed in His prayer of confession and supplication was, "*O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain*," and, "*Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name*," and, "*O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.*" (See Daniel 9:16-19) Indeed, precisely that for which Daniel prayed was the Lord's forgiveness upon the children of Israel such that He might turn away His anger and fury from the city of Jerusalem and might cause His face of favor to shine upon the temple in Jerusalem. In fact,

Daniel himself reported in Daniel 9:20 that for which he was praying, saying, "*And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God **for the holy mountain of my God.***" Herein Daniel himself indicated that he was confessing the sin of his people Israel, but that he was praying for the holy mountain of God, that is – not so much for the people, but for the city of Jerusalem and for the temple in Jerusalem.

Contextually, that which motivated Daniel's prayer for these things was His reading of Jeremiah's prophecies concerning the Lord's promise that He would limit the captivity in Babylon unto seventy years. (See Daniel 9:2) This may be found in Jeremiah 25:11-12 -- "*And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.*" Furthermore, this may be found in Jeremiah 29:10-14 -- "*For thus saith the LORD, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the LORD: and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the LORD; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive.*"

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Q6. It is superfluous to ask which covenant? All are broken by Israel, & all are secured by Christ, & all will find their perfection in the New Heaven & New Earth.

Concerning the form of reproof – Earlier in this very discussion, you engaged in significant reproof against me for employing the phrase, "some covenant," in an explanation concerning Daniel 9:27, rather than "the covenant." With that significant reproof, it was strongly argued that the definite article "the" indicates a specific, singular covenant (with which I fully agree). However, now you declare that "it is superfluous" for us to discern what that specific, singular covenant is. So then, the definite article "the" was not superfluous at all, but quite significant when it came to reproving me. However, now the definite article "the" is not really that significant, but is actually superfluous when it comes to seeking for your position to be precise on which specific, singular covenant the definite article "the" is intended to specify. This seems like a contradiction and a double standard.

Installment from External Discussion #9 – Brother Ian Day

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning the expression of agreement – With these two answers I would be in full agreement. I would only add that some of those Old Testament prophetic utterances also speak concerning events that would occur *after* the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25, such as those prophetic utterances concerning our Lord Jesus Christ's second coming, such as those prophetic utterances concerning the final resurrection, etc.

I won't argue with that.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning the expression of disagreement – I cannot agree that every single prophetic utterance in Daniel 9:24-27 was about the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25. Daniel 9:25 speaks prophetically concerning the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and concerning troublous times of that rebuilding. These things actually were fulfilled hundreds of years before the "these days" about which Peter spoke in Acts 3:25. Even so, not every prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 was to be fulfilled in those days.

Again I won't argue with that, except to observe that the preceding events during the 69 weeks were leading up to "these days."

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Now, if it is possible that some of the prophetic utterances in the passage concerned matters that were to be fulfilled hundreds of years before the "these days" about which Peter spoke, then it is also possible that some of the prophetic utterances in the passage might concern matters that were to be fulfilled hundreds of years after the "these days" about which Peter spoke. As such, Peter's declaration in Acts 3:25 is no precise evidence at all that all of Daniel 9:24-27 was being fulfilled at that time in those days.

The preceding events during the 69 weeks were leading up to "these days" of the 70th week & the ultimate destruction, which Moses (see Deut. 18) & Peter relate to the consequences of rejection of Messiah. We know that the consequences did happen to "this generation" but there is not a prophecy in Dan. 9:24-27 regarding hundreds of years after the 70 weeks.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning my further question – It appears from the above answer and explanation that you believe that all of the individual covenants that God made along with all of their precise, individual details (such as with Abraham, with the children of Israel at Sinai, with David, and in His promise of a new covenant with the children of Israel) are really just parts and pieces of a single over-arching covenant (which you appear to entitle, "The Covenant Relationship of God with His People"). Am I correct in this understanding concerning your position on the covenants?

That is a correct understanding. That "*I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*" relationship is a fully comprehensive expression of the Covenant relationship of God with his people. We don't need the word "covenant" to see the covenant promises. God's every promise is a covenant promise. I understand "the covenant" to be the covenant relationship of God with his people. The people of Israel had broken the covenant relationship, but God would mend/confirm it by Messiah being cut off, not for himself, by his death in the midst of the week, at Calvary. "The covenant" is fully meaningful as an expression of the relationship, hopelessly broken, but to be gloriously confirmed.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Furthermore, it appears from your above statement, "No need to study every detail of the promises concerning the restoration of Israel, nor to propose a future millennial fulfilment. We have a New Covenant relationship now," that you believe that the precise, individual details of God's promises concerning Israel's restoration are no longer relevant because they have been replaced by the New Covenant in Christ. Am I correct in this understanding concerning your position?

How will the covenant promises to Abraham & God's people Israel be fulfilled? Or how WERE they fulfilled?

Joshua declared them fulfilled. Joshua was able to say:

¹⁴ And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the LORD your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof. (Joshua 23:14)

God had kept his covenant promises to Israel, but Israel failed (remember the IF) so that the other clause in the covenant applied:

*Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all good things are come upon you, which the LORD your God promised you; so shall the LORD bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the LORD your God hath given you.
¹⁶ When ye have transgressed the covenant of the LORD your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods, and bowed yourselves to them; then shall the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you. (Joshua 23:15-16)*

So the covenant history continues - fulfilment under the kingdom of David & Solomon, with occasional revival under later kings until the Babylonian captivity; then the return from Babylon to the promised land, but without the Davidic king. So the 69 weeks progresses, & Messiah comes to his Father's house & finds it in spiritual ruins: (See John 2) See Luke 19:45-46 – "*And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought; ⁴⁶ saying unto them, It is written, My house is the house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves.*"

Did Messiah offer the promised possession of the land to the people if they acknowledged his Messiahship? No. He refused them in John 6, & did not call them to arms when he rode into Jerusalem in fulfilment of Zech. 9. He implied a spiritual, internal kingdom:

²⁰ *And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: ²¹ neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you. (Luke 17:20-21)*

One of the great IFs is, "what would have happened had the Jews recognised Jesus as Messiah?" Prophecy would not have been fulfilled regarding his rejection & crucifixion, so no salvation. Prophecy WAS fulfilled at Calvary, by that rejection. That did not end the covenant relationship but was the grounds for its perfect fulfilment. None of the covenant promises would have any basis for realisation, for the obedience IF clause would have continued to spoil the relationship.

The many covenant promises, all outflowing from the all-pervading covenant relationship "I will be your God, you will be my people" can only be fulfilled in a perfect environment, as we see in the New Heaven & New Earth in Rev. 21:4-5 – "*There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. ⁵ And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.*

Whatever our views on the millennium, that perfect state comes AFTER. The final state is perfect harmony between heaven & earth - renewed. That's the promise Peter was looking towards. His teaching on the millennium was an indefinite period before the Lord returned for resurrection & judgement. (See 2 Peter 3)

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning the expression of greater Biblical precision -- Precisely that for which Daniel prayed in His prayer of confession and supplication was, "*O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let **thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain . . .***," and, "*Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, **and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name . . .***," and, "*O Lord, hear; **O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.***" (See Daniel 9:16-19) Indeed, precisely that for which Daniel prayed was the Lord's forgiveness upon the children of Israel such that He might turn away His anger and fury from the city of Jerusalem and might cause His face of favor to shine upon the temple in Jerusalem. In fact, Daniel himself reported in Daniel 9:20 that for which he was praying, saying, "*And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God **for the holy mountain of my God.***" Herein Daniel himself indicated that he was confessing the sin of his people Israel, but that he was praying for the holy mountain of God, that is – not so much for the people, but for the city of Jerusalem and for the temple in Jerusalem.

