

Literary Methods

Dan 9

1) LITERARY DEVICES IN DANIEL 9

a) Chiasm

- i) Daniel's prayer (vv. 4–19) is structured as a **chiasm**—a literary pattern with a mirrored structure:
 - (1) **A (v. 4)** – Invocation of God's covenant love (*hesed*)
 - (2) **B (vv. 5–10)** – Israel's rebellion
 - (3) **C (vv. 11–14)** – God's judgment according to covenant
 - (4) **B' (vv. 15–16)** – Confession and appeal based on past mercy
 - (5) **A' (vv. 17–19)** – Plea for restoration and forgiveness
- ii) This structure emphasizes the **covenant foundation** of the prayer and reinforces that the **answer (vv. 24–27)** must be understood in **covenantal terms**.

b) Intertextual Allusions

- i) Daniel's prayer and the angelic response are loaded with **echoes of earlier Scripture**:
 - (1) **Leviticus 26 & Deuteronomy 28–30**: Covenant blessings/curses and exile
 - (2) **Jeremiah 25 & 29**: The 70 years of exile
 - (3) **Exodus 34:6–7**: God's mercy and forgiveness (quoted in v. 9)
- ii) These references show that Daniel 9 is a **covenantal reflection**, not just an apocalyptic timetable.

c) Numerical Symbolism (70 x 7)

- i) The “seventy weeks” (שבעים שבועים) in v. 24 are a symbolic intensification of Jeremiah's 70 years of exile.
 - (1) **70 x 7 = 490**: Echoes **Jubilee cycles** (Lev. 25) and **total covenant fulfillment**.
 - (2) Jesus likely alludes to this when He says, “*Forgive seventy times seven*” (Matt. 18:22)—pointing to **complete mercy and restoration**.
 - (a) So the numbers are **symbolic of total redemption**, not just **calendar math**.

d) Hebrew Parallelism

- i) In v. 24, the six purposes for the 70 weeks are grouped in **parallel poetic structure**:

(1) Negative (undo sin):	ii) Positive (establish righteousness):
(2) Finish transgression	iii) Bring everlasting righteousness
(3) Put an end to sin	iv) Seal up vision and prophecy
(4) Atone for iniquity	v) Anoint a most holy one/place
- vi) This shows the **covenantal reversal** of Israel's guilt and the establishment of the **new covenant reality**.

e) Ambiguity & Narrative Compression

- i) Daniel 9:26–27 condenses major theological events into tight, loaded phrases—this is called **narrative compression** or **telescoping**.
 - (1) “An anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing” — Jesus' crucifixion
 - (2) “The people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city” — AD 70
 - (3) “He shall make a strong covenant with many” — New Covenant
- ii) Each clause evokes broad theological realities that stretch across time, using **dense prophetic shorthand**.

f) TYPOLOGY IN DANIEL 9

- i) Typology is when a person, event, or institution in the OT **foreshadows** a greater fulfillment in Christ or the new covenant.
- ii) Here are key **typological themes in Daniel 9**:
 - (1) **Exile → Restoration Typology**

- (a) Daniel is praying during the **Babylonian exile** about Jeremiah's **70 years**.
- (b) The answer: "**seventy sevens**" — a new, ultimate period of **redemptive restoration**.
- (c) Typological movement:
 - (i) From **physical exile in Babylon** → to **spiritual exile under sin**
 - (ii) From **return to Jerusalem** → to **return to God through Christ**
 - (iii) Jesus is the One who **leads the true return from exile** (Luke 4:18; Isa. 61; Heb. 13:12–14).

(2) Anointed One (Messiah) Typology

- (a) "Anointed one, a prince" (*mashiach nagid*) in v. 25 points typologically to:
 - (i) The **Davidic king** (2 Sam 7)
 - (ii) The **suffering servant** (Isa. 53)
 - (iii) The **high priest** who atones for sin (Lev. 16)
- (b) Jesus fulfills all three roles:
 - (i) **King, Servant, and Priest**—cut off for sin, yet vindicated.

