

LESSON 7

This week our author covers only a little ground in his first of at least three studies on the popular 70 “weeks” forecast of Dan. 9. I will therefore integrate his polemic once more, then close by presenting my integrated critique of that simple polemic.

Our Author’s Polemic

Our author begins with a minuscule summary of the prime structural links which he believes he has verified between Dan. 7, 8 and 9. However, although I am by no means persuaded that he has established *any* such structures, these may all be ignored here in entirety since they in no way influence his polemic this week.

First, this “amazing 70-week prophecy, which provides powerful evidence not only for the inspiration of Scripture but for the messiahship of Jesus,” is juxtaposed with that of the 2,300 evenings-mornings and is the smaller of the two. For in Dan. 9:24:

Though various translations are used for the verb (root is *chatchak*), such as “determined,” or “decreed,” the basic meaning is that of “cut off,” which is how most Hebrew lexicons define it (unfortunately, the word doesn’t appear anywhere else in the Bible, so we can’t see how it is used elsewhere in Scripture). In Ugaritic, a language similar to Hebrew, scholars have noted that the parallel word in that language for *chatchak* means “cut off,” as well. Thus, the basic rendering of the text is “70 weeks are cut off.”

Cut off from what? What else other than from another time prophecy? What other time prophecy? Obviously, the *mareh*, the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14, the longer of the two prophecies. [Sunday]

Secondly, “When you understand that the Hebrew word for ‘Messiah’ is translated in Greek as ‘Christos,’ or Christ (9:25), to whom then is this prophecy referring?”

Thus, we can see here a crucial point: This prophecy is centered on Jesus. The first 69 weeks of the prophecy are used to bring us to Jesus, “the Messiah the Prince.” We can say, then, that the prophecy has its foundation in Christ Himself. To the degree, then, that we can have confidence in the messiahship of Jesus is the degree that we can trust the prophecy itself. [Monday]

In passing, our tutor also asks: “What immediate evidence do you see here for the day-year principle? Why can the 69 weeks not be taken as literal time?” Yet thirdly:

The crucial issue facing us now is, What is that starting date, the date of the command to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem? Fortunately, as long as we believe that the 69 weeks end with Jesus, we can narrow down the known decrees to only one, the one given in 457 B.C., which was the command by Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign... [Tuesday]

For such common options as 538 B.C., 520 B.C. and 444 B.C. are quite intolerable in terms of the year-day principle because each is “an impossible date for Jesus.”

In prefacing his comment on Ezra 4:7-16, our author asks: “Would Scripture give us such an important prophecy without also providing the key to understanding it?”

Sometime after the Jews returned to Jerusalem, a group of Persian officers wrote to King Artaxerxes, complaining about the Jews rebuilding Jerusalem. In the letter they stated two important points: (1) that the city was being rebuilt (*Ezra 4:12*) and (2) that the Jews who were rebuilding had come there because of the king. Said the letter, “Be it known unto the king, *that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations*” (*vs. 12, emphasis supplied*). In other words, the Jews who were rebuilding the city had come there because of King Artaxerxes. He must have issued the decree that allowed them to rebuild their city. The question is, What decree was that? [Wednesday]

The book of Ezra is not in chronological order, so the events in Ezra 4 came later than what was in chapter 7. And though nothing in this decree specifically talks about rebuilding the city, it was obviously understood to entail that, because, according to what we read yesterday, that’s exactly what the Jews were doing. Both they and their enemies understood that the decree, issued by Artaxerxes in his seventh year, by which the Jews “which came up from thee to us” (*Ezra 4:12*), must have included the command “to restore and to build Jerusalem.” This is even more obvious because nothing in their letter expressed any idea that rebuilding of the city by the Jews was somehow in contradiction with the decree of the king.

Thus, taken together, Ezra 4 and 7 make it clear that the decree, dated in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes (*Ezra 7:7, 8*) is indeed the “commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem” (*Dan. 9:25*). This, too, can be firmly dated at 457 B.C. (and though some argue for 458, the difference entails only a six-month discrepancy).

