

According to this view it was written at the time when the ~~ASPPZZSS~~ Syrian kings, from this Hellenistic empire, tried to put a complete end to the Jewish religion. A great persecution was involved in this and a group of Jews fled into the wilderness. There was gathered together a band which attacked these various parts of the Syrian control and eventually won complete freedom for Judea, a freedom which lasted for about a century.

These leaders came to be called the Maccabees. This period we can speak of as the time of the Maccabees and according to this view which is held by all the critics and by some who would not call themselves critics, the book of Daniel was written by someone of that period who made out to be ~~by~~ prophecy what was really his knowledge of history. And thus he showed as if it was predicted 400 years earlier the course of events up to his time. Then when it gets to his time it goes on with prophecy and what it contains is only wishful hopes. He believes-- or at least he ~~xxx~~ tries to get the people to believe that they were to be delivered from their difficulties by God intervening and completely destroying this wicked power that was trying to destroy them.

That is a view which it is surprising you will find some men who are usually thought of as very earnest Christians presenting this view in their commentaries. For instance, F. W. Farrar, the author of the Life of Christ, which is highly regarded ~~as~~ he has a commentary on Daniel in which he takes this view. The same is true of Moses Stuart of Andover. Both of them have written some fine Christian material but have taken this view regarding Daniel. I personally don't see how they can because the NT -- Christ definitely takes the attitude that the OT is entirely true and reliable.

When you look at history that is a great difficulty with this view. According to this view the time of the Maccabees has to be the fourth kingdom. And according to history it is only the third kingdom. As you have in on your sheet of the history I have you all last week, Nebuchadnezzar's empire was succeeded by the Persian empire which lasted for two centuries and that by the Hellenistic empire. So we have three empires. The Romans came later--the fourth, and there are four empires in this picture. Either ~~ZZZZZZZ~~ a fifth nor a second part of the fourth

So that is a very great difficulty with a view that imagines a Median empire between the Babylonian and the Persian. The book of Daniel specifically tells us that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar was given to the Medes and Persians putting them together as one empire. That is one view, the view of the critics.

A second view which you will not find in any commentary as far as I know is the obvious view as it might be seen at A.D. 750 if the NT were left out of consideration. In A.D. 750 a person who knew nothing about the NT could look at this picture in Daniel and say, There's the Babylonian empire conquered by the Persian empire, conquered by the Hellenistic empire, and then conquered by the Roman empire. The Roman empire stood there for as long as the two ~~preced~~ preceding ones put together. In fact, longer than the two preceding ones--maybe as long as the other three. It was a great, powerful