

Homiletics Analysis: Daniel 9

Content & Intent

This Text — Content

Daniel 9 divides into two closely integrated movements. The first (vv. 1–19) is Daniel’s extraordinary prayer of corporate confession — one of the longest sustained prayers in the Old Testament. Meditating on Jeremiah’s prophecy of seventy years (Jer. 25, 29), Daniel does not simply wait for its fulfillment; he throws himself before God in fasting, sackcloth, and ashes, confessing the sins of Israel with exhaustive thoroughness. He confesses rebellion, disobedience, refusal to heed the prophets, national shame, and the justice of God’s judgment — repeatedly identifying himself with the people (“we have sinned,” “we have rebelled”). The prayer culminates in a plea not grounded in Israel’s righteousness but entirely in God’s mercy, His great compassion, and the honor of His own name. The second movement (vv. 20–27) is the angelic interruption. While Daniel is still praying, Gabriel arrives “in swift flight” to deliver a divine response. But the response does not directly address the seventy-year exile. Instead, Gabriel announces a vastly larger framework: seventy weeks (seventy “sevens”) decreed over Daniel’s people and the holy city — the purpose of which is nothing less than the full atonement of sin, the end of transgression, the ushering in of everlasting righteousness, and the anointing of a Most Holy. The seventy weeks unfold in three stages: seven weeks, sixty-two weeks, and one final week — terminating in a figure who makes a firm covenant, brings sacrifice and offering to cessation, and is himself cut off. The chapter’s two halves are not loosely joined: Daniel’s prayer for mercy and forgiveness receives an answer that far exceeds his immediate request, revealing that the forgiveness he pleads for requires a cosmic act of atonement that the exile itself only shadows.

This Text — Intent

God’s intent through Daniel 9 is to break open the category of “restoration” for His people — and for the reader. Daniel asks for the relief of exile; God answers with the architecture of ultimate redemption. The intent is threefold: (1) to humble the reader before the full weight of human sin and God’s just judgment — the prayer of confession is not merely Daniel’s but a template for any generation of God’s people who have gone after false gods and despised God’s word; (2) to establish that no earthly return from exile — not the one under Zerubbabel, not any subsequent one — is adequate to address the depth of the problem sin creates; and (3) to drive hope forward to a coming anointed figure whose being “cut off” will accomplish what no human repentance, prayer, or restoration can — the decisive, once-for-all ending of transgression and securing of everlasting righteousness. God is calling His people to confess deeply, hope eschatologically, and wait for the One whose atoning death alone closes the account.

Subject Sentence: Daniel's prayer for mercy receives an answer that reframes all restoration as pointing forward to final atonement.

Primary Claim: God is declaring through Daniel 9 that the exile Israel needed rescue from was never primarily geographical — it was the exile of a race from righteousness — and the only sufficient answer is the cutting off of an anointed one who bears what Daniel confesses. The reader is being called to the confession that creates the posture to receive that answer.

Interpretive Evaluation

The Seventy Weeks (vv. 24–27) — The Central Controversy

No passage in the Old Testament generates more sustained interpretive divergence than Daniel 9:24–27. Four major interpretive traditions must be evaluated:

(1) Dispensational/Futurist Reading: The seventy weeks are seven-year periods (490 years total), running from a decree to restore Jerusalem (typically identified with Artaxerxes' decree in 445/444 BC, Neh. 2) to a final eschatological consummation. The first sixty-nine weeks (483 years) run to the triumphal entry or the crucifixion of Christ. The seventieth week is then separated from the sixty-ninth by an indeterminate “gap” — the church age — and placed entirely in the future as a final seven-year tribulation period. The “prince who is to come” (v. 26) is a future Antichrist figure; the “abomination of desolation” belongs to the last days. This reading produces the Left Behind eschatological architecture.

Evaluation: The gap theory requires importing a concept — an indeterminate parenthesis inserted between week 69 and week 70 — that the text itself does not mention, anticipate, or signal. The text presents the seventy weeks as a continuous unit “decreed over your people.” The dispensational reading solves a chronological problem it partly creates by its choice of starting decree. More seriously, by relocating the seventieth week entirely to the future, it severs the interpretive link between Daniel's prayer (which concerns the covenant people, the holy city, and the ending of transgression) and the answer Gabriel delivers.

