

July 16, 2026

Dear Brother Rangel,

Here is my response letter to your concerns about my essay.

Subject: Review of “According to the Bible, When Was the Writing of the New Testament Completed?”

Mr. Rangel wrote: Thank you for sending me your paper. I appreciate the amount of time and study that obviously went into it. It is evident that you have spent many hours thinking through these passages and attempting to harmonize Daniel, Revelation, and the New Testament into one coherent picture. I also appreciate your desire to begin with Scripture rather than treating uninspired historical sources as the final authority. Every Christian ought to be committed to letting the Bible speak first.

My response: Thanks you for your kind words. I have been looking into these matters over the last four or five years and seeking advice from anyone who was willing to discuss them. Believe it or not, almost no members of the church are actually willing to have an extended conversation regarding Revelation and the problem of dating it. Some preachers have actually told me that they didn’t know enough about the book to even talk about it. Most told me they had a very busy schedule and didn’t have time to discuss it with me.

And one in particular said that I was “riding a hobby horse” and thought that I was seeking to cause trouble in the church regarding the date of completion of Revelation. He said that he had already done all his research in the matter years ago and was not about to change now.

Well, there is a lot of information to read and understand when you are dealing with a topic which mostly involves two books of prophecy, those being Daniel and Revelation. Even now, after having been a Christian since 1974, I do not feel qualified to teach either book. That’s primarily why I began to study them in earnest a few years ago.

I am certainly not satisfied with what is currently being taught about those books, especially Revelation. It has already been decided by most that the book was written in AD 85-95 and was therefore about God’s judgment against the Roman Empire when Domitian was emperor. When asked how they know when it was written, the response is because Iraneaus, the ancient historian, told us. When asked how they know it is about God’s judgment against Domitian and the Roman Empire, the response is that the atmosphere of the book indicates that to be so. (“I saw the Heaven Opened” by Daniel H. King, Pg. 43-45)

My question to them is, “Really? Is that how we know?” That means that our entire interpretation of the book is based on both the quotes of ancient uninspired historians (regarding its date of writing) and the evaluation of the ancient Roman political atmosphere by modern uninspired historians (regarding who the judgment of Revelation was against).

Ed Harrell, a university professor and preacher in the church, told a story about a discussion in a university when he was present. Someone asked, “What do we

absolutely know for sure about the theory of evolution?” No one responded. Finally, someone offered, “Maybe we shouldn’t be teaching it.”

In that same spirit of truth, we might ask our church members, “What do we absolutely know for sure about the events written about in the book of Revelation?” We would likely be met with the same period of silence. Maybe it’s time we actually began learning the book instead of just quoting from those who obviously do not know. That requires reading and comparing and drawing conclusions on our part without the help of commentaries written by people who don’t know.

The first thing we need to learn is when the book was written. The second is to learn the structure of the book, which means how it is organized. Once those two things have been accomplished, we are on our way to learning what it is about.

By the way, I do not usually try to harmonize Daniel, Revelation and the New Testament. I mostly read and study them while keeping my mind open to obvious similarities and try to let them harmonize themselves.

Mr. Rangel wrote: After reading your paper carefully, however, I am not persuaded that it proves what it claims to prove.

My response: If we discuss this again, I hope to make changes towards truth in my own understanding of these issues, as well as to change your thinking on some of them in return. As you know, I’ve already revised the essay in a few places due to your suggestions. For me, truth is always better and much easier to defend.

Mr. Rangel wrote: My concern is not primarily with your conclusion that the New Testament was completed before A.D. 70. Rather, my concern is with the method used to reach that conclusion.

My response: Does this mean that you agree that the New Testament was completed before AD 70? If there is another method other than the one I used, I’m all ears! I want to know what it is. It is obvious that the idea of picking out one verse here and another one there and then trying to prove an early date will not work. Everyone always has a way of “explaining away” what the one verse means. So far, it is my belief that only by presenting an entire package of correlated proof, the way I am trying to do, that truth can be proven and falsehoods exposed. Revelation MUST be understood in such a way that it harmonizes with Daniel, Matthew 24, Luke 21, etc. To say that it must be understood so that it harmonizes with ancient Roman historical accounts is not a good idea. We only have two methods to date the book: internal evidences and external evidences. External evidences are from men and are circumstantial at best while internal evidences are from the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Rangel wrote: Throughout the paper there are a number of places where conclusions are presented as though they are demanded by the text, when in reality they are inferences built upon previous inferences. There is nothing wrong with drawing inferences from Scripture. We all do it. The question is whether an inference should be treated as certain doctrine or as a possible explanation.

