

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #56; December, 2002 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY

AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my fifty-sixth monthly teaching letter and continues my fifth year of publication. With this *Teaching Letter*, we will continue our walk-through series in the Book of Daniel. One very important element we should understand about Mohammedanism is the fact that they don't worship the same god as the Christians. Before Mohammed came along, Mecca was a center of the worship of many false gods. All Mohammed did was to reduce their pantheon of approximately ten false gods down to one false god, Allah. In Judaism, Mohammedanism and Christianity there are three different deities. For Christianity it is the Mighty One of the Hebrews; for the Mohammedans it is the false god Allah; and the "Jews" actually worship Lucifer.

It might be well to show the variant pronunciations and spellings of the name of Mohammed. For this, I will quote from the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia*, volume 16, page 405:

"MOHAMMED ..., an English form of one of the commonest Muslim names, first borne by the founder of the Muslim religion (which is sometimes called Mohammedanism after him). The name has had various forms and spellings in the West: Mohammed, Mohamed, Mahomet, Mahound, and even Baphomet. All these forms derive from the Arabic *Muhammad* ... A Turkish form of the name, *Mehmed*, is used for several sultans of the Ottoman Empire; and a modern spelling that has come into English through French, *Mehemet*, is frequently used in the name of Mehemet Ali, the Ottoman viceroy who founded modern Egypt.

"The name Muhammad is ultimately derived from the verb *hamada*, 'to praise'; it is actually a verbal noun meaning 'the one worthy of praise.' Other derivatives of *hamada* are also used as proper names *Mahmud* ('the one who is praised'), *Ahmed* or *Ahmad* ('I praise'), and *Hamid* ('praised'); the first two have occasionally been used to refer to the Prophet Mohammed."

Then, from the book *Secret Societies*, edited by Norman MacKenzie, from a depiction on page 126 we read: "A medieval French representation of Baphomet, the 'devil' or foreign god the Templars were accused of worshipping. His name derives from medieval Christian forms of the name Mohammed, which became *Mafomat* in Spanish, *Bafomet* in Provençal. (Sculpture at Saint-Merri church, Paris.)"

From the 1910 Eleventh Edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, volume 26, page 596: “Baphomet was a common medieval corruption of Mahomet (Maphomet, Mahom, &c.), who was regarded, not as a false prophet only, but as a demon, a false god to whom human sacrifices were offered. Hence any unholy or fantastic rites came to be called *baffumerie, mahomerie, momerie, i.e. ‘mummery’.*”

If you follow and are in agreement with what the current clergy-diviners and “mainstream” purveyors of fallacies are fostering and vomiting out behind their pulpits and on the airwaves, with their theological system of eschatological [end-time] prophecy, you may not appreciate what is taught in this series on Daniel, which in turn reflects on John’s Revelation. On the other hand, should you be searching for fidelity on Scripture, possibly you will find this series interesting. With what I am continuing to present along this line, you really need to analyze and prove these things for yourself. In the end, it is each individual’s responsibility to arrive at the truth.

In lesson #55 we saw how the “little horn” in Daniel 8:9 was a prophecy foreseeing the period of the development of Mohammedanism. It was also explained that the fifth trump of Revelation 9 was a parallel passage about the Mohammedan Saracens, very fittingly describing them. We discovered further that, after describing the Saracens up to verse 12, the rest of chapter 9 related itself with the Turkish period of Mohammedanism. It was pointed out that the Turks used gun-powder firing cannon in their siege at Constantinople in 1453 A.D. On the front cover of a book entitled *Marvels of Prophecy* published by Howard Rand, there is a picture of one of those cannons. It is evidently made of brass, and is molded into the shape of a lion in a sitting position. There is a large cap over the barrel, and they molded teeth around the lion’s mouth which is always in a wide-open position. From the buttocks to the lion’s head along the vertebra column is the tail of the lion. To fire the cannon, a wick was lighted with fire at the end of the tail just behind the head which travels down to the rump and ignited the powder charge to propel the cannon balls. Revelation 9:18-19 describes this type of cannon quite well when it says:

“... by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone which issued out of their mouths. For their power is in their mouth, and in their tails: for their tails *were* like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt.”

If one could see a picture of this old cannon shaped like a lion, he could clearly understand the meaning of that passage in Revelation predicting the uprising of the Turkish Mohammedans. When Futurists make commentary on this passage, they come up with some of the most outlandish, damnable statements one could imagine. People like Tim LaHaye, Jerry Jenkins, Thomas Ice, John Hagee among many others are selling books by the millions in which they make such utterances. Should one want to go around repeating and spreading some of that Futurist garbage, making a fool of himself in the process, that’s up to each individual. But if you are in the Israel Identity Message, it would be better “to study to show yourself approved.”