Refute the gap-theory insertion as a non-textual imposition, though the chronological connection to Christ remains significant.

(2) Liberal/Critical Reading: The “seventy weeks” are a post-event theological construction written during or after the Maccabean crisis (167–164 BC). The “anointed one cut off” is Onias III (assassinated high priest); the “abomination of desolation” is Antiochus IV Epiphanes' desecration of the Temple. The passage is vaticinium ex eventu — “prophecy” written after the fact. This reading denies genuine predictive prophecy and treats Daniel as second-century pseudepigrapha.

Evaluation: This reading is driven by a prior philosophical commitment against predictive prophecy rather than by the text itself. It fails on internal grounds: the second-century dating of Daniel is contested by conservative scholars on literary, linguistic, and historical grounds; and the “cutting off” language in v. 26 — combined with the cessation of sacrifice and offering — sits uneasily with Onias III, who was killed before the Maccabean crisis reached its apex. The atonement language of v. 24 (“to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness”) vastly exceeds anything Onias or the Maccabean era achieved. **Refute.**

(3) Historic Reformed/Messianic Reading: The seventy weeks are a symbolic-yet-structured period culminating in the first coming of Christ. The anointed one “cut off” (v. 26) is Jesus Christ, whose death brings sacrifice and offering to their intended end (the veil torn, the temple’s purpose fulfilled). The “abomination of desolation” is referenced by Christ Himself (Matt. 24:15) in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 — an event Jesus treats as both fulfillment and type. The seventieth week encompasses the ministry, death, and resurrection of Christ, with the desolation of Jerusalem following as consequence. This reading finds the passage’s primary referent in Christ while acknowledging layers of historical shadow (Antiochus) and typological fulfillment (AD 70). The endpoint of the seventy weeks is the inauguration of the new covenant, not a future tribulation period.

Evaluation: This reading requires no insertions not found in the text. It accounts for the atonement language of v. 24 with full seriousness — only Christ’s atoning death meaningfully “puts an end to sin” and “brings in everlasting righteousness.” It takes seriously that Gabriel’s announcement to Daniel comes as a response to a prayer about sin, forgiveness, and God’s reputation — concerns that find their ultimate resolution at the cross. The chronological reckoning is approximate rather than mathematically precise (as the text’s own symbolic framework — $70 = 7 \times 10 = \text{Sabbath of Sabbaths}$ — invites), which is a strength, not a weakness. **Affirm as the Reformed reading.**

(4) Preterist Reading: All of the seventy weeks are fulfilled in the period between Ezra/Nehemiah and AD 70, with no remainder pointing beyond that. This reading handles the AD 70 destruction as the full terminus and tends to minimize any ongoing eschatological significance.

Evaluation: The preterist reading rightly keeps the text’s referents in the historical arena of Israel and the Second Temple, but the atonement language of v. 24 strains against a purely AD 70 terminus — the ending of transgression and securing of everlasting righteousness is the work of the cross, not the Roman siege. **Qualify:** preterist elements (the AD 70 connection) are illuminating as part of the fulfillment pattern without constituting the totality of it.

Reformed Verdict: The passage is genuine predictive prophecy, structured around a symbolic Sabbath-of-Sabbaths framework (seven sevens of years), pointing forward to the ministry and atoning death of the Anointed One, with the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 as the seal of the old covenant order’s end. The prayer of confession (vv. 1–19) and the

prophetic answer (vv. 20–27) must be read together: the depth of sin Daniel confesses demands an answer greater than geographical restoration, and Gabriel provides it — the One who will be cut off to make atonement, end transgression, and bring in everlasting righteousness.

The Prayer of Confession (vv. 1–19) — Lesser Controversy

Some traditions read Daniel’s prayer primarily as a model of intercessory identification — Daniel praying on behalf of others, a prophetic/priestly intercession pattern (Wesleyan and Catholic traditions emphasize this). This is worth **acknowledging**: Daniel’s corporate identification with his people’s sin (“we have sinned”) is remarkable and does model a kind of priestly intercession. However, the primary function of the prayer within the chapter is not to establish Daniel as an intercessor but to establish the depth of the covenant breach that requires the response Gabriel brings. The prayer establishes the problem; Gabriel announces the only sufficient solution. The intercessory dimension should not eclipse the confessional-theological function.