My response: I’ve tried my best to avoid building arguments on foundations that could not be proved. I began with God’s will and purpose for mankind, then showed that the “mystery of God” phrase was actually defined by the Bible and included the idea of a plan to accomplish His will, according to His purpose, through Jesus Christ. Then I proved through the use of syllogisms that the “mystery of God” basic plan was in the

form of six objectives found in Daniel 9:24. Once that was known, we knew that, based on the information found in the four gospels, the first three objectives were accomplished through Christ. Even Homer Hailey knew this. "With the transgressions restrained, the sins blotted out, sealed up, and reconciliation made for iniquities, God revealed to Daniel three positive blessings. He would bring in "everlasting righteousness," "seal up vision and prophecy," and he would "anoint the most holy" (Commentary on Daniel, Pg. 189).

The difference between Hailey and myself is, for whatever reason, he never made the connection in his own mind that the "to objectives" of Daniel 9:24 were the steps of God's plan of redemption set forth in Christ. So, he and I differ about what the "sealing of both vision and prophet" means and what "anoint the Most Holy place" means. And because I DID make the connection in my mind, I was better prepared to understand them more accurately.

Mr. Rangel wrote: For example, much of your argument depends on identifying the six objectives of Daniel 9:24 as a chronological action plan extending all the way to the completion of the New Testament, the cessation of miraculous gifts, and the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary. I do not believe Daniel explicitly makes those connections. The text certainly speaks of God's redemptive work through the Messiah, but the additional conclusions appear to come from the system being built rather than from the words of Daniel themselves.

My response: Yes, of course I do. Revelation 10:7 states that the mystery of God would be fulfilled in the days of the seventh angel. So, we know that the accomplishment of the six objectives also extend to those days. Daniel did not have to make those connections because Daniel is a book of prophecy requiring divine interpretation. Even the prophets themselves did not always understand the very prophecies that they themselves had uttered (1 Peter 1:10-12). The last objective in Daniel 9:24 was the anointing of the Most Holy place. If the mystery of God was completed in the days of the seventh angel, then the anointing of the Most Holy place must have taken place at the same time, being the last objective. I proved that to be so through the use of syllogisms.

Concerning the fourth objective, the book of Acts and the epistles of the New Testament demonstrate the "bringing in of everlasting righteousness." Homer Hailey said, "This 'everlasting righteousness' which was 'brought in,' was brought into the world of lost men through Jesus Christ, the anointed one of God" (Commentary on Daniel, Pg. 90). Hailey is right, but I would add that it began to be brought in after his resurrection beginning in Acts 2:1.

And Paul wrote about the cessation of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians. So, all these things have the Bible as the support text. If the "sealing of both vision and prophet" does not mean what I said it means, then we are left in a situation of not knowing when the spiritual gifts ceased, not knowing when the last inspired book was written, not knowing if there are still prophets of God walking the earth, not knowing if miracles are still in use. I know that the New Testament is complete because I know that the "sealing of both vision and prophet" has taken place and that it happened nearly 2,000 years ago. The "sealing of both vision and prophet" were meant to bring the temporary things to and end (spiritual gifts and such) so that the permanent things could begin (eternal proclamation of the gospel of salvation to all men for the fullness of time).

Mr. Rangel wrote: The same concern arises in your treatment of Revelation 10. You identify the little book with the completed New Testament, the mighty angel with the Holy Spirit, the command to seal the seven thunders with the end of inspired revelation, and the fulfillment of the mystery of God with the completion of the New Testament canon. Those identifications may fit your overall framework, but the text itself never identifies them in that way. They remain interpretations rather than demonstrations.

My response: First, I've never identified the fulfillment of the mystery of God with the completion of the New Testament canon. I did say that the New Testament was completed simultaneously with the completion of the fourth objective. And I also said that the mystery of God was fulfilled when the sixth objective was accomplished. And yes, the writing of the New Testament was indeed completed in or before AD 70, and it was also completed before the mystery of God was fulfilled, just as the fourth objective was accomplished before the sixth objective was accomplished. Once the New Testament was completed there was no more need for inspiration to write Scripture.