Contextually, that which motivated Daniel's prayer for these things was His reading of Jeremiah's prophecies concerning the Lord's promise that He would limit the captivity in Babylon unto seventy years. (See Daniel 9:2) This may be found in Jeremiah 25:11-12 -- "*And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.*" Furthermore, this may be found in Jeremiah 29:10-14 -- "*For thus saith the LORD, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the LORD: and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the LORD; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive.*"

God's revelation is progressive - God's purposes for redemption by his Son are slowly revealed, with different aspects being revealed over time, often by examples, shadows & patterns - types. His Sonship, Kingship, Priesthood, sacrifice, Godhood, etc we can read in Scripture in the light of Jesus' birth, life, perfection, ministry, healings, suffering, death & resurrection, ascension, etc.

Neither Jeremiah, nor Daniel (nor any of the prophets) fully understood what they were prophesying. (See 1 Peter 1) So their prayers were affected by their understanding of what God had revealed. In particular, God prophesied the wonderful promised land of the New Heaven & New Earth in terms of an idyllic land on earth. Hebrews 11 tells us that Abraham understood the promises as referring to "*a better country, that is, an heavenly*" rather than the land where he was living, as far as he could see, even though the promises referred to the land.

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

Concerning the form of reproof – Earlier in this very discussion, you engaged in significant reproof against me for employing the phrase, "some covenant," in an explanation concerning Daniel 9:27, rather than "the covenant." With that significant reproof, it was strongly argued that the definite article "the" indicates a specific, singular covenant (with which I fully agree). However, now you declare that "it is superfluous" for us to discern what that specific, singular covenant is. So then, the definite article "the" was not superfluous at all, but quite significant when it came to reproving me. However, now the definite article "the" is not really that significant, but is actually superfluous when it comes to seeking for your position to be precise on which specific, singular covenant the definite article "the" is intended to specify. This seems like a contradiction and a double standard.

We are thinking very differently. I have (I hope) shown that "the covenant" is the covenant relationship of God with his people. I see all THE trees of the forest, while you ask, "which tree is THE tree?"

When I read Ezekiel 37, I see a glorious view of the New Heaven & New Earth, whereas you see a millennium preceding that New Heaven & New Earth. BUT, the Rev. 20 millennium, despite the binding of Satan, sees the souls of the martyrs resurrected to live & reign with Christ. It's not a bodily resurrection from the graves - that comes after the end of the "millennium," after a Satanic rebellion & fiery intervention from heaven. I don't read that in Ezekiel, nor in Jeremiah. I do read of such warfare - & I see it TV & the news.

Ex. 38 & 39 - The Gog-Magog war is alluded to in Rev. 19:17-21 (see Eze. 39:17-22) & referred to in Rev. 20:7-9 . That shows that the millennium is not the perfect state of the covenant fulfilment.

We are presently living in a millennium where the Gospel is preached, where Satan's captives are being freed by the Gospel, where the martyrs are living & reigning with Christ in glory, where opposition to the Gospel is still killing Jesus' martyrs. Jesus in John 5:24-29 explains the two resurrection situation:

²⁴ Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. ²⁵ Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. ²⁶ For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; ²⁷ and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. ²⁸ Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, ²⁹ and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.

Jesus explains that conversion is a change from death to life - a spiritual resurrection that secures believers for “*the resurrection of life*” whereas those who continue in sin will suffer “*the resurrection of damnation.*”

In the present Gospel age sinners of all nations are called to repent, & by faith in Jesus become children of Abraham, members of Israel, along with physical descendants of Abraham. These may or may not call themselves Jews. God knows. But it makes no difference. God is keeping/confirming his covenant promises by the Gospel, & ALL who come to Jesus are welcome. I don't see in Scripture a Gospel for a future dispensation after Jesus' return. Certainly not in Daniel 9.

Installment #33 – Pastor Scott Markle

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Bro Scott, Your extreme grammatical analysis makes it difficult to appreciate what you are actually trying to say.

You compel me yet again to defend my focus upon grammatical analysis in Bible study. Concerning your accusation above, I believe that a more accurate word would have been the word “precise,” rather than the word “extreme.” That in which I have engaged is *precise* grammatical analysis in order that we might rightly understand what God the Holy Spirit has *precisely* inspired. It is our responsibility as Bible students to be “*rightly dividing the word of truth.*” (2 Timothy 2:15) This instruction portrays the picture of *precisely* cutting a line in accord with a *precise* pattern. Through inspiration God the Holy Spirit has established the *precise* pattern of truth in God’s Holy Word. It is now our responsibility to be just as *precise* in our study of that word of truth. Now, when God the Holy Spirit *precisely* inspired God’s Holy Word, He not only *precisely* inspired the words; He also *precisely* inspired the grammatical placement of those words into sentences and the flow-of-thought placement of those sentences into contexts. Therefore, when I engage in the *precise* grammatical and contextual analysis of a passage, I am being *directly obedient* unto my Lord’s instruction to be “*rightly dividing*” (cutting the line of understanding *with precision*) His Holy Word in accord with the *precise* pattern of words, grammar, and context that God the Holy Spirit *precisely* inspired. Even so, let it be known unto you and unto all others – **No matter how much you may attack me for engaging in such precise grammatical and contextual analysis, I will NOT disobey my Lord by complying to your wishes and by giving up on that precise grammatical and contextual analysis!**

Now, concerning the matter of appreciation for my precision in the grammatical and contextual analysis of the passage – Any individual who desires to pursue a *precise* understanding of the passage will greatly appreciate my precision in handling the passage. However, it is just as certain that an individual who prefers to handle God’s Holy Word with loose generalities and who finds the precise grammar and context to be against his position will not at all appreciate my precision in handling the passage. Indeed, the very fact that you and those who stand with you in this matter so regularly seek to disregard and disrespect precise grammatical analysis is evidence in itself that the precise grammar of the passage is more in favor of my position and more in contradiction to your position. Certainly, why would you want to find appreciation for that?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You complain about me rearranging the words of Scripture

Most certainly I will stand against you for so doing. **God the Holy Spirit Himself *precisely*** inspired the grammatical arrangements for the words of Scripture in order to communicate *precisely* the truth of God as He intended. Do you believe that He has given you the authority to rearrange the grammatical arrangement of those words as you see fit? I am certain that He has not. Do you believe that you know better than He did and does concerning how the grammatical arrangement of those words ought to be? I am certain that you do not. Now, since you have revealed how little regard and respect you have for the precise grammar of the passage, I am not

actually surprised that you feel comfortable rearranging the Holy Spirit inspired, grammatical arrangement of the words in that passage.

Even so, I would repeat the warning that I gave in my previous posting – Whenever an individual changes the grammatical arrangement that God the Holy Spirit inspired in any given statement of God’s Holy Word, that individual changes the meaning from that which God the Holy Spirit communicated into some other meaning. Such changing of the meaning from that which God the Holy Spirit communicated by inspiration *is not* right dividing of God’s Word of truth. Yet again, I would challenge all to develop a greater respect for every single word that God the Holy Spirit inspired and for the grammatical arrangement of those words in each sentence that God the Holy Spirit inspired in each given context.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

You complain about me rearranging the words of Scripture, but we need to understand what the Scripture is saying before we interpret.

