The Millennial Sacrifice Quandary: A Critique in Light of Hebrews

Millennial Temple Sacrifices ~ Video Statements

To understand the essence of this post's title, we should examine the prevailing perspective within Dispensational Premillennialism, as expressed by theologians such as John MacArthur in the video below. Additionally, figures like John Walvoord and Charles Ryrie suggest that Christ will physically govern from Jerusalem during a forthcoming millennium and serve as High Priest over a reconstructed temple, where animal sacrifices will be reintroduced as memorials of His crucifixion. This is a profound and powerful theological point—the idea of Christ returning to the Levitical system is a complete negation of His finished work on the cross.

Consider this scenario. Envision Christ re-entering the Old Testament sacrificial system. How would it appear for Him to oversee the sacrifices that He concluded by becoming the ultimate sacrificial lamb for humanity? However, Christ cautioned the apostles that the Old Covenant system would eventually cease, as He predicted in Matthew 24:2, and that the temple where the sacrificial system was administered would be terminated with its destruction by the Romans in A.D. 70. Can you now comprehend how humiliating this would be for Him? It would cast doubt on the adequacy of His death and sacrifice for the sins of humanity.

While this teaching exists online and can be found by others, its proponents often betray a lack of conviction in their own

interpretations. The following video in question is a prime example, where the presenter consistently uses qualifying language such as “it seems,” effectively questioning the clarity and finality of God’s ordained system. This linguistic uncertainty reflects a deeper hermeneutical weakness. The argument then leans heavily on a misapplication of Acts 21, a tactic we will expose and correct in the following section.

Christ Himself prophesied the total and permanent end of the Old Covenant system with the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 (Matthew 24:2). For Him to then re-enter that system as its high priest would be for the author of history to violate His own prophetic word. It would mean His warning was in error and that the Temple’s destruction was not the conclusive end He said it would be. This would undermine His authority as a prophet and the finality of the covenant He established through His own blood, reducing His ultimate sacrifice to just another in a long line of inadequate offerings.

Introduction

Ezekiel 40–48 sketches an immense temple, Zadokite priests, a Davidic “prince,” and regular offerings. Premillennial dispensationalists often read these as **future, literal** features of Christ’s earthly reign; covenantal/amillennial interpreters see the vision as **typological**, fulfilled in Christ and, ultimately, in the temple-less New Jerusalem (Rev 21:22, KJV). Whatever one’s reading of Ezekiel, Hebrews speaks with decisive clarity about the atoning work of Christ: ***“by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all… For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified”*** (Heb 10:10, 14, KJV).

This essay argues that any future rites cannot be **propitiatory**

or atonement-adding without contradicting Hebrews' finality. If Ezekiel's temple is future and literal, its rites must be understood as **memorial** or **purificatory**, not sin-removing. If Ezekiel is symbolic, the vision culminates in the New Jerusalem where ***"the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it"*** (Rev 21:22, KJV). For readers, the non-negotiable is Hebrews: Christ's atonement is complete.

Reading Ezekiel Carefully

Within Ezekiel's vision, **Zadokite priests** officiate, and a **"prince"** bears administrative and cultic responsibilities—including providing a sin offering ***"for himself and for all the people of the land"*** (Ezek 45:22). That detail is why many premillennial interpreters conclude **the prince is not Christ**. Bible HubGotQuestions.org

This matters rhetorically: the text does not depict Jesus personally resuming Levitical priest-work as if reversing His heavenly session. Rather, either (a) Ezekiel's system functions under a subordinate prince and priesthood (literal view), or (b) the vision is ideal-typological and fulfilled in Christ and His people (symbolic view). For the latter, see redemptive-historical treatments that track "temple" from Eden to the **temple-less** consummation (Rev 21–22). The Gospel Coalition

---

What Hebrews Settles

Hebrews insists that the Levitical system was a **shadow**, not the substance (Heb 10:1); Christ's self-offering is **once for all** and **final** (Heb 10:10–14), and His session ("sat down," Heb 10:12) signals the completed, accepted work. Any reading of

Ezekiel that implies **additional, propitiatory** sacrifices collides with this settled theology. (Scripture citations supplied; no external web source needed.)

