

Jesus and the Future Based on Daniel and Matthew 24, Especially the “70 sets of sevens” (Dan. 9:24-27)

Anthony Buzzard

25th Annual Theological Conference, Calvin Center, GA, 28th April-1st May, 2016

First what I hope is a salutary shock to help us realize the enormity of the struggle we are up against (you have all read “the Satan is the god of this age” and that “the whole world lies in his grip”). Note that we are working against a “Christian” system which does not believe that the teaching of Jesus really matters! This comes from Luther who said that the synoptic gospels don’t count for much, but that John is the only really spiritual Gospel. C.S. Lewis: “The Gospel is not in the Gospels.” Thus the late Dr. James Kennedy of Coral Ridge Ministries and Dr. O.J. Brown of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School:

Dr. James Kennedy of Coral Ridge Ministries (he died some years back):

“Many people today think that the essence of Christianity is Jesus’ teachings, but that is not so. If you read the Apostle Paul’s letters, which make up most of the NT, you will see that there is almost nothing said about the teachings of Jesus. Throughout the rest of the NT there’s little reference to the teachings of Jesus, and in the Apostles’ creed, the most universally-held Christian creed, there is no reference to Jesus’ teachings. There is also no reference to the example of Jesus. Only two days in the life of Jesus are mentioned — the day of his birth and the day of his death. Christianity centers not in the teachings of Jesus, but in the person of Jesus as Incarnate God, who came into the world to take on himself our guilt and die in our place” (*Truth Notes: “How I Know Jesus is God,”* Nov. 17th, 1989).

Dr. Harold O.J. Brown:

“Christianity takes its name from its founder, or rather from what he was called, the Christ. Buddhism is also named for its founder. And non-Muslims often call Islam Mohammedanism. But while Buddhism and Islam are based primarily on the *teaching* of the Buddha and Mohammed, respectively, Christianity is based primarily on the person of Christ. **The Christian faith is not belief in his teaching**, but in what is taught about him. The appeal of Protestant liberals to ‘believe as Jesus believed,’ rather than to believe in Jesus, is a dramatic transformation of the fundamental nature of Christianity” (*Heresies*, 1984, p. 13).

Dr. James Dunn: “Hurtado does not think it necessary for Jesus to have thought and spoken of himself in the same terms as his followers thought and spoke of him in the decades subsequent to his crucifixion, in order for the convictions of those followers to be treated as valid by Christians today; though he also notes that most Christians probably think that there was ‘some degree of continuity’ between what Jesus thought of himself and subsequent Christology” (*Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?* p. 93, fn 2, referring to Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, p. 9).

Has Hurtado read the NT?!

Prof. Richard Hiers, *Jesus and the Future*, 1981, p. 1: “Interpreters of Christian persuasion have ordinarily not been especially interested in what Jesus intended and did in his own time.”

Did you notice that the creeds leap over the teaching of Jesus and go from “born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate...”?

“Look, I have told you in advance” (Matt. 24:25)

My hope in this presentation is to bring some clarity to the Messiah Jesus’ mind on the future. We are to have the mind and spirit of Jesus (1 Cor. 2:16, quoting LXX Isa. 40:13, mind in Greek = spirit in Hebrew).

We have to *learn* to have that mind. In Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21, which are obviously parallel accounts, Jesus gave us what we need to know and understand to face the future with intelligence. These are long discourses of the master rabbi and are never to be relegated to any secondary position, as not necessary and essential for us. We are to live by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God, in this case, via the mouth of Jesus, God’s unique mediator, go-between, *shaliach* (one sent as agent, 1 Tim. 2:5; 1 John 2:1, advocate; 2 Cor.

3:8, spirit). Christian faith and love are “based on, derived from” **HOPE** (Col. 1:4-5). If clarity of hope fails then love and faith dwindle.

It is appropriate to start with Matthew and then of course to harmonize with Mark and Luke, and of course Daniel. It is with good reason that we get three corroborating accounts of Jesus and his view of the future and the coming *Parousia* (Second Coming). Matthew has just finished telling us that his contemporaries were responsible for killing Abel and all the prophets to the end of the OT period! (24:23). This should alert us at once to the very instructive “corporate” and very non-western way of seeing people in groups bound by a common quality (a generation, *genea*) — in this case, evil. Cp. “the evil generation that was Israel” (Deut. 32:5, 20). For Jesus, society is an evil brood, bent on getting things wrong. This awful condition will persist until the one future arrival of Jesus in glory to raise the dead (1 Cor. 15:23), catch them up to meet him along with the surviving true believers (1 Thess. 4:16-17) and inaugurate the political-spiritual Kingdom on the earth (Rev. 11:15-18), society to be renewed by reeducation (“the world will learn righteousness,” Isa. 26:9).