Also, if one believed that Jesus were [*sic*] “the Messiah the Prince,” this date would work perfectly. In other words, Jesus is our Surety in regard to this prophecy. [Thursday]

Evaluation

A word of pastoral caution is apposite at the very outset. As our author notes, in its application of the 70 “weeks” of Dan. 9:24-27 to Jesus Christ’s ministry, Seventh-day Adventism stands close beside countless conservative Christians. The *slightest* suggestion, therefore, that this prediction may not be Messianic is utter *anathema* to such devotees of Holy Writ. Indeed, the more vociferous are often quick to hurl the *ad hominem* accusation of liberal leanings, if not scholarship, at such critics.

Our author can be quite certain, therefore, that come Sabbath, August 12th, 2006, his Lesson 7 will be greeted world-wide by many an enthusiastic “**Amen!!**” The enigma, though, is that, like conservative Christians beyond their profession, such Seventh-day Adventists so conclude in glancing at Dan. 9:24-27 in a wide variety of *conservative* OT translations, in some *half* of which it **cannot** be read Messianically!!

In the interests, then, of the crucial Berean Test, Acts 17:11, which our author himself endorses back in Lesson 2 – “let the Bible speak for itself on this important topic” – I will preface my review by appealing for absolute *open mindedness* by permitting a selection of such versions to speak for themselves in my Addendum.

Please observe, though, that the sole surveys of the reasons for their major differences which I will offer this week are those mooted already by our author. These I have taken the liberty of colour coding throughout my Addendum. Any others must await the common courtesy of first permitting him to present his own case.

The Actual Import of the Hebrew Verb **ḥātak**

As our author attempts to assign a commencement date to the 2,300 evenings-mornings of Dan. 8:14, in his tenuous journey to his pre-Advent judgment beginning in 1844, he appeals to the 70 “weeks” of 9:24a. And his first point is that both temporal forecasts share a *common* outset. Then how much credibility is there in his unequivocal assertion that, back of *decreed*, 24a, the Hebrew verb *neḥtak*, a passive form of **ḥātak**, has the basic, *literal* meaning *cut off*, with support in Ugaritic?

Frankly, I stand aghast that *any* meticulous Bible tutor, let alone a *scholar*, would risk being charged with sheer *recklessness*, if not downright *intellectual dishonesty*, in mouthing such utter *nonsense!!* At very least, can our author parade even one *single* OT translation verifying his claim!? Even his KJV reads “determined”, without marginal options! As for its Greek renderings, the Septuagint has *ekrithēsan*, one passive form of *krinein*. Theodotion prefers *synetmēthēsan*, one passive form of *syntemnein*. And *krinein* bespeaks *judgment*, while *syntemnein* connotes *limit*. Either way, the nuance *determine* is manifest, while that of *cut off* is *impossible*.

More importantly, which Hebrew lexicons define **ḥātak** as *cut off*? Even *one* recognised authority would suffice amongst the unnamed “most”, as our author asserts! The simple fact of the matter is that this nuance is quite common in late, *Mishnaic* Hebrew, the variety current up to one millennium *beyond* the era of penning Daniel. However, even Dr. W. H. Shea, one of Seventh-day Adventism’s most articulate apologists for its exclusivist dogmas, concedes that “our late Mishnaic sources do not provide sufficient evidence” to ascertain the meaning of **ḥātak** in Dan. 9:24a – “The Relationship Between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9”, *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies* (R&H, 1981), 244.

As for Ugaritic, an extinct, Semitic language of northern Syria, current around one whole millennium *preceding* the era when Daniel was written, I am no expert, and am perfectly content to be corrected. However, if Shea’s conclusions, *ibid.*, are at all cogent, the onus of offering evidence bolstering our author’s claim that “the parallel word in that language... means ‘cut off,’ as well” falls firmly on his own shoulders:

Of some 16 such occurrences, *htk* appears clearly as a verb in only *one* case... The context preceding the line in which this verb occurs if [*sic*] broken away, and unfortunately *the significance of this verb here is not clear*... Thus, for any definite information about the meaning of this word in Ugaritic, *we are left with its occurrences as a noun*. In this case it is clear that it can mean either father or son, although the latter meaning appears to predominate... [stress supplied]

It is little wonder, then, that, after tugging this evidence every which way, Shea himself finally concedes, *ibid.*, 246, that “the information about *hṭk* from Ugaritic is not strongly determinative for interpreting its use in Dan 9:24”. Our author ought to listen!