That which follows the adversative conjunction “but” in your statement above – Is this your defense for rearranging the precise grammatical arrangement of the words that God the Holy Spirit inspired. How can you come to a right understanding of what God the Holy Spirit *precisely* intended to communicate in the Scriptures, if you first rearrange the *precise* grammatical arrangement for the words by which He communicated? *Precise* grammatical analysis (as that in which I engage) handles each statement of God’s Holy Word *word-for-word according to the precise grammatical arrangement in which God the Holy Spirit inspired and communicated that statement of God’s Holy Word*. (For example – If God the Holy Spirit inspired the coordinating conjunction “and” to be precisely arranged at the beginning of each and every independent statement (sentence, clause) in a series of statements, then God the Holy Spirit had a precise reason for so arranging that conjunction; and it is my responsibility as a Bible student to discern and understand God the Holy Spirit’s precise reason for so doing.) Such a practice is not “extreme” grammatical analysis. Rather, such a practice is a *precise, word-for-word* (“*jot and tittle*”) grammatical analysis *that regards and respects every single word* that God the Holy Spirit inspired, *in the precise grammatical arrangement* in which God the Holy Spirit inspired it. Indeed, such a practice is “rightly dividing” God’s Holy Word of truth. Indeed, such a practice is the only way to understand *precisely* what God the Holy Spirit has inspired and communicated, before we engage in the matters of “interpretation” and “application.”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Interpreting is seeking to understand & explain the Scripture, so needs additional words or in this case, emphasis of the actual words.

By definition “to interpret” is “to explain the meaning of something, to make understandable.” As such, interpreting does indeed require “additional words” and an “emphasis upon actual words” for the sake of explanation. However, rearranging the grammatical arrangement of the words is not engaging in the process of explanation in order to make God’s truth understandable. Rather, it is engaging in the process of transformation in order to adapt God’s truth unto one’s own ideas.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The Scripture is saying "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city..." However many words you write, you cannot change that statement.

My efforts of precise grammatical and contextual analysis have not engaged in changing that statement even one word. (Although if I remember correctly, there was another who *did* seek to change that Scriptural statement from "*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city*" to something like "Seventy weeks are determined upon all the nations of the earth and upon thy holy city.") However, my efforts of precise grammatical and context analysis have made note that the statement does not actually read, "Seventy *consecutive* weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city." Furthermore, my efforts of precise grammatical and contextual analysis have engaged in combating the loose generalities by which you have sought to support your position.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Seventy weeks (of years) corresponding to the seventy years of exile just being completed. Inserting a gap of thousands of years or hundreds of "weeks" denies the actual words of the prophecy.

I myself did not insert the "gap;" God the Holy Spirit did. By inspiration ***He arranged*** for Daniel 9:25 to mention specifically the conclusion of the 69th "week" of years. By inspiration ***He arranged*** for Daniel 9:27 to mention specifically the beginning of the 70th "week" of years. And by inspiration ***He arranged*** for Daniel 9:26, along with its reported events, to be placed ***precisely between*** these two other verses. Now, 69 plus 1, regardless of any "gap" between them, still equals the 70 "weeks" of years that the Lord God determined to administer upon Daniel's people, the children of Israel.

So then, what about that "gap" of time? Does it not have any administration upon the children of Israel? Actually, the New Testament passage of Romans 11:25 teaches that this is the time wherein spiritual "*blindness in part is happened to Israel*" and that this spiritual blindness will continue upon them "*until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*" Even so, this "gap" of time is to be understood, not as the time for Israel, but as "*the times of the Gentiles.*" (See Luke 21:24) Yet the New Testament passage of Romans 11:26-27 further teaches that after "*the fulness of the Gentiles*" comes in and "*the times of the Gentiles*" are fulfilled, then the Lord shall bring forth the salvation of and fulfilled covenant blessings upon the children of Israel.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I have repeatedly referred to the teaching of Jesus & his Apostles, & the fulfilment of the 70 weeks prophecy as recorded in Scripture, ending about 3 years after Calvary.

Indeed, you have presented many "supporting" passages from the New Testament. Yet you have not provided a single passage that ***precisely*** indicates that the 70 "weeks" of years of Daniel 9:24-27 were fulfilled at any time during the 3.5 years after Christ's resurrection. Indeed, not a single New Testament passage that you have presented has mentioned the 70th "week" of Daniel at all.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

By contrast, you have insisted on staying in the OT, quoting the land prophecies & promises.

Indeed, as much as I have been able, I have attempted to remain with a *precise examination* of the grammar and context of Daniel 9:24-27 *itself*. Certainly, I have made some references to other supporting passages concerning the Lord God's new covenant promises unto the children of Israel. Since Daniel 9:24-27 is a prophecy concerning the Lord God's intended blessing upon Daniel's people, the children of Israel, and since the Lord God's new covenant promises unto the children of Israel are prophetic utterances concerning the Lord God's intended blessings upon the children of Israel, it seemed Biblically appropriate. However, when I have handled these passages at length, I have done so in "external" discussions. Furthermore, in so doing I have also handled at least one New Testament passage concerning this matter, that is – Romans 11:25-27.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We have the inspired record of the fulfilment of the prophecy in the NT Scriptures, so should study the related NT Scriptures.

Actually, we have no such thing; for no New Testament Scripture directly indicates that it is the fulfillment of Daniel 9:27. Oh, in your manner of loose generalities, you have made the claim that there are such passages. Yet when these passages are examined *with precision*, your loose generalities are found faulty.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We should look at verse 24 being fulfilled by the saving work of the Lord Jesus.

Yes, this is *the assumption* of your position. Yet you have not given evidence for that assumption. You have simply made the assertion of your assumption over and over again as if your personal declaration thereof is evidence enough. Did the transgression of the children of Israel "finish" (completely stop) at the event of Christ's death and resurrection ("... upon thy people . . . to finish the transgression")? No, it did not. Did the sins of the children of Israel "end" (completely stop) at the event of Christ's death and resurrection ("... upon thy people . . . to make an end of sins")? No, they did not. Did the children of Israel as a national people group enter into their condition of reconciliation with God at the event of Christ's death and resurrection ("... upon thy people . . . to make reconciliation for iniquity")? No, they did not. Did the children of Israel as a national people group enter into a walk of everlasting righteousness at the event of Christ's death and resurrection ("... upon thy people . . . to bring in everlasting righteousness")? No, they did not. So then, we should not look at Daniel 9:24 as being fulfilled at the event of Christ's death and resurrection. Rather, we should look for a future event wherein the Lord God will precisely fulfill every detail of the new covenant promises that He declared that He would make with the children of Israel as a national people group.

Furthermore, even if for the sake of the argument we considered that the event of Christ's death and resurrection was the fulfillment for the six-fold purpose statements of Daniel 9:24, we would

find another problem of imprecision. According to your position, Christ did not die at the end of the 70th “week,” but in the midst of the 70th “week.” As such the event of Christ’s death and resurrection would have been 69.5 “weeks” of years, not 70 “weeks” of years. Yet Daniel 9:24 declares that 70 “weeks” of years were determined in order to bring forth the six purposes. Again, when the matter is examined *with precision*, loose generalities are found faulty.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Obviously he considered he had finished the work the Father had given him. (See John 17:4; John 19:30)

Indeed, He did consider that “He had finished the work the Father had given Him.” Indeed, He did finish that work! However, that is not the point of the debate. The point of the debate, as I have made clear on a number of occasions, is whether Daniel 9:24 is even speaking about the saving work of our Lord Jesus Christ that God the Father had given for Him to finish.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

He explained to his disciples:

*Luke 24:25-26 – “Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: **26** Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?”*

Luke 24:44 – “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.”