(3) Covenant Confirmation Typology

- (a) "He shall make a strong covenant with many" (v. 27) mirrors:
- (b) Isaiah 53:12 — "He bore the sin of many..."
- (c) Jeremiah 31 — promise of a **New Covenant**
- (d) Jesus' words: "*This is the new covenant in my blood*" (Luke 22:20)
- (e) This "one week" is the **typological fulfillment of the Day of Atonement**, Jubilee, and Exodus themes—all **culminating in Christ**.

(4) Temple Typology

- (a) Daniel mourns the ruined **physical temple**.
 - (i) But by v. 27, "sacrifice and offering" come to an end.
 - (ii) This points typologically to:
 - 1. **Jesus as the new temple** (John 2:19)
 - 2. **Jesus as the final sacrifice** (Heb. 10:10–14)
 - (iii) So the destruction of the temple (AD 70) becomes a **typological judgment** on the old system and **vindication of Christ**.

(5) Abomination of Desolation

- (a) This echoes **Antiochus IV** (167 BC) but finds a **greater fulfillment** in:
- (b) **Rome's destruction of the temple** in AD 70 (Matt. 24:15; Luke 21:20)
- (c) Possibly pointing forward typologically to any future **desecration of true worship**
- (d) Typologically, it represents the **judgment** that comes when **God's people reject His covenant** (cf. Ezek. 10, Matt. 23).

2) Summary of Daniel 9 view

a) Textual and Literary Structure Focus

- i) Daniel 9 is rooted in the **covenantal context** of Leviticus 26, Deuteronomy 28–30, and Jeremiah 25 and 29. Daniel's prayer (Dan 9:4–19) reflects a deep understanding of Israel's exile as the **covenantal curse** for disobedience under the Mosaic covenant.
- ii) Daniel confesses national sin and appeals to God's covenant faithfulness (hesed).
- iii) The "seventy weeks" prophecy is God's answer to Daniel's concern about the end of exile and full restoration.

b) Typological Fulfillment, Not Chronological Speculation

- i) the "seventy weeks" (sevens) are **symbolic periods** representing the **completion and fulfillment of covenant purposes**, not literal 490 years or a prediction map of political events.

(1) While the “**seventy weeks**” as **symbolic and covenantally patterned**, he still proposes a **real historical starting point** and timeline for the arrival of the Messiah, **especially for the first 69 weeks**.

(a) affirms a **literal and historical 483-year period** from 457 BC to the baptism of Christ.

(b) The fulfillment of **Daniel 9:25** — the coming of the *mashiach nagid* (Anointed Prince).

(c) Balanced with a **symbolic and theological reading of the 70th week**, seeing it **not as future**, but **fulfilled in the ministry, death, and resurrection of Christ**, and the judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70.

ii) The language is **apocalyptic and symbolic**, in line with Daniel’s genre.

iii) The “weeks” correspond to **Jubilee cycles**, connecting to Leviticus 25–26 and Isaiah 61.

iv) Just as the exile was linked to land sabbaths, the seventy sevens mark a **full covenantal restoration** beyond just returning to the land—it points to **forgiveness, righteousness, and the arrival of the messianic age**.

c) Messianic Fulfillment in Jesus

i) We see the fulfillment of Daniel 9:24–27 in the **life, death, and resurrection of Jesus**, the **Messiah**, rather than a future antichrist or rebuilt temple.

ii) “To finish transgression, to put an end to sin, to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness” (9:24) are **fulfilled in the cross and resurrection**.

iii) The “anointed one” (Messiah) is **cut off** (v. 26) — a reference to **Jesus’ crucifixion**, which accomplishes the covenantal goals of restoration and forgiveness.

iv) The destruction of the city and sanctuary (v. 26–27) refers to **70 AD**, as a **judgment on Israel** for rejecting the Messiah, not a distant end-time event.

