

**THIS IS A DOCUMENT IN PROGRESS! REVISIONS ARE
BEING MADE ON A REGULAR BASIS!! Latest Revision Monday, May
19, 2014**

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST
INTERPRETATION OF TWO TIME PROPHECIES IN THE BOOK
OF DANIEL - THE 2300 DAYS OF DANIEL 8 AND THE 70
WEEKS OF DANIEL 9.**

ASSUMPTION 12

**Dn9:1-19 reveals that Daniel was
perplexed over the relationship
between the seventy-year
prophecy of Jeremiah and the
2300-days of Dn8.**

BY FRANK BASTEN

NOVEMBER, 1990

copyright F.A.Basten, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Purpose of This Assumption	2
The Method of This Assumption.....	2
The Problems with the Method of this Assumption	6
The Conclusion.....	17
The Assumption Chain used in this assumption.....	20
Bibliography	21

The Purpose of This Assumption

This is another assumption used in a small collection of inter-chapter assumptions between Dn8 and Dn9 to bind the two chapters together. Assumption 11 creates a cognitive continuity in the thinking of Daniel by portraying that the time period involved in his continuing thoughts on the 2300-days given in Dn8 was only very short. It leads us to believe that Daniel's mind was exercised on the issue until the answer came, as revealed in Dn9. Assumption 12 tends to be more specific by having us believe that in the short time since the revelation about the 2300 days, Daniel was searching the books of Jeremiah with a view to help him solve the dilemma that had been in his mind ever since the time period of the 2300-days was first revealed. That is to say, it was his dilemma with the 2300-days that drove him to a re-reading of the book of Jeremiah to find a solution as to when the 2300-days would begin.

The outcome of this study is that the text explicitly shows that Daniel was perplexed about the fulfillment of the seventy years of captivity and the execution of God's promise to return Israel from captivity back into Palestine. There is no indication that the 2300-days are under consideration here or anywhere else.

The Method of This Assumption

The following are a typical example of statements supporting this assumption:

1852

Dan ix commences with the earnest, importunate prayer of the prophet, from the reading of which it is evident that he had so far misunderstood the vision of chapter viii that he concluded that the 2300 days of treading underfoot the sanctuary would terminate with the 70 years desolation of the city and sanctuary predicted by Jeremiah. Compare verses 1 and 2 with verses 16 and 17. The man Gabriel is now sent to undeceive him, and to complete the explanation of the vision.

J.N.Andrews, *R & H*, Dec,23,1852

1944

Daniel then intercedes for the city of Jerusalem, called by God's name, and His holy mountain, for which He has had such love, and beseeches Him for His mercies' sake, to let His anger be turned away. Finally, his mind centres on the holy sanctuary, God's own dwelling place upon this earth, and he pleads that its desolation may be repaired.

Daniel understood the seventy years of captivity to be near their termination. From his allusion to the sanctuary, it is evident that he so far misunderstood the important vision given him in Daniel 8 as to suppose that the 2300 days expired at the same time. This misapprehension was at once corrected when the angel came to give him further instruction in answer to his prayer.

[U.Smith, 1944](#), p.196.

So for Smith and Andrews, Daniel thought the 2300 days would terminate with the 70 years of captivity. For the next four quotes from Cottrell, Maxwell, Woolsey and Weber, we see the idea canvassed that Daniel thinks the 2300 years are an extension of the 70 years of exile.

1963

Daniel specifically mentions that he did not understand "the vision of the evenings and the mornings," the 2300 "days," and appears to have concluded that it implied an extension of the captivity and the continued desolation of the sanctuary. He well knew that the promised restoration was conditional upon sincere repentance, and his erroneous conclusion that the vision of chapter 8 implied an extension of the seventy years of exile led to the fear that his people, still in exile, had not truly repented and returned to God- as his importunate prayer recorded in chapter 9:3-19 makes evident. In this prayer he intercedes most earnestly for God's forgiveness, for the return of the exiles, and for the restoration of the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The prayer closes with a reiteration of his plea that God will "forgive" Israel's sins and not "defer" (King James' Version) the promised restoration. A careful comparison of the prayer of chapter 9 with the unexplained problem of chapter 8 convinced these earnest students of prophecy that Daniel had the problem of the 2300 "days" in mind as he prayed.

[R. Cottrell, 1963](#), p.303

1981

But what about the 2300 evenings and mornings? The temple in Jerusalem was in ruins. An "evening and morning" is a day according to Genesis 1, and Daniel quite likely knew that his contemporary, the prophet Ezekiel, had been shown in long-time visions that a day symbolizes a year. Ezekiel 4.6. Was it possible, then, he must have wondered, that the sanctuary in Jerusalem would not be restored for 2300 years?...Daniel decided to look at the passages in Jeremiah again. Unrolling the scroll, Daniel read after seventy years God would "punish the king of Babylon and ... the Chaldeans for their iniquity." Jeremiah 25:11, 12. This was encouraging- for Babylon by now had been punished by the Medes and Persians, and Jerusalem had been subjugated for sixty-eight years (605-538 counted inclusively). The seventy years were almost at an end! But Jerusalem and its temple were in ruins; and nothing, apparently, was being done towards the rebuilding them. Had Jeremiah, after all, been wrong? Would the sanctuary, perhaps, lie waste for 2300 years?

(Maxwell, 1981, p.196)

Daniel had not needed an explanation of the cleansing of the sanctuary, but the 2300 days perplexed him. Were they literal days (as he must have hoped), or were they symbolic like the other items in Daniel 8: 3-14 and like the days in Ezekiel 4:6? And if they did refer to 2300 *years*, was God saying that the *tamid* services at the Jerusalem temple would not be restored for 2300 years? If so, what about Jeremiah's prophecy of only 70 years?

(Ibid, p. 205)

2001

The whole thing troubled the prophet; in fact, he says he fainted and was sick "certain days" (Daniel 8:27). Not only was he concerned for the integrity and honor of the Lord's name and worship; he was grieved to know that the period of desecration would be protracted.

The ninth chapter opens with Daniel still concerned for His Lord's honor. Several years have transpired since his second vision. As he studies the prophecies of Jeremiah, he reads that his people, the Jews, were to spend 70 years in Babylonian exile (Jeremiah 29:10). He ascertains that the time is near when they should be returning to Jerusalem. But there is that nagging memory of a vision wherein the sanctuary would be trodden underfoot, a vision that was to be "for many days" (Daniel 8:26). What did it mean? Was there to be a delay to the return? Were his people not to go back and rebuild the destroyed Temple? Would God not honor His word? Or did the vision apply to something else?