“This generation which will not pass until ALL the events of the discourse come to pass” (24:34-35) is explained by “heavens and earth,” that is, the social order (see Isa. 51:15-16) will not pass away until all the words of Jesus are fulfilled. In Acts 1:6-7 Jesus explicitly says that no date at all can be put on the Parousia, his return. Times and seasons cannot be known. He could easily have told them, if “generation” means 40 years, “I told you 40 years!” He said nothing of the sort.

Then this: “What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit himself? Whoever wants to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and the Gospel [of the Kingdom’s] sake, will save it. Whoever is ashamed of me and **my words** in this **adulterous and sinful generation**, the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” (Mark 8:35-38). This society is compared and contrasted with the new society which is coming at the Parousia. The people of this age are wiser in relationship to their own brood [*genea*] than the children of light” (Luke 16:8, 9). “This generation will not pass until all these things have happened = heaven and earth [this present world order, since the flood] will pass away but my words will not.” It does not get any more beautifully clear than that!

On that Tuesday of the week in which Jesus went to his ignominious (as the authorities saw it) death at the hands of the “church establishment,” dying on 15th Nisan, a Friday, and at the hands of hostile Roman and Jewish authorities, Jesus walked out of the temple, and in a private lecture to his inner circle of well-instructed students (disciples) he was asked. “When will these things happen and what will be the sign of your coming (Parousia) and end of the age?” This is a single question referring to one climactic event, his Second Coming to raise the dead at the 7th trumpet (Rev. 11:15-18; 1 Cor. 15:50ff). Jesus answered that one question. The parallels in Mark and Luke are not meant to give us something entirely different. They express the same idea as Matthew.

As good commentary notes, obviously trouble in the temple and the Second Coming are closely associated in the question of Jesus’ students, *and* by Jesus. The disciples were not wrong to think thus. They had been well instructed in the prophecies of Daniel, and it was Daniel who had plainly linked the “Abomination of desolation standing where **he** ought not to” (Mark 13:14, “in the holy place,” Matt. 24:15) in direct connection with a unique time of unparalleled great tribulation (Dan. 12:1 = Matt 24:21) — not ever to be confused with the general “much tribulation which it is our lot to experience” on the journey to the Kingdom (Acts 14:22).

In the minds of Jesus and his students, there is to be a final and ultimate, unparalleled, unrepeatable time of tribulation, the time of Jacob’s trouble (Jer. 30:7), the punishment of the end (Ezek. 7, the Great Tribulation of Rev. 3:10, 7:14, Matt. 24:21=Dan. 12:1), the day of the wrath of God’s testing punishment on Israel and the world, with the resounding and positive result and happy outcome, that “they will know that I am the LORD.” This certainly did not happen in AD 70! Much less in AD 33!

Jesus defined the Great Tribulation (Matt. 24:21) by appealing to Daniel 12:1, an event just before the death of the final King of the North of Daniel 11 (see Dan 12:45, “his end”), and close to the resurrection of the dead (Dan. 12:2). Habakkuk looked forward to a “striking of the head of the household of evil” (3:13), “to lay him open from thigh to neck. I must wait quietly for the day of distress (tribulation) for the people to arise who will invade us” (3:16). “Why are you silent when the wicked swallow up those more righteous than they?” (1:13) “Record the vision and inscribe it on tablets that the one who reads it may run. For the vision is yet for the appointed time. It hastens towards the goal and it will not fail. Though it tarries, wait for it, for it will certainly come; it will not delay” (2:2, 3).