In the book by Tim LaHaye and Thomas Ice, entitled *Charting The End Times*, on page 57 they have a chart of the so-called seven years of “The Tribulation.” Under the heading “The Seven Trumps” they show trumpet five and six in the future. If you have followed us with this series on Daniel, then you are aware these two trumpets are already past by many hundreds of years. In his book *Revelation Unveiled*, Tim LaHaye claims these cannons just described are “evil spirits” when he says on page 174:

“It is obvious that these are not to be taken as humans, for horsemen do not wear breastplates that are ‘fiery red, dark blue, and yellow as sulfur’, nor do horses have mouths that emit ‘fire and smoke and sulfur.’ Instead, this is a literal description of unnatural, demonlike evil spirits that come out of the Abyss, advancing under the leadership of the four bound angels.”

This is a good example of the *bull manure*, (defecation which the Bible terms “dung”), the Futurists are spreading around with their pitchforks. Not only that, but LaHaye is getting the sixth trumpet mixed-up with the fifth.

With this lesson, we are going to deal with Daniel’s seventy-weeks prophecy. For anyone who is interested in that period of time, I have a book entitled *An Outline History Of The Seventy Weeks Nation* on my Supplementary Teaching Aids List. This book was originally published by The Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd., 6 Buckingham Gate, London S.W.1, and the author was the Rev. Alban Heath. This is a very good book to have in one’s reference library, but as usual in British Israel, they have difficulty in distinguishing the impostor “Jews” from the true Tribe of Judah. Unless one can comprehend the history during this 490 years of Daniel’s prophecy, one cannot fully understand the New Testament! There are a lot of Jew-deo-unChristian clergy out there spouting the New Testament and haven’t the slightest idea of the five hundred year history between the testaments. And, sorry to say, we also have some in the Israel Identity Message. Like I have commented before, we need a Bible in one hand and a history book in the other.

DANIEL CHAPTER 9

Chapter 9 brings us to Daniel’s prophecy of the Seventy Weeks of Weeks, or 490 years. Daniel, understanding that Jeremiah’s literal Seventy Weeks prophecy concerning Jerusalem was quickly coming to an end, agonized what the future of the Holy City might be. The Darius spoken of in verse 1 is the same as mentioned before, and is dated from his first year, or about 539/538 B.C. Being greatly afflicted about the future, Daniel earnestly sought guidance through fasting, meditation and fervent prayer to the Almighty, recorded from verse 4 to 21. In his prayer, Daniel didn’t make any excuses for our people, but spelled everything out exactly as it was. One must remember that before those Judahites were taken captive into Babylon, they had incorporated many of the religious practices brought into Israel by Solomon’s foreign wives, which hurried their process into paganism. Though afterward many of those Judahites reformed, that fraction of the original nation of Judah was doomed to final extinction in 70 A.D., and they never became an enduring self-governing sovereign nation after their Exile. They were the cursed-fig tree, broken-bottle nation, never to be

put back together again. Though being doomed as a nation, nevertheless there was still some good seed among them. Surely, Daniel, with his copy of Jeremiah, knew the prophecy of the “broken bottle”, Jeremiah 19:10-11.

When we consider these things, we can begin to see why Daniel was so anxious of what Jerusalem’s fate might be. Understanding this, we can see that Daniel’s prayer and supplications were not just the ordinary run-of-the-mill kind of prayer. We cannot help but believe that Daniel already understood Jerusalem’s fate. What he didn’t know was when.

It is simply amazing today that nearly all the “mainstream” clergy try to imply that the present-day “Jews” gathering in Palestine, and especially Jerusalem, is a fulfillment of Bible prophecy. Yes, they are fulfilling prophecy, but not in the manner they suggest. When Scripture proclaims that that remnant nation is like a broken bottle, “that cannot be made whole again”, how can they sidestep and reconcile that inalterable fact? Yet they try! Again, how can they remove the curse of the fig tree of Matthew 21:19 which our Redeemer placed on them when he said: “Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.” Both of these passages totally eliminate any such future (so-called) fulfillment. Therefore, Daniel’s prophecy in chapter 9 concerns itself with the sum and substance of how long, and under what conditions, that post-exilic remnant, non-sovereign nation would last.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF SEVEN-YEAR-WEEKS

