

Is it just a general expression? You cannot rule that out as we start. It certainly is a possibility.

Now there are some who say it cannot possibly be weeks of years. The term is never used this way in Scripture. That's going to the other extreme. We cannot dogmatically make a statement like that. The OT has many references to the 7~~0~~ year period, the period which has its seventh year actually called the Sabbath year. It is a definite feature of the OT economy, the seven year period. So it cannot be ruled out as a possibility. It must not be adopted as a starting point that they are weeks composed of years comparable to the weeks of days.

Also as you finish~~ed~~ the ch. and start the next ch. you find that 10:2 says, I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. And the next verse refers to three whole weeks and if you look at the Heb. the words "full" and "whole" do not occur. What it says is "three weeks of days" in both verses. It does not settle the matter but it certainly creates a presumption that after he talks about these 70 weeks here without saying what they are, then when he immediately thereafter speaks of weeks, he puts on the word "weeks of days". It creates a certain presumption that one should see whether it is a reasonable way to take it that they are weeks of years.

The length then is not to be dogmatically decided but to see what works out as we go further into the passage.

In v.26 it says "after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off". Translating it a bit more literally it would be and "after these sixty-two weeks shall an anointed one be cut off." The expression Messiah is certainly not impossible here. It is the very word from which our word Messiah comes. But this word is used a great many times in the OT and there are only two cases where the KJV translates it "Messiah" and these are in these two verses. It may be the ~~xxxxxxx~~ the correct translation but it is not the starting point. And the critics who think this was written in Macabean times and represents somebody's imagination of that time as he tries ~~to~~ reconstruct ~~xxx~~ its history and imagines it was prophecy given 400 years before this time, say this points to the murder of Onias, the High Priest. "An anointed one was cut off." We, of course, who believe the Bible is God's revelation and entirely true cannot accept that interpretation. But does this mean an anointed one, one whom God has set apart for a particular ~~for~~ function as it is used dozens of times in the OT? Or does it specifically mean ==refer to the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ? That is not the point at which to start, but it is to be kept in mind. "The Messiah shall be cut off but not for himself". The KJV is very explicit there. Surely we have the atonement as it stands in the KJV. But no modern translation that I have seen translates that phrase that way, "but not for himself." Because the word here translated "not" ~~is~~ is not the Heb. verbal lo which ordinarily means "not" but is the Heb. ayin const. ain which literally means "nothing" and therefore practically all the present translations render it "he shall be cut off and have nothing." Now that gives a very different idea. "He shall be cut off and have nothing." It seems at first sight to be much more literal. But immediately we ask the question: Shall have nothing of what?