Earnestly Daniel prayed that the Lord would fulfill His promise. On behalf of his people he confessed their waywardness, but he asked that the Lord be merciful. While he was praying, the angel Gabriel appeared to him again. Right away we must determine the relationship between this appearance and the vision of chapter 8...in the ninth chapter Daniel introduces Gabriel as the one "whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning (verse 21), and Gabriel describes his purpose as "to give thee skill and understanding...therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision" (verses 22, 23). Obviously it was the vision of chapter 8 that Daniel was to understand, and it was the time factor that yet remained to be explained.

(Woolsey, 2001, pp.46f)

1985

Daniel had discovered in the prophecies of Jeremiah that the desolation of Jerusalem was to last for seventy years (verse 2), after which the captive nation would be restored to Jerusalem (Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10). But now with his people on the verge of freedom, a delay appears imminent.

Jeremiah had warned that God's promises were conditional upon the spiritual attitude of His people (chap. 18: 7-10). The Jewish nation was in trouble because that had rebelled and refused to trust Him (Dan. 9:11, 12). Now, as Daniel observes the continued wickedness and "open shame" (verse 7) of his people, he fears that God would have to delay their deliverance to the Promised Land. This happened in the days of Moses and Joshua. Daniel's apprehension increases as he remembers his vision received some ten years

previously, when the angel Gabriel informed him of a long time of trouble ahead for the saints and their sanctuary. It had been predicted that “ ‘both the holy place and the host [were] to be trampled’ ” until 2,300 days had expired; “ ‘then the holy place will be properly restored’ ” (chap.8:13. 14).

...All these years Daniel had wondered when this tribulation would occur. Now, because of the Jew’s abiding wickedness, the dreaded events appear imminent. Instead of return and restoration, a deeper crisis seems to threaten. Heartbroken, Daniel seeks God...(Weber, p.44)

2004

Approximately ten years had passed since Daniel had received the vision of the 2300 evenings and mornings recorded in chapter 8. Though an angel told him to “seal up the vision, for it refers to many days in the future” (Dan. 8:26), he longed to know what the long time period of 2300 evenings and mornings meant. According to Jeremiah’s prophecy (Jer.29:10), the time for the return of the Jews to Jerusalem in 539 B.C. was close at hand. Yet in his last vision, the angel had told him that it would be 2300 prophetic days before the sanctuary would be restored. Daniel no doubt feared that God somehow intended to prolong the period of captivity. In response to these concerns, the Lord sent Gabriel to assure him that it was not the case. The first 490 years of the 2300, he learned, had special significance for the Jews, for toward the end of the period the promised Messiah would come. (Pfundl, 2004b, p.94)¹

These examples give a typical presentation of the rationale associated with this assumption. Though Smith (1944) and Andrews (1852) present a different explanation of the relationship between the seventy weeks of Jeremiah and the 2300 days when compared to the explanation of Maxwell (1981) and Cottrell (1963), there are certain basic assumptions common to these writers.

1. Daniel’s concern in reading Jeremiah’s prophecy was to try and help him understand the starting date of the 2300 days;
2. Daniel’s prayer indicates that he had an incorrect understanding of the relationship between the seventy weeks of Jeremiah and the 2300 days;
3. When the angel Gabriel appeared, the 2300 days and the seventy weeks of Jeremiah were uppermost in Daniel’s mind, and the angel’s injunction

¹ What Pfandl and others who reiterate this notion do not notice about their line of logic here, is that this interpretation implies Daniel understood the restoration of the sanctuary referred to in Dn8:14, as the reversal of that done by Nebuchadnezzar, and therefore, is one and the same as that portrayed in the actions of the little horn in Dn8:9-11, making the power to come after the breakup of the Grecian empire to be the Babylonian empire!! This would be the case with this reasoning because the 2300 days of the desolation of the sanctuary in Dn8:13-14 is related to that sanctuary decimated by a power that appears after the four Grecian kingdoms have run their course. Even the most superficial reading of the text leads us to believe it is referring to a destruction of the temple some time beyond the times of the Grecian empire, after the temple had been rebuilt by the Jewish refugees from Babylon.

to “consider” and “understand” is in reference to the *true* starting point for the 2300 days;

Given these three assumptions are the premises upon which this assumption is based, it would be appropriate to examine the validity of these premises.

The Problems with the Method of this Assumption

It is significant to observe in the SDA Bible Commentary there is no reference in the first twenty verses to a misunderstanding on Daniel’s part regarding the relationship between the prophecy of Jeremiah and the 2300-days of Dn8. It attempts to establish the validity of this link through an intricate list of premises supporting the assumption that Daniel “thought that the vision of the 2300 ‘days’ of desolation for the sanctuary and persecution for God’s people implied that God would ‘defer’ the restoration.” (Nichol, 1957, p. 850). In the comments under the first twenty verses, the closest the Commentary comes to this topic is a comment under Dn9: 2:

Understood by books. Although busy amid the affairs of state, the prophet did not cease to study the Word of God. Daniel was obviously perplexed as to how to relate what had been revealed to him in the vision of ch. 8 to the events of the immediate future – the return of the Jews at the end of the seventy years (Jer. 29: 10). See on Dn9: 21. (Nichol, 1957, p. 848f)

In the commentary on verse 19, we read “Daniel is anxious that the promised deliverance be no longer delayed.” (Ibid) This passing comment in verse 19 is picked up later in the commentary and developed to make the link with the 2300-days. We can hardly conclude that this comment however explicitly tries to link in the 2300-days at this point, as will shown at the fourth section below.

The only way the Commentary can make any link between the thoughts of Daniel when he sought God by prayer in Dn9 and the 2300-days is through a convoluted series of assumptions and wild assertions. These are addressed in section four below. Suffice it to say here that verse 2 and verse 19 are the only texts used by the Commentary to make any link to Dn8 and as any reader can clearly see, there is no reference in those texts to the former revelation in chapter 8 at all!! So much for concrete evidence!!

Daniel indicates in verse 2 that his efforts to understand through the use of books was to use these “books” to ascertain “the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.” Dn9:2. This text clearly says that Daniel’s use of the books was to calculate the period of the seventy years of Jeremiah’s prophecy, including the writings of Jeremiah itself. This can mean either an understanding of the actually period of the seventy years itself, or the termini associated with the period.