Second, I said that the mighty angel MAY be symbolic of the Holy Spirit. However, this statement has no impact whatsoever on the value of the essay itself. I'm perfectly willing to remove that statement if it has become a great tree blocking the view of the forest.

Third, the little book does indeed represent the last book of the New Testament that was written. The fact that it was completed means that the mystery of God had been completely revealed to mankind and that the fourth objective had been accomplished. At that point there was no more need for miracles and other spiritual gifts to continue. Even the apostle Paul had said they would cease once the New Testament was completed (1 Cor. 13:8-10).

The mystery of God was completely revealed in the New Testament and the sealing of both vision and prophet came immediately after the New Testament had been completed. So yes, inspired revelation discontinued after the sealing of both vision and prophet. More specifically, the revealing of the mystery of God ended as soon as the last book of the New Testament was written. If it is "inspiration of the Holy Spirit" that is under consideration, then yes...that too ended when the last book of the New Testament was completed.

The sealing of both vision and prophet was the means by which the spiritual gifts were discontinued. It wasn't a long drawn out affair. God simply said, "Seal up what the seven thunders have said, and do not write it down." If He had wanted spiritual gifts to continue later, it would have been necessary for him to rescind his previous decision, but we have no record of that ever happening.

God didn't have a sudden change of mind and decide that He didn't want John to write the words down. This was a theatrical performance, figuratively speaking, which God was using to remind those in the audience of what He had said 600 years earlier in Daniel 9:24. Bear in mind that none of these things had actually happened yet. In reality, John was still physically back on the island of Patmos while his mind was seeing a vision taking place in heaven.

"The first century Christians were not expecting any more inspired books to be written after Revelation because they understood that it was the last inspired book that would be written and that the fifth objective would be accomplished immediately after that. Who told them? The apostle John, of course! He had things yet to prophecy (Revelation 10:11). And those things were in the book!

The symbolism of the imagery used in Revelation 10:1-7 (the little book and the thunders) are not interpreted anywhere in the Bible. However, it's not necessary to interpret them because they merely illustrate what has already been proven about the six objectives through the use of the syllogisms. That is, the accomplishment of those six objectives did in fact fulfill the mystery of God. Those three events — the book, the thunders, and the fulfillment of the mystery (Rev. 10:7) — align perfectly with the last three objectives of Daniel 9:24. Think about this: The imagery of the book and the thunders in Revelation do in fact "demonstrate" what God had told Daniel would take place nearly 600 years earlier. By these events in Revelation 10 we are able to understand Daniel 9:24.

Suppose I told you today, "Next week I'm going to wash my car, cut my grass, and then lay down on the hammock and rest." What would you think if the next week you saw me spraying soapy water on my car, and then starting the lawn mower? I know exactly what you would think! You would think, "I can see that he's doing today what he told me last week that he was going to do. When he finishes the lawn cutting, I'll bet he's planning to lay down and rest for awhile." And, you would be correct! That's the relationship between Daniel 9:24 and Revelation 10:1-7. You don't need anyone to interpret my actions for you because you can see with your own eyes that I'm only doing what I said I was going to do the previous week.

Whether anyone agrees with what I think about the symbology of Revelation 10:1-7 matters very little. What DOES matter is that the syllogisms prove that the six objectives in Daniel 9:24 were the objectives by which the mystery of God was fulfilled. In other words, the six objectives were the basic outline of God's plan set forth in Christ.

Almost without failure, practically every teacher of Revelation that I'm aware of always skips over what the little book symbolizes in verse one and they always jump to the part about John having to eat it. Concerning the thunders, they always quote Deut. 29:29 and say, "The secret things belong to the LORD our God, but the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." In other words, they don't have a clue what those verses are about. On the other hand, I provided an symbolic explanation for those events that aligns perfectly with what the six objectives say.

Mr. Rangel wrote: I also found your repeated use of syllogisms interesting. Logical reasoning has an important place in Bible study. Scripture itself often reasons from premise to conclusion. Yet a syllogism is only as strong as its premises. If the premises are themselves interpretive judgments rather than explicit biblical statements, then the conclusion cannot be presented as established fact. Logic cannot supply certainty where the premises remain debatable.