Why A.D. 70 Matters for the "Third Temple" Claim

Thesis (in plain terms).
If Christ's cross rendered the Levitical system obsolete, then **A.D. 70**—the public, covenantal dismantling of temple and altar—functions as history's confirmation of Hebrews' theology. Re-starting that system in a future millennium would re-erect what God *both theologically and historically* brought to an end.

A simple deductive reasoning.

1. Christ's sacrifice is **once for all**; the Levitical order is **obsolete** (Heb 7:27; 9:12, 26; 10:10–14; 8:13).
2. God **judged** the old order in space-time (Matt 23:38–24:2; Luke 21:20–24).
    - **Therefore,** a return to temple sacrifices (whether "memorial" or otherwise) conflicts with the New Covenant's finality.

Key NT anchors (KJV).

- "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second… **once for all**." (Heb 10:9–10, 14)
- "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, **nor yet at Jerusalem**, worship the Father… the true worshippers shall worship the Father in **spirit and in truth**." (John 4:21–23) – What Jesus is saying (in

context)

- **Setting:** Jesus answers the Samaritan/Jewish debate over the *place* of true worship (Mount **Gerizim** vs. **Jerusalem**).
- **Pivot:** "**The hour cometh, and now is**" points to His death-resurrection and the New Covenant it inaugurates.
- **Claim:** "**Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem**" → worship will no longer be *geography-bound* to a holy site or temple.
- **Positive replacement:** "**The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth**" → worship is now rooted in the **Holy Spirit** and the **truth fulfilled in Christ** (cf. John 14:6).

- "**Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.**" (Matt 23:38; cf. 24:2)

Canonical trajectory (shadow → substance).

- **Shadows**: sacrifices, priesthood, temple (Heb 8–10; Col 2:16–17).
- **Substance**: Christ's once-for-all offering; the church as a **spiritual house** offering **spiritual sacrifices** (1 Pet 2:5; Eph 2:19–22).
- **Consummation**: **"I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it."** (Rev 21:22)

Common Replies & Clear Answers

Reply A (Dispensational Memorial): "Millennial sacrifices won't atone; they'll be **memorials** like the Lord's Supper."
Answer: Hebrews doesn't only say "no more *atoning* animal blood"; it says the old *ritual*, is **obsolete** (Heb 8:13) and that God now desires **better** worship tied to Christ's finished work (Heb 10:5–10; 13:15). The NT's ordained memorial is **bread**

and cup (Luke 22:19–20; 1 Cor 11:23–26)—*not* a revival of the very shadows Christ fulfilled.

Reply B (Purification View): "Ezekiel's rites would only **purify** people/space among mortals."
Answer: Even if labeled "purification," it is still the **Levitical** mechanism. Hebrews' contrast is not merely about *what* the blood achieves but **which order** God now owns as His way of approach (Heb 7:12, 18–19; 9:9–10). The **order** has changed, permanently.

Reply C (Prophetic Obligation): "Ezekiel 40–48 is so detailed, it must be **literal** in a future age."
Answer: Unclear visions must be read through **clear** apostolic doctrine (Hebrews). Either (a) Ezekiel's temple is **typological** of God dwelling with His people (ending in Rev 21:22), or (b) any literal elements **cannot** re-establish a superseded priestly order without violating the New Covenant. In either case, Hebrews governs.

Reply D (Destroyed then restored—like Babylon → Zerubbabel): "God has destroyed and rebuilt before; A.D. 70 doesn't preclude future restoration."
Answer: Before the cross, yes. **After** the cross, the apostolic witness declares a **covenant shift** (Heb 8:6–13). A.D. 70 isn't just another exile; it is the **public ratification** of what Calvary already achieved—the end of the shadow-system. The comparison to Zerubbabel's temple misses the decisive difference of **Christ's finished work**.

Acts 21 Isn't a Shortcut Around Hebrews

Synopsis: The key passage is Acts 21:17-26. Here, Paul arrives in Jerusalem after his missionary journeys. The elders, led by James, inform him that thousands of Jewish believers in Christ are "all zealous for the law." They are concerned that rumors

are circulating that Paul teaches Jews to abandon the Law of Moses. To prove this is false, they advise Paul to participate in a Nazirite vow purification ceremony at the Temple, which includes offerings and sacrifices.

