

LETTER 77
1977

**MORE COMMENTS ON
DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS**

Dear Dr MacRae,

It was a real pleasure to hear you at the Evangelical Theological Society and enjoy the vigor of your methodology and understanding....

I have shared your paper on Daniel 9 with several of my Old Testament colleagues. Let me again urge you to print up your results and submit them to Journal of Evangelical Theological Society for publication. Those to whom I spoke after your presentation were "almost persuaded" by your Cyrus dating (instead of the 445 date) and expressed deep appreciation for your work....

The most interesting development, from my own analysis of the paper, is that the much discussed "parenthesis" of the "Church Age" could turn out to be at least two gaps with the "Church Age gap" beginning even earlier than previously assumed. That may be a healthy corrective in steering us away from theologizing on what was not the point of the author anyway.

Another answer I found was a solution to the 1 Peter 1:10-12 passage which definitely says that the prophets did not know the time (*eis tina e poion kairon*) of Messiah's coming. If Daniel is treated as traditional futurists have handled it, then certainly some of the prophets should have known the *kairon*. Your exegesis is clearer on this point. It is also a healthier clearing of the air on what tends to be an excessive emphasis on discontinuity in the plan of God as regards the 70 weeks, but which discontinuity hardly fits in well with the teaching on the "new covenant" which is also addressed to the same persons, viz. the House of Israel and Jacob, yet includes the ministers of Paul's day and those who participated in the Lord's Supper. The only alternative to the latter dilemma is to have two new covenants and even Charles Ryrie and teachers of theology at Moody Bible Institute have