v) This understanding avoids the **dispensational gap theory** (where the 70th week is postponed into the future), affirming instead a **unified covenantal timeline culminating in Christ**.

d) No Reinstitution of Mosaic Institutions

i) As a **progressive covenantalist**, I **reject the idea of a future temple, priesthood, or animal sacrifices**, since these are types fulfilled in Christ (see Hebrews).

ii) The “covenant” in v. 27 is often misread as a future antichristic peace treaty, but it is better understood as **the New Covenant** established by Christ.

iii) The cessation of sacrifice (v. 27) refers to the **abrogation of the sacrificial system** through the once-for-all atonement of Jesus.

3) DANIEL 9: VERSE-BY-VERSE (GENTRY’S VIEW)

a) Verses 1–2 – *Historical Setting and Awareness of Jeremiah’s Prophecy*

i) **Daniel 9:1–2 (ESV)** ¹ *In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, by descent a Mede, who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans—* ² *in the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of the Lord to Jeremiah the prophet, must pass before the end of the desolations of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years.*

ii) Daniel reads **Jeremiah 25:11–12; 29:10**, realizing the **70-year exile** is nearly complete.

iii) Daniel’s **covenant awareness**: exile was the result of breaking the Mosaic covenant (cf. Leviticus 26).

b) Verses 3–19 – *Daniel’s Prayer of Confession*

i) “*We have sinned...*”

ii) A model of **covenant repentance**.

iii) Echoes language from **Deuteronomy 30, Leviticus 26**, and the **Sinai covenant curses**.

iv) the theological heart of the chapter: Daniel is not simply asking for a **return to the land**, but for **covenantal restoration** and **forgiveness**.

c) **Verses 20–23 – Gabriel’s Arrival and God’s Response**

i) *“I have come to give you insight and understanding...”*

(1) God responds not only to Daniel’s **request for land restoration** but offers a **greater vision**: total **covenantal redemption**.

(2) The “seventy weeks” are God’s plan to **fully answer** the problem of sin, not just exile.

d) **DANIEL 9:24–27 – GENTRY’S DETAILED VIEW**

i) This is the climax. I am arguing this prophecy is not primarily chronological but **theological and typological**, pointing to the work of the Messiah.

ii) **Verse 24 – The Purpose of the Seventy Weeks**

(1) **Daniel 9:24 (ESV)** ²⁴ *“Seventy weeks are decreed about your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.”*

(a) **Progressive Covenantal view:**

(i) **“Seventy weeks”** = 70 * 7 years → symbolic of **Jubilee language** (Leviticus 25), connected to **sabbath rest and full covenantal restoration**.

(2) These six purposes describe the **work of Christ**:

(a) **Finish transgression / atone for sin**: accomplished by the **cross**.

(b) **Bring everlasting righteousness**: introduced in the **new covenant**.

(c) **Seal vision and anoint the holy one**: relates to Jesus as the **anointed one** and the **true temple**.

(d) **Some notes on to finish transgression. [kālā’ the peša’]**

(i) We understand this as a covenantal transgression, not just moral or generic sin. The “transgression” in view is Israel’s breaking of covenant, culminating in the rejection of the Messiah. Jesus even frames His death in this light (cf. Matt. 21:33–46; Luke 19:41–44). The idea that “the transgression” would be “finished” doesn’t necessarily mean that sin ceases universally, but that a particular covenantal rebellion has reached its climax and been judicially dealt with.

(ii) In this light, the cross and the destruction of the Temple can be seen as God’s judicial end to the Old Covenant system—and the corporate rejection of Messiah by first-century Israel. That rebellion is “finished” in the sense that its consequences have been rendered final. The door, of course, remains open for *individual Jews* (and Gentiles) to enter the New Covenant. Paul is clear that this partial hardening is temporary (Rom 11:25), and in that we share great hope.