Indeed, it was necessary for Christ to have suffered those things “*and to enter into his glory.*” It was necessary for the Lord God’s plan of salvation for us sinners to be fulfilled, and it was necessary for the Old Testament prophecies concerning those things to be fulfilled. (Although at the moment wherein our Lord Jesus Christ was speaking to these disciples, He had not yet fully entered “*into His glory.*”) Indeed, all of the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ that pertain to His first coming were fulfilled in His first coming. Such does not mean that every single Old Testament prophecy of any and all types was fulfilled in His first coming, for some of the Old Testament prophecies are not “concerning” Him and His first coming. In addition, such does not mean that every single Old Testament prophecy concerning Him of any and all types was fulfilled in His first coming, for some of the Old Testament prophecies “concerning” Him are “concerning” His second coming (which has not yet occurred). Even so, we find ourselves returning to the point of the debate – Is Daniel 9:24 one of those Old Testament prophecies that is “concerning” His first coming? Nothing in either Luke 24:25 or Luke 24:44 precisely indicates such; therefore, neither of these two verses is precisely relevant to the point of the debate.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

As Gabriel prophesied:

Dan. 9:24 – “*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.*”

Those 70 weeks contrast with the 70 years of exile, the people would be in their homeland for seven times the period of the exile, & by the end of that period Messiah would have come & completed his prophesied saving work.

I can't think why you want to deny the simple words of Scripture with your elaborate scheme of distant future interpretation. You deny quoting Scofield, (I agree you haven't referred to him) but you cannot deny his influence on the line of interpretation you follow. His one-volume commentary influenced fundamentalist thinking in the Bible colleges & helped popularise dispensationalism in the last century.

I have no desire “to deny the simple words of Scripture” by any means. Rather, I have a desire to be “*rightly dividing*” God’s Holy Word of truth **with precision** in accord with the **precise** grammar and context that God the Holy Spirit inspired.

Concerning Scofield – I believe that any individual who reads through my postings in this debate can quite clearly observe that I have placed my emphasis upon the grammar and context of the passage (not upon the “Scofield” of the passage). The foundational authority for my understanding is just that – the **precise** grammar and context of the passage. Brother Scofield’s teachings concerning the passage serve as an authority for my understanding of the passage exactly **none at all**.

(Note: It is interesting to me that you would engage in this practice of “throwing Scofield in my face.” It is interesting since you were the one who, at the beginning of the debate, made significant request (such that it became a rule of the debate) that I not do a search for the beliefs of other partial-preterists, and then apply the resulting information to you. So then, Brother Day, are you now practicing a double standard?)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

As we agree that week 69 brings us to the baptism of Jesus & his earthly ministry, we should expect the key events of the other verses to take place during the following 7 years - week 70.

By its very nature, the phrase, “we should expect,” indicates human assumption and expectation. However, human assumption and expectation is **not at all** the authority for Bible study and Biblical understanding. The Lord our God’s wisdom and ways are far above human wisdom and ways. Therefore, it is far better to accept what God’s Word says according to **precise** grammatical and contextual study, than to expect what God’s Word meant according to human assumptions.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Scripture records these prophesied events as occurring during that final week, while consequential events take place after the completion of the seventy weeks.

As I have indicated above, not one New Testament passage precisely indicates that it is a fulfillment of Daniel's 70th "week" of years. It is only your method of human assumptions and loose generalities that makes this application. Does any New Testament passage speak precisely concerning our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion? Certainly. Does any New Testament passage state precisely that the event of our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion was a part of Daniel's 70th "week" of years? No, not one. Does Daniel 9:26 state precisely that the event of our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion was to be within the 70th "week" of years? No, it does not; for Daniel 9:26 does not directly mention the 70th "week" of years at all; and then Daniel 9:27 begins by directly mentioning the beginning of that very 70th "week" of years.

Furthermore, your method of human assumption finds another difficulty. If (for the sake of the argument) by the method of human assumption, we humanly assume and expect the events of the 70th "week" to follow immediately upon the end of the 69th "week," and thus humanly assume and expect Daniel 9:26 to present those events because it follows immediately after verse 25 – then we should also humanly assume and expect all of the events of Daniel 9:26 to fall within the 70th "week," since Daniel 9:24 only speaks concerning 70 "weeks" being determined upon the Daniel's people, the children of Israel (not 70 "weeks" plus some time more), and because Daniel 9:26 and its events are presented before verse 27 wherein the 70th "week" is still being specifically referenced. Not a single statement of Daniel 9:24-27 precisely speaks concerning anything after the 70 "weeks" that were determined; therefore, by human assumption and expectation, we should expect every detail of the prophetic utterance to be a part of the 70 "weeks" of years (which even your position denies).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Verse 25 prophesies the rebuilding, as recorded by Ezra & Nehemiah & the troublous times experienced as recorded by Esther. We agree that the total of 69 weeks takes us to the baptism of Jesus.

Yes, we are agreed.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Verse 26 speaks of events after the 69 weeks, *but not necessarily during the 70th week.* [emphasis added by Pastor Scott Markle]

Indeed, we are still agreed, especially on the fact that Daniel 9:26 does *not necessarily* speak concerning events that are during the 70th and final "week" of years. The difference and disagreement between us is that I would place the events of Daniel 9:26 *between* the end of the first 69 "weeks" of years as recorded in verse 25 and the beginning of the 70th "week" of years as recorded in verse 27, just as verse 26 was arranged by the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit to be *between* verse 25 and verse 27 – whereas you would indicate that the events of Daniel 9:26 occur during and beyond the 70th "week" of years.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

We know that Messiah was cut off after about 3 1/2 years of ministry, or half a week - 3 1/2 years of the "week" immediately following his baptism. He was cut off, not for himself, but to redeem his people (many), and to ratify the new covenant/testament in his blood. (See Mat. 26:36-28) Those who would reject the saving new covenant would suffer the consequences prophesied – the city & sanctuary would be destroyed.

Indeed, we know by historical record that our Lord Jesus Christ, "*the Messiah the Prince,*" was crucified approximately 3.5 years after His baptism. Furthermore, we know by historical record that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple was approximately another 40 years after that. Finally, we know by historical record that "*the end of the war*" (if we view this as a reference only to that immediate conflict, and do not view this as a reference to the ongoing conflict between Rome and the children of Israel that has continued unto this very day) occurred even some number of years after that. As such, by historical record we know that the prophesied events of Daniel 9:26 extend after our Lord's baptism to a time period of 44+ years. That is quite a bit longer than one "week" of years. In fact, this is so because Daniel 9:26 not even once precisely states that it is prophesying concerning events that would fall within the 70th and final "week" of years. Rather, the beginning of that 70th and final "week" of years is not precisely mentioned until the beginning of Daniel 9:27, which then proceeds to mention precisely the middle of that 70th and final "week" and the consummation of that 70th and final "week."

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Verse 27 speaks of events during "one week" which obviously is the seventieth week.

Herein, we are fully agreed.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The 70th week naturally immediately follows the 69th week . . .

Your use of the word "naturally" in the above statement again reveals your reliance upon human assumption.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The 70th week naturally immediately follows the 69th week, so runs from the baptism of Jesus, through his death, resurrection & ascension in the middle of the seven years until 3 1/2 years after his saving work at Calvary & his ascension to David's throne.