In fact, it is astounding that Seventh-day Adventism’s *distinguishing* dogma consists largely in a series of small units linked by slender, *fragile threads* like this dubious definition of *hātak*! Whenever Christians concur that a biblical doctrine is important, it has a *robust fabric* whose warp and woof has enough *redundancy* even to *mute* the loss of a particular reference or two. For example, were the doctrine of Jesus’ Parousia ever to lose Mt. 16:27 and its juridic caveat, it could still rely upon Rev. 22:12. This major difference *alone* warns the wary that this may well be a *dubious* dogma!

As our author confessed, way back in his entire Introduction, of all Seventh-day Adventism’s sweeping doctrines, every one is repletely endorsed by other confessions, too, “(e)xcept one: the 1844 pre-Advent judgment.” ***There are GOOD reasons!!***

Is the **Anointed One** the Messiah?

Beyond Seventh-day Adventism’s special touch, countless devout Christians still deem Dan. 9:24-27 Messianic. Moreover, our author tugs at the heart strings in seeking Christ’s support for his dogma: “To the degree... that we can have confidence in the messiahship of Jesus is the degree that we can trust the prophecy itself.” We owe him the courtesy, therefore, of carefully weighing the evidence he offers.

First, although our author ignores the point, the Messianic leaning often results in the intensified expression *qōdeš qādāšîm*, 24, being rendered personally: ***Most Holy***. And this is readily applied to Jesus Christ, “anointed” by the Holy Spirit following his baptism. However, *this expression is never applied to any person in the OT*. Rather, it regularly denotes the ***Most Holy Place*** of the sanctuary/temple, as in Ex. 26:33, 34; 2 Chr. 5:7. This is easily recognised in the Greek equivalent *hagia hagiōn*, as in Heb. 9:3. As well, like the rest of the OT, Daniel applies the single noun to the entire *temple* complex in Dan. 8:13, 14; 9:26, with desecration in mind. It follows that the anointing Gabriel envisions is the (re)inauguration of the *sanctuary*, as in Ex. 30:22-33.

Secondly, is “the Hebrew word for ‘Messiah’... translated in Greek as ‘Christos,’ or Christ (9:25),”? And, Does it really matter? Here our author is either a poor scholar, or he is playing upon the theological inexperience of his largely lay audience. For this is most certainly ***no*** way to practise cogent exegesis! For one thing, ***Christos*** took time, even in the NT, to metamorphose from a mere *title*, as in Jn. 1:41, to a *name*. There is no cause whatever to read it as the latter in Dan. 9:25, 26, especially when the relevant Hebrew noun *māšîaḥ* is anarthrous – ***an*** anointed one. For another, ***māšîaḥ***, which is employed almost 40 times throughout the OT, is applied regularly to its prophets, as in Ps. 105:15, priests, as in Lev. 4:3, and kings, as in 1 Sam. 2:35 – even to Cyrus, Isa. 45:1. It follows that, *per se*, ***there is nothing*** Messianic about it! Indeed, the popular reading is a very sorry example of the bad habit which far too many lay Christians have of *forcing the NT back into the OT*, instead of seeking simply to embrace the Semitic text *as it would have impressed its pristine readers*.

Other exegetical evidence can readily be added here. But, as I have already indicated, it is most apropos that this be delayed till our author speaks on the issues.

How Many “**Weeks**” Until ***māšîaḥ*** Appears?

One of the major interpretive points by which modern OT versions can be separated into Messianic and non-Messianic is their partition of the first 69 of those 70 “weeks” into seven “weeks” and 62 “weeks”, Dan. 9:25. Why, though, irrespective of what events are assigned to each division, do some translations *combine* them into one single, 69 “weeks” unit, while about as many *segregate* them completely?