The Dispensationalist Argument: The central aspect of their argument for a sacrificial system during the millennium that is based on Acts 21, which recounts an incident where Paul's teachings were misinterpreted. A more developed story line is as follows:

- **1. The Jerusalem Council Validated the Continued Practice of the Law.** The apostles, including James and presumably others present, did not tell the Jewish believers to stop observing the Mosaic Law. On the contrary, they acknowledged and affirmed their zeal for it. This indicates that following Christ did not automatically nullify the Law's ceremonial and sacrificial aspects for Jewish people. It remained a valid expression of their national and religious identity.
- **2. Apostolic Endorsement of Temple Sacrifices.** The specific action recommended was for Paul to fund and participate in a ceremony that culminated in animal sacrifices at the Temple. The text states the purpose was for Paul, as stated in verese 24: *"and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law."*
  Crucially, the apostles did not say, "Don't do that, Paul. Christ's sacrifice made those obsolete." Instead, they orchestrated it. For dispensationalists, this is a powerful precedent: the highest authorities of the early church explicitly sanctioned and participated in the Temple sacrificial system *after* Christ's death and

resurrection.

- **3. A Distinction Between Jewish and Gentile Believers.** Dispensationalism emphasizes a distinction between Israel (the physical descendants of Abraham) and the Church (the spiritual body of Christ, composed of Jew and Gentile). The decision in Acts 15 and the actions in Acts 21 are seen as reinforcing this distinction. Gentiles were not placed under the Law (Acts 15:19-20, 28-29), but Jewish believers were free to continue observing it as their national covenant. Therefore, the Law's ordinances, including sacrifices, were not "done away with" for Israel; they were simply not required for the Church.
- **4. Application to the Millennium:** Dispensationalists interpret Old Testament prophecies (particularly in Ezekiel 40-48) literally. Ezekiel provides detailed, physical descriptions of a future Temple with a priesthood, rituals, and animal sacrifices.
    - **The Purpose of Millennial Sacrifices:** The argument is that these future sacrifices will not be for atonement for sin—that was accomplished once and for all by Christ (Hebrews 10:10-12). Instead, they will serve as a **memorial**. Just as the Lord's Supper is a memorial of Christ's sacrifice for the Church, the reinstated Temple system will be a national memorial and teaching tool for Israel and the nations during Christ's earthly reign. They will be a perpetual reminder of the cost of sin and the ultimate sacrifice of the Messiah, visually reinforcing the gospel in a tangible, covenantal form for the nation that was central to God's redemptive plan.
    - **The Precedent of Acts 21:** The events in Acts 21, they claim, are the biblical proof that such a system can and does operate *post*-Cross without being a theological contradiction. If the apostles could sanction it in the 1st century as a valid

> practice for Jewish believers, then God can certainly reinstitute it in the future millennium for the same nation, with its purpose transformed from propitiation to commemoration.

In essence, the dispensationalist uses Acts 21 to argue that the New Testament itself provides a working model for how the Mosaic sacrificial system can coexist with the finished work of Christ, not as a means of salvation, but as a form of worship, national identity, and memorial for the people of Israel.

Paul's participation in temple rites (Acts 21:23–26) is best read as **pastoral accommodation** within a Jewish milieu—not as a norm for Gentile churches or a template for post-Calvary atoning ritual. Craig Keener underscores this contextual, conciliatory purpose and the Jerusalem elders' concern for Jewish believers' perceptions (Acts 21:17–26). [1]

Views Among Dispensationalists (labeled)

D1. Literal–Memorial (LM)
A future, literal temple with **memorial** sacrifices that look back to Christ's cross—analogous to the Lord's Supper; not propitiatory. (Scofield; Walvoord; many pastors, incl. MacArthur.)

D2. Literal–Purification (LP)
Rites function for **ritual/ceremonial purification** of people/space in the presence of God among mortals; not salvation-adding.

D3. Literal–Propitiatory (LProp; minority)
Proposes a form of theocratic/administrative forgiveness tied

to kingdom worship. This view faces the sharpest objections from Hebrews' "once for all" finality.

D4. Literal–Christ-as-Priest Emphasis (LCP; sub-stream of LM/LP)
Non-propitiatory sacrifices with special emphasis on **Christ's ongoing high-priestly role** in the millennial economy (often how MacArthur frames it).

