

commentary, Young allows his presuppositions to dictate his conclusions. Why should it be assumed without proof that the six purposes run only to Christ's first coming? Why is this small group of writers so insistent that nothing in the six purposes can include divine actions later than the first advent of Christ? Can it be due to an unwillingness to admit even the possibility that verse 27 might refer to Antichrist? Such a strong feeling on this matter might seem illogical, since most evangelical interpreters, including writers who take this position on Daniel 9, recognize that Daniel 7 and 11 specifically predict an antichrist who is to appear near the end of the present age!

In this connection it is appropriate to note Young's criticism of Keil's interpretation of the course of the 70 weeks. Speaking of "the view of Keil and Kliefoth that the 7 sevens extended from Cyrus to Christ" he says:

There is nothing inherently objectionable in this except that vs. 25b is then made to extend from the 1st advent of Christ to the consummation, and this is contrary to the Messianic character of vs. 24.¹¹

Young says that Keil's view cannot be taken because it looks beyond the first century A. D. and that it cannot do that because the passage is Messianic. When did the term Messiah come to refer only to Christ's first coming? Is not His second coming equally Messianic? Is not His relation to believers in the world today also a part of His Messianic function? How can we say that a prophecy has to be fulfilled in the first century to be Messianic?

Young gives no explanation of the reason why he thinks that the 70 weeks are in their entirety Messianic and therefore must be related only to the first coming of Christ. He simply assumes this without evidence and then lays it down as a reason.

As far as I can determine, the only scholarly source of support that he mentions as warrant for restricting the purpose of the 70 weeks to the time of the first coming of