Whether Daniel’s copy of Jeremiah was kept in one document or more than one cannot be ascertained. The eighth chapter of Daniel has no bearing on the termini of the seventy years of exile or the actual period of the seventy years per se. The eighth chapter of Daniel was not included in the scope of his reading. Rather, the most obvious documents Daniel would have referred to apart from the writings of Jeremiah,

were those that had the records of the events around the time of the beginning of the Babylonian captivity – books like those used by the Chronicler to collate the history of the pre-exilic history of Israel and Judah. It need not be limited to those books we now find in the Scriptures since the work of Ezra in collecting and preserving the sacred writings from Jewish collections around the time of Persian Empire was still in the future. But it did refer to writings that Daniel thought would have some bearing on answering the chronological question pertaining to the starting date of the exile period. These writings were probably those housed in the synagogues in Babylon as opposed to the concept of Daniel having a private collection of these writings. On the other hand, with a Jewish Prime Minister of Babylon, the Jewish community would not be averse to providing a copy of their documents for the private library of the palace, especially with one so favourable to the Jewish religion in the seat of power.

Other scholars use the occurrence of the phrase “by books” to mean a number of things. Critical scholars used this as an indication that the canon of Old Testament Scriptures had been set by the time this was written, and argue along the lines of the translation of “Scriptures” for this text (as the NIV and BDB), since they assume a late (i.e., third-second century B.C) authorship for the book of Daniel.

Another argument, and quite correct, is that the plural, really is just being used in the singular in this case, as is evident of this usage for the same word as referring to a singular item elsewhere. In this case, the phrase “by books” refers only to the book of Jeremiah and it refers to Daniel’s discovery of the actual statement concerning the length of time until the end of the exile.²

Consider the following comments on the topic offered by Keil, and more recently by Leupold, Walvoord and Young:

Keil:

In *b^assepharîm* lies nothing further than that writings existed, among which were to be found the prophecies of Jeremiah; and the article, *the* writings, is used, because in the following passage something definite is said of these writings. In these writings Daniel considered the number of the years of which Jeremiah had prophesied. (1978, p. 321)

Leupold:

How much is involved in the term *bassepharîm*? BDB goes so far as to suggest the translation “by means of the Scriptures [canonical books].” We

² Gesenius discusses a variety of words given as plural but in some cases meaning singular and in other cases meaning plural: “Some nouns are only used in the singular (e.g., *adam*, *man*, and collectively *men*); a number of other nouns only in the plural, e.g., *m^ethîm*, *men* (the old sing. *M^ethu* is only preserved in proper names, see §90.o; in Eth. The sing. is *mêth*, *man*); some of these have, moreover, a singular meaning (§124.a) as *panîm* face. In such cases, however, the same form can also express plurality, e.g., *panîm* also means *faces*, Gn 40⁷, Ez 1⁶; cf. *lohîm*, *God*, and also *gods* (the sing. *loah*, a later formation from it, occurs only ten times, except in Job forty-one and in Daniel four times). (Kautzsch, 1982, p. 244, note also pp. 394-401)

happen to know why critics usually construe the phrase thus: they give as late a date as possible to the composition of Daniel and so claim that the canon of the Old Testament was already complete (300 B.C. or later as some claim), and that Daniel had a complete Old Testament in his possession. Surely the expression does not suggest anything of the sort. The article before “books,” according to Hebrew usage, need imply nothing more than the idea of the books requisite for the passage involved, i.e., “Jeremiah.” In fact, the plural *sepharîm* may refer to a single letter, cf., II Kings 19:14; Isa 37: 14. The requirements of the Hebrew are fully met if Daniel had only the roll of the book of Jeremiah, as well as if a few other books had been written on the same roll. (1949, p. 377f)

Walvoord:

The immediate occasion of this chapter, however, was the discovery by Daniel in the prophecy that the desolations of Jerusalem would be fulfilled in seventy years. The expression *by books* may be understood to mean “in books.” Jeremiah the prophet, in addition to his oral prophetic announcements, had written his prophecies in the closing days of Jerusalem before its destruction at the hand of the Babylonians. Although the first record of Jeremiah had been destroyed (Jer 36:23), Jeremiah rewrote it, acting on instructions from the Lord (Jer.36: 28). Jeremiah himself had been taken captive by Jews rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar and had been carried off to Egypt against his will to be buried in a strange land in a nameless grave. But the timeless Scriptures which he wrote found their way across desert and mountain to far away Babylon and fell into the hands of Daniel. How long Daniel had been in possession of these prophecies is not known, but the implication is that Daniel had now come into full comprehension of Jeremiah’s prediction and realized that the seventy years prophesied had about run their course. The time of the vision recorded in Daniel 9 was 538 B.C., about 67 years after Jerusalem had first been captured and Daniel carried off to Babylon (605 B.C.)...On the basis of these remarkable prophecies, Daniel was encouraged to pray for the restoration of Jerusalem and the regathering of the people of Israel. (1971, p.202f)

E.J. Young:

The Books] – The phrase does not indicate a private collection of sacred books, nor the canonical books of the Prophets. Stuart takes it to refer to the book of Jer. In 23:13 Jer. calls his prophecy of the 70 years “this book.” These two, thinks Stuart, may be called “the books.” But this is over refinement. It is better to take the word in its simple sense as referring to a group of writings among which the prophecies of Jer. were to be found. Probably the term applies broadly to the Scriptures, those sacred books that were recognized as authoritative. It should be noted that there is nothing whatsoever in this phrase which lends support to the idea that the canon was closed. These books, because they were regarded as inspired, were accepted as Divinely authoritative. (1949, p. 183)

In this paper, I will look at the three premises listed earlier used by SDA historicists to develop this assumption. Then I will examine the approach used by the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, and draw my conclusions.

SDA Historicist Premise No.1 –Daniel’s concern in reading Jeremiah’s prophecy was to try and help him understand the starting date of the 2300 days.

SDA historicists assert that Daniel’s motive in turning to Jeremiah’s prophecy was to try and help him understand the starting date for the 2300 days is made without the slightest shred of evidence from the text of Dan 9. There is absolutely nothing in the introduction of the prayer in vs1-4a that hint of a perplexity in regard to the starting point for the 2300 days of Dn8:14. There is absolutely nothing in the introduction of the prayer of vs4b-19 that leans in this direction either; and there is absolutely nothing in the concluding summary of the purpose of his praying as recorded in v20 which could be used in the most vaguest sense to support this first assumption.

