

## EVANGELICAL INTERPRETATIONS of DANIEL'S 70 WEEKS©

Proponent	The Decree to Rebuild		Beginning/Ending Termini			Identities			
	Author of Decree to Rebuild (9:25)	Date of the Decree (9:24,25)	End of First Seven Weeks = 49 years (9:25)	End of Sixty-two Weeks = 434 years (9:25,26)	Beginning of Seventieth Week = 7 years (9:27)	Identity of "Messiah the Prince" (9:25)	Identity of "Messiah" (9:26)	Identity of "the prince to come" (9:26)	Identity of the Covenant Maker, "he" (9:27)
MacRae	God (Jer. 25:1; 29:10; 31:38; cf. Is. 44:28; 45:13)	587 BC	538 at coming of Cyrus	Begin in 404 (close of canon) and ending in 30 AD	Tribulation period at end of the age	Cyrus (Is. 44:28–45:1)	Jesus Christ (Isaiah 53:8)	Titus	Phps the same as "Prince" in 9:26; more probably Antichrist
Keil; E.J. Young	Cyrus (Is. 44:28)	538 BC	Time of Nehemiah	First Advent of Christ	Beginning of Christ's Ministry	Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ	Titus	Jesus Christ
Payne; (Wood)	Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:6,7,13,23)	458 BC	ca. 407	26 AD	26 AD (Wood=Trib)	Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ	Titus ← Wood	Payne = Jesus = Antichrist →
Sir Robert Anderson; McClain	Artaxerxes (Neh. 2:1-8)	445 BC	ca. 397 BC	32 AD	Tribulation period at the end of the age	Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ	Antichrist (little horn of Dan. 7:8)	Antichrist
Misc.: e.g., David Lurie in <i>JETS</i> 33:3	Cyrus	538 BC	440 BC ("7 weeks" really is 7 Fourteens)	6 BC, birth of Jesus	6 BC, ending in 65 AD (= one 70)	Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ	Titus	Jesus Christ

SCHEME	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
MacRae	⇒ Observes three periods and their natural breaks ⇒ "Abomination" is apocalyptic (Mt. 25:15) ⇒ BP scholar...	
Keil; Young		⇒ None of the three time periods is meaningful
Payne; (Wood)	⇒ Fits first advent chronology fairly well	⇒ No "decree" to rebuild the city in 458 ⇒ Seven year covenant (9:27) is forced
Anderson; McClain	⇒ Abbreviated lunar years of 360 days seem to parallel the time scheme in Rev. 11:2,3 etc. ⇒ "abomination" is apocalyptic (Mt. 25:15)	⇒ 69 weeks terminates with difficult 32 AD crucifixion date
Lurie		⇒ Arbitrary/ fanciful use of numbers violates original proportionality