(e) **Put an end to sin.**

(i) His death did “put an end” to its dominion and its condemning power (see Romans 6:14; Heb. 9:26).

(ii) The language of “end” [tāmam] doesn’t necessarily mean *eradicate all existence*, but to *bring to completion or fulfillment*. Hebrews 10:12–14 uses very similar language: *“By one offering He has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified.”* That’s priestly, covenantal, and eschatological language. The full eradication of sin is inaugurated in Christ’s first coming and will be consummated in His return. But the prophetic clock in Daniel isn’t necessarily paused between two advents—it may be pointing to the whole arc of redemptive history centered in Christ.

(3) **Summary**: This is the **spiritual and covenantal climax** of redemptive history, fulfilled in **Jesus**, not a future political timeline.

iii) **Verse 25 – The Coming of the Anointed One (Messiah the Prince)**

- (1) **Daniel 9:25 (ESV)** ²⁵ *Know therefore and understand that from the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time.*

(2) Progressive Covenantal view:

- (a) **“Anointed one, a prince” (*mashiach nagid*):** Refers to **Jesus the Messiah**, not a generic or political leader.
- (b) **“Seven weeks” and “sixty-two weeks”:** Represent **symbolic periods** (not necessarily literal years), again drawing on sabbatical and jubilee patterns.
- (c) The rebuilding of Jerusalem is literal, but it is only **provisional**; true restoration comes **through the Messiah**.

(3) Start Point:

- (a) The decree of Artaxerxes to Ezra (457 BC) – Ezra 7
 - (i) According to Ezra 1:1–4 and 2 Chronicles 36:23, the “word” of Cyrus in 537 BC is focused on building a house for the Lord at Jerusalem. This word matches perfectly the prophecies of Isaiah 44:28 and 45:13, which predict Cyrus giving leadership to **rebuild the city and temple of Jerusalem**. Cyrus’s divinely appointed purpose (Ezra 1:2) led him to allow the people to return to accomplish this task (1:3). After the altar was rebuilt and foundations were laid for the new temple, **opposition brought the work to a halt**. A decree of Darius allowed it to be finished (Ezra 6), spurred on by the ministries of Haggai and Zechariah. In Ezra 7, the “word” of Artaxerxes (ca. 457 BC) is focused on support for the new temple. Yet Ezra 6:14 speaks of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes as though they issued a single decree. **Darius’s decree (Ezra 6) was based on the fact that Cyrus had already issued the decree to permit the return and rebuilding of Jerusalem** (see 5:17–6:7). Darius’s decree was therefore a renewal (6:6–7) and an expansion (6:8–12) of Cyrus’s original decree (6:3–5). Ezra 6:14 shows that Artaxerxes’s decree to Ezra (in Ezra 7) is also an extension of Cyrus’s original decree. **So the decree that Cyrus drafted in 537 BC to restore the temple is not completed until 457 BC under Artaxerxes**, which is therefore the date of the “word to rebuild Jerusalem,” starting with its sanctuary¹
 - (b) This decree reinstated **theocratic government** under the Torah.
 - (i) **Granted Ezra authority to teach, judge, and rule using the Law of Moses.**
 - 1. Ezra 7:25: “*You, Ezra, according to the wisdom of your God that is in your hand, appoint magistrates and judges who may judge all the people...*”
 - 2. This gave **judicial and administrative authority** to Ezra over the Jewish community—**based on the Torah**, not Persian law.
 - 3. This was **theocratic authority**: the right to govern God’s people using God’s law.
 - (ii) **Restored religious and civil autonomy to the Jewish people.**
 - 1. Ezra was granted:
 - a. **Freedom to appoint judges** (v. 25),
 - b. **Power to punish** (even by death or banishment) violations of the Law (v. 26),
 - c. Authority over both **civil and religious affairs**.
 - d. This is the first time since the exile that **Torah-based governance** was restored in Jerusalem.