The only support for this assumption is Assumption No.11 previously discussed, that the starting point for the 2300 days was not given in Dn8 and that it was this that perplexed him (8:27). And as has been shown, this assumption is likewise built upon a whole chain of assumptions which have been examined and found wanting. If, as Shea acknowledges³, the 2300 evenings-mornings could be related to the activities of the little horn, and thus the 2300 evenings-mornings begin with the desolation of the sanctuary, why would Daniel want to search out the start of the 2300-day period from the book of Jeremiah? It would be pointless. He already has the starting point. Therefore, it is obvious that one has to assume the starting point has not been given, in order to see any substance in this assertion

SDA Historicist Premise No.2 –Daniel’s prayer indicates that he had an incorrect understanding of the relationship between the seventy weeks of Jeremiah and the 2300 days.

The second premise supporting Assumption No.12 is that Daniel’s prayer indicates that he had an incorrect understanding of the relationship between the seventy weeks of Jeremiah and the 2300 days. Andrews (1852), refers us to vs1, 2, 16, 17 for evidence on this, whereas Cottrell (1963) refers us to v19. I quote these verses now for consideration:

2. In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

16. O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem thy holy mountain: because for our sins and for the iniquity of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us.

³ He points out, if the word “vision” can be applied to vs 9-12, then “the 2300 days should be represent the period of time during which his (the horn power) pollution of the temple in Jerusalem, or some similar action, was carried out. According to this perspective, the 2300 days were to begin when such pollution began.” (1981, p.249) See further comments on this at Assumption No.3.

17. Now therefore O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate for the Lord's sake.

19. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

Andrews says on these texts:

... it is evident that he had so far misunderstood the vision of chapter viii that he concluded that the 2300 days of treading underfoot the sanctuary would terminate with the 70 years desolation of the city and sanctuary predicted by Jeremiah. Compare verses 1 and 2 with verses 16 and 17. The man Gabriel is now sent to undeceive him, and to complete the explanation of the vision.

J.N.Andrews, *R & H*, Dec,23,1852

One must really wonder how a specific misunderstanding as the termination of the 70 years exile would also signal the termination of the 2300 days can be gleaned from these verse. There is absolutely nothing that one can even start with. This monumental eisegesis is echoed a little later in this paper when the SDABC says that with "A careful comparison of the prayer of ch. 9 with the problem of ch. 8 makes it clear beyond possible doubt that Daniel had the problem in mind as he prayed." It is a truly monumental farce. There is *nothing* explicit that one can even begin to use to try and highlight this misunderstanding. Where does it even mention either time period, let alone indicating they would terminate together? And this suppose to be the proof "beyond possible doubt?"

Moving from Andrews to the SDABC, Nichol says, commenting on vs16-19 and especially to v19:

In his prayer Daniel pleads with God that the time allotted to the Captivity should not be extended (see vs16-19). A careful comparison of the prayer of ch.9 with the problem of ch.8 makes it clear beyond possible doubt that Daniel had the problem in mind as he prayed. He thought that the vision of the 2300 "days" of persecution for God's people implied that God would "defer" the restoration (ch 9:19). (1957, p.850)

Again, it must be said that there is nothing in vs16-19, not even in the request to "defer not" that even hints of the faintest connection of the 2300 days with this section of Scripture. As Maxwell has pointed out (quoted above), there were still two years of the captivity remaining. The most obvious reading of the *time* Daniel prayed– the first year if the reign of Darius (538 B.C) after the fall of Babylon to the Medes which was in the prophecy of Jer 25:12; the *subject* about which he prayed – the Lord "would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem"; and his *request* in verse 19 to "defer not" all make it clear that Daniel was praying that God would indeed fulfil his promises in Jeremiah 29:10-14:

10. For thus saith the Lord that after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place.

11. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end.

12. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me and I will hearken unto you.

13. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart.

14 And I will be found of you saith the Lord, and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you saith the Lord; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive.

Maxwell rightly points out that God's performing of his "good word" upon the exiles at the close of the seventy year period is dependent upon God being "found" by supplicating Israelites (v14), by means of heartfelt prayer (v13). (*Ibid*, p.196-197) Thus the request to "defer not" is a request that God will visit and perform his good word *on time*, and that God would take cognisance of the heartfelt prayer of faithful Israelites like Daniel who follow the injunction of Jeremiah to seek out God for a restoration from exile. There is nothing in vs 16-19 or vs 1,2 that even hints that the 2300 days is so me how related to Daniels thought concerning the seventy years exile foretold by God through Jeremiah.

The "careful comparison" that Nichol (1957) refers to between Dn 8 and 9 is only careful insofar as it has to ensure that one assumes that the starting point of the 2300 days was not given in ch 8 but *is* given in Dn 9. In Nichol's mind, one has to be careful to impute the following thoughts to Daniel even though there is no explicit evidence to indicate that we should:

1. That Daniel was perplexed about the starting point for the 2300 days;
2. That Daniel was thinking that the desolation of the sanctuary would continue for another 2300 years beyond the seventy years exile;
3. That Daniel thought that the treading down of the sanctuary terminated with the expiry of the 70 year exile.

When one is careful to impute all these thoughts to the mind of Daniel-without any explicit evidence to do so- *then* it is clear BEYOND POSSIBLE DOUBT that Daniel had this particular "problem in his mind as he prayed." (Nichol, *ibid*.)

It is amazing that the phrase "beyond possible doubt" appears again and again in the documents of SDA apologists where there is not a shred of evidence to support the assertions. Nichol here resorts to this tactic to try and convince us of the validity of the argument, without success.

The statement of Daniel in v19 requesting God to "defer not" in no way indicates that Daniel needed to have his thinking corrected. Even after Daniel received the vision of Dn 9, Daniel could still write in v2 of Dn 9 that he "understood by books the number of years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem". He did not say that in the vision changed his thinking from what he *thought* he understood concerning the

seventy years exile period. His understanding *before* being visited by the man Gabriel was valid understanding – he understood; and what he understood was correct.

Thus Daniel’s writing of this experience indicates that Daniel had a correct understanding of the seventy years of exile, and the command of Gabriel to “consider” and “understand” (v23) in no way undermines the correctness of his understanding of the matter concerning which he was praying. Thus the second premise of Assumption No.12 is dismissed as fanciful and without foundation.