Many commentators make mention along this line. But to saw seven years off this prophecy and project them 2000 years in the future is preposterous. Nowhere did Daniel even remotely suggest such a thing. Verse 24, in no uncertain terms, points out that the seventy weeks of seven-year-weeks were “determined” upon thy people and upon thy holy city. All the rest of this prophecy revolves around a specified “people” and “holy city.” Shortly after this point in history, Jerusalem would become, and remain to be, until 70 A.D., essentially a subservient city-state. Therefore, this prophecy by Daniel must include, in some way, the final fall in 70 A.D. of Jerusalem to Rome. Again, Daniel’s prophecy is predictive of events surrounding the Mediterranean Sea area.

In order to acquire a concept of the thrust of this topic, we will first read it from verses 24 through 27. For this, I am going to weave portions of the Septuagint text in with the Masoretic text in a lighter font in italics, and in brackets:

“24 Seventy weeks are determined [*set apart*] upon [*for*] thy people and upon [*for*] thy [*the*] holy city, to finish the transgression [*for finishing sin offerings*], and to make an end of sins [*and for sealing up sin offerings*], and to make reconciliation for iniquity [*and blotting out iniquities, and making atonement for iniquities*], and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy [*and for sealing vision and prophet*], and to anoint the most Holy [*and for anointing the Holy of Holies*].
25 Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks [*Therefore thou art to know and understand, that from the going forth of a word for returning an answer and for building Jerusalem until an*

Anointed ruler are seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks]: the street shall be built again, and the wall [They shall indeed return and a street shall be built and a wall, and these times shall be emptied out], even in troublous times. 26 And after threescore and two weeks [and after sixty-two weeks], shall Messiah be cut off [though there is no crime in him], but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and sanctuary [and he, with the ruler who is coming, will destroy the city and sanctuary]; and the end thereof shall be with a flood [They shall be destroyed with a deluge], and unto the end of the war desolations are determined [and even to the end of the war determined on in course, with desolations]. 27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week [Now one week shall confirm a covenant for many]: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease [and in the half of that week My sacrifice and libation shall be taken away], and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate [And upon the temple shall be an abomination of the desolations], even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate [and at the end of time, an end shall be put to that desolation].”

For some, this passage is somewhat confusing for they do not take the time to determine who the major players are. By weaving in portions of the Septuagint, it will help clear up some of the essential particulars. Because many jump to conclusions before ascertaining the facts, they arrive at some very bizarre opinions. One thing that most commentaries do agree on is that these seventy weeks of seven-year-weeks, or 490 years, are broken down into $7 + 62 + 1 = 70$ weeks of years. But from that point on, it's a hodgepodge, conglomeration of confused concepts.

SAME OLD PROBLEM

As I pointed out in lesson #49, there are two schools of thought on Daniel's prophecy. One places the fourth empire of Daniel's dream-image of iron, in chapter 2, as Greece rather than Rome. By this spurious interpretation of making Greece the "iron" part of that image, they attempt to place the "Jews" under the rule of the Seleucid dynasty of Syria, and tie the prophecy in Daniel 2:40-43 with Antiochus Epiphanes. Then, again, this school of thought attempts to make the "little horn" of Daniel 7:8 Antiochus Epiphanes. Then, again on the "little horn" of Daniel 8:9 — you guessed it — they say Antiochus Epiphanes. Now we come to Daniel 9:24-27, and according to this same fraudulent school of thought on Daniel's seventy weeks of seven-year-weeks, again they make the claim that it involves Antiochus Epiphanes. All this makes one wonder if Daniel prophesied anything else other than Antiochus Epiphanes!

One of the reference commentaries we must be especially careful with on this school of thought is *The Interpreter's Bible*, both the one and twelve volume editions. Some other commentaries which put forth this same claim are the *Concise Bible Commentary* by Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke; *A Commentary On The Holy Bible*, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow; *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, edited by Raymond E.