Daniel is replete with information about the final antichristian figure, the “abomination of desolation standing in the holy place,” “where **HE** ought not to” (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14; Rev. 13:14). The abomination represents the ultimate in idolatry: “What profit is the idol when its maker has carved it? Or an image, a teacher of falsehood”

(Hab. 2:18) — false views of God and of Jesus and of man. John had written: “You have heard that Antichrist [a single individual] is coming” (that was not wrong!), but even then the *spirit* of antichrist was flourishing (1 John 2:18ff). It had many exponents, and they presented a non-human Jesus, one not genuinely human (come *en sarki*, “in the flesh,” not “INTO the flesh” as mistranslated by Luther, 1 John 4:2). One must, on the other hand, believe strictly and conscientiously in “that Jesus” (1 John 4:3), that is, the one presented by John, the genuine human, descendant of David, Son of God and the Messiah (Luke 1:43, my lord; 2:11, Ps. 110:1, the Messiah lord, the anointed lord, certainly not GOD!). Failure to grasp the Shema remains the greatest threat to good and faithful belief, and obedience to Jesus.

Micah 4:6-8 announces the Gospel of the Kingdom, when Messiah will rule over Israel in Mount Zion, from now on (then on). “This one Messiah will go forth from Me to be ruler in Israel. Details of his birth are from ancient days... He will be our peace when **the Assyrian** invades the land and tramples on our citadel” (5:2-6), “a wicked counselor from Nineveh” (Nahum 1:11; see Ps. 83 for that final 10-nation coalition against Israel). For the Assyrian, see “The Assyrian in Messianic Prophecy” at our site. Also Isa. 11:4=2 Thess. 2:8, the **114→228** connection!

With this background and much more, Jesus answered the question about “the sign of your Parousia and end of the age.” The first essential move in right exegesis is to settle on the meaning of “end of the age.” This is done by the established method of comparing text with text. “End of the age” is a fixed datum in Matthew. “**The harvest is the end of the age**” (Matt. 13:39-40; cp. Rev. 16, “put in the sickle”), “the close and consummation of the age” (Amplified). This is the time when the wicked will be burned as tares. This is emphatically not AD 70! There is no such thing as “the end of the Jewish age,” any more than there is an “eternal generation of the Son.”

Where else do we find “the end of the age”? In Matthew 28:19-20. Here again the end of the age is evidently the future coming of Jesus. He promises to be with his faithful followers until the end of the age, clearly his Parousia. In all of its 5 occurrences in Matthew, the end of the age is future to us. Virtually the same expression is found in Daniel 12:13, and it is the moment when Daniel will rise in the resurrection to obtain his appointed destiny and position of authority in the future Kingdom.

Another excellent and necessary exegetical move is based on Matthew’s careful link between **the Parousia and end of the age** in Matthew 24:3: In the Greek a single definite article links, inextricably, “the Parousia and end of the age.” “What will be the sign of your Parousia and end of the age?”

The Parousia is obviously the future one coming of Jesus, which coincides with the close of the present age. When a few verses later Jesus says “the end is not yet” he means of course the only end mentioned in the discourse! It is the end just referred to in Matthew 24:3. One cannot switch meanings and pretend that the end (*telos*, 24:6) is somehow not the end of the age which is in the immediate context! There are not two ends in Matthew 24 any more than there are two Gods or two natures in Christ.

We must insist that there is only one Parousia, one second coming. Chaos ensues when one is turned into two. That is, there is One God, in the shema (Mark 12:29). God is one Person and not two. Man is a psychosomatic whole, body and soul, and not two distinct parts, body and separable immortal soul. Jesus does not have two natures. Bishop Wright and others are now busy trying to turn the Shema into two, by splitting it at 1 Corinthians 8:6! Others are busy presenting a double second coming by inventing a PRE-tribulation rapture/resurrection! They have stolen the biblical term “being caught up” (rapture) in 1 Thessalonians 4:17 and applied it to an event 7 years before the one actual visible, arrival/Parousia of Messiah. 1 Thessalonians 4:15 identifies the catching up (v. 17) as the Parousia.

The basis of Jesus’ thinking, which must be ours too, is Daniel 9 and the other three references to the Abomination of Desolation (9:27; 8:13; 11:31; 12:11). Daniel for 23 impassioned verses prays for the restoration of the city and sanctuary which are in ruins. This requires that the goal and resolution of the prophecy, the answer to his prayer, the end of the 490 years, will see the requested restoration of the city and sanctuary. AD 70 saw a massive *destruction* of Israel! To end the 490 years in 33 AD will not work either, because it is 40 years before the other proposed end in AD 70. But AD 70 is definitely not the end to which Daniel or Gabriel looked!

