

to cease. But sacrifice went on for 40 years after Christ's death! He did not cause it to cease then. The answer some would give then is, Yes, but the sacrifices were no longer valid after Christ's death. They no longer had validity. Well, what validity did they have before? Paul says, The blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sin. The sacrifices point to Christ. You can point to Him before and you can point to him afterwards. But they did not cease; they were not made to cease if you meant something different, different phraseology could be used. It is utterly absurd to interpret it this way. But Young is far from being the only one who interprets it in that way.

There are many now, more in recent years than before who try to make the whole thing point to the first coming of Christ.

3. It is often but unnecessarily assumed that the periods must immediately follow one another. We have noticed that rather clearly.

As quickly as we can I want to examine the view of Keil and Leupold. It is very interesting that Young in his commentary says in the beginning of it that he must his great help from Keil's commentary. This, he says, is I believe by far the best commentary on Daniel. Yet, where he quotes the views of many ^{scholars} ~~scholars~~ on ch.9 he makes no reference whatever to Keil's view which is about as far removed from his view as any view could/possibly be! But he makes not mention of it. He many recent writers whom he derides and shows that their views are utterly impossible, but Keil's view which is just as different from his as any of them, he does not even mention.

The view of Keil and Leupold is this: There are 3 periods. They are indefinite periods. The first period of 7 weeks reaches from Cyrus to Christ. The second period of 62 weeks reaches from