

Many take this action to refer to the impression of a seal upon a writing so as to accredit it. Thus to seal up vision, etc., is said to mean that the prophecies are accredited ... This use of *to seal*, however, does not appear to be supported from the OT. The reference is not to accrediting the prophecy, but to sealing it up so that it will no longer appear. Its functions are finished, and it is not henceforth needed

Keil thinks that this extinction of prophecy is not to be sought in the period of Christ's first advent, since that concluded only OT prophecy. NT prophecy and its fulfillment are yet to be sealed up. Hence, Keil believes that this prophecy is to be fulfilled in the future.

However, the particular description herein chosen very clearly refers to the OT period. Vision was a technical name for revelation given to the OT prophets . . . The *prophet* was the one through whom this vision was revealed to the people. The two words, vision and prophet, therefore, serve to designate the prophetic revelation of the OT period When Christ came, there was no further need of prophetic revelation in the OT sense.⁸

It is strange that Young should say that the word "seal" is not used in the Old Testament in the sense of accrediting, for such a meaning seems to be obvious in a number of Old Testament contexts. One of the clearest is Daniel 6:17 where a stone was placed over the mouth of the lion's den, and "the king sealed it with his own signet ring and with the rings of his nobles." Here we note that it was not the sealing with their rings that closed up the den. The sealing was an authentication of the fact that the authority of the king and also of his nobles stood behind its being closed by a stone.

Perhaps Young means that the word "seal" is not used in the Old Testament to indicate ratification by some method other than by a physical seal. Even if this be true, there can