Brown *et. al.*, and I am sure there are many more. To give you an example of how they falsely tie in Antiochus Epiphanes with the seventy weeks of seven-year-weeks of Daniel 9, I will quote from the *Concise Bible Commentary* by Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, page 586. What I like about this commentary is the fact that it is “concise.” While we are critiquing this book, consider that you’re reading very similar comments from other commentaries who have adopted this same concept:

“These verses are very difficult, and the interpretation here given is not universally accepted. The new clue is that the seventy years mean seventy weeks (of years), i.e. 490 years; cp. 2 Chr. 36:21 and Lev. 25. This is split up into 62 x 7 (434), 7 x 7 (49). The first period ends at 538, the return from exile; this takes us back to 588, instead of 586, when the sacrifice ceased. **the anointed one**. Joshua, the High-priest, Hag. 1:1. A period of 434 years follows, ending with the assassination of Onias, the High-priest (2 Mac. 4:34). Then comes a final period of seven years, when Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the sanctuary. The desecration actually lasted three and a half years. (In 1 Maccabees the period is three years; perhaps the figure three and a half was substituted for the sake of symbolism.) The *many of* are the Jewish aristocracy at Jerusalem, who took the side of the Syrians. **wing**. The destroyer comes as a flying monster. The objection to this explanation is that a much longer period is needed than the time which elapsed between 586 and 167-164; but, as the historical errors elsewhere in the book prove, the writer had no reliable sources for his chronology.”

At this juncture, you may be beginning to see what I mean about this particular *Concise Bible Commentary* by Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke. You may be wondering: why even give a book like this shelf-space in your library? The reason is: while this is a very poor insight on the book of Daniel, a few comments made on other subject material is outstanding. For example, I will quote a segment about the Hittites on pages 24-25. Although they don’t get it entirely correct, nevertheless this material is remarkable:

“HITTITES.— A people which by 1600 [B.C.] formed a powerful State centered in eastern Asia Minor. Representations on the monuments show them to have been of a strongly ‘ Armenoid ’ type; the Jew of today resembles the ancient Hittites more than the pure Semites (Arabs). Khatti, as the Hittite kingdom was called, penetrated as far as Babylon c. 1550; also into N. Syria. In 1370 it conquered Mitanni, the N. Mesopotamian kingdom, and for a long period faced the Egyptian empire in central and southern Syria. In the 14th and 13th centuries Khatti probably profited by the weakness of Egypt and pushed into Palestine. About 1200 the Hittite empire collapsed before the attacks of invaders from the north, though Hittite States seem to have continued in the Carchemish district. Hittites occur regularly among the lists of nations to be driven out from Palestine. We read of Ephron the Hittite in Gen. 23, of Uriah the [supposed] Hittite in David’s reign, even (in 2 K. 7:6) of the Syrian conviction that ‘ the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites.’ It seems as if the word is used loosely in the sense of Canaanites and in 2 Kings of petty States to the N. of Damascus. Also we may suppose that pockets of

genuine Hittites created by the great expansion of their empire remained where they were when it collapsed and were eventually absorbed into the population of Syria and Palestine. Cp. Ezek. 16:3, ‘thy mother was an Hittite’ (of Jerusalem). It is permissible to hold that the sturdy Anatolian stock from Asia Minor contributed to the formation of the tenacious Jewish race. Comparison of the Hittite Code of Laws with Hammurabi’s and the Hebrew Codes show that there was a common basis of law throughout the ancient Near East.” []
mine

The writer here is mostly correct if we apply it to the “Jew” rather than to the Israelite. Once properly directed, it is correct to show the “Jews” to be of an “Armenoid” type. Incidentally, the Armenoid is the Ashkenazic “Jew.” This shows that the Jews of Khazaria had the same genetics which Esau married into. The author here calls the Arabs “pure Semites.” This is a serious error, for the pure Semites would appear like the Anglo-Saxons. He is correct when he says: “It is permissible to hold that the sturdy Anatolian stock from Asia Minor contributed to the formation of the ... Jewish race!” Other than these things, the article is quite well written. It would be great if the antichrist, anti-seedliners were as competent on the subject of the background of the “Jews” as is W. K. Lowther Clarke.

But, back to the commentaries on Daniel which foster this false position. On the protective dust cover of *The (One-Volume) Interpreters Commentary On The Bible*, edited by Charles M. Laymon, there is a note which says: “Seventy scholars — Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish — have contributed fresh, new interpretations of the ageless truths of the Bible.” Need I say more? The bottom line is, it is imperative we be very discriminative of every bit of evidence we research. With that thought in mind, let’s see what we can determine with Daniel 9:24-27.

