

an answer in four vv. which have been argued about perhaps as much as any four vv. in the Bible. There is much in these four vv. that is not at all clear. There are about 6 views of them that are held very tenaciously by various individuals. People become very emotional that their view is correct. Most of those who interpret these 4 vv. (Dan. 9:24-27) most who do so approach it with a definite idea in mind. Then they try to fit everything into that definite idea.

There are two definite ideas that are widely held. As an approach to it there are those who say, These vv. must tell us exactly how many years it would be before Christ would come. That would be a very strange thing if 400 years in advance he told us exactly when Christ would come! That would be a very strange thing. We do not find predictions like that elsewhere in Scripture. God could do that if he chose. But we have no right to assume that He did that, and no right to twist the statements around in order to force them into giving us an exact number of years from the time of Daniel to the time when Christ will come.

I would say, We have no right to do that. There are others who say we must do it. At least they do it without saying anything about it, just insist it occurred. But I say we should not approach it with such a presupposition. We should look at it and see what is there, and when we do we should emphasize what is clear first, and then try to fit in with what is clear what is less clear. That, I feel is the only reasonable approach to it.

Now I see that I have already discussed what I have put here as A. The Situation (by discussing Daniel's prayer and the answer coming to him. This is the situation.)

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

I asked you for today to look at these vv. and see exactly what you think they mean and whether there is a definite order. Many commentators will insist that the first three are paralleled by the last three. The first by the fourth; the second by the fifth; the third by the sixth. I think that is entirely imaginary. So I was interested in seeing how many of you would suggest that sort of an arrangement. There were one or two papers that were given me last Wednesday which said that the first three were negative and the last three positive. That is an important observation.

You can say there are three that are rather negative. They speak of destroying sin, and then number four speaks of bringing in everlasting righteousness. So it might be divided two threes on that basis. But to say that one corresponds to four and two to five and three to six, you find dogmatically stated in many commentaries and I do not think it is warranted.

I should mention at this point that there is another approach that is taken which does not contradict the first false approach