SDA Historicist Premise No.3 –When the angel Gabriel appeared, the 2300 days and the seventy weeks of Jeremiah were uppermost in Daniel’s mind, and the angel’s injunction to “consider” and “understand” is in reference to the *true* starting point for the 2300 days.

The third premise of this assumption asserts that the injunction by the man Gabriel in v 23 for Daniel to “consider” and “understand the vision” means that the angel was going to give the prophet the true starting point for the 2300 days. This premise has no evidence to support it nor is there any evidence that the 2300-days were uppermost in Daniel’s mind as he was praying.

Daniel says in verse 4 that he made his confession to God, a confession that is then recorded in vs4b-19, and in v20, Daniel explicitly states that the burden of his mind during praying was not the starting point for the 2300 days but rather his sin and the sin of his people Israel and the desolated mountain of his God. There is absolutely not even the slightest hint of any explicit reference to the 2300-days in the first half of Daniel 9. The only manner that any connection in the thoughts of Daniel can be associated with the 2300-days is to adopt the entire chain of assumptions presented so far in this research.

The command to “understand” and ‘consider” was in relation to “the commandment” (v23) (*dabhar*), “the matter” (*dabhar*), which came forth from God and given to Gabriel to convey to Daniel. This *dabhar*, this vision (*mar’e*) (Smith, 1898, p.170), which Daniel is told to consider, is verses 24-27. The command to understand does not imply that what Daniel had been reading and interpreting from the book of Jeremiah had been incorrect. This assumption is entirely interpolated into the text by SDA historicist logic. And it is entirely without warrant. There is nothing in the first half of Daniel 9 indicating that he misunderstood anything from the book of Jeremiah.

The fact that Gabriel is sent to Daniel to give him skill (*l’haskil’ka* : “insight” (NASB, NIV)) and / with understanding (*bînah*) (v23) does not deny the validity of his understanding which Daniel says he had before this visitation from Gabriel. Daniel understood that God’s favour would return to Israel after the seventy years of exile had been fulfilled, and Gabriel comes to give Daniel the word that this favour upon Israel is a probationary favour. If anything be said on the matter, the vision of the second half of Daniel 9 endorses the view taken by Daniel in that the repentance of Israel was absolutely essential in the restoration of God’s favour and the fulfillment of God’s plan with Israel. This repentance was not only to be evident in the initial phases but was to be manifest in the fulfillment of the tasks or responsibilities laid out before them in

verse 24. The vision of Dn 9 explicitly states that Israel have “seventy weeks” to make things right and to come into line with God’s purpose for the nation as revealed in the visions and the prophecies as well as the Law. (Maxwell, 1981, p206; Doukhan, 1981, p.256)

In other words, initially, the favour is not unconditional and everlasting. It is conditional and it is limited. This vision does not contradict what Daniel was “understanding;” it supplements the message of Jeremiah 29:10-14 perfectly. It is true that the vision of Dn 9 adds more information to the previous revelations, but that in no way means that the reference to “consider” and “understand” in v23 refers to the starting point for the 2300 days. One has to assume that the information is not given in ch 8 in order for the third premise to be even considered. And even if the starting point wasn’t given in Dn8, the injunction in Dn9:23 fits more readily in referring to vs 24-27 as the ‘vision’ than it does in referring to Dn 8.

Furthermore, the fact that Daniel says that he had no understanding of the vision of Dn 8, does not mean that a visit by the same messenger over a decade later must necessarily refer to this lack of understanding when he says “I am now come forth to give the skill and understanding”. Daniel is left without additional information in Dn 7 and Dn 12, yet that does not necessarily mean that the angel is obliged to answer every perplexity that these revelations evoked in Daniel.

The *message* and the *time period* in Dn 9:24-27 fits more completely with the preceding verses than they do with Daniel 8. This is not to say though that Dn 8 and Dn 9 are totally unrelated. They are very closely related, and Dn 9 gives detail which clarify the vision of the evening and the morning recorded in Dn 8:10-12 in a more specific and chronological way. But this is not to say that the starting point of the 2300 days is not given in Dn 8.

The Development of the SDA Commentary Argument.

The SDABC has a very intricate argument running for nearly two columns to defend the idea that Daniel had a misconception regarding the relationship between the seventy years of exile prophesied by Jeremiah and the 2300-day prophecy he was given a decade before. The purpose of this argumentation is to put the 2300 days into the mind of Daniel while he is receiving the revelation from Gabriel in Dn9. Once this is seen to be in Daniel’s mind, it becomes easy to show how that revelation in Dn9:24-27 is a *clarification* about the beginning of the 2300 days (the classical circular argument scenario). They say that Daniel was under the misconception that the 2300 days were a continuation of the 70 years of captivity. But the revelation of Dn9: 24-27 shows him that the true beginning of the 2300 days is with the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. So much for the general thrust of the argumentation.

The ultimate textual basis for this intriguing piece of pseudo logic presented in the Commentary is verse 2 and verse 19.

Those texts say:

Dn9: 2 In the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the

prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

Dn 9: 19: O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord hearken and defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

Here then is the argumentation from the SDABC:

1. All the symbols of the vision of ch.8: 2-14 are explained fully in vs.15-26, with the exception on the 2300 “days” of vs. 13, 14 (see GC325). In fact, all of vs. 13 and 14 is explained in vs.24, 25 *except the time element involved*. In v.26 Gabriel mentions the time element, but breaks off his explanation before saying anything further about it (see No. 3 below).
2. Daniel knew that the 70 years of captivity foretold by the prophet Jeremiah were nearly at an end (ch9: 2; see Vol. III, pp. 90-92, 94-97; see on Jer.25: 11).
3. Daniel did not understand the 2300-day time period, the only part of the vision not yet explained (ch.8:27; see No. 1, above), and evidently feared that it implied an extension of the Captivity and the continued desolation of the sanctuary (see ch. 9:19). He knew that the promise of restoration was conditional upon Israel’s sincere repentance (SL 48; see Vol IV, p. 34).
4. The prospect of terrible persecution during the course of the 2300 “days” (Dan. 8: 10-13, 23-25) proved more than the aged Daniel could bear, and as a result he “fainted, and was sick certain days” (ch. 8:27; GC 325). Accordingly, the angel discontinued the explanation of the vision at this time.
5. During the interval preceding the angel’s return (ch. 9:21) Daniel turned to the prophecies of Jeremiah for a clearer understanding of the divine purpose in the Captivity (see Vol IV, p.31), particularly with respect to the 70 years. (ch9: 2).
6. Concluding that Israel’s transgression as a nation was responsible for what he evidently took to be an extension of the 70 years (see No. 3 above), Daniel interceded most earnestly with God for forgiveness, for the return of the captive exiles, and for the restoration of the now desolate sanctuary in Jerusalem (see ch. 9:3-19). His prayer closes with a reiteration of the petition that God will “forgive” the sins of the nation and “defer not” the promise of restoration (v 19).
7. Note particularly that the unexplained portion of the vision of ch. 8 had foretold that “the sanctuary and the host” would be “trodden under foot” (vs. 13, 14, 24) for a period of 2300 “days.” In his prayer Daniel pleads with God that the time allotted to the Captivity should not be extended (see vs. 16-19). A careful comparison of the prayer of ch. 9 with the problem of ch. 8 makes it clear beyond possible doubt that Daniel had the problem in mind as he prayed. He thought that the vision of the 2300 “days” of desolation for the sanctuary and persecution for God’s people implied that God would “defer” the restoration (ch.9:19).