Key Canonical Support

- **Jeremiah 25:11–12; 29:10** — The seventy-year prophecy that Daniel is reading (9:2); the prayer arises from Scripture, grounding Daniel’s intercession in God’s own word and establishing the pattern of exile-as-judgment-and-promise-of-return that Gabriel’s seventy weeks vastly expands.
- **Isaiah 53:8–10** — “He was cut off out of the land of the living... yet it was the will of the LORD to crush him... as an offering for guilt.” The “cutting off” of Gabriel’s Anointed One (Dan. 9:26) finds its fullest explication here — the servant’s atoning death that ends transgression and secures righteousness for many.
- **Leviticus 26:33–45** — The covenant curse of exile for disobedience, with the promise that even in exile, if Israel confesses their iniquity, God will remember His covenant. Daniel 9 enacts this structure precisely: the exile is the covenant curse acknowledged, the prayer is the confession Leviticus 26 anticipates, and Gabriel’s answer is God honoring the covenant at a depth Leviticus does not yet reveal.
- **Hebrews 9:11–14, 25–28** — The “once for all” atoning work of Christ as the decisive end of the sacrificial system — the theological fulfillment of what Daniel 9:27 announces (the making of sacrifice and offering to cease); Christ’s blood accomplishes the atonement that the daily sacrifices could only anticipate.
- **Romans 3:21–26** — The righteousness of God revealed through the faith of Jesus Christ, the “propitiation by his blood” that demonstrates God’s righteousness and justifies the ungodly. This is the “everlasting righteousness” of Daniel 9:24 unpacked in its full New Testament clarity — the righteousness that exile and return could never produce, secured by the One cut off.

Aim: To lead the reader through Daniel’s prayer of confession into a clear-eyed recognition that the exile of sin runs deeper than any earthly restoration can reach, and to fix hope precisely and exclusively on the atoning death of the Anointed One as the only ground of everlasting righteousness.

Content Table

Verse(s)	Content	Notes
9:1–2	Darius the Mede’s first year; Daniel reads Jeremiah’s prophecy of seventy years of desolation for Jerusalem	Prayer arises from Scripture — Daniel interprets Jer. 25/29; sets the “seventy” motif that Gabriel will vastly expand
9:3	Daniel turns to the Lord in fasting, sackcloth, and ashes — seeking God by prayer and pleas for mercy	Physical posture of mourning; the prayer is preceded by humiliation, not confidence
9:4	Daniel begins with adoration — the LORD is great, awesome, keeping covenant and steadfast love for those who love Him	The foundation of the prayer is God’s covenant faithfulness, not Israel’s merit
9:5–6	Corporate confession: “we have sinned and done wrong and acted wickedly and rebelled, turning aside from your commandments”; we have not listened to the prophets	Comprehensive confession — the verb pile (“sinned... done wrong... acted wickedly... rebelled... turned aside”) is exhaustive; Daniel includes himself
9:7–8	To the LORD belongs righteousness; to Israel belongs shame — a contrast sustained throughout; all Israel, wherever dispersed, bears the shame of unfaithfulness	Acknowledges the justice of exile; the shame is not unjust suffering but earned consequence
9:9–10	To the Lord belong mercy and forgiveness — even though Israel has rebelled against Him and not obeyed	The twin foundations of the appeal: God’s mercy and Israel’s acknowledged guilt; these are not in tension —

Verse(s)	Content	Notes
	His voice	mercy is God's free act toward the guilty
9:11–12	All Israel has transgressed the Law; the covenant curse of Moses (Deut. 28) has been poured out — “the calamity that has come upon us”	Explicit invocation of Deuteronomic covenant theology; the exile is the curse of the broken covenant — not divine caprice but divine faithfulness to His own word
9:13–14	Even under calamity, Israel did not entreat the LORD or turn from their iniquities; the LORD has been righteous in all He has done	The indictment deepens — not just past sin but continuing refusal to repent under judgment; “the LORD our God is righteous in all the works that he has done” is the premise of the appeal
9:15–16	Appeal to God's redemptive history — He brought Israel out of Egypt with a mighty hand; let His anger turn from Jerusalem because of His own righteous acts	The exodus grounds the appeal — God has acted in history for His name's sake; Daniel asks Him to act again
9:17–19	Urgent, stacked petitions: let Your face shine on the sanctuary; hear, O Lord; forgive, O Lord; pay attention and act; do not delay — “for your own sake, O my God, because your city and your people are called by your name”	The prayer's climax — the appeal is entirely God-centered: His sanctuary, His city, His people, His name; not “because we deserve it” but “because You are who You are”
9:20–21	While Daniel is still praying, Gabriel arrives “in swift flight” at the time of the evening sacrifice	The angel's arrival while the prayer is ongoing signals the immediacy and certainty of the divine response; “swift flight” — urgency from the divine side
9:22–23	Gabriel is sent to give Daniel “insight and understanding”; the word went out at the beginning of Daniel's pleas	The answer precedes the petition's completion — God's determination to answer is prior to Daniel's

