

I just mentioned. To say this must point exactly to the time of Christ, this other factor which may be in connection with it or may be separate from it, is the assumption that this passage must look to the first coming of Christ and nothing else!

There are a number of books written in recent years which take that assumption, which assume it can point to nothing else. It can only point to the coming of Christ. We noticed in the other chs. they all look, except ch. 8, they all look specifically to the time of the complete destruction of human government. We have not found in the book of Daniel any other clear prediction-- any clear prediction anywhere else than in these four vv. of the first coming of Christ!

Therefore to assume that these vv. must point only to the first coming of Christ is quite unwarranted. I believe they do point to the first coming of Christ, but to assume that is all they point to is quite unwarranted. There are many who interpret the statement in v. 27 which says "he will put an end to sacrifice and offering i.e. he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease"-- interpret that as meaning that Christ by His death on the cross put an end to sacrifice and offering. It seems to me that is taking an assumption and reading it into the text.

Because we have statements in two other places in Daniel how the little horn is going to cause sacrifice and offering to cease, referring to his putting an end to it. To say that in this case that Christ by His death on calvary will cause sacrifice and offering to ~~cease~~ cease, is quite out of parallel with what you find elsewhere in the book of Daniel.

These other chs. point very definitely to the second coming of Christ. It would be strange if there was nothing nothing in this particular prediction that pointed to that. That does not prove it does, but to assume it points only to His first coming, is utterly unwarranted.

If you look at these purposes, some of them have been interpreted in many different ways. I believe that to approach the passage we should emphasize what is clear and then fit in what is less clear. Consequently I believe we should place considerable emphasis on the third purpose, which in the NIV is to atone for wickedness. In KJV it says "to make reconciliation for iniquity." But ~~xxx~~ this word is used c. 70 t. in the OT to mean atone. There are only 4 cases where it is trans. "to make reconciliation" in KJV. I don't know why they did it in this passage because there is no passage I know of where it means "to reconcile" in today's sense.

Now perhaps in the time of King James that meaning would fit. But today if I reconcile you it means that I make each of you stop thinking false things about the other, and become friends again. That's not what this term means. This term means when one is at fault to provide some way of remedying the ~~xxx~~ fault so that they can again be friends. In other words atonement. It is used constantly in the OT in connection with the sacrificial system. The making of atonement. This is the standard word for atonement. So I don't know why KJV in this particular case translated it "to make reconciliation."