8. In answer to this prayer, Gabriel, who had been commissioned to explain the vision of ch. 8 (ch. 8:15-19) but had not as yet completed the explanation (see No. 4, above), greeted Daniel with the announcement “I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding” (ch. 9: 22).
9. The explanation of ch. 9:24-27 is clearly Heaven’s reply to Daniel’s prayer (v23), and the solution of the problem about which he was praying (see Nos. 6, 7, above). Compare the original command to Gabriel to explain the vision to Daniel (ch. 8:16) with the renewal of the command at the time of Daniel’s prayer (ch. 9:23), and Gabriel’s command to Daniel to “understand” and “know” (ch. 8: 17, 19) with similar expressions in ch. 9:23.
10. Note particularly that Daniel was told to “understand the matter, and consider the vision” (ch. 9:23), that is, the vision he had seen “at the beginning” (v. 21). This can refer only to the vision of ch. 8: 2-14, as no other vision had been given since that one. Compare the words “understand the vision” (ch.8:16) with “consider the vision” (ch. 9:23).
11. The context thus makes certain, beyond the possibility of doubt that the explanation of ch. 9: 24-27 is a continuation, and completion, of the explanation begun in ch. 8:15-26, and that the explanation of ch. 9:24-27 deals exclusively with the unexplained portion of the vision, that is , with the time element of the 2300 “days” of ch. 8:13, 14. The angel is Gabriel in both instances (chs. 8:16; 9:21), and the subject matter is identical, and the context makes evident that the concluding portion of the explanation picks up the thread of explanation at the point it was laid down in ch. 8. (Nichol, 1957, p.850f.)

One can immediately see in this list most of the assumptions listed in this research. The points to be considered here are only those relating to Daniel’s research on the 70 years of captivity and the prayer of Daniel prior to the visitation of Gabriel for the second time. Points No. 3, and. 5 to 9 are the ones we are to consider here.

The Commentary in point No. 5 wants us to believe that Daniel went back to the books of Jeremiah to understand the “divine purpose in the Captivity” and in particular, the 70 years. This is assumed of course, because the text of Dn9: 2 gives us no indication as to whether he knew about the 70 years of captivity before he went to read more about it or whether he just went to study the writings of Jeremiah and found the 70 years of exile explained there. Indeed, commentators like Walvoord (quoted at length above) take the position that the study by Daniel was a *discovery* of the 70 year period in the book of Jeremiah. And as to Daniel going to Jeremiah to study the “divine purpose for the Captivity,” this is mere conjecture. Thus the points in No. 5 have no explicit basis in Scripture.

In point No. 3, we have more wild conjectures, and interpolating of certain concepts into the head of Daniel that the text does not endorse. The point says, “Daniel...evidently feared that it [the 2300 days] implied an extension of the Captivity and the continued desolation of the sanctuary (see ch. 9: 19).” This is an absolute fabrication. There is NOTHING in ch. 9: 19 intimating *at all*, that the request to “defer not” refers to the extension of the seventy years by a definite time period in Daniel’s

thinking. There is also no evidence in verse 19 that he is considering the extension enduring 6.3 years (2300 literal days) or even extending it another 2300 years (as SDAs would understand the 2300 days using the day for a year principle). This is just as bad eisegesis as Origen's fanciful interpretation of the Scriptures in earlier Christian times. The thrust of Daniel's request is merely for God not to delay his execution of his plan for the restoration of Israel. No more, no less. No definite period is referred to or intimated. We are not even given a hint that a definite period is in Daniel's mind either. I challenge any SDA scholar to show clearly in verse 19 where a definite period is under consideration, or that Daniel had a definite period in mind here, and that Daniel had the misconception of the 2300 years as an extension to the 70 years.

Point 6 in the argumentation is based on the wild proposals of No.3 examined in the preceding paragraph. It says,

“Concluding that Israel's transgression as a nation was responsible for what he evidently took to be an extension of the 70 years (see No. 3 above), Daniel interceded most earnestly with God for forgiveness, for the return of the captive exiles, and for the restoration of the now desolate sanctuary in Jerusalem (see ch. 9:3-19).”

Again, as in the point examined above, there is nothing in the texts quoted – verses 3-19 – that remotely suggest that Israel was responsible for extending the 70 years captivity for another 2300 days/years. We find nothing that gives occasion for us to believe that Daniel was trying to reduce the time of the captivity by either 6.3 years or 2300 years. There is no evidence to suggest that he “evidently took” the 2300 days/years “to be an extension of the 70 years.” This is another classical example of crooked thinking in the proposal of these points. Point No.6 has point No. 3 as its basis, and when one examines point No. 3, it has a dubious interpretation of v.19 as its basis. When one reads verse 19, there is not a shred of information that could infer the validity of their argument. Thus, points No.6 and 7, which depend on point No.3 are also invalid, merely from their dependence on the validity of No. 3 for any credibility.