Verse(s)	Content	Notes
	because Daniel is “greatly loved”	finishing; “greatly loved” — Daniel is a beloved covenant figure
9:24	Seventy weeks are decreed over Daniel’s people and the holy city: to finish the transgression, put an end to sin, atone for iniquity, bring in everlasting righteousness, seal vision and prophet, and anoint a Most Holy	The six-fold purpose of the seventy weeks — three negative (ending sin/transgression/iniquity) and three positive (everlasting righteousness, sealed prophecy, anointed holy one); this is ultimate, eschatological, covenantal resolution
9:25	From the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to an anointed prince: seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; Jerusalem will be built with squares and moat, even in troubled times	The first two segments: 7+62 weeks; the reconstruction of Jerusalem as the framework; the “anointed prince” — Zerubbabel/Joshua or pointing forward to Christ (interpretive divergence here)
9:26	After the sixty-two weeks, the anointed one shall be cut off and have nothing; the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; its end in a flood; war and desolations decreed	The “cutting off” — the atoning death; “have nothing” (or “have no one,” Heb. לֹא יִהְיֶה לוֹ) — without successor, forsaken, without inheritance; destruction of city and sanctuary (AD 70) follows
9:27	The prince will make a strong covenant for one week; he will put an end to sacrifice and offering; on the wing of abominations will come the desolating one, until the decreed end is poured out	The final week — the new covenant confirmed; sacrifice ended by fulfillment, not abolition; the desolation as terminus of the old order

Divisions Table

Division	Verses	Label
----------	--------	-------

Division	Verses	Label
1	9:1–3	The Occasion: Daniel Reads, Mourns, and Turns to God
2	9:4–14	The Confession: Comprehensive Acknowledgment of Sin and God’s Justice
3	9:15–19	The Petition: Urgent Appeal to God’s Mercy, Name, and Redemptive History
4	9:20–23	The Interruption: Gabriel Arrives While Daniel Still Prays
5	9:24–27	The Answer: Seventy Weeks Decreed — Ultimate Atonement and Final Restoration

Subject Sentence & Primary Claim *(restated)*

Subject Sentence: Daniel’s prayer for mercy receives an answer that reframes all restoration as pointing forward to final atonement.

Primary Claim: God is declaring through Daniel 9 that the exile Israel needed rescue from was never primarily geographical — it was the exile of a race from righteousness — and the only sufficient answer is the cutting off of an anointed one who bears what Daniel confesses. The reader is being called to the confession that creates the posture to receive that answer.

Applications (Five)

1. Confess with the comprehensiveness the depth of the problem actually requires. *(Mind/belief)*

Daniel’s prayer is striking in its refusal to minimize, qualify, or contextualize Israel’s sin — he names it from every angle (“sinned, done wrong, acted wickedly, rebelled, turned aside”) and traces it across every generation and social stratum. Most contemporary confession stays surface-level — apologizing for symptoms while leaving root rebellion unnamed. This passage calls the reader to examine not just what they have done but what they have been: people who, like Israel, have heard the word of God and turned away from it, who have been warned by the prophets (and their modern equivalents) and closed their ears.

Genuine confession identifies with Daniel's "we" — not performing penitence before others but collapsing before God with honest acknowledgment that the calamity, whatever form it takes, is not unjust.