D5. Progressive Dispensational Spectrum (PD)
Keeps a future kingdom with "already/not-yet" nuance; some PD writers land in LM/LP, others speak more cautiously.

Sidebar: Dispensationalism — Schools at a Glance

Classical / Traditional (Darby–Scofield). *19th–early 20th c.; sharp Israel/Church distinction; pre-trib rapture standard. Key names:* ***John N. Darby****,* ***C. I. Scofield****.*
Revised / Normative (mid-20th c.). *Academic refinement of Classical; retains pre-trib/premil and Israel/Church distinction. Key names:* ***John F. Walvoord****,* ***Charles C. Ryrie****; many pastors in this lane (e.g.,* ***John MacArthur****).*
Progressive Dispensationalism (1990s–). *"Already/not-yet" kingdom; retains a future for national Israel with softer separations. Key names:* ***Craig Blaising****,* ***Darrell Bock****.*
Hyper/Ultra (Mid-Acts / Acts-28). *Church begins in Acts 9/13 or Acts 28; typically outside the mainstream of dispensationalism. (No one in this essay is in this category.)*

Name map (quick reference):
Darby → Classical*,* ***Scofield → Classical****,* ***Ryrie → Revised/Normative****,* ***Walvoord → Revised/Normative****,* ***MacArthur → Revised/Traditional*** *(often describes himself as a "leaky" dispensationalist).*

John MacArthur's Position (documented)

In multiple public Q&As for **Grace to You**, MacArthur affirms a literal millennial temple whose sacrifices function as **memorials**—an enacted **remembrance** analogous to communion, **not** a renewal of atoning efficacy. He also speaks of Christ's priestly role in that economy. Representative statement:

> *"In the time of the millennium… there's going to be a sacrificial system… The answer… is simply this: the same reason we have the Lord's Table today… a **memorial**… with the same kind of idea as the **communion** is for us."* *Grace to You*

See also an earlier Q&A where he anticipates **communion** and symbolic temple activity in the kingdom, again as **remembrance** rather than propitiation. Grace to You

---

A Covenantal/Typological Reading (for balance)

Covenantal and amillennial interpreters read Ezekiel's temple as a **grand symbol** of God's eschatological dwelling, fulfilled now in Christ and the church and consummated in the **cosmic temple** of Revelation 21–22 where **no** physical temple remains. For accessible syntheses of this trajectory, see Beale & Kim's essay on the **temple theme**. The Gospel Coalition
(For early Christian instincts here, note **Justin Martyr**'s arguments that temple rites foreshadow and yield to Christ—see *Dialogue with Trypho*.) New Advent

---

Pulling the Threads Together

1. **Hebrews** gives the doctrinal non-negotiable: Christ's atonement is complete, final, and unrepeated (Heb 10:10–14).
2. **Ezekiel** must therefore be read so that any future rites are **non-propitiatory**: either **memorial** (LM) or **purificatory** (LP), administered by **Zadokites** and a **prince** who is **not** the Messiah (Ezek 45:22). Bible Hub
3. **Acts 21** shows **accommodation** in a Jewish context, not a counter-theology to Hebrews (Keener). craigkeener.com
4. On a **typological** reading, Ezekiel's temple finds its telos in Christ and, finally, in the **temple-less** city (Rev 21:22). The Gospel Coalition

Conclusion. However one adjudicates Ezekiel's details, Scripture is united here: **no future worship diminishes or adds to Christ's finished work. "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God"** (Heb 10:12, KJV).

Selected Sources (quick check points)

- **Scofield** (Ezek 43:19 note): memorial sacrifices; not sin-removing. Internet Sacred Text Archive
- **Walvoord**: resumed sacrifices as **memorial of the Cross** in the kingdom. walvoord.com Bible.org
- **Ryrie**: *"Why Sacrifices in the Millennium?"* (*Emmaus Journal* 11/2). Galaxie
- **Waymeyer**: millennial sacrifices as **purification**, not propitiation. PeterGoeman.com
- **Hullinger** (*BSac*): addresses Ezekiel's sacrifices without contradicting Hebrews. joelstrumpet.com

