In Revue de Qumran numero 40, Dec. 1981, R. T. Beckwith writes on "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation." The article runs from pp. 521-543. On the first page of this article he says, "The Messianic interpretations of the prophecy . . . concentrate their attention on the concluding part of the 70-week period, and expect 'the anointed one, the prince' of verse 25 not after the 7 weeks but after the 7 weeks and 62 weeks (i.e. 69 weeks)." On the next page he says:

## [ see photostat of p. 522]

These are very sweeping statements. We note first that a statement is made [order] about the contents of these various translations and second that a conclusion is drawn. The conclusion is that the Hebrew did not have three periods but only two Duntil the time of the Massoretic punctuation, Since there is no evidence of any within the Murgieto werked, and here is no evidence that the consonantal text was different wo lawing then it is now, this is purely a dogmatic statement without evidence, as far as the Mebrow text the Aramaic text is concerned. In view of the absurdity of calling a 69 week period a period of 7 weeks and 62 weeks the making of such a dogmatic statement would require very definite evidence and actually as far as the Aramaic is concerned there is no evidence at all for such a statement. Mow let us look at the evidence that is given == that he gives about these other translations. As far as the Septuagint is concerned he says in footnote (1) "The Septuagint reads: 'And after 7 and 70 and 62 the unction will be taken away' zxzxzaźkekzkzkzandzkoktines and then in the next verse it says 'after 7 and 70 times and 62 years.' These are very confused statements and no one takes them very seriously. It is very evident the Septuagint text preserved in only one or at most two manuscripts is quite corrupt at this point. It is obvious then that