2. Ground your prayers entirely in God's mercy and God's name — not in your own faithfulness. (*Affections/worship*)

The structural spine of Daniel's prayer is a sustained contrast: to God belongs righteousness; to us belongs shame. To God belongs mercy; to us belongs guilt. The petition never appeals to Israel's goodness, Daniel's own righteousness, or the merit of the prayer itself. The appeal is entirely God-ward: "for your own sake," "because your people are called by your name," "because you are merciful." The reader who approaches God calculating their own record of faithfulness as a reason for God to act is standing on sand. This passage reorients the affections toward a God whose mercy is not a response to our worthiness but an expression of His own character — and that reorientation is itself an act of worship. Pray from the bankruptcy that Daniel modeled, not from the account balance you imagine you hold.

3. Let Scripture determine the scope of what you are praying for. (*Mind/belief*)

Daniel does not simply feel the weight of exile and begin to pray; he reads Jeremiah, understands the word, and prays accordingly. His prayer is Scripture-shaped at its origin. The reader is being shown that genuine intercession for covenant concerns is not generated by impressions, feelings, or circumstantial urgency alone — it is formed by the word of God. Before Daniel knows what to ask for, he knows what God has said. The application is direct: prayer that is unmoored from Scripture tends either toward presumption (asking for what God has not promised) or despair (failing to ask for what He has). Read the prophets. Pray the promises. Let the seventy-year prophecy of Jeremiah — and the gospel's own promises — shape the content and confidence of your intercession.

4. Stop expecting earthly restoration to deliver what only atonement can. (*Affections/worship*)

Gabriel's response is not "here is the timeline for your return from Babylon." It is "here is the framework within which transgression will be finally ended and everlasting righteousness will be secured." The implication is that the exile Daniel mourns over is a symptom of something far deeper — and that something far deeper will not be addressed by geographical relocation, political restoration, or national revival alone. This speaks with direct pastoral force to anyone who has placed eschatological weight on earthly fixes: the right political climate, the right family circumstances, the right church, the right country. These things matter. But they cannot end transgression. They cannot atone for iniquity. They cannot bring in everlasting righteousness. The ache that drives Daniel's prayer will not be resolved by anything this side of the One who is cut off. Calibrate your hope accordingly.

5. The anointed one cut off is the specific answer to the specific confession — bring them together. (*Will/behavior*)

The architecture of Daniel 9 is deliberate: the prayer that names sin with maximum specificity receives an answer that promises atonement with maximum scope. The reader is being invited not merely to admire this connection but to enact it — to bring their own named, confessed, specific sin before the cross of the One who was cut off, and to receive not management but atonement. This is not abstract. It means: identify the specific transgression, rebellion, or iniquity that the first half of this chapter would name in your own life; bring it to the One who “made an end of sin” (v. 24); and receive from Him not a deferred hope but the everlasting righteousness that is the purpose of the seventy weeks. The gospel logic of Daniel 9 is that the depth of confession (vv. 4–14) is met by the fullness of the answer (v. 24). Don’t confess generically and then receive grace generically. Match the specificity of the confession to the specificity of the atoning work.

Theological Importance

Theological Importance: Daniel 9 teaches that sin is a covenant problem of cosmic depth — not merely a list of failures to be corrected but a structural rupture between humanity and God that has brought justified exile and shame upon the people who bore God’s name. The prayer of confession models what honest theological anthropology looks like in practice: it does not negotiate with sin, minimize its scope, or appeal to human goodness as a counter-weight. It spreads the full account before God and appeals entirely to His mercy and His name. The divine response to this prayer reveals that God’s purpose in redemption is not merely to restore people to a geographical location or a prior condition of blessing, but to bring transgression to its final end, to secure everlasting righteousness, and to anoint a Most Holy — a program whose scope implies that nothing less than a substitutionary atoning death will be adequate. The seventy weeks are not a calendar curiosity; they are the theological architecture of the entire redemptive project, from the covenant with Israel through the cross to the consummation.