My response: My purpose for using syllogisms was to prove that the six objectives together were in fact the the basic plan to accomplish God's will and purpose for mankind which resulted in them being adoptable by Him. I have changed the essay to show that they were theoretical syllogisms still requiring verification. However, once Revelation had been examined and it was shown that the Most Holy was indeed anointed during the days of the seventh angel, then the syllogisms were no longer to be considered as theoretical, but rather — established fact.

It's like when you are working on a crossword puzzle and you don't know for sure whether a certain word will work in a certain space. So, you pencil it in and see where

it leads. If everything works out then you erase the pencil and write it in pen. In the same way, it was not known for sure whether the objectives would be proven as the plan, but once the Most Holy place was shown to have been anointed as the syllogisms suggested, then the word “theoretical” could be erased.

Mr. Rangel wrote: One of the statements that gave me pause appears near the end of the paper, where you conclude that the study has “proven” the completion of the New Testament before A.D. 70. I do not believe the paper reaches that level of certainty. It presents a thoughtful interpretive model, but a model is not the same thing as proof. There is a difference between saying, “This best explains the evidence,” and saying, “This is what the Scriptures unquestionably teach.”

My response:

Major Premise: Everything contained within the seventy-week decree was completed by the end of the seventy weeks.

Minor Premise: The fourth objective was contained within the seventy-week decree.

Conclusion: Therefore, the fourth objective was completed by the end of the seventy weeks.

Main Premise: The fourth objective was completed by the end of the seventy weeks.

Minor Premise: The New Testament was completed before or when the fourth objective was completed.

Conclusion: Therefore, the New Testament was completed by the end of the seventy weeks.

I spent twenty years here teaching English and talking about objectives which begin with the word “to”. They are called “to objectives,” meaning that they are things to be accomplished by the one who has the authority to do so. If you asked me how to improve your house, I would evaluate the situation and then say, “You need to cut the grass, to paint the house, to repair the roof, etc.” Daniel 9:24 is describing what God said that He was going to accomplish, in chronological order, regarding Daniel’s people and his holy city during the seventy-week period. If God says through prophecy that He is going to accomplish something during a certain period of time, it is not a thoughtful interpretive model; it is established fact.

The import (meaning) of the words of the prophecy themselves declare that everything would be accomplished by the end of the seventy weeks, “Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city” (Daniel 9:24). That seventy weeks ended with the destruction of the city and sanctuary, according to Daniel. And that took place in AD 70 when General Titus and the Roman army lay siege to the city.

Even Homer Hailey agrees with this. “So, the seventy weeks that began with Cyrus and the return of the Babylonian captives to Jerusalem, ended with the complete destruction of the nation, a city, and the temple” (Daniel Commentary by Homer Hailey, Pg. 200). In the previous paragraph on that same page, Hailey said regarding the days of vengeance of Luke 21:22, when Jesus spoke about the destruction of the city, “They were being fulfilled at that time, and were completely fulfilled in AD 70 when the city was destroyed.”

Everything contained within the seventy-week decree (Daniel 9:24-27) was to be completed by the end of the seventy weeks. No one that I'm aware of disagrees with that statement. The six objectives were contained within that seventy-week decree. Therefore, the six objectives were all completed by AD 70. That is a fact.

Through the use of syllogisms I proved that the mystery of God was fulfilled by the accomplishment of those same six objectives. Therefore, the mystery of God was fulfilled by the end of the seventy weeks in AD 70. That is a fact. The writing of the New Testament was a sub-objective (obviously) of the fourth objective. The fourth objective, being one of the six, was also completed in or before AD 70, which means that the writing of the New Testament must have also been completed during that time.

Paul was an apostle "born out of due season" according to the Bible. Was the book of Revelation an inspired book that was "written out of due season"? The late date people apparently think so. If so, where is the Biblical evidence for it. Obviously, there is none — only the words of some ancient uninspired historians which imply such to be the case. I prefer inspiration to speculation.

Mr. Rangel wrote: I also wonder whether the paper dismisses historical testimony too quickly. I agree completely that uninspired writers are not our authority. Scripture alone is inspired. At the same time, historical evidence has value when it is used in its proper place. We routinely use historical information to identify kings, cities, customs, manuscripts, and chronology. Such evidence should never overrule Scripture, but neither should it be rejected simply because it is uninspired. The Bible itself often records and expects us to recognize historical events.