In point No. 7 we have a very interesting comment: “A careful comparison of the prayer of ch. 9 with the problem of ch. 8 makes it clear beyond possible doubt that Daniel had the problem in mind as he prayed. He thought that the vision of the 2300 “days” of desolation for the sanctuary and persecution for God's people implied that God would “defer” the restoration (ch.9:19).” How is one to conduct a “careful comparison” in order to come up this a conclusion “clear beyond possible doubt” when the premises used to make this “careful comparison” are wild, fanciful and lacking any shred of evidence? Surely, the only way one can accomplish this “careful comparison” is to put the SDA-historicist's blinkers on and ignore the issues raised in this brief discussion of the argumentation offered in the Commentary. The concept of “clear beyond possible doubt” is a phrase frequently used in SDA literature, where there is little or no evidence to support their position. The mere assertion is expected to count for credibility. *There is no evidence that Daniel had the 2300 days in relation to the 70 years of captivity in his mind as he prayed.* Daniel 9 makes no reference to this time period in relation to the 70 years of Jeremiah. The “careful consideration” needed to come to this conclusion certainly needs a certain type of “rose-coloured glasses.” Furthermore, not only do they want us to believe that this was in the mind of Daniel as he prayed, but they want us to believe that this is evident “beyond possible doubt.”

Therefore, it can be confidently concluded that point No.7 is also invalid and can be confidently dismissed with expedition.

Point No. 9 wants us to believe that “The explanation of ch. 9:24-27 is clearly Heaven’s reply to Daniel’s prayer (v23), and the solution of the problem about which he was praying (see Nos. 6, 7, above).” But since the problem supposedly in Daniel’s mind is merely an interpolation by SDA-historicist’s and has no basis in the text itself, we do not have to believe that the clarification of the relation of the 2300 days in relation to the 70 years of exile is the central issue of the revelation brought by Gabriel in verses 24-27. There is no evidence that the 2300 days is on Daniel’s mind *at all*.

After considering the argumentation proffered by the Commentary on the relation between the 70 years of captivity and the 2300 “days” as misconceived by Daniel, at least until Gabriel arrived and corrected him, I can only conclude that this argumentation fails dismally to prove that they hold a correct position. The only thing that is “clear beyond possible doubt” with this argumentation is that the fabrication of this linking of Dn8 with Dn9 in the manner proposed by SDA-historicists is fatally flawed.

The Conclusion

Thus in summarizing my examination of the three premises which are used to support the assumption that in ch 9:1-19 Daniel was perplexed over the relationship between the seventy year prophecy of Jeremiah and the 2300 days of Dn 8, all three have been found to be invalid, and the premises upon which they themselves are founded are invalid links in a chain of fabricated assumptions-

1. Daniel’s concern in reading Jeremiah’s prophecy was to try and help him understand the starting date of the 2300 days. This was found to be without any evidence;
2. Daniel’s prayer indicates that he had an incorrect understanding of the relationship between the seventy weeks of Jeremiah and the 2300 days. This is just a figment of a creative imagination;
3. When the angel Gabriel appeared, the 2300 days and the seventy weeks of Jeremiah were uppermost in Daniel’s mind, and the angel’s injunction to “consider” and “understand” is in reference to the *true* starting point for the 2300 days. Again, this assumption is sheer nonsense. Any high school course on logic and the development of essay argumentation would highlight the flaws in this crooked thinking.

There is explicit evidence however that the prophecies of Jeremiah 25 and 29 would pose a perplexing issue for Daniel especially when he considered them in light of the recent fall of the king of Babylon as predicted in Jeremiah, but at a different time than that which was predicted. Consider the text of Jer25:12:

And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations

This text speaks explicitly of the 70 years of exile and would have been one of the texts that Daniel would have consulted. The obvious problem that is that the king of Babylon had been punished by King Cyrus and Darius the Mede, but there was no evidence that things were moving in favour for the Jews. What was the problem? How come the king of Babylon had been punished *before* the end of the seventy years when the text says that “when the seventy years *are accomplished*” the Lord would “punish the king of Babylon?” Surely this means that the seventy years are over or that the Lord is accomplishing his purposes earlier. Note Jer 29:10:

For thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place.

The prepositional phrase translated “after” here is *l'phî* which has the sense of “according to.” In this text it says literally “according to the fulfilling /fullness / the accomplishment to Babylon seventy years I will visit you....” As can be readily seen, the sense of the words in Jer 25:12 and 29:10 are virtually identical in terms of explaining to the reader the relationship between the punishment of the king of Babylon and the visitation of God to the Jewish exiles. They were to both occur at the fulfilment of the seventy years. There’s no clue from the text itself that the punishment of the Babylonian king was to come first.

That fact is explicit and it is scriptural, yet the king of Babylon was punished *before* the end of the 70 years exile. That didn’t seem to fit with the text in Jer25:12. What was wrong? Did the Lord start the time of the exile from another starting point? Did he act on his purpose earlier than He said? And if the 70 years exile was fulfilled as the judgement on the king of Babylon by the Medes indicates, why hasn’t anything been done about the restoration of the Jews to their promised land? What is missing? Is the responsibility on the Lord or is He expecting something from the Jewish people as well? In the words of Nichol:

Little wonder that Daniel’s attention was focused upon the time prophecy. He was anxious lest the Lord should delay the liberation of His captive people.

(Nichol, 1957, p.849)

As can be seen from the above deliberations, there had been enough perplexity in the confusion around him with the change of empire control and all the upheaval which that would engender that the question of “What about us?” would have been in his mind as he watched all this chaos. And there was enough confusion around the 70 year prophecies of Jeremiah to warrant the tension we read in Daniel 9.

Keil raises another issue worth introducing into the discussion. He asks the question,

“What was it that moved Daniel at this time to pour forth a penitential prayer in behalf of Jerusalem and the desolated sanctuary? Did he doubt that the truth of the promise, that God after seventy years of exile in Babylon, would visit His people and fulfil the good word He had spoken, that He would again bring back His people to Judea?”

(1978, p.322)

His point is that it is not the state of current events that would unsettle Daniel's faith in the promises, but rather:

That which moved Daniel to prayer was rather the religious condition of his own people, among whom the chastisement of the Exile had not produced the expected fruits of repentance; so that, though he did not doubt regarding the speedy liberation of his people from Babylonish exile, he might still hope for the early fulfillment of the deliverance prophesied of after the destruction of Babylon and the return of the Jews to Canaan. ...

This confession of sin, and this entreaty for mercy, show that the people, as a whole, were not yet in that spiritual condition in which they might expect the fulfillment of that promise of the Lord spoken by Jeremiah (ch. xxix.12 ff): "Ye shall seek me and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart; and I will be found of you, and will turn away your captivity, " etc.

(p.326)

Keil points out that Daniel would have been familiar with Isaiah's prophecy in ch.44.28 that Cyrus would be the one to rebuild Jerusalem and that Darius "was of such an age (ch. vi.i) [English version ch5:31] that now his reign must be near its end, and that Cyrus would soon mount his throne as his successor." (p.326)

Thus from this perspective Daniel would not be troubled by current affairs in Babylon because he would know that the rebuilding would begin when the Lord stirred up the heart of Cyrus:

Isa 44.28 Thus saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.