Simply stated, this is a matter of scholarly judgment regarding the relevant Hebrew *punctuation*. And here a word of robust caution is apropos against the backdrop of a minuscule overview of this highly enigmatic subject. For *if ever humility were requisite in modern minds striving to plumb a complex, ancient language it is here!*

There is good evidence that, in their autographs, the OT manuscripts were penned in CAPITAL LETTERS alone, without vowels (beyond a few primitive forms), punctuation or even word divisions. By and large, their scribes employed numerous devices to minimise mistakes in its *written* transmission, while the integrity of its *oral* transmission was assisted by various musical and cantillation techniques, especially.

Yet over time, as attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls, a number of divergent traditions took their place side by side. Moreover, stirred on by the rise of Christianity, it became essential, finally, to standardise the OT text. Eventually, around a millennium beyond Christ, the ultimate result was the Masoretic Text (MT), replete with vowels and punctuation, as supplied by the Masorete scribes from the best traditions. It is fairly widely accepted that the punctuation preceded the vowels. Whatever, in order to preserve the sacrosanct consonants, both were added mostly beneath the latter, as illustrated briefly below, in a highly relevant, interlinear quotation from Dan. 9:25.

In other words, dogmatism should walk hand in hand with *humility* in OT exegesis because *neither the MT's vowels nor its punctuation is inspired* like its consonants. And even among the latter there are certain ambiguities, which need not detain us. However, it would be extremely naïve to conclude, let alone permit it to dominate exegesis, that the salience of such “additions” may safely be minimised. For they often engendered subtle changes in the proximate words. *The entire text became one well-oiled, comprehensible “machine”*. So we need compelling cause to spurn the ancient scribes’ judgment by placing our clumsy, modern hands on *any* “cog”.

It is even possible that some translations of Dan. 9:24:27 are somewhat naïve in that most OT scholars still appear to have something to learn about *cantillation* in the MT, especially in poetry like this passage, where pure punctuation makes little sense of the sacred text! For example, in 25a there is a rather strong *disjunctive accent* between “weeks” and seven, while a weaker *accent* occurs between “weeks” and sixty-two in 25b, to mention two of several accents challenging exegesis in 24:27.

I plan to proceed, then, on the basis that the MT's second most forceful *accent* is purely punctuative in 25, in order to decide whether this supposition makes sense.

atnah, the MT's Second Most Significant Accent

It suffices here to give specific attention to just one punctuation mark, the disjunctive *atnah*, which usually approximates our semicolon, dividing a verse into two parts. It is positioned beneath the final word of the first portion. Although I am extremely reluctant to expose lay readers to the Hebrew text, those who really wish to grasp this crucial point should be able to do so in the following interlinear citation from Dan. 9:25, in which all *vowels* and the *atnah* are colour coded for convenience. Moreover, to assist the curious, I also mark both minor *accents* mentioned above:

שְׁבַעִים שְׁבַעַה וְשִׁבְעִים וְשָׁנִים וְשָׁנִים
and-two sixty and-“weeks” ;seven “weeks”

Remember, a Hebrew text reads from right to left. Converting this “literal” translation into our modern convention of reading from left to right, then, this becomes *“weeks” seven; and-“weeks” sixty and-two*. It is immediately clear why so large a proportion of modern translations *separate* these 69 “weeks” into seven “week” and 62 “weeks”. Why, though, do around as many versions choose to read them as a *single* unit?

One sound reason for modern translators to practise humility in approaching any Hebrew text is that *its highly dominant atnah can be less than fully disjunctive*. For example, it may be *emphatic*, as at the holy name *Yahweh*, Gen. 1:1. It may mimic our *comma*, as in 35:9, before the clause “and blessed him.” It may resemble our *colon*, as in 6:15, dimensioning the ark. And it may be *parenthetical*, as in 1 Ki. 8:42.

It follows that the *atnah* in Dan. 9:25 should not be read as if *certainly* disjunctive. Although Daniel utilises it most often this way, the other nuances also appear. The

option of segregating the seven “weeks” and the 62 in 9:25 is not even credible, then, unless it is invited by solid *exegetical* evidence. But first, the other options.

