

dams God he can do it only because God gives him the breath with which to do it, and I don't think God is going to abdicate his power even when antichrist comes along. And I believe that even people under the reign of antichrist there are going to be Jews coming to the Lord Jesus Christ and accepting Him as Saviour, and following him. I don't think there is any doubt of it.

So to say that he will be so cut off that he has nothing in the beginning of the reign of antichrist, to me that is a decisive point against Keil's view. Now Leupold in his commentary on Daniel (probably 20 -30 years ago), follows Keil's view on the 70 weeks. Leupold speaks of it as === speaks of Messiah as losing all prestige that he had === losing all influence and prestige that he ever had before men, as far as the world is concerned Messiah shall be a dead issue, his cause shall have seemed to have failed." That seems a mighty strong statement. It's no stronger than the statement "he shall be cut off and have nothing". I don't believe Jesus is going to be cut off and have nothing when antichrist is raised up. I think it is far better to take this phrase as describing the atonement than as describing the rise of antichrist.

I find myself unable to follow Keil. But I think Keil has some excellent points. The three advantages I think are very great in his teaching, but I think the difficulties are insuperable. So for the solution, as I have stated on your papers, I would note two words and one characteristic feature of Isaiah's (Daniel's) prophecy. And here I would like to look at the second of these words that I have listed first.

That is the word meshiach, the word that is translated in the OT simply as anointed one in many many cases and is only translated Messiah in these two cases. It is most frequently used of a ruler in 29 occurrences. It is used of the high priest in only 5 passages. Seven times in the historical books we find David calling Saul the Lord's anointed. Once it is used of a foreign ruler (Is. 45:1). There is one very excellent scholarly commentary on Daniel which makes this statement: "The phrase Messiah the Prince must refer to Christ because he's a prince, he's a priest, he's a king and he's Messiah, and Christ is the only one who is both a king and a priest.

Well, the word Messiah doesn't mean priest at all. (And Christ is the only one who both a priest and a king.) A priest may be a messiah; he may be anointed as a messiah, but the word Messiah is used far more of kings than of priests. I can't think of anybody much less like a priest than Saul, but seven times David calls Saul the Lord's anointed. This phrase Messiah the prince or the leader, does not have to refer to Christ. It is a term it is altogether possible to refer to Christ but it certainly does not have to. I read to you a few minutes ago from Is. 44. I read that wonderful verse in which it was predicted Cyrus would order the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the last v. of Is. 44. If you go right on (the ch. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ divisions as you know are late, they are not in the original at all) if you go right on and after this statement that Cyrus will cause Jerusalem to be rebuilt he says in Is 45:1, "Thus says the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus" And the very word used here in Daniel is here applied to Cyrus. Cyrus is called the Lord's Anointed.