None of the difficulty arises if we first establish that the end of the age is the future coming of Jesus. “The harvest is the end of the age” (Matt. 13:39-40), not AD 70! The saints’ faces will shine like the sun in the kingdom at that end of the age (v. 43). None of this is remotely possibly in AD 70. 1 Corinthians 15:23 ties the Parousia inextricably with the future resurrection. Any suggestion of a Parousia in AD 70 flirts with the mistake of saying that the resurrection has already taken place (2 Tim. 2:18). The great commission guarantees that Jesus will be with us “till the end of the age” (Matt 28:19-20).

Jesus insists on defining the Abomination as **the Abomination defined already by Daniel!** “Let the reader please understand” (Matt. 24:15). All mistakes arise when this fact is ignored and people make up their own version of the Abomination. Daniel 12:11 is critically decisive. For Jesus, the placing of the abomination and the removal of the daily sacrifice will occur 1290 days before the end of the final vision (Dan 12:11), which ends with the resurrection (12:2). 1290 *years* is obviously a serious mistake since if it were true one could predict the resurrection 1290 years in advance (see paper on the refutation of the day/year theory).

Daniel 9:26 is also entirely decisive. There is first a prediction of the Messiah prince (*Mashiach Nagid*) who arrives after 483 years. He is then cut off in death (his crucifixion). Then comes “the people of a prince who is to come, who will **destroy and ruin the city** and sanctuary.” The fixed fact about this other prince is that “he comes **to HIS END**” in the flood of judgment which ends the prophecy (9:26b, 27). This same wicked prince also “comes desolating [*meshomem*] on the wing of abominations,” until he is finally brought to **his end** by judgment. As the final King of the North, “he comes **to his end**” in the land (Dan. 11:45), at a time associated with the unparalleled Great Tribulation (Dan. 12:1=Matt. 24:21).

Paul referred to this final antichristian tyrant standing in **the** temple of God (2 Thess. 2:4).¹ When speaking of the individual Christian or the church as “**a** temple of God,” he does not introduce the idea by speaking of “**the** temple,” but “**a** temple” (1 Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16). But in 2 Thessalonians 2 the natural meaning of “the temple” is a real building.

“The people of the prince who is to come who desolates city and sanctuary” (Dan 9:26) is positively *not* Jesus using the Roman armies! The Romans were never the people of Jesus. Such a false reading would turn Jesus into the Antichrist!

***Kalah ve Necheratzah* — Final and Decisive End**

There is a further hub of connected texts in the very rare expression, “the decisive and final end,” the “*kalah ve necheratzah*” of Daniel 9:27.² This phrase is cited by Daniel from Isaiah 10:22-23 and again in Isaiah 28:22, in connection with “a covenant of death” (v. 18). In each case the future Day of the Lord is the context. Then in Romans 9:27-28 Paul cites from Isaiah 10:23 the **same final end of the age event** as the future time when a remnant of now blinded Israel (“Jews”) will come to salvation. “All Israel will be saved” (Rom. 11:25, 26). This will not happen until the full quota of Gentiles has come in. Until then Paul describes Jews as enemies of the Gospel. Of course he went out to convert now as many as would listen to him.

In Matthew 23:35-36 Jesus had just announced to his enemies that **they** had killed all the righteous starting with Abel! This is the corporate thinking which dominates the mind of Jesus. “You killed Abel,” he says to the hostile group standing in front of him. In the same way he can look at the buildings in front of him and announce any future destruction of them. Yes, we know that the buildings were ruined in AD 70, but what Jesus goes on to describe is a desolation and ruin connected with the future **Great Tribulation**, which Jesus calls “days in which it will be severely difficult for pregnant and nursing women” (Mark 13:17-19). That cannot be a prolonged period of thousands of years! It cannot be AD 70 because “immediately after” that very time of great tribulation (24:29), there will follow cosmic signs and the spectacular, visible arrival of Jesus. AD 70 is not *the* Great Tribulation. It cannot be a time spanning millennia, and it cannot be a brief time in AD 70. The Great Tribulation has to be followed *immediately* by cosmic signs (Matt. 24:29).