Neither nuance of *colon* nor *parenthesis* is plausible, and *emphasis* struggles. A *comma* simulation makes fairly good sense. Yet this appears rather trite in light of a plausible option involving normative disjunction. I apologise in advance that my polemic may prove difficult for many a lay reader. But I will strive hard for clarity.

One subtle distinction among the translations is that in most, the command of 25a involves two verbs, *šûb* (restore) and *bānâ* (build). In contrast, some appear to omit *šûb*. For in its basic, *Qal* conjugation, it readily coördinates with a following verb to give it the nuance of repetition: here *rebuild*. This is manifest in 25b, in which most translations have *rebuild* alone. The trouble is, in 25a *šûb* is in the generally medio-passive, *Niphal* conjugation, not *Qal*. This implies that *there is a very subtle difference between the prediction of Jerusalem’s future in the two halves of 25*, and this distinction should be preserved carefully in any translation. What is this variance?

In 25b, the temporal expression *sixty-two “weeks”* can imply duration: *for sixty-two “weeks.”* However, if the *atnah* is deemed *fully* disjunctive, translators appear to face the enigma of Jerusalem’s rebuilding taking the *entire* 62 “weeks”, or 434 years. This dilemma may possibly be resolved through two exegetical details. On one hand, 25b makes it clear that this rebuilding would be *hindered* by troubled times. On the other, the verb *šûb* may give the verb *bānâ* the nuance of *repetition*, even *continuity*, as in Eze. 8:17. In this light, the 434 years are by no means impossible, above all when 25a seems to entail *one* salient event alone, the coming of *māšîah*. Moreover, this tentative deduction is consistent with interpreting the temporal phrase “after the *sixty-two “weeks”*”, 26a – otherwise, *why not 69?* – as implying that they are to be terminated by the destruction, yet again, of this city and its temple, 26b.

In brief, the option of reading the *atnah* in Dan. 9:25 as a major, *disjunctive* punctuation accent permits quite good sense to be made of the prophetic text. Whatever, as may well be manifest once I have responded to all that our author has to say about these 70 “weeks”, his appeal to the Christ-event is still eisegetical. Moreover, his dubious definition of *hatak* is already caustic for his complete 1844 apologia. Similarly, Seventh-day Adventism’s most crucial dogma by far is scarcely assisted by Gabriel’s forecast that *māšîah* would appear *after the initial 49 years of the 490*.

Which Decree to Rebuild Jerusalem?

It remains this week for me to evaluate our author’s polemic that “the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem”, Dan. 9:25a, was that of Artaxerxes in 457 B.C. But first, it is important to observe that *his technique is scarcely exegetical*: “(A)s long as we believe that the 69 weeks end with Jesus, we can narrow down the known decrees to only one...” Rather, this is a splendid example of historicism’s folly of *interpreting Holy Writ through its history books*. The *only* procedure which respects the sacred text fully is to exegete it *per se*, *whatever* history’s eventual outcome. For *no historical detail can possibly reach right back and alter its prophetic blueprint!*

The Hebrew noun behind *decree* in 25a is *dābār*. Since this also occurs in 23 back of both *answer* and *message*, various commentators conclude that the relevant decree was Yahweh’s, *already* issued in heaven. For others, it is imperative that it relates to Jeremiah’s prophecy, about which Daniel had been praying earnestly. In this case the relevant decree is obvious in the open OT. For no sooner has 2 Chr. 36:21 attributed the Babylonian exile to Jeremiah’s grim prediction than 22 explains that, “*in order to fulfil the word of the LORD spoken by Jeremiah,*” in Cyrus’ first year he issued a decree to rebuild Yahweh’s temple in Jerusalem. This explanation is repeated in Ezra 1:1, together with the complete text of this restorative decree in 2-4.

As our author asks rhetorically himself: “Would Scripture give us... an important prophecy without also providing the key to understanding it?” I have scant interest, then, in his protracted efforts to locate this decree through *implicit* detail and a process of *elimination* founded firmly upon his *surmise* that the Christ-event is in view.

