

try to twist passages to fit their desires. I prefer to study Daniel without such designations. In my opinion one of the best presentations of dispensations (even though, I believe, naming one too few) is the discussion in Hodge's Theology. I have known vociferous supporters of each of the two alleged viewpoints who were really almost identical in their ideas.

You were quite correct in showing that the 70 years of Jeremiah is not a precise number; yet I feel that there can be no doubt that what Jeremiah actually predicted (namely, the remaining years under which the nations would be subject to Babylonian control) was to begin at the time indicated at the beginning of chapter 25, and consequently was only a very few years short of seventy, so that a period of seven decades is really quite a close approximation. Attempts to relate the seventy years to some other beginning or ending seem to me to involve an absurd twisting of Jeremiah's words.

You are certainly correct in saying that if the passage refer to a decree to rebuild the city, the decree of Cyrus would be the only one that is worthy of consideration. The other suggestions are merely unjustified attempts to fit the numbers together.

The translation of *dabar* as "decree" is very far from precise, particularly since the same word is used three or four times earlier in the same chapter to indicate a divine message. If command were meant, *dabar* might be used, but surely *miswan* would be more likely.

Your discussion of the various mentions of "ending sacrifice" in Daniel as raising doubt about interpreting "put an end to sacrifice" as a reference to the atonement is very excellent. I do not know whether Hengstenberg was the originator of this idea. It impresses me as being about as absurd as his statement that the millennium began with the conversion of the Germans about a thousand years before his time and that already in his day he could see signs of such commotions as might well be the beginning of the uprising predicted for the end of the millennium.

Since Hengstenberg wrote some excellent material and rendered valiant service in defense of the Scripture it is sad that he should have resorted to such wild fantasies at these two points....