Your above conclusion ("so runs from . . .") is founded upon your human assumption ("the 70th week naturally . . ."). I myself reject that human assumption (as I have revealed many times throughout this debate) based precisely upon the Holy Spirit inspired information and arrangement of Daniel 9:25, Daniel 9:26, and Daniel 9:27.

Now, concerning the three elements of detail in Daniel 9:27.

1. To whom does the pronoun “*he*” make reference?

My own answer has been given previously, as follows:

Grammatically and contextually, there are two possible antecedents for the pronoun “*he*” in Daniel 9:27. The first of these is “*the Messiah the Prince.*” The second is “*the prince that shall come.*” Three times throughout the context of Daniel 9:24-26 the Messiah is referenced, and each time He is referenced with an exalted title, as follows: (1) “*the Most Holy*” in verse 24, (2) “*the Messiah the Prince*” in verse 25, and (3) “*Messiah*” in verse 26. Considering that such exalted titles are used for Him in every one of these prior cases, it seems out of contextual character then to reference Him in verse 27 simply with the pronoun “*he*” for all three uses. Furthermore, when the pronoun “*he*” could have been used for the Messiah in verse 26 without any ambiguity from the context of verse 25 (since the other “*he,*” “*the prince that shall come,*” had not even been mentioned yet in the context), still the exalted title “*Messiah*” was employed. As such, this seems to emphasize the characteristic of this context to reference the Messiah only with exalted terminology.

On the other hand, by referring to “*the prince that shall come*” with such a more general and less exalted phrasing, it would fit the character of the context quite well then to reference him in verse 27 with the simple pronoun “*he.*” Furthermore, it is a common principle of communication (although not a universal principle) to arrange the antecedent for a pronoun as the closest possibility, which “*the prince that shall come*” would be in the contextual flow of thought from verse 26 unto verse 27. As such, the grammatical and contextual evidence seems to point unto “*the prince that shall come*” as the correct antecedent for the pronoun “*he*” in Daniel 9:27, rather than “*the Messiah the Prince.*”

Even so, I would contend that the “*he*” of Daniel 9:27 refers to some political leader of the Roman kingdom (within the context of its “iron and clay mixed” form as a religious force – see Daniel 2:40-43) who “*shall come*” unto Jerusalem and “*shall confirm*” some specific “*covenant*” with some group of “*many*” from among the children of Israel. Furthermore, I would contend that this “*prince*” from the Roman kingdom “*shall confirm*” this specific “*covenant*” only and specifically for a period of “*one week*” (that is – for a period of 7 years), even as the modifying prepositional phrase, “*for one week,*” directly indicates. Finally, I would contend that this confirming of this specific “*covenant*” will initiate the beginning of the 70th and final “*week*” of years of the “*seventy weeks*” that the Lord God “*determined*” to be administered “*upon*” Daniel’s people, the children of Israel.

Brother Day’s answer has also been given previously, as follows:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

When we consider the whole prophecy it is evident that God is answering Daniel's prayer for God's rebellious people by the 70 weeks prophecy by sending Messiah to deal with Israel's

transgression, sins & iniquity, & bring in everlasting righteousness. That was accomplished at Calvary.

Thus when Gabriel says, “he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week,” we should expect the “he” to be the one who is fulfilling the prophecies & promises made to Israel, i.e. The Messiah. Israel certainly needs God himself to fulfil the Covenant promises he made to Abraham, the Patriarchs & Moses, because Israel has failed. Moreover, if the city & sanctuary that were to be rebuilt unto Messiah the Prince, why should they be so completely destroyed? (v. 26) After all, God has made the old covenant promises, & promised a new covenant. God's eternal plans did not require an earthly city & sanctuary. (See John 4)

The old covenant promises required Israel's obedience, so they failed. How could THE covenant be confirmed? Only by the one who made it becoming obedient under the covenant.

Yet it should be noted that Daniel did not precisely reference the Messiah even one time throughout His prayer of confession and supplication. Furthermore, it should be noted that Daniel's primary request of supplication was for the Lord God to turn away His anger and fury from the city of Jerusalem (see Daniel 9:16, 18) and to cause His favor to shine upon the temple in Jerusalem (see Daniel 9:17). Indeed, the Messiah is not first mentioned throughout the context of Daniel 9 until Daniel 9:24. To make the claim that the Messiah is the theme of the entire context of Daniel 9 is not discovered through the method of precise grammatical and contextual analysis, but through the method of human assumption. So then, each member of the audience must now make a decision as to the authoritative basis for his or her own conclusion on this matter.

3. To what specific covenant does the phrase “*the covenant*” make reference?

My own answer has been given previously, as follows:

Indeed, the use of the definite article “*the*” in the phrase “*the covenant*” indicates that this “*covenant*” is some definitely specific covenant. However, no further description is given in Daniel 9:27 concerning this “*covenant*,” or even in the full context of Daniel 9:24-27, by which to specifically define this “*covenant*.” Therefore, we must consider the broader context of the entire chapter of Daniel 9 and of the entire book of Daniel. In so doing, we find one other reference to a covenant with the definite article “*the*” in Daniel 9, that is – in Daniel 9:4. Furthermore, we find five other references to a covenant with the definite article “*the*” in Daniel 11, that is – in Daniel 11:22, 28, 30 (twice), 32.

In Daniel 9:4 Daniel indicated that the Lord God was keeping (in the present tense of Daniel's time) “*the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments.*” So then, what “*the covenant*” was the Lord God keeping with His people at that present time? It would seem most likely that Daniel was referring to the covenant that the Lord God had made with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai during Moses' time. This understanding would be supported when we consider the similarity in terminology, as per Moses' declaration unto the children of Israel in Deuteronomy 7:12-13, saying, “*Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the LORD thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: and he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee:*”

he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee.”

Furthermore, this understanding would be supported when we consider Daniel’s own reference unto “*the law of Moses*” in Daniel 9:11-13, saying, “*Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; **therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the LORD our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.***”

Finally, within their individual contexts every one of the five references to “*the covenant*” or “*the holy covenant*” in Daniel 11 also appears to be a reference unto the covenant that the Lord God had made with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai.

So then, in what way will the “*he*” of Daniel 9:27 “*confirm*” the Lord God’s covenant with the children of Israel that He had made with them at Mount Sinai? In order to answer this question, it might be of value to consider the opposite behavior as presented in Daniel 11:30-31. Therein we learn of a foreign ruler who would “*have indignation against the holy covenant,*” which he would demonstrate by polluting “*the sanctuary of strength*” (that is – the temple in Jerusalem) and by taking away “*the daily sacrifice*” from being engaged. Even so, if having indignation against “*the holy covenant*” is to pollute the temple and to take away the sacrificial system from the temple, then it would seem reasonable to conclude that confirming “*the covenant*” would be to support the temple and the engagement of the sacrificial system in the temple.

Even so, I would contend that some political leader of the Roman kingdom (within the context of its “*iron and clay mixed*” form as a religious force – see Daniel 2:40-43) “*shall come*” unto Jerusalem and “*shall confirm the covenant with many*” among the children of Israel for “*one week*” (that is – for a seven year period), such that there shall be an agreement that those “*many*” among the children of Israel will be permitted to engage in the sacrificial system of the temple for that period of time.

From his immediately previous installment, Brother Day’s answer appears to be as follows:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

“And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.”

Jesus inaugurated the new covenant in his own blood at the last supper, the new covenant fulfilling & ratifying the everlasting covenant relationship of God with his people. We commemorate the new covenant as we drink the 'wine' at every communion service.