Jesus is offered one question, which embraces the end of the age and his coming again. Granted that his prediction includes the obvious reference to a destruction of the temple. The fact that a destruction of the temple occurred in AD 70 must not be allowed to undermine the equally clear fact that trouble in the temple is associated with the Parousia. The sequence which appears in all three accounts of the Lord’s presentation is very clear: 1) Various general signs, famine and war and persecution. 2) The appearance of the person of the Abomination standing where *he* ought not to, in a holy place. 3) The onset of the one unparalleled, and thus unique time of severe trouble found in Daniel 12:1, close to the future resurrection, 4) *Immediately* following (Matt 24:29) that definite final, unparalleled tribulation, heavenly signs in the sun and moon will introduce the spectacular and visible arrival of the Messiah (Acts 1:11; 3:21).

Every attempt to divide this information between two events, i.e. AD 70 and the yet future Parousia, have failed, as is shown by the complete and chaotic disagreement among commentators as to where to place the divide.

¹ In John 17:12 and 2 Thess. 2:3 the Antichrist/Man of Sin and Judas are described with the same words “son of perdition.” Cp. Ps. 55, where Ahithophel’s opposition to David is a *type* of Judas’ opposition to Jesus (Matt. 26:50).

² See *Focus on the Kingdom*, January 2008 and December 2010 at focusonthe kingdom.org

As an extreme and obviously failed attempt I mention the book by Kimball on *The Great Tribulation* in which he places the Great Tribulation in AD 70, and then says that the signs in the heavens which follow immediately refer to nearly 2000 years of political disturbance! The vast majority of commentary has rightly not imagined heavenly signs as being prolonged for nearly 2000 years. So they try this move: they say that the Great Tribulation in Jesus' mind began in AD 70 and has been going on continuously for nearly 2000 years, to be followed "immediately" (Matt. 24:29) by cosmic signs and the visible arrival of Jesus in power and glory. But this solution fails on the simple basis that Jesus described the days of the Great Tribulation as days which will call for immediate flight from Jerusalem and "days in which it will be impossibly difficult for pregnant women and those nursing babies" (Mark 13:15-20).

Hence it is entirely appropriate for us to say, as we enter, say, Olive Garden for a special celebration, or as we look at a dessert-laden table at a church potluck: "this is NOT the Great Tribulation."

Daniel 9:24, 27 looks like this in the Hebrew. Translations have often not allowed you to hear the text (see at our site the article on Daniel 9:26b). Here is what the Hebrew says:

"From the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the appearance of the Messiah 7 weeks and 62 weeks shall pass away. The city shall be restored and built up amid the oppressions of the times. But after the 62 weeks, the Messiah will be cut off, so that to him nothing remains. And the city, together with the sanctuary, shall be destroyed by the people of **a prince** who will come, **who will find his end** in the flood. But the war shall continue to the end, since destruction is irrevocably decreed. That prince will force a strong covenant for one week on the mass of the people, and born on the wings of idol **abominations** he shall carry on a **desolating** rule, till the firmly decreed judgment shall pour itself upon him as one desolated" (partly based on Keil and Delitzsch).

Moses Stuart on Daniel 9:26b

"*v'kitzo* — "and his end" Whose end? The **obvious** grammatical answer is the end of the *nagid haba*, the prince to come. One has only to compare 8:25... 'he shall be broken in pieces without human hand' and join this with 11:45, 'and he shall come to **his end** (*ad kitzo*) and none to help him (*v ayn ozer lo*),' in order to see **how exactly all three of the passages agree**. In all, the end in question follows the injuries done to the holy city and temple. Manifestly the same personage is concerned. We cannot, therefore, refer 'his end' to city and sanctuary, for the suffix should then be plural; nor to 'he will ruin,' i.e. the action of destruction (Hengstenberg) which ends in overflowing. Indeed such an application would probably never have been thought of, had not that interpretation needed its aid, which makes Titus the Roman chief to be the *nagid*, prince, in this case, who is to destroy city and sanctuary. But such a construction is incompatible with grammar, and equally so with the parallel passages to which reference has been made above."

