

Those are five points which should not be decided in advance. But the problems should be noted and then we should proceed to see what the evidence is and therefore decide which of these is most likely. Some move on to

D. A Fact Clearly Involved but Generally Ignored should be Recognized at the Start. This fact is that there are three periods, not two that are predicted. And the first of these is seven weeks, not 69. Most modern translations including KJV say "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks; (semicolon) and the street shall be build again and the wall. . . ." But the Hebrew is accented in such a way as to show that in the ~~W~~ the opinion of the Hebrew scribes, the semicolon should not be after 62 weeks, but after 7 weeks, exactly as in the parallel sentence which I gave. To Messiah the Prince is seven weeks; and 62 weeks the following situation will exist. That is not nearly as important, the fact of the accentuation of the Hebrew, as the beginning of v. 26 which begins, "And after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off." After the 62 weeks. Now most interpreters take it as if there were two periods; one of 69 weeks and one of one week. While they may in a footnote somewhere or in some small type make a guess as to where there is a slight break between 7 weeks and 62 weeks, they treat it as if it were one period--69 weeks.

But clearly the passage makes 7 weeks. And the clear proof that the Hebrew accentuation is right is found in the beginning of v. 26 because v. 26 says "after the 62 weeks" it does not say, "after the 69 weeks." It says after the 62 weeks.

The Living Bible is a paraphrase. It ~~attempts~~ attempts to give you what the translators think the original means, rather than to give a real translation. KJV and NIV both attempt to be translations. Most any translation occasionally, like the KIV's in "but no for himself," will