Reformed Theological Significance

Reformed Theological Significance: Daniel 9 is one of the Old Testament’s most concentrated anticipations of substitutionary atonement and the passive obedience of Christ. The anointed one who is “cut off and has nothing” — forsaken, without inheritance, bearing the weight of what Daniel’s prayer confesses — is the conceptual seedbed for Isaiah 53 and its New Testament fulfillment. Reformed theology’s insistence that justification is by grace alone, through faith alone, on the basis of Christ’s atoning work alone, finds in Daniel 9 its Old Testament skeleton: the problem is not that Israel needs improvement — it is that Israel needs someone to “put an end to sin” and “bring in everlasting righteousness” on their behalf. Daniel cannot do this. His prayer cannot do this. The return from Babylon cannot do this. Only the cutting off of the Anointed One can. This is the logic of imputed righteousness: the everlasting righteousness of v. 24 is not Israel’s

achieved righteousness but a righteousness secured by another and received by a people who stand, like Daniel, with “open shame” and no claim of their own. The passage also demonstrates the Reformed understanding of Scripture’s unity: Gabriel’s answer to Daniel’s prayer is the gospel in seed form, and the New Testament’s fulfillment is not an addition to the Old Testament’s storyline but its irreplaceable conclusion.

Main Takeaway

The exile you most need rescue from is not the one you can see — it is the one that runs all the way down to “we have sinned, we have rebelled, and to us belongs open shame.” And the One who answers that prayer is not a political restoration or a change of circumstances — He is an Anointed One who is cut off, who bears what you confessed, and who alone can bring in the everlasting righteousness you cannot earn, build, or pray yourself into. Come to Daniel’s confession. Receive Gabriel’s answer. The cross is where those two things meet.

Preaching/Teaching Pitfalls

- **Spending the entire sermon on the seventy weeks and none of it on the prayer.** The interpretive complexity of vv. 24–27 creates a powerful gravitational pull toward extended chronological discussion at the expense of the prayer that takes up two-thirds of the chapter. The prayer is not merely prologue — it is the theological engine of the passage. Daniel’s confession establishes the human condition that makes Gabriel’s answer necessary. A sermon that jumps straight to the prophetic calculation has answered a question the congregation was not yet asking and will not be moved by. Begin where Daniel begins: in the rubble of acknowledged sin.
- **Treating the prayer of confession as a technique or model to be imitated rather than a posture to be inhabited.** The moralistic error here is “pray like Daniel.” The text is not primarily offering Daniel as a hero to emulate; it is showing what genuine covenant reckoning looks like when someone takes God’s word seriously about the depth of human sinfulness. The application is not “try harder in your prayer life” — it is “this is what it looks like when you actually believe what God says about sin.” The Clowney/Edmonson anti-moralism principle is essential here: the motivation to confess this deeply must come from the gospel (we can afford to confess because the One who answers is merciful and atoning), not from Daniel as a model.
- **Resolving the seventy-weeks controversy as the sermon’s goal.** The preacher can and should take a clear hermeneutical position (the Reformed messianic reading is defensible and necessary), but the congregation should leave not with a filled-in prophetic chart but with the conviction that the problem sin creates requires the atoning death of the Anointed One. If the sermon has explained the

three segments of seventy weeks but has not brought the hearer to the cross, it has explained the scaffolding but not built the building.

- **Separating vv. 24–27 from vv. 1–19 in preaching.** Some series treat the prayer and the prophecy as separate sermons, which can work structurally but creates the hermeneutical risk of reading the prophecy as free-floating future-history prediction rather than as the divine response to a specific prayer about sin, forgiveness, and God’s name. If preached in two parts, the second must begin by re-anchoring in the prayer — “Gabriel’s answer is an answer to *this prayer*.”
- **Flattening the “cut off” language into merely historical or political categories.** “Cut off” (כָּרַת, *kārat*) in the Hebrew is covenant and atoning language — it is used of covenant-making (cutting a covenant) and of covenant-exclusion. When Gabriel says the Anointed One will be cut off, the word carries the weight of covenant sacrifice. Preaching that domesticates this to “he died prematurely” or “his movement was crushed” loses the atoning freight the vocabulary carries. The “cutting off” of the Anointed One is the answer to Daniel’s plea that God would “atone for iniquity” (v. 24) — connect these explicitly.
- **Using the seventy weeks to map current events onto a prophetic timeline.** Congregations may arrive expecting the preacher to connect Daniel 9 to contemporary geopolitical events, a specific date-setting calculation, or a contemporary Antichrist figure. This is one of the most durable misuses of the passage in popular preaching. The preacher should address this expectation directly, not by mocking it, but by redirecting: the question Daniel 9 answers is not “when?” but “who?” and “what for?” — and both answers point to Christ and the cross, not to a newspaper. Date-setting hermeneutics have consistently produced embarrassment and have never produced the sanctification this passage is designed to achieve.