However, the understanding that the phrase “the covenant” in Daniel 9:27 is a reference to the new covenant that was established at our Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion with His shed blood and sacrificial death has a timing problem. Daniel 9:27 reveals that the “*he*” of the verse would “*confirm the covenant*” for the period of “*one week*,” thus indicating that this confirmation of this covenant will be initiated at the beginning of the 70th and final “week” of years. If we accept for the sake of the argument that the 70th “week” of years began with our Lord Jesus Christ’s baptism, and if we accept for the sake of the argument that the “*the covenant*” of Daniel 9:27 is the new covenant in our Lord Jesus Christ’s blood, then we are moved to ask – How did our Lord Jesus Christ confirm the new covenant at His baptism, 3.5 years before the new covenant was even created in His blood? No, even if I accepted the argument that the 70th and final “week” of years began immediately at the end of the first 69 “weeks” of years and with the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ, I could not accept that “*the covenant*” of Daniel 9:27 is the new covenant in Christ’s blood; for the method of precise detail would not allow for this.

Yet Brother Day adds further in his immediately previous posting, as follow:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

As the second half of the 70th week began, Peter assured the Jews :

“Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.” (Acts 3:25)

Paul wrote to the Romans:

“Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers” (Rom. 15:8)

However, in Acts 3:25 the apostle Peter revealed precisely the covenant about which he was speaking. Peter was speaking about the covenant which the Lord God had made with the patriarchal fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob-Israel. Furthermore, Peter even specified the specific, singular promise of that covenant about which he was speaking – “. . . *saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.*” As such, Peter was not speaking about every detail of every single promise that the Lord God had made unto the patriarchal fathers, but only about this one specific, singular promise.

In addition, in Romans 15:8 the apostle Paul also specified the divine promises about which he was indicating that our Lord Jesus Christ had confirmed. Paul specified that our Lord Jesus Christ confirmed the promises that the Lord God had made unto “*the fathers*,” that is – either the promises that the Lord God had made unto the patriarchal fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob-Israel, or the promises that the Lord God had made unto the exodus fathers at Mount Sinai through Moses (and repeated to the next generation in Deuteronomy). Furthermore, the continuing context of Romans 15:9-12 reveals the specific element of those promises that the apostle Paul was seeking to specify, that is – that the gospel of eternal salvation from sin was for all mankind, not only to the circumcision (the children of Israel), but also to the Gentiles. As such, Paul was not speaking about every detail of every single promise that the Lord God had made unto the patriarchal fathers or the exodus fathers, but only about this one element of promise.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Peter in his first letter takes up the Sinai covenant dependent on obedience of the Israelites (see Exo. 19:5-6) and shows it to be fulfilled in Christian believers. (See 1 Peter 2:9) The obedience of Christ secures the covenant promises. Everlasting covenants can only be fulfilled through Christ.

In 1 Peter 2:9-10 does the apostle Peter indicate that New Testament believers are “*now the people of God*” as a **replacement** for the children of Israel, or **in addition to** the children of Israel?

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Note that Peter says in his letter what he preached in Jerusalem:

*Acts 3:24-26 – “Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. **25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. 26 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.”***

Indeed, although not every single prophetic utterance that they delivered concerned those days, every prophet from Samuel forward had foretold of our Lord Jesus Christ’s first coming. Indeed, even the closing line of Daniel 9:25 and the opening line of Daniel 9:26 foretold of those days. (However, this does not mean that every single prophetic utterance of Daniel 9:24-27 concerned those days.) Indeed, the audience to whom Peter was speaking at that time were the children of the Old Testament prophets and of the Old Testament covenants; for they were all members of the children of Israel. Indeed, God the Father had sent forth His only-begotten Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, as Savior to bless the children of Israel with eternal salvation from their sinful iniquities in accord with the promise that He had made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob-Israel; for the children of Israel are indeed a part of “*all the kindreds of the earth.*”

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

*1 Peter 1:9-12 – “Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. **10 Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: 11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. 12 Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.***

There is absolutely no suggestion of a future dispensation when the covenant promises would apply. Take them NOW by repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, or

“every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.”

Indeed, the apostle Peter did not speak concerning the fulfillment of the many detailed promises that the Lord God had promised to fulfill for the children of Israel in the new covenant. This is because in context Peter was speaking to New Testament believers concerning the eternal salvation of their souls. He was not speaking in context to the children of Israel concerning the restoration blessings that the Lord God had promised unto them. Brother Day teaches as if these two categories of truth are mutually exclusive, that they cannot both be true. However, God's Holy Word teaches them both as truth in accord with God's divine promises.

4. What does it mean that this “*he*” will “*cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease*”?

My own answer has been given previously, as follows:

The second independent statement of Daniel 9:27 states, “*And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*” This statement clearly indicates that this event will occur “*in the midst of the week,*” that is – at the 3.5 year point of the 7 years for which “*the covenant*” had originally been confirmed. What then will this “*he*” do at this time? He personally “*shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*” He will cause the sacrificial system of the temple in Jerusalem to cease being engaged. He will no longer permit sacrifices and oblations to continue. Now, if it is correct that the confirming of “*the covenant*” would be an agreement to permit the engagement of the sacrificial system in the temple, then this act would be a direct violation of the agreement in that confirming of “*the covenant.*”

To this I would add that grammatically the infinitive “to cease” does not possess any modifiers. This phrase means just what it says – At the prophesied time, the sacrifice and the oblations will be made to stop, to cease happening, to cease existing. To add a modifier such as “to cease being effective or acceptable in God's sight” is to add unto that which God the Holy Spirit inspired. Even to add such a phrase as “to create the cause whereby the sacrifice and oblation would eventually cease” is to add unto that which God the Holy Spirit inspired. (By the way, such also changes the action verb “cause” to a noun, and thereby changes the grammatical meaning of that which God the Holy Spirit inspired.)

From his immediately previous posting, Brother Day's answer appears to be as follows:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

“*and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease,*”

At Calvary Jesus shouted out, “*It is finished!*” All the sacrifices & oblations of the Law pointed forward to the one perfect sacrifice of Jesus. Jesus would:

“finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,”

In the midst of week 70 as prophesied. The temple veil was rent from top to bottom to show the way into the holiest place was open. (See Heb. 9:1-15)

“and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate.”

The sacrifices that continued to be offered in the temple were the sacrifices of the wicked – an abomination. (See Prov. 15:8) They were offered in defiance of the sacrifice of Christ. They were sacrifices that can “*never take away sins.*” (See Heb. 10:11) Isaiah 1:10-20 warns against such sacrifices offered by an earlier generation before the 70 years exile & the destruction of Jerusalem & Solomon's temple.

Jesus warned the Scribes & Pharises, hypocrites, the leaders in Jerusalem:

“Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.”

Even so, Brother Day acknowledges that the sacrifice and oblation did not cease occurring at the time of our Lord Jesus Christ's crucifixion. Rather, he indicates that these sacrifices and oblations were now an abomination before the Lord God. Thereby he implies that these sacrifices and oblations had ceased, not in their occurrence, but in their effectiveness and acceptableness before the Lord God.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Please note that all those OT prophecies concerning the complete restoration of Israel are stated by Peter to be actually directed towards believers in Jesus - “you” - 1 Peter 1:10-12 to which Hebrews agrees. (See Heb. 11:39-40) These are experienced by faith in Christ now, in our mortal life, but experienced to perfection in the New Heaven & New Earth where the promised land will truly & perfectly be experienced. There is no future temporary millennium taught in the Gospels nor the Epistles, and there is no salvation for those who reject the Messiah. When he comes again it will be too late -

*“(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the **day of salvation** have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the **day of salvation.**)”*

Neither 1 Peter 1:10-12 or Hebrews 11:39-40 precisely speaks concerning the restoration and land promises to the children of Israel. As such, it is not even possible for them to indicate those promises about which they do not even speak are now mine as a New Testament believer. (Ah, the method of loose generalities versus the method of precise details.)