First of all, you will notice that the *Concise Bible Commentary* by Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke couldn’t justify his timeline with Scripture for his theory. The book *An Outline History Of The Seventy Weeks Nation* by Alban Heath has a better explanation for fitting the predicted time into the equation on page 82:

“God had declared through Daniel: ‘From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be ‘seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks’ (Daniel 9:25), ‘weeks of years’, as Moffatt renders it. Sixty-nine weeks of years is 483 years. From the decree of Artaxerxes to the Baptism of our Lord is exactly 483 years. This was a prophecy definitely related to the Jews. ‘Seventy weeks are determined upon *thy* people, and upon *thy* holy city’ ... At the end of the sixty-ninth week Messiah was to appear. The time allotted had expired. Messiah appeared saying, ‘The kingdom of God is at hand.’ Immediately after His Baptism Jesus began to gather around Him those with whom He would establish on earth the abiding Kingdom. One of the first was Andrew, who communicated to his brother Peter the glad tidings: ‘We have found the Messiah’ (John 1:41). The Messiah, on whom their hopes had been so long set, was here, in their midst.”

We have now cleared one major hurdle. The “Messiah of Daniel 9:25” is our Redeemer, Yahshua the Messiah, not Antiochus Epiphanes! W. K. Lowther Clarke, in his *Concise Bible Commentary*, identifies the first “seven weeks” in this same verse as the seventy years Judah was to be captive in Babylon. By doing that, he is claiming that that part of Daniel’s prophecy concerning the seventy weeks of seven-year-weeks was retroactive; that being the first seven weeks (7 x 7), or forty-nine years. No wonder he suggests that “these verses are very difficult” and cannot get his arithmetic to conform to the text. It is my opinion that the reason for trying to force Daniel’s prophecies to fit Antiochus Epiphanes in chapters 2, 7, 8, and 9 is to avoid the Pope as being the “little horn” antichrist of Daniel 7:8. In other words, there is evidently a Catholic influence in some of these Bible commentaries. I can see where the fake-Judahite (Jews) might also want to take that same position in order to avoid recognition of the True Messiah. Surely, we don’t want to be influenced by either of these sources, but avoid them at all cost. Additionally, I might point out that both the Futurists’ and Preterists’ interpretations on both Daniel and Revelation were invented by “Jewish” Jesuit Catholic priests.

When we once understand that Daniel was prophesying to all of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and not just that remnant Judahite nation alone, that was slated for extinction (which came to represent less than 1% of the original Southern Kingdom), we can begin to reconcile some of his predictions. Of course, because Daniel was a citizen of that remnant nation, he was quite concerned about its future. Therefore, it is a serious mistake to concentrate only on that remnant entity, which most commentaries do.

Another very serious error is not to identify “the people of the prince” in verse 26. Some commentaries state the “prince” was Titus, who as a young man he accompanied his father, Vespasian, to Palestine at the time of the “Jewish” revolt, being a “prince” at the time, and later became emperor. Of one thing we can be quite certain, it was not Antiochus Epiphanes, as W. K. Lowther declares. The “people” of the “prince” were the Roman soldiers made-up of Benjamites, true Judahites known as Germans, and probably many other Israelites from the various tribes. The answer to whom the “prince” is can be found in Romans 16:20: “And the Elohim of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly ...” Therefore, the “Prince” was **Yahshua the Messiah**, and “the people of the Prince” were the Roman soldiers. Thus, Titus was only part of “the people of the Prince.” The Roman seed of the woman bruised the “Jewish” seed of the serpent under Titus in 70 A.D. (Genesis 3:15).

While we are speaking of errors, we need to repeat again that the so-called scholars of the Futurists’ school of interpretation, by their failure to recognize the RACE of the BOOK, resort to what is known as the “parenthesis” or “gap” postulation (assumed as true). Then, in order to reconcile their beliefs with Scripture, they chronologically detach the 70th week-of-years from the preceding 69 weeks-of-years. They then place 2000 years in-between and label it the “Christian Dispensation.” The proponents of that theory infer Daniel’s prophecy came to a stop and is only marking time, which they say will continue with what they fallaciously dub the “rapture.” This has to be the most harebrained theorization of prophecy ever fabricated.

Of all their serious blunders, their view on verse 27 has to be the greatest. Let's take a second look at it:

“And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make *it* desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”

In this verse, when speaking of confirming a covenant with many for one week, it is prophesying that Yahshua would make a New Covenant of His Body and His Blood, represented by the bread and wine, to the House of Israel and the House of Judah. You will notice that it says “many” rather than “all.” The Futurists view this verse as “the reign of the Antichrist”, but it is quite the opposite. Therefore, the Futurists assign to the Antichrist (Satan) that which belongs to our Messiah. In the *Baker Commentary On The Bible* (based on the *NIV*), edited by Walter A. Elwell, on verse 27 it is put very correctly: “According to another [Futurists’] view, the last ‘seven’ pertains to the Jewish people and marks the period of great tribulation before the millennial kingdom.” The way the author states this, it is apparent he is not in agreement with that view.