Here, then, is further patent evidence – with more likely as our author’s pending lessons on these 70 “weeks” are carefully reviewed – that they are by **no** means Messianic. Indeed, the considerable effort which an exegete is forced to expend in extricating such a protracted interpretation from Daniel’s sacred text is altogether out of proportion even to any competent Bible student’s most *reasonable* expectations concerning such an “amazing 70-week prophecy, which provides powerful evidence not only for the inspiration of Scripture but for the messiahship of Jesus”.

It is worth sober contemplation, moreover, that so problematic was the restoration of Yahweh’s temple that *it eventually required no fewer than four decrees*, with Holy Writ making no distinction whatever between the final three, according to Ezra 6: 14b: the Jewish elders “finished building the temple according to the *command* of the God of Israel and the *decrees* of Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, kings of Persia.” It may well be significant, in fact, that the implicit priority afforded here to Yahweh’s edict echoes the divine decree of Dan. 9:23a *well after Gabriel’s proclamation*. In brief, *our author’s date gains no support even from Ezra’s vast benefit of hindsight!*

Summary

In launching his interpretation of the 70 “weeks” of Dan. 9:24-27, our author begins to cover two broad aspects, those crucial in continuing his protracted journey to 1844, and therefore exclusive to Seventh-day Adventism, and those which it shares with conservative Christendom at large in reading them as decisively Messianic.

Our author’s initial interest majors in exegeting the verb *hātak*, 24a. However, this exercise achieves little more than casting quite a shadow across his scholarly reputation! For it is utter **nonsense** to read it literally as *cut off*, spurning the *unanimous* judgment of conservative exegetes and translations – including both major Greek versions – that in Daniel’s sixth century Hebrew, the *solitary* option was *decreed*. And *there is no pathway to 1844* via this defunct, Seventh-day Adventist novelty.

Secondly, our author completely ignores even the paramount *watershed* amongst modern translations, the relevance of the weighty accent *atnaḥ* in Dan. 9:25. If it is chiefly punctuative, not musical, a princely *māšīaḥ*, or at least the first of two, enters the scene after just 49 years, not 434. In this case, supported by around one half of modern versions, these 70 “weeks” cannot be Messianic. **Humility** is therefore *a prime requisite in exegesis!* At very least, such uncertainty scarcely accords with any claim that they constitute striking evidence supportive of Jesus’ Messiahship!

Finally, *our author begs the very question* in assuming that these 70 “weeks” are Messianic in deciding which decree Gabriel refers to in Dan. 9:25a. Quite apart from his virtual circular reasoning, and the testimony of the Book of Ezra, with its vast benefit of **hindsight** concerning Gabriel’s declaration, there is scarcely any striking evidence in support of Jesus Christ’s Messiahship in any regal, Persian decree *the inspired record of which completely fails to mention rebuilding Jerusalem explicitly!*

Addendum

Dan. 9:24-27 in a Selection of Conservative, Modern, English Translations

- The Apostles’ Bible (2003)

Seventy weeks have been **determined** upon your people, and upon the holy city, for sin to be ended, to seal up transgressions, to blot out iniquities, to make atonement for iniquities, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the **Most Holy**. And you shall know and understand, that from the going forth of the command for the answer and for the building of Jerusalem, until **Christ the Prince**, there shall be **seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks**; and then the time shall return, and the street shall be built, and the wall, and the times shall be exhausted. And after the sixty-two weeks, the **Anointed One** shall be killed, and there is no judgment in Him. And He shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the prince that is to come: they shall be cut off with a flood, and to the end of the war which is rapidly completed He shall appoint the city to desolations. And one week shall establish the covenant with many. And in the midst of the week my sacrifice and drink offering shall be taken away: and on the temple shall be the abomination of desolations; and at the end of the time an end shall be put to the desolation.