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

The Gospel is for all, Jew & Gentile now, in this present age of grace. It's not a promise for the remnant of a future generation of Israelites after Jesus returns, God having abandoned many generations of his chosen people between his first & second comings.

I fully agree and have never denied that the gospel of eternal salvation from sin through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, God the Son, as Savior is for all mankind at the present time. I have never once indicated that this gospel truth is only for a “remnant of a future generation of Israelites

after Jesus returns.” Rather, I have argued from the promises of God’s Holy Word that the restoration and land promises are for the entirety of a future generation of the children of Israel at the time of our Lord’s Second Coming, as per Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28; Romans 11:25-27.

Finally, concerning the millennial (1,000 year) reign of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the earth after His Second Coming, God’s Holy Word in Revelation 19:11 – 20:9 is quite precise on the subject.

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

I’ll let Zacharias have the last word from Luke 1:67-79:

*67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 68 Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, 69 And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; 70 As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71 **That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72 To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; 73 The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, 74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, 75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. 76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; 77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, 78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, 79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.***

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (in response to Brother Ian Day)

So then, at the time of the Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection, did the Lord God fulfill His holy covenant concerning the children of Israel, which He made with Abraham, such that they were delivered out of the hand of their enemies and all that hated them? Are the children of Israel now serving the Lord their God “*without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,*” all the days of their lives? It appears to me that we must still be looking to the future for the fulfillment of these New Covenant promises unto the children of Israel as a national people group (as per Jeremiah 31:31-40; 32:37-42; Ezekiel 36:21-38; 37:19-28).

Quoted from Brother Ian Day (in response to Pastor Scott Markle)

We should look to Scripture for the answer, not to rhetoric.

Asking precise questions concerning the precise promises of God’s Holy Word is not rhetoric, it is “rightly dividing.” The fulfillment of the prophetic utterances in God’s Holy Word are to be considered according to the principle of precise detail. (See Deuteronomy 18:20-22) Now then, Zacharias, speaking as an Old Testament member of the children of Israel, spoke concerning two of the promises that the Lord God had made unto the children of Israel, as follows: (1) “*that we*

should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us,” and (2) *“that he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies [as per the first promise], might serve him without fear [of our enemies], in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of or life.”* In accord with the principle of precise detail, I then asked the following two questions:

1. So then, at the time of the Lord Jesus Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection, did the Lord God fulfill His holy covenant concerning the children of Israel, which He made with Abraham, such that they were delivered out of the hand of their enemies and all that hated them?
2. Are the children of Israel now serving the Lord their God “without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,” all the days of their lives?

In answer to the first question, Brother Day presented John 16:33 and Romans 8:28-39, and then declared that the answer of Scripture is a resounding “YES!” However, neither of these passages speaks concerning the children of Israel; therefore also, neither of these passages speaks concerning the children of Israel being delivered from any of their enemies, not to mention all of their enemies and those that hate them. In fact, even concerning the New Testament believer, in John 16:33 our Lord did not promise deliverance from all of our enemies, but actually taught that we most certainly would experience tribulation in this world. Furthermore, Romans 8:36 teaches that we New Testament believers *“are killed all the day long”* and *“are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.”* Yes, Romans 8:37 declares that *“in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.”* Yet this is not because we are delivered from these experiences, but because although we must suffer these experiences, none of them *“shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”* (See Romans 8:39) Even so, the method of precise detail reveals the faultiness in the method of loose generalities.

In answer to the second question, even Brother Day must admit the following:

Quoted from Brother Ian Day

Sadly those calling themselves “Israel” but who reject the Lord Jesus Christ are NOT “now serving the Lord their God “without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him,” all the days of their lives?”

Throughout this debate it has become apparent to me that the primary disagreement between Brother Day and myself is not over Daniel 9:24-27, but is over the method of Bible study itself. Therefore, with my conclusion to this concluding installment of the debate, I wish to provide a warning unto the members of the audience. The Lord our God desires that we should study His Holy Word according to the principle of precise detail, “rightly dividing” precisely in accord with the precise pattern that God the Holy Spirit has inspired. Indeed, in Deuteronomy 8:3 the Lord our God teaches the truth that we do not live by physical food alone, but *“by every word”* that has proceeded out of His mouth as recorded in His Holy Word. In Matthew 5:18 our Lord Jesus Christ indicated the importance of every *“jot and tittle”* in God’s Holy Word,

indicating that not even one of them would pass “*till all be fulfilled.*” Even so, any Bible study or Bible teaching that follows a method of loose generalities, wherein things that are not precisely presented in God’s Word as the same are claimed to be the same, should be rejected as faulty. Indeed, when a Biblical position teaches us that there is “no need to study every detail” of the truths and promises of God’s Word concerning a matter, or that there is no need to ask concerning specific details of truth on a matter because it would be superfluous to do so, then that position of belief should be viewed with spiritual suspicion.

Installment #34 – Brother Ian Day

Thank you, Brother Scott for the manner in which you have conducted the debate & the thought provoking challenges in your installments. I hope & pray that our contributions to this & other threads will be helpful to others as we discuss the Holy Scriptures.

While we disagree on many points, it is wonderful that we have a fundamental agreement on our shared salvation by faith in our Lord & Saviour Jesus Christ, & our eternal hope of glory in the New Heaven & New Earth.

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.

As I understand this Scripture:

The prophecy is about the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ, his saving work & its results for God's redeemed people. Generally OT prophecy is best understood by its fulfilment, particularly in the life & ministry of Jesus, his saving work, & the Gospel resulting from the saving work, therefore read the NT to understand the OT.

The timescale - completed in 70 weeks or 490 years - around 35 AD:

69 weeks takes us to the baptism of Jesus, so the 70th week includes Jesus earthly ministry & the early Apostolic ministry - the first half of Acts.

Old Testament (Old Covenant) vision & prophecy will be sealed up by Messiah's life & saving ministry so that prophecy focuses on Jesus, his saving work & his kingdom, not on Israel's future, apart from the glorious restored covenant relationship detailed in v. 24.

All the blessings for God's people of v. 24 are accomplished by Messiah's saving work, and are received by repentance & faith and must be appropriated in the present Gospel age of grace.

Messiah's saving work - his death for sinners - ends the examples, shadows & patterns of the Law, so that the temple, and Jerusalem centred worship will cease with the destruction of the temple & city.

OT prophecy includes judgement for those who reject the covenant & particularly for those who reject the Messiah (See Deut. 18, quoted by Peter in Acts 3);

The timescale for the perfect realisation of the prophesied covenant blessings of v. 24 is not revealed - the focus is on Jesus & his saving ministry - but Jesus himself in his Olivet prophecy could not reveal the timescale for his coming, only the timescale for the destruction.

The perfect fulfilment of all prophecy & covenant promises for Israelite believers, together with believers from all nations on earth will be accomplished in the New Heaven & New Earth, after Jesus returns for resurrection & judgement, which is the next & final event of prophecy.

A gap between verse 69 & verse 70, a future end times tribulation, millennium, restored kingdom for national Israel, earthly reign of Messiah, etc, are not written in the passage.