This same Bible commentary does a better job on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel than most, and is worth quoting:

“Building on the seventy-years motif, the angel reveals that the Lord has decreed ‘seventy sevens’ (v. 24) The purpose of the ‘seventy sevens’ is to finalize judgment on sin, to atone for sin and transgression, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to fulfill all the prophetic word, and to anoint the most holy (v. 24) ... The first period of seven ‘sevens’ pertains to the return of the people from exile and the rebuilding of the temple and Jerusalem (ca. 536-445 B.C.). This period begins with the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, but opinions differ on when this took place: 538 B.C. (Cyrus’s decree to restore the temple in Jerusalem) or 445 B.C. (Nehemiah’s permission to restore the walls of Jerusalem). There is little disagreement on the identification of ‘the Anointed One, the ruler’ with our Lord Jesus ... A longer period of ‘sixty-two ‘sevens’ brings us to the crucifixion of the Messiah. The last ‘seven’ will witness the confirmation (renewal) of the covenant by the Messiah and the desecration of the temple. Gabriel promises that ‘he will confirm a covenant with many for one ‘seven’” (v. 27), but our problem is the identity of the ‘he.’ Some hold that the Messiah is the subject of the sentence, but others see here a reference to Titus and the Antichrist. Indeed, Titus brought an end to sacrifices and offerings and set up pagan symbols in the temple court. This is the ‘abomination that causes desolation’ (v. 27). On the other hand, the confirmation of the covenant could be reference to the Anointed, whereas the abomination of desolation is an allusion to Titus. These events are associated with the Romans, who destroyed the city and the sanctuary.”

If there is any question of whether or not the Futurists base what they call “the tribulation period” on verse 27, all one need do is go to Tim LaHaye’s book *Revelation*

Unveiled, page 132, where he uses Daniel 9:24-27, the passage we are now addressing, to attempt to prove his thesis.

A PROBLEM STILL REMAINS

It might appear that because verse 27 indicates that the “sacrifice” and the “oblation” would “cease” in the “midst of the week”, that there might be a period of three and a half of Daniel’s 490 years that were never used. But, if we examine the text thoroughly, we will see that the time element depends “unto the Messiah” (v. 25), rather than the destruction of Jerusalem. Many use the forty years from the crucifixion until Titus to prove their theory for a “gap.” If we analyze verse 26, that Messiah would be cut off **after** the sixty two week of years period, thus, $7 + 62 = 69$, and **after** would put it into the 70th week of seven years. In other words, Messiah came upon the completion of 69 weeks of seven-year-weeks. The first three and a half years of the seventieth prophetic week would then represent the ministry of Messiah.

That still leaves us with the word “midst” in verse 27. The Hebrew word “midst” is #2677 in the *Strong’s* or *Gesenius’* and means: a half; our half; or middle. This seems to confirm that Messiah was crucified in the middle of Daniel’s 70th prophetic week. But, we must remember that Yahshua continued to confirm His covenant after His Resurrection. This could have included His Ascension; the Advent of the Holy Spirit; the very beginnings of the origination of the Church, along with many dreams, visions and personal appearances, such as like with Saul, later called Paul.

Scripture doesn’t seem to give us a sharp cutoff point for the end of the 70th week, but we can be sure it was exactly three and a half years after His crucifixion. As you can plainly see, there isn’t any time left over for a future seven years of tribulation or the coming of a super-duper-poopier Antichrist.

Much of the error concerning Daniel’s prophecies is a misunderstanding of Matthew 24. There is not enough space here to get involved in that study, but one must know the historical background of that period. Some may not be aware of it, but the complete works of *Josephus* supply much of that information. If you don’t have one already, I recommend the one translated by William Whiston. Please don’t take me wrongly though, I am not implying that *Josephus* is a perfect source of information, but he supplies much of what we need to know in order to understand Matthew 24. The secret to understanding Matthew 24 is to be able to separate the short, medium, and long-range predictions Messiah instructed us to look for, and most of His predictions were of a short-range nature. But, as usual, the Futurists take Matthew 24 and try to fit most of it into a so-called “future seven years of tribulation.” The “tribulation” of Matthew 24:29 was the ordeal through which Jerusalem would suffer at the hands of the Romans. There is much more, but this will have to suffice for now. It is of the utmost importance that we interpret Daniel and Revelation **CORRECTLY!**