Isa 45.13 I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts.

But the most interesting aspect of Keil's comment is his summary of Dn9:24-27:

With this view of the contents of the prayer corresponds the divine answer which Gabriel brings to the prophet, the substance of which is to this effect, that till the accomplishment of God's plan of salvation in behalf of his people, yet seventy weeks are appointed, and that during this time great and severe tribulations would fall upon the people and the city.

(p.326)

Thus God deals with two major issues in the answer to Daniel as recorded in 9:24-27. The first issue and the easiest is the rebuilding of the city but the major issue in the mind of Daniel- that of the unreadiness of God's people, is the real issue of the message given because the seventy weeks is then given them to correct, once and for all time as a people, the very things that Daniel sees as causing their spiritual lethargy:

- a. Finish the transgression
- b. Make an end of sins

- c. Make reconciliation for iniquity
- d. Bring in everlasting righteousness
- e. Seal up the vision and the prophecy
- f. Anoint a/the Most Holy one/place.

Both individually and corporately as a nation they had to address the national religious issues and put in place measures to counteract the destructive religious culture that had been their downfall. Haskell outlines the atmosphere among the Jews in Bablyon around the time of Daniel's prayer succinctly:

Some who were in Babylon were careless and indifferent concerning the truth of God. Many had gotten them homes. Some were content with present surroundings, and dreaded the difficulties which must attend the journey to Jerusalem, which was in the hands of hostile tribes, and where there were no pleasant homes. Jerusalem should be built, they argued, but others should do it, not they. A love of Babylon was strong in the hearts of many, for seventy years after the decree of Cyrus, when all were at liberty to return to Palestine, there were still hundreds of Jews in Babylon. In fact, but a small percent of the Jews ever returned. The young, who had been educated in the city, had, many of them, like the daughters of Lot in Sodom, partaken so largely of the customs that they lingered among the heathen, though angels bade them to hurry out....Daniel knew of this condition, and he confessed the sins of the people before God. He identified with his people. (1995, pp.119-120)

The Assumption Chain used in this assumption

This assumption uses all the assumptions related to Daniel 8: It presumes that at the end of Dn8, the starting point for the 2300 days had not been given (Assumptions 3-11) and that the start for the 2300 days relates to the full vision of Dn 8 (Assumptions 2 and 1).

Assumption 11: Only a little time elapsed between Dn 8 and Dn 9. (Not all writers include this one)

Assumption 10: The "shutting" of the vision did not mean the shutting of the explanation of the vision (that is, the "vision" was complete and could be shut, but the explanation was not complete).

Assumption 9: The time of the end began in 1798.

Assumption 8: The "shutting" of the vision of Dn 8 (vs3-12) meant that it would not be understood until "many days", that is, until the "time of the end".

Assumption 7: Daniel's statement in Dn 8:27 on the lack of the understanding is due to the fact that the information had not been given.

Assumption 6: Daniel's statement in Dn 8:27 that he did not understand the mar'ê meant that he did not understand the 2300 days .

Assumption 5: The instruction of Gabriel to Daniel in ch8 is *incomplete*.

Assumption 4: Daniel was sick *before* the instruction of Daniel was finished.

Assumption 3: The starting point for the 2300 days is not declared in Dn 8.

Assumption 2: The meaning of “vision” in Dn 8:13, where it asks “How long shall be the vision...?” refers specifically to vs2-12 and not to vs9-11.

Assumption 1: The two Hebrew words in Dn 8-12 translated by the English word “vision” have specialised meanings that support the SDA argument linking the 70 weeks of Dn 9 with the 2300 days of Dn 8.

It also has some assumptions which are unique to this assumption. They include:

- The statement in Dn9:2 shows that Daniel was searching for the relationship between the 70 years of exile and the 2300 days;
- Daniel was thinking about the 2300 days when he was reading about the 70 years of exile in Jeremiah;
- Daniel misconstrued the 2300 days to be an extension of the 70 years of Jeremiah. Smith’s position was that Daniel believed the 2300-days would conclude at the same time;
- Daniel is thinking about the 2300 days in relation to the 70 years of exile when he is praying;
- The statement in Dn9:19 asking to “defer not” refers to Daniel’s belief that the 70 years exile would be extended 2300 days/years;
- Gabriel comes to correct Daniel’s misunderstanding of the relation between the 2300 days and the 70 years of exile.

All of these assumptions have been found to be lacking any credible supporting evidence.

Bibliography

Cottrell, Raymond F.,

1963 Beyond Tomorrow, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association.

Doukhan, Jacques,

1979 The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: an Exegetical Study, Andrews University Seminary Studies, Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press. Also found in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical,

and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshler , (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Haskell, Stephen N.,

1995 (1904) The Story of Daniel the Prophet, New York City: Teach Services, Inc.

Kautzsch, E.,

1982 (1909) Gesenius Hebrew Grammar 2nd English Edition revised in accordance with the 28th German edition by A. E. Cowley, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F.,

1978 (?) Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Daniel: Translated from the German by James Martin.

Leupold, H.C.,

1949 Exposition of Daniel, Nineteenth Reprinting, 1985, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House Company.

Maxwell, C. Mervyn.,

1981 God Cares. Volume 1: The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family, Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Nichol, Francis D. (Ed.),

1976 The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment in seven Volumes. Volume 4: Isaiah to Malachi. Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association. Revised.

Pfandl, Gerhard,

2004a “Daniel,” *Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide*, Oct-Dec, 2004, Warburton, Australia: Signs Publishing Co.

2004b Daniel: The Seer of Babylon, Hagerstown, M.D.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Smith, U.,

1898 Looking Unto Jesus or Christ in Type and Antitype. Warburton, Victoria, Australia: Signs Publishing Company, 1898.

1944(18?) The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, Revised Edition, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Company

Walvoord, John F.,

1971 Daniel: the Key to Prophetic Revelation, a commentary, Chicago: Moody Press

Weber, M.,

1985 Some Call it Heresy: A Young Pastor Takes a Second Look at His Church. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Woolsey, Raymond,

2001(1978) On the Edge of Forever: History's Grand Design and Coming Climax, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Young, Edward J.,

1949 Daniel, A Geneva Series Commentary, Reprinted 1978, The Banner of Truth Trust, London: Billing and Sons