

The assignment had two parts: look at Daniel 7 and see which vv. are part of the vision, and which are part of the interpretation. Also, which are figurative and which literal. Most of you did very well. There were two or three from whom I expected good papers who I came to the conclusion they either weren't listening at the end of the hour or that they were much more exegesis than they thought they were, because they simply gave me a comparison of ch. 2 and ch. 7 as to the general course of events. Not the assignment at all. That would not detract from the mark but did not add anything to it because they did not deal with the two things that I asked for: which parts of the vision are figurative and which are literal.

I got the impression that one or two did not clearly understand what we mean by figurative (or symbolic). In Dan. 2 we had a vision Nebuchadnezzar had. Daniel describes the vision. In vv. 31-35, and every single thing in that vision was figurative. A symbol. If you heard that vision you could not have known what much of it meant. They are symbols. Unless you had seen the same figures used some other time, you have no way to approach it. Or unless you have an idea what it is supposed to describe and then you can make a comparison. It is strictly figurative. Perhaps "strictly" is a little bit too strong, but mighty little. The only thing I noticed that is at all literal is the statement at the ~~kk~~ end "and fill the whole earth." Whatever it was filled the whole earth. That, of course, is a rather literal statement. But it could be part of the dream which he had.

Up to that there is a statue. As we noticed there are many things in the statue. We don't just know how many there were. We don't know how many fingers were visible. We have no reason to think the two arms and chest had a specific reference to a second kingdom or anything of the ~~kingx~~ kind. We have no definite evidence as to specific meaning of the first three metals. We are told the fourth one indicates strength. There are many things which are just figures and maybe just part of the general picture.

As to which parts have a meaning and what they mean, we have no basis whatever to go on unless we had the interpretation.

(Question: . . . Is it the whole earth that we know, or the whole earth that they know?)

Of course this was just a dream. In the dream did he see a ~~globe~~ globe? Did he see the stone flowing around and covering the whole globe? Or did he see the stone enlarge so as to cover everything he could see? We don't know. When we get to the interpretation we have a literal interpretation, and there we have to ask the question you just raised. What does the interpretation mean in that regard? That is a question I don't want to take time with here now. It's the sort of question I'd rather have you give me in writing and I'll see whether it fits in with the course of our discussion or whether I should discuss it with you personally. I wish you would give it to me in writing.

That is all figurative, all symbol. The interpretation is all