- Bible in Basic English (1949/1964)

Seventy weeks have been **fixed** for your people and your holy town, to let wrongdoing be complete and sin come to its full limit, and for the clearing away of evil-doing and the coming in of eternal righteousness: so that the vision and the word of the prophet may be stamped as true, and to put the holy oil on a **most holy place**. Have then the certain knowledge that from the going out of the word for the building again of Jerusalem till the coming of a **prince**, on whom the **holy oil** has been put, will be **seven weeks**: in **sixty-two weeks** its building will be complete, with square and earthwork. And at the end of the times, even after the sixty-two weeks, one on whom the **holy oil** has been put will be cut off and have no...; [*sic*] and the town and the holy place will be made waste together with a prince; and the end will come with an overflowing of waters, and even to the end there will be war; the making waste which has been fixed. And a strong order will be sent out against the great number for one week; and so for half of the week the offering and the meal offering will come to an end; and in its place will be an unclean thing causing fear; till the destruction which has been fixed is let loose on him who has made waste.

- GOD'S WORD Translation (1995)

"Seventy sets of seven time periods have been **assigned** for your people and your holy city. These time periods will serve to bring an end to rebellion, to stop sin, to forgive wrongs, to usher in everlasting righteousness, to put a seal on a prophet's vision, and to anoint the **Most Holy One**. Learn, then, and understand that from the time the command is given to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the **anointed prince** comes, **seven sets of seven time periods and sixty-two sets of seven time periods** will pass. Jerusalem will be restored and rebuilt with a city square and a moat during the troubles of those times. But after the sixty-two sets of seven time periods, the **Anointed One** will be cut off and have nothing. The city and the holy place will be destroyed with the prince who is to come. His end will come with a flood until the end of the destructive war that has been determined. He will confirm his promise with many for one set of seven time periods. In the middle of the seven time periods, he will stop the sacrifices and food offerings. This will happen along with disgusting things that cause destruction until [those time periods] come to an end. It has been determined that this will happen to those who destroy [the city]."

- Good News Bible (1994):

"Seven times seventy years is the length of time God has **set** for freeing your people and your holy city from sin and evil. Sin will be forgiven and eternal justice established, so that the vision and the prophecy will come true, and the **holy Temple** [or altar] will be rededicated. Note this and understand it: From the time the command is given to rebuild Jerusalem until **God's chosen leader** comes, **seven times seven years** will pass. Jerusalem will be rebuilt with streets and strong defences, and will **stand for seven times sixty-two years**, but this will be a time of troubles. And at the end of that time **God's chosen leader** will be killed unjustly [*Hebrew unclear]. The city and the Temple will be destroyed by the invading army of a powerful ruler. The end will come like a flood, bringing the war and destruction which God has prepared. That ruler will have a firm agreement with many people for seven years, and when half this time is past, he will put an end to sacrifices and offerings. The Awful Horror will be placed on the highest point of the Temple and will remain there until the one who put it there meets the end which God has prepared for him."

- Green's Literal Translation (1993).

Seventy weeks are **decreed** as to your people, and as to your holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the **Most Holy**. Know, then, and understand that from the going out of a word to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem, to Messiah the Prince, shall be **seven weeks and sixty two weeks**. The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in times of affliction. And after sixty two weeks, Messiah shall be cut off, but not for Himself. And the people of a coming prince shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end shall be with the flood, and ruins are determined, and war shall be until the end. And he shall confirm a covenant with the many for one week. And in the middle of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the offering to cease. And on a wing of the altar will be abominations that desolate, even until the end. And that which was decreed shall pour out on the desolator.

- New American Standard Bible (1977)

"Seventy weeks [or units of seven] have been **decreed** for your people and your holy city, to finish [or restrain] the transgression, to make an end of [or seal up] sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy [or prophet] and to anoint the **most holy place**.

"So you are to know and discern that from the issuing of a decree [or word] to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until **Messiah** [or an anointed one] the **Prince** there will be **seven weeks and sixty-two weeks**; it will be built again, with plaza [or streets] and moat, even in times of distress.

"Then after the sixty-two weeks the **Messiah** [or anointed one] will be cut off and have nothing [or no one], and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its [or his] end will come with a flood; even to the end there will be war; desolations are determined [or war will be decreed for desolations].

"And he will make a firm covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will put a stop to sacrifice and grain offering; and on the wing of abominations [or detestable things]

will come one who makes desolate [or causes horror], even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate [or causes horror].”