¹ Gentry, P. J., & Wellum, S. J. (2018). [*Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*](#) (Second Edition, pp. 618–619). Crossway.

(iii) **Re-established Torah as the basis of society in Jerusalem.**

1. Artaxerxes provides **silver, grain, wine, oil, and salt** to support the sacrificial system (vv. 16–22).
2. While the **temple had been rebuilt earlier**, Ezra's mission **revives its function** as the **center of covenantal worship** under Mosaic law.

(iv) **Fulfilled the theological idea of “restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem” which is the theological heart of Dan 9**

1. Daniel 9:25 says: *“From the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem...”*
2. Gentry argues that this “word” refers **not merely to physical construction** (like Nehemiah's wall-building), but to the **spiritual and covenantal restoration** of God's people in their land under His law.

(v) **Fits the timeline** to Messiah's arrival perfectly ($69 \times 7 = 483$ years)

(4) 7 Weeks (49 years):

- (a) Time to rebuild Jerusalem, including physical and institutional restoration.

(5) 62 Weeks (434 years):

- (a) Brings us to **the coming of the Messiah**, which dates to **Jesus' baptism (AD 26/27)**—the beginning of His public ministry and **anointing with the Spirit**.

(6) **Summary:** This verse transitions from physical rebuilding (post-exile) to **spiritual fulfillment in Christ**.

e) The literary structure of 26-27

This last week is described twice in 9:26 and 9:27. Verses 26a and 27a describe the work of the Messiah in dying vicariously to bring into force a covenant with “the many” and to deal decisively with sin, thus ending the sacrificial system. Verses 26b and 27b show that, ironically, supreme sacrilege against the temple at this time will result in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem. Thus 9:26–27 has an a–b–a'–b' structure.²²⁰ **This fits the normal pattern in Hebrew literature to deal with a topic recursively.** The literary structure can be diagrammed as follows:

a	The beneficial work of the Messiah	26a
b	The ruination of the city by his people	26b
a'	The beneficial work of the Messiah	27a
b'	The destruction of the city by one causing desolation (via abomination)	27b

Observing this literary structure is *crucial* because one can explain difficulties in one section using the parallel section.

i) **Verse 26 – The Cutting Off of the Anointed One and Destruction**

(1) **Daniel 9:26 (ESV)** ²⁶ *And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing. And the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war. Desolations are decreed.*

(2) **Progressive Covenantal view:**

- (a) **“Cut off”** = The **crucifixion of Jesus** (Isaiah 53 imagery: “cut off from the land of the living”).
- (b) **“Shall have nothing”** = He dies **without earthly kingdom**, rejected by men.

²²⁰ Williamson acknowledges this a–b–a'–b' structure, although he interprets “leader” or “prince” differently; see Paul R. Williamson, *Sealed with an Oath: Covenant in God's Unfolding Purpose*, NSBT 23 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 175.

(3) **Who are the people of the coming prince?**

- (a) If God used foreign nations to judge His covenant people, but the primary cause of judgment was the rebellion of Israel/Judah, then why can't we say that in Daniel 9:26, the "coming prince" is Jesus (as the covenant Lord), and the "people" are the Jews whose rebellion caused the destruction?

(i) **BIBLICAL PRECEDENT: THEOLOGICAL CAUSALITY VS. HISTORICAL INSTRUMENT**

1. In Scripture, there's often a **distinction between the agent of judgment and the cause of judgment**:
 - a. **Babylon destroys Jerusalem in 586 BC**
 - i. **Agent**: Babylon
 - ii. **Cause**: Judah's covenant rebellion
 - iii. **God's role**: He *sends* Babylon as judgment (Jer. 25:9; Hab. 1:6)
 - iv. *"Though Babylon burned the city, the guilt and responsibility lay primarily on Judah."*
 - b. **Rome destroys Jerusalem in AD 70**
 - i. **Agent**: Rome
 - ii. **Cause**: Israel's rejection of the Messiah
 - iii. **God's role**: Jesus explicitly **foretells** and **declares** this judgment (Matt. 23:37–24:2; Luke 21:20–24)
 - iv. *"The Romans executed the act, but Israel's rebellion triggered the sentence."*
2. Biblically, **God's covenant people are responsible**, even when **foreign agents carry out the judgment**.