My response: I agree with you completely regarding the use of historical references. For example, on page 3 there is a statement made by me which says, "Historically, that destruction took place at the hands of the Roman army under General Titus in AD 70, meaning that the seventy weeks also came to an end at that time." Jesus, as well as Daniel, prophesied that this event would take place (Daniel 9:24-27; Luke 19:41-44). And the historical evidence outside the Bible indicates that the event did in fact take place. My statement shows that I do indeed accept as fact certain historical accounts in matters such as this.

However, I would never accept as fact the quotes of any ancient uninspired historians in matters where my understanding of an entire book of the Bible would be affected. That is exactly what Daniel H. King, Sr. has done. In his book "I Saw Heaven Opened" on pages 34-35 he states, "On the other hand, the date for the Apocalypse which holds that it was written in the latter part of the reign of Domitian is consistent with almost all the evidence from the writings of the early churchmen." He then quotes Irenaeus and a couple of other historians and states, "It is difficult to argue with such early evidence, especially given the writer's confidence in the historical accuracy of what he was saying."

Homer Hailey, in his commentary "The Book of Revelation," had a much more balanced approach in that he stated on page 28, "Determining the exact date of composition is not as essential as recognizing the purpose of the book." I agree with those words in that its contents and links to other books, such as Daniel, should help determine the application and interpretation of the book. Even so, Hailey favored a late date of writing (page 28) based mostly on the writings of the ancient uninspired

historians. On page 34 he writes, “The force of this evidence is challenged by some, but it appears that those who reject it have failed to sustain their objection.” That means that their writings absolutely affected the way Hailey interpreted the book.

If there is anything worse, I suppose it is the fact that most preachers and teachers, regardless of being conservative or institutional, almost always recommend Hailey’s book when they teach Revelation and then begin quoting him whenever they get to a section that they do not personally understand. If Hailey was wrong, everyone who relies on his book for guidance is also wrong.

I feel justified when I scrutinize and criticize those who write commentaries and classroom studies on the Bible. When they and men such as King and Hailey stand before people and teach what they think the Scriptures say, they have obviously thought it all through and decided that they are ready and willing to have their thoughts and teachings carefully examined by everyone. The same is true with me. I wrote an essay and then sent out copies of it to as many congregations as I was able to find email addresses for. So, I fully expect to be scrutinized, criticized, and quoted from time to time in the coming weeks or months. I accepted that because I felt that what I had to say was not only the absolute truth, but was also important enough to be shared with others who may not have been aware of that information. Furthermore, I felt that if I did not have the courage to write about those things, then they would likely go unsaid for another hundred years or more.

I would personally be scared out of my wits to stand before God in judgment and try to explain that my misapplication of the entire book of Revelation and misinterpretation of all the events contained therein were based entirely on quotes taken from the writings of ancient uninspired historians. Although I do not want to be wrong in my understanding of the Bible, I prefer to stand before God not having understood some parts of it simply because of my own ignorance.

Mr. Rangel wrote: Please do not misunderstand these observations. I appreciate your commitment to Scripture and your desire to think carefully about prophecy. Those are strengths. I also agree that many approaches to Daniel and Revelation have been driven more by tradition than by careful exegesis. We should always be willing to reexamine our conclusions in the light of God’s word.

My response: I both appreciate your words and agree that “many approaches to Daniel and Revelation have been driven more by tradition than by careful exegesis.”

Mr. Rangel wrote: My encouragement would simply be this: allow the text to establish every major conclusion. Whenever a conclusion depends on several interpretive steps, acknowledge that distinction. Doing so does not weaken your argument. It strengthens your credibility because it clearly separates what the Bible explicitly says from what you believe is the best explanation of the evidence.

My response: I agree and I will do my best to follow your advice.

Mr. Rangel wrote: Thank you again for allowing me to read your work. I appreciate your willingness to invite criticism for the sake of truth. That attitude is commendable, and I hope you will receive these comments in the same spirit in which they are offered.

My response: And I appreciate you taking the time to evaluate my work and also provide honest and sincere criticisms designed to help.

Mr. Rangel wrote: May we both continue to search the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so (Acts 17:11).

My response: I agree. I certainly would not want it any other way!

Your brother in Christ,

Ed Rangel

My response: And yours also.