- New English Bible (1970)

“Seventy weeks are **marked out** for your people and your holy city; then rebellion shall be stopped [or restrained], sin brought to an end [or sealed], iniquity expiated, everlasting right ushered in, vision and prophecy sealed, and the **Most Holy Place** anointed. Know then and understand: from the time that the word went forth that Jerusalem should be restored and rebuilt, **seven weeks** shall pass till the appearance of **one anointed**, a **prince**; then for **sixty-two weeks** it shall **remain** restored, rebuilt with streets and conduits. At the critical time, after the sixty-two weeks, **one who is anointed** shall be removed with no one to take his part; and the horde of an invading prince shall work havoc on city and sanctuary. The end of it shall be a deluge, inevitable war with all its horrors. He shall make a firm league with the mighty [or many] for one week; and, the week half spent, he shall put a stop to sacrifice and offering. And in the train of these abominations shall come an author of desolation; then, in the end, what has been decreed concerning the desolation will be poured out.”

- New International Version (1990)

“Seventy ‘sevens’ [or ‘weeks’] are **decreed** for your people and your holy city to finish [or restrain] transgression, to put an end to sin, to atone for wickedness, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the **most holy** [or Most Holy Place or most holy One].

“Know and understand this: From the issuing of the decree [or word] to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the **Anointed One** [or an anointed one], the **ruler**, comes, there will be **seven ‘sevens,’ and sixty-two ‘sevens’**. It will be rebuilt with streets and a trench, but in times of trouble. After the sixty-two ‘sevens’, the **Anointed One** [or an anointed one] will be cut off and will have nothing [or and will have no one or but not for himself]. The people of the ruler who will come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. The end will come like a flood: War will continue until the end, and desolations have been decreed. He will confirm a covenant with many for one ‘seven’. In the middle of the ‘seven’ he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on a wing {of the temple} he will set up an abomination that causes desolation, until the end that is decreed is poured out on him [or it]. [or And one who causes desolation will come upon the pinnacle of the abominable {temple}, until the end that is decreed is poured out on the desolated {city}.]”

- New Living Translation (1996)

“A period of seventy sets of seven [or 70 sevens] has been **decreed** for your people and your holy city to put down rebellion, to bring an end to sin, to atone for guilt, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to confirm the prophetic vision, and to anoint the **Most Holy Place** [or the Most Holy One]. Now listen and understand! **Seven sets of seven plus sixty-two sets of seven** will pass from the time the command is given to rebuild Jerusalem until the **Anointed One** [or an anointed one] comes. Jerusalem will be rebuilt with streets and strong defenses [or a moat or trenches], despite the perilous times.

“After this period of sixty-two sets of seven, the **Anointed One** will be killed, appearing to have accomplished nothing, and a ruler will arise whose armies will destroy the city and the Temple. The end will come with a flood, and war and its miseries are decreed from that time to the very end. He will make a treaty with the people for a period of one set of seven, but after half this time, he will put an end to the sacrifices and offerings. Then as a climax to all his terrible deeds [or on the wing of abominations], he will set up a sacrilegious object that causes desecration [or an abomination of desolation], until the end that has been decreed is poured out on this defiler.”

- New Revised Standard Version (1989)

“Seventy weeks are **decreed** for your people and your holy city: to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a **most holy place** [or thing or one]. Know therefore and understand: from the time that the word went out to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the time of an **anointed prince**, there shall be **seven weeks**; and for **sixty-two weeks** it shall be built again with streets and moat, but in a troubled time. After the sixty-two weeks, an **anointed one** shall be cut off and shall have nothing, and the troops of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its [or His] end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war. Desolations are decreed. He shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and in their place [correction: meaning of Hebrew uncertain] shall be an abomination that desolates, until the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator.”

- The World English Bible (1997)

Seventy weeks are **decreed** on your people and on your holy city, to finish disobedience, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the **most holy**. Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem to the **Anointed One**, the **prince**, shall be **seven weeks**, and **sixty-two weeks**: it shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troubled times. After the sixty-two weeks the **Anointed One** shall be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince who shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end of it shall be with a flood, and even to the end shall be war; desolations are determined. He shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the offering to cease; and on the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate; and even to the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out on the desolate.