(ii) **DANIEL 9:26 – CAN JESUS BE THE "COMING PRINCE"?**

1. Let's examine what it would mean if we said:
 - a. The **"prince who is to come" is Jesus**, and
 - b. The **"people" are the Jews**, as covenant-breakers who effectively destroy the city by rejecting the Messiah.
2. **Theological Strengths of This View**:
 - a. **Keeps Jesus as central throughout the passage**, continuing from v. 25.
 - b. **Highlights Israel's covenant guilt**, which aligns with Daniel's prayer.
 - c. **Fits covenant pattern**: God allows destruction of His city because **His people rebelled** (as in 586 BC).
 - d. **Jesus Himself declares Jerusalem's judgment**:
 - i. *"Your house is left to you desolate..."* (Matt. 23:38) *"Not one stone will be left upon another..."* (Matt. 24:2)
 - e. **Prophetic causality is often moral, not military**: The ones who make destruction **necessary** may not be the ones who physically carry it out.

(iii) **Is It Reasonable to See Jesus as the Prince and the Jews as the People?**

1. Yes—**theologically**, it's a legitimate and thought-provoking proposal. In fact, this is an example of **real covenantal logic**:
 - a. **God's judgment falls on His people** when they reject His Word.
 - b. **Jesus is the covenant Lord** (cf. Mal. 3:1), so in a real sense, **He brings judgment on Jerusalem**—not as a destroyer, but as the rejected King whose rejection brings destruction.
 - c. So, if you emphasize **covenantal causality**, you could reasonably say:

- i. “Though the Romans carried it out, the **destruction of Jerusalem** was **ultimately brought about by Israel’s rejection of her Prince—Jesus.**”
 - ii. This allows a kind of **blended interpretation**:
 - iii. The “**prince who is to come**” is Jesus, in a **judicial/covenantal sense**.
 - iv. The “**people**” are the **Romans**, the physical executors of divine judgment.
 - v. The **Jews** are morally responsible, but not the direct agents.
- (b) “**People of the prince**” = Roman armies in AD 70; but the focus is not on the Roman general (Titus) as the “prince,” but rather on the **covenantal judgment**.
- (c) **Destruction of Jerusalem** = God’s judgment on Israel for rejecting the Messiah (cf. Luke 21; Matt 23–24).
- (4) **Summary**: This verse spans from the **death of Christ** to the **destruction of Jerusalem**, showing **Messianic rejection and covenant judgment**.
- ii) **Verse 27 – The Covenant and the End of Sacrifice**
 - (1) ***Daniel 9:27 (ESV)** ²⁷ And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week he shall put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator.”*
 - (2) **Progressive Covenantal View**:
 - (a) “**He**” = **The Messiah (Jesus)**, not a future antichrist.
 - (b) “**Strong covenant**” = The **New Covenant**, promised in Jeremiah 31, inaugurated by Jesus (Luke 22:20).
 - (c) “**One week**” = The **final stage** of redemptive history; not future tribulation, but Christ’s **ministry, death, and resurrection**.
 - (i) The word for is not in the text it is added to make the sentence make sense in English but unfortunately it makes the covenant sound temporary.
 - 1. the emphasis is not on **duration**, but on **effectiveness**—the Messiah causes the New Covenant to triumph.
 - 2. The **timing** (one week) sets the context of when this happens but does **not limit** the covenant to that period.
 - 3. It’s not “a one-week-long covenant”; it’s “a covenant made effective in the final week.”
 - (d) “**Put an end to sacrifice**” = Jesus’ death **renders the temple system obsolete** (see Hebrews 9–10).
 - (3) **What is the abomination?**
 - (a) **The Event: High Priest Tears His Robe**
 - (i) **Matthew 26:63–65 (ESV)**: “*But Jesus remained silent. And the high priest said to him, ‘I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God.’ Jesus said to him, ‘You have said so...’ Then the high priest **tore his robes** and said, ‘He has uttered blasphemy. What further witnesses do we need?’*”
 - (b) **Why This Moment Matters Theologically**
 - (i) **Violation of Torah**
 - 1. **Leviticus 21:10** strictly forbids the high priest from tearing his robes:
 - 2. “*The priest who is chief among his brothers... shall not let the hair of his head hang loose nor **tear his clothes.***”
 - 3. By tearing his robe, **Caiaphas disqualifies himself** as high priest under the law.