- **MacArthur**: memorial/communion analogy; Christ's priestly role (Q&A transcripts). Grace to You+1
- **Prince ≠ Messiah**: note the "for himself" language (Ezek 45:22). Bible Hub
- **Keener on Acts 21**: cultural accommodation, not norm. craigkeener.com
- **Beale/Kim (TGC)**: temple theme consummated in Rev 21–22. The Gospel Coalition

---

Christ's Once-for-All Work and the Temple Question

Part 2: How the Modern Timeline Arose—Daniel 9, the Olivet Discourse, and the Rapture Schema

Overview

This part traces how a popular modern sequence—**pre-tribulational rapture → seven-year tribulation → rebuilt temple with renewed sacrifices → earthly millennium**—took shape, and evaluates its exegetical bases in **Daniel 9:24–27** and the **Olivet Discourse** (Matt 24; Mark 13; Luke 21). It also shows how early Christian writers and later interpreters read these texts, and why many classical voices identify the key actor in Dan 9:27 as **the Messiah**, not a future antichrist, which better aligns with **Hebrews'** teaching that Christ's sacrifice ended temple offerings.

---

1) Daniel 9:24–27—Who is the "he" in v. 27?

Textual focus. Daniel 9 climaxes with a final "week" in which **"he shall confirm a covenant with many,"** and in the middle **"cause sacrifice and offering to cease."** In classic Christian exposition, the "he" naturally resolves to **the Messiah** of vv. 25–26 whose death ("cut off") brings the sacrificial order to its telos. John Calvin comments: *"The angel now returns to Christ … he should confirm the covenant with many for one week … and … cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."*[1] Matthew Henry likewise takes the "he" as Christ who, *"by offering himself a sacrifice once for all,"* ends Levitical sacrifices and **confirms the covenant**.[2]

Why this reading fits the context. Verse 24's six infinitives (finish transgression, make an end of sin, make atonement, bring everlasting righteousness, seal vision, anoint the Holy) belong to Messiah's redemptive work, making it exegetically natural for v. 27 to continue describing that same work: covenant confirmed and sacrifices ceased—precisely the argument of **Hebrews 7–10**.

The alternative ("antichrist") reading. From the nineteenth century onward, many dispensational interpreters identify "he" with *"the prince who is to come"* (v. 26) and insert a long **gap** between the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks, placing v. 27 in a yet-future seven-year tribulation. Representative defenses appear in Walvoord's essays on the seventy weeks and on Daniel 9:27.[3] This view is often coupled to a future covenant made and then broken by an eschatological ruler.

Assessment. The **Messiah-referent** has deep and broad precedent in historic Protestant commentary (e.g., Calvin, Henry) and coheres with the New Covenant termination of sacrifices. The **gap-futurist** reading is viable as an internal dispensational

construct but depends on (a) identifying the nearest viable antecedent as the hostile "prince," (b) a large temporal hiatus, and (c) re-starting temple sacrifices after the cross—moves many non-dispensational and several Reformed interpreters find exegetically strained.[4]

---

2) How the modern timeline formed

Mini-Glossary: Names & Lanes (quick reference)

Classical / Traditional (Darby–Scofield)
19th–early 20th c. form; sharp Israel/Church distinction, literalist reading of prophecy, **pre-trib rapture** standard. *Names:* John N. Darby, C. I. Scofield.

Revised / Normative (mid-20th c.)
Academically refined classical view; retains Israel/Church distinction and pre-trib rapture, systematized at DTS. *Names:* John F. Walvoord, Charles C. Ryrie; many pastors (e.g., John MacArthur).

Progressive Dispensationalism (1990s–)
Keeps a future for national Israel but stresses "already/not-yet" kingdom and softer separations. *Names:* Craig Blaising, Darrell Bock.

Hyper / Ultra (outside mainstream)

- **Mid-Acts ("Grace Movement")**: Church begins in Acts 9/13; often drops water baptism as an ordinance.
- **Acts-28 (Bullingerism)**: Church begins at Acts 28; narrows church epistles.

Rapture timing (cross-cuts schools)
Pre-trib • Mid-trib / Pre-wrath • Post-trib.

Millennial frameworks (for contrast)
Dispensational Premill • Historic Premill • Amillennial • Postmillennial.