As I understand Bro. Scott,

He sees OT promises & prophecies specifically relating to the earthly nation of Israel, & as they were not fulfilled before Messiah came, & the nation rejected Messiah & the Apostolic Gospel, & are not being fulfilled now in the present nation of Israel, there must be a future dispensation when all the OT prophecies happen literally.

That requires a gap in the 70 weeks, re-establishment of Israel as a Jewish nation, rebuilding the temple, & then destroying it all again in the 70th week, after which the surviving Israelites will believe in Jesus Christ who will reign over them as a mortal people, on earth, in person, for 1,000 years.

The present Gospel age is thus in effect a gap in prophetic revelation between weeks 69 & 70 during which God is not dealing with Israel as a nation, but mainly the Gentiles, & any Jews who do repent & believe in Jesus Christ.

I hope that is a fair brief summary of Bro Scott's position.

Brother Scott replied:

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle (from an external discussion)

Brother Day,

Although I myself would add more details, and although I would not claim that all of these things are taught specifically in and by Daniel 9:24-27, and although a few of the specifics are not exactly correct to my position, the above was indeed a fair "brief summary" of my position -- all except the parenthetical note at the end of the summary.

Putting the summary even simpler, I believe Dan. 9:24-27 refers to the Messiah, Jesus Christ & his finished saving work at Calvary, followed by the Apostolic Gospel, so that the purpose of the 70 weeks is the securing of the promised blessings to repentant sinners, & the confirmation of the covenant – as the new covenant - relationship of God with his people, both Israel & Gentiles who come to the same saving faith in Jesus. The fulfilment of the prophecy is thus recorded in Scripture, in the Gospels & the first half of Acts.

Brother Scott considers that the whole prophecy concerns the nation of Israel, & is yet to be fulfilled - in a future millennium, & has no relevance to the present Gospel age of grace. The blessings of 9:24 teach the perfect millennial condition of the people of Israel

In his final posting, Brother Scott raised points of interpretation – jot & tittle:

Quoted from Pastor Scott Markle

How can you come to a right understanding of what God the Holy Spirit *precisely* intended to communicate in the Scriptures, if you first rearrange the *precise* grammatical arrangement for the words by which He communicated? *Precise* grammatical analysis (as that in which I engage) handles each statement of God's Holy Word *word-for-word according to the precise grammatical arrangement in which God the Holy Spirit inspired and communicated that statement of God's Holy Word*. (For example – If God the Holy Spirit inspired the coordinating conjunction “and” to be precisely arranged at the beginning of each and every independent statement (sentence, clause) in a series of statements, then God the Holy Spirit had a precise reason for so arranging that conjunction; and it is my responsibility as a Bible student to discern and understand God the Holy Spirit's precise reason for so doing.) Such a practice is not “extreme” grammatical analysis. Rather, such a practice is a *precise, word-for-word (“jot and tittle”)* grammatical analysis *that regards and respects every single word* that God the Holy Spirit inspired, *in the precise grammatical arrangement* in which God the Holy Spirit inspired it. Indeed, such a practice is “rightly dividing” God's Holy Word of truth. Indeed, such a practice is the only way to understand *precisely* what God the Holy Spirit has inspired and communicated, before we engage in the matters of “interpretation” and “application.”

Throughout this debate it has become apparent to me that the primary disagreement between Brother Day and myself is not over Daniel 9:24-27, but is over the method of Bible study itself. Therefore, with my conclusion to this concluding installment of the debate, I wish to provide a warning unto the members of the audience. The Lord our God desires that we should study His Holy Word according to the principle of precise detail, “rightly dividing” precisely in accord with the precise pattern that God the Holy Spirit has inspired. Indeed, in Deuteronomy 8:3 the Lord our God teaches the truth that we do not live by physical food alone, but “*by every word*” that has proceeded out of His mouth as recorded in His Holy Word. In Matthew 5:18 our Lord Jesus Christ indicated the importance of every “*jot and tittle*” in God's Holy Word, indicating that not even one of them would pass “*till all be fulfilled.*” Even so, any Bible study or Bible teaching that follows a method of loose generalities, wherein things that are not precisely presented in God's Word as the same are claimed to be the same, should be rejected as faulty. Indeed, when a Biblical position teaches us that there is “no need to study every detail” of the truths and promises of God's Word concerning a matter, or that there is no need to ask concerning specific details of truth on a matter because it would be superfluous to do so, then that position of belief should be viewed with spiritual suspicion.

I agree 100% when Brother Scott says “the primary disagreement between Brother Day and myself is not over Daniel 9:24-27, but is over the method of Bible study itself.”

But, does his attention to every jot & tittle find support in the words of our Lord? I think not, if we analyse them in context.

Mat. 5:17-20 – “*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. 18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. 19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. 20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.*”

We need to read the inspired words – the inspired Word – in its immediate context, & in its wider context. Jesus is there declaring that “*I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.*” The minutiae of the Law would indeed be fulfilled, perfectly, by the One who gave the Law. The Law & covenants were hopelessly broken by the priests, lawyers & Pharisees who paid extreme attention to the detail. (See Mat. 23) Jesus as the true Israel, as the covenant surety for his people, fulfilled the Law, so that in him we have perfect righteousness – the righteousness of faith. As Gabriel puts it: “**to bring in everlasting righteousness.**”

Jesus quoted from Hosea 6:6 on two occasions when the Pharisees accused him or his disciples of breaking the Law – eating with publicans & sinners, & eating with unwashed hands. (See Mat. 9 & 12) Those who paid extreme attention to the precise details of the Law were rebuked as not understanding the Word of God:

But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.

Paul the ex-Pharisee puts it like this:

Phil3: 3-9 – “*For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. 4 Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: 5 circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; 6 concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. 7 But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. 8 Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, 9 and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:”*

Incidentally Paul is writing to the Philippians, where it is presumed Philippi did not have enough Jews to establish a synagogue, so he went to a riverside women's prayer meeting. And he writes to them: “*we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh*”. He teaches that the Gentile believers are *the circumcision* which brings us to another major point of interpretation:

There is no suggestion in the teaching of Jesus or his Apostles that the Gospel age beginning at Pentecost is in any sense a gap in the purposes of God; that God is concentrating on saving Gentiles until such time as the Jews come to repentance after the church has been “raptured.” The inclusion of uncircumcised Gentiles into the church was accepted by the Jewish Christians at the Jerusalem conference (Acts 15) and as that went against the laws for incorporating foreigners into Israel, (see Exo. 12:48) it does show a surprising change. That is not a “replacement” but an inclusion. Paul refers to that inclusion as a mystery. (See Rom. 11:25; Eph. 3:1-11) Note particularly:

8 Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; 9 and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: 10 to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, 11 according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord:

The present Gospel age Jew-Gentile body of Christ is *according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord:* It certainly isn't a gap.

Your conclusions from your attention to the precise grammatical detail of OT prophecy show a blindness to the reality of the fulfilment in & by the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ.

You maintain that “not one New Testament passage precisely indicates that it is a fulfillment of Daniel’s 70th “week” of years.”

I maintain that a reading of the Dan. 9 prophecy, in context, and keeping it in mind as we read the Gospels & Epistles will show that countless New Testament passages – indeed the whole message of the NT - show that Jesus Christ & his saving work is the fulfilment of the prophecy.

Dare anyone wait for another dispensation to come to repentance? *NOW is the day of salvation.* The Jews who rejected the Messiah & the Apostolic Gospel suffered the prophesied consequences.