4. This act was **not merely emotional**—it was **illegal and symbolic of covenantal breach**.

(ii) The True High Priest Is on Trial

1. The **true and eternal High Priest—Jesus (Hebrews 4:14)**—is standing before a **corrupt, apostate high priest**.
2. **Typological inversion**: The one who should intercede **condemns** the only One who can truly intercede.
3. Caiaphas **represents** the **entire old covenant priesthood**, which is now:
 - a. Lawless (tearing robes),
 - b. Blind (rejecting the Messiah),
 - c. And **under judgment**.

(iii) The Ultimate Abomination: Rejecting the Messiah

1. Gentry and others argue that the **abomination that leads to desolation is not merely a Roman act, but a covenantal act of rejection**.
2. By condemning the **Son of God**, the priesthood:
 - a. **Desecrates its own office**.
 - b. **Closes the door on covenant mediation**.
 - c. **Invokes judgment on the temple and nation**.
 - i. *“He came to his own, and his own people did not receive him.”* – John 1:11

(iv) Connection to the Temple's Desolation

1. Just days earlier, Jesus had said:
 - a. *“See, your house is left to you desolate.”* – Matthew 23:38
2. The **temple is already declared desolate before** the Romans arrive.
 - a. Why? Because the leadership:
 - i. **Rejected the cornerstone** (Matt. 21:42),
 - ii. **Denied the Messiah** (Matt. 26),
 - iii. **Crucified the Son** (Matt. 27).
3. This makes the **tearing of the high priest's robe** the **visible signal** that the **priesthood has failed**, and the **temple is under divine sentence**.

(4) Thus, **this moment is an “abomination”** in the fullest biblical sense:

- (a) A **high-handed rejection** of God's plan,
- (b) A **desecration** of God's appointed office,
- (c) And the **trigger** for desolation—**both spiritual and literal**.

(5) How This Fits Typologically with Daniel 9

- (a) **Daniel 9:26–27**: The Messiah is “cut off”; sacrifice and offering cease.
- (b) The **rejection and death of Jesus** is the **covenantal turning point** that leads to:
 - (i) The **end of temple significance**,
 - (ii) The **destruction of Jerusalem** (AD 70),
 - (iii) And the **inauguration of the New Covenant**.

(6) Conclusion

- (a) Yes—the **high priest tearing his robe and condemning Jesus is arguably the most theologically potent “abomination”** that led to the desolation of Jerusalem.
- (b) It is:
 - (i) A deliberate **covenant violation**,
 - (ii) A **rejection of God's own Son**,
 - (iii) And the **legal and spiritual severing** of the old priesthood.

(7) **Summary**: Christ brings the **new covenant**, ends the sacrificial system, and **fulfills** the seventy weeks.

(a) **The Big Idea**

- (i) Daniel's prayer for **restoration** is answered in the **Messiah**, not just the return from Babylon.
- (ii) The seventy sevens are **not a rigid timeline**, but a **symbolic theological pattern** showing how Christ accomplishes the **true and final exile-ending**.
- (iii) The chapter is not about a **future antichrist**, but about **Jesus fulfilling the redemptive purposes of God**.