Counter-Reformation seeds. In the late sixteenth century, Jesuit exegetes **Francisco Ribera** and **Robert Bellarmine** articulated **futurist** readings that relocated the Antichrist to a short period immediately before the end, contributing ingredients later used in Protestant futurism (e.g., a future tyrant, rebuilt temple).[5]

Nineteenth-century systematization. John Nelson Darby (Plymouth Brethren) developed a comprehensive **dispensational** scheme including a pre-tribulational rapture and a distinct Israel–church program; his ideas spread to North America and were codified for lay readers via the **Scofield Reference Bible** (1909), which famously suggests Ezekiel's sacrificial system in a future temple would be **"memorial, looking back to the cross."**[6] In the twentieth century, scholars such as **John F. Walvoord** championed the framework in seminaries and popular works.[7] Mass-market titles like **Hal Lindsey's** *The Late Great Planet Earth* and the **Left Behind** novels further embedded this timeline in popular imagination.[8]

Not one dispensationalism. Dispensationalists themselves vary (classical, revised, **progressive**), and not all hold identical views on temple sacrifices, the exact nature of the tribulation, or the relationship of the church and Israel. But the **pre-trib rapture + seven-year tribulation** structure remains the most widely recognized expression in popular evangelical contexts. [7] [8]

3) The Olivet Discourse—Near and far horizons

Synoptic alignment. Jesus' eschatological discourse speaks of the temple's desolation and of climactic tribulation. **Luke** explicitly frames the near-term sign as **"when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies"** (Luke 21:20), which historically occurred in **A.D. 66–70**. New Testament scholar **Craig Keener** notes how first-century historian **Josephus** could see the "abomination" as a desecration tied to events that led to the temple's fall in **A.D. 70**.[9] **Matthew 24** and **Mark 13** retain Daniel's phrase "abomination of desolation," which many interpreters take as encompassing **both** the **near horizon** (A.D. 70) and a **final horizon** at the consummation.[9]

Pauline coordination. 2 Thessalonians 2 speaks of a "man of lawlessness" who exalts himself; futurist readers connect this with a final "abomination," while others see the Olivet material largely fulfilled in **A.D. 70** with remaining elements reserved for the Parousia. Either way, the Discourse doesn't require a post-cross revival of atoning sacrifices; it calls for vigilance and faithfulness amid judgment and hope.

---

4) Early Christian voices on the millennium

Chiliasm and diversity. Some early writers expected a future earthly reign: **Justin Martyr** explicitly mentions a thousand-year hope while acknowledging that *"many who belong to the pure and pious faith"* disagreed.[10] **Irenaeus** also envisioned a restored creation in Book V of *Against Heresies*.[11] By contrast,

Augustine (Book **20** of *City of God*) interprets the "thousand years" of Revelation 20 **non-literally**, shaping the classic **amillennial** reading in the West.[12] These data show variety in early eschatology; they do not, however, support the notion that Daniel 9:27 predicted a future resumption of atoning sacrifices after the cross.

---

5) Where rapture timing debates come from

The **pre-tribulational rapture** (church caught up **before** a seven-year tribulation) became widely taught in the nineteenth century and after. **John MacArthur** is an example of a contemporary evangelical who argues for a **pre-trib rapture** and also likens **millennial sacrifices** to a **memorial** comparable to the Lord's Supper rather than atoning rites.[13] Others (mid-trib, post-trib, historic premillennial, amillennial) locate the church's gathering at different points relative to tribulation or see the "millennium" as the present age.

Claims of pre-trib teaching **before** the nineteenth century are debated. Texts like **Pseudo-Ephraem's** sermon and **Morgan Edwards'** thesis are cited by some as **proto-pre-trib** witnesses, but their interpretation and relevance remain contested in scholarship.[14]

---

6) Summary judgment

Daniel 9:27's "he" most naturally points to **Christ** aligns with a long line of historic exegesis and with **Hebrews'** theology: Christ **confirmed** the covenant and **caused sacrifices to cease** by his once-for-all offering. Read this way, Daniel does **not** furnish a proof-text for re-instituting sacrificial atonement

after Calvary. Modern schemes that place an antichrist in Dan 9:27 and require a renewed sacrificial system should be weighed against this broader canonical logic and the history of interpretation.

AI-assisted, human-edited; accuracy checked but not certified—please verify key details.

Endnotes