Keil is equally clear, whose translation we quoted in part just above. We quote his comment:

"The *Nagid Haba* (the prince to come) who destroys the city and sanctuary, **whose end** will be with the flood, consequently cannot be the Messiah, but is the enemy of his people and of the Kingdom of God, who shall arise in the last time (7:24, 25)... In the following phrase '**and his end with the flood**,' the suffix refers **simply** to the hostile *Nagid* (prince) **whose end** here is emphatically placed in contrast to his coming (so also R. Kranichfeld, Hofmann and Kliefoth). Preconceived ideas as to the historical interpretation of the prophecy lie at the foundation of all other references. The Messianic interpreters who find here a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans and thus understand by the prince, Titus, cannot apply the suffix (his) to the prince (Titus). Some therefore refer the suffix ('his end') to **the city and the sanctuary**; but that is inadmissible since the city is feminine. Others refer the 'his end' to the masculine sanctuary only; but the separation of the city and sanctuary is quite arbitrary. Others (Hengstenberg) refer the suffix to the idea of 'ruining.' On the other hand von Lengerke and Kliefoth have rightly objected to this view. They say 'this reference of the suffix ('**his end**') is inadmissibly harsh; the author must have written erroneously, since he suggested the reference (**his end**) to **the masculine singular people or prince**. One cannot imagine what is meant by 'end of the destruction,' since the destruction itself is the end... There remains therefore nothing else than to apply the suffix (**his end**) to the prince. *Ketz* [end] can therefore accordingly only denote the destruction of the prince... the prince will find **his end** in his warlike expedition... the people of a prince who shall come and find his destruction in the flood" (*Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 360ff).

Other translations have agreed: “And after the sixty-two weeks an Anointed One put to death...city and sanctuary ruined by a prince who is to come. **The end of that prince will be catastrophe** and, until the end, there will be war and all the devastation decreed” (Dan. 9:26, New Jerusalem Bible).³

Jesus Putting the Texts Together

Jesus in Luke 21:24 tells us that Jerusalem will be **trodden down** until the times of the Gentiles are completed. The treading down of Jerusalem is based on LXX of Zechariah 12:3: “It will come to pass in that day that I will make Jerusalem a stone **trodden on** by all the nations. Everyone who tramples on it will utterly mock at it and all the nations of the earth will be gathered against it.” Jesus resumes the same subject exactly in Revelation 11:2-3: “Leave out the court which is outside the temple and do not measure it, because it has been given over to the nations, and they will **tread** it under foot for 42 months.” This is 1260 days (v. 3), the second half of the final “seven” of Daniel 9:24-27. This shows how Jesus our rabbi reads the last “seven” of Daniel 9. It is future at the time of the two witnesses whose two corpses finally lie in the street in Jerusalem.

Israel says, “Your holy people possessed your sanctuary for a short time. Our adversaries have **trodden** it down” (Isa. 63:18-19; 64:10-12; Ps. 74). Zechariah 13:8, 9 and 14:1-2 speak of a future time of invasion and extreme trouble for Israel. Through this punishment a remnant will repent and welcome the Messiah at his return. This will be the moment described by Jesus in Matthew 23:39: You will see me and say ‘Blessed is the one coming in the name of the Lord God.’” The “you” is the corporate you: “You and all who belong to you.”

Further information:

Alexander Reese, *The Approaching Advent of Christ*

Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Prophecy* for a survey of commentary

Robert Gundry, *The Church and the Tribulation*

Neil Nelson, “This Generation in Matthew 24:34: A Literary Critical Perspective,” *JETS*, Sept. 1996

Various articles on prophecy at restorationfellowship.org

Sean Finnegan on the historical elements of the 70 “sevens”

³ For our German readers here is the Einheitsubersetzung, 1980: Daniel 9:26b: **Er findet sein Ende in der Flut**; bis zum Ende werden Krieg und Verwüstung herrschen, wie es längst beschlossen ist. (Translation: “He [the wicked prince] will find his end in the flood.”)

French Jerusalem Bible: La ville et le sanctuaire détruits par **un prince qui viendra. Sa fin** sera dans le cataclysme et, jusqu'à la fin, la guerre et les désastres décrétés. (Translation: “...a prince who will come. His end will be in the cataclysm.”)

Traduction Oecumenique de la Bible, 1988: Quant à la ville et au sanctuaire, le peuple d'un **chef à venir les détruira; mais sa fin viendra** dans un déferlement, et jusqu'à la fin de la guerre seront décrétées des dévastations. (Translation: “...a prince to come will destroy them, but his end will come...”)

Bible en Français Courant, 1997: Puis un chef viendra avec son armée et détruira la ville et le sanctuaire. Toutefois **ce chef finira** sous le déferlement de la colère divine. **Mais jusqu'à sa mort** il mènera une guerre dévastatrice, comme cela a été décidé. (Translation: “However this ruler will come to his end...”)