

The word definitely means atonement. And the few cases where it is not used in connection with the sacrificial system it is used of somebody making somebody else friends with him again, but by repaying him for something or making up for something that was done to hurt him so that it is an exact parallel in the few cases where it is used in relation with people to what it means of our relationship with God.

So this third one, I think we can say is definite proof ~~ix~~that this passage, the only one in the book of Daniel, does look to the first coming of Christ. I think we can say that positively from that third purpose.

Then when you look at the first, second, and fourth they read in KJV, "to finish transgression, to put an end to sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." There have been various interpretations of those. I know of one very fine Christian writer who insists that they all describe what Jesus Christ did at His first coming. One of them, I think, he makes an end of wickedness, he makes describe His going into the temple and driving out the moneychangers! for instance. Which it seems to me is a rather small thing to make in view of the great purposes that are here described.

But there are a number of writers now who insist that it must all refer to the first coming of Christ. But these three purposes (1) to finish transgression (2) to put an end to sin (3) TO BRING IN everlasting righteousness-- it seems to me must refer to that which is so stressed elsewhere in the book of Daniel i.e. ~~ix~~ to the complete end of the reign of wickedness over the world, with the complete destruction of the statue and the complete destruction of the fourth beast.

So I think we can say that we can reasonably expect to find references, clear references, to both the first advent and the second advent in this passage.

I see I got ahead of my outline there. I mentioned the second advent, some or all of the first, second, and fourth purposes.

In this ch. there are a number of uncertainties. These uncertainties I believe we should not assume something, but see what fits the context. There are also some things which are absolutely positive, and definite which we can overlook if we approach it with a presupposition and try to fit everything into that presupposition.

The first of these uncertainties is

1. Are the weeks weeks of years or general periods of time? There are some who insist they must be general periods of time. They think they cannot be exact periods. But in the OT we have the sabbatical year, we have the seven sevens followed by the Jubilee. I feel it is utterly wrong to say they can't be precise periods. But we have no right to dogmatically assume they are precise periods! It is also possible to approach it with the question: Are they exact numbers of years, or are they general