

This can be briefly stated in about two sentences, but it is quite important at various points of our interpretation. Our purpose in this class is not to discuss the critical theory. We believe that this is a book that God inspired. The critical theory is that it was not written by Daniel but written two centuries later!

We could spend a good bit of time on the evidences. I believe that the evidences are not sufficient to raise great doubt about Daniel's having written it. But there are many commentaries written from that viewpoint, and it affects their interpretation at many points. So it is vital to have a clear understanding of what the critical theory is. And the critical theory that was advanced at least as early as the second century A.D. which was answered by St. Jerome in the 4th century A.D.

The critical theory is that the book of Daniel was written at c. 160 B.C. That it was written in order to encourage the Jews at the time when Antiochus Epiphanes, a Seleucid king was persecuting them. And that it contains == it claims to be written by a man three centuries earlier, and predicts things the writer knew had already happened. So it gives past history as if it were future prediction. And that when it comes to Antiochus Epiphanes, it gives a true account of him and his reign up to a certain point and then beyond that it just gives the guesses of the writer, and his hopes as to what might occur.

This (view) affects a great many commentaries on the book of Daniel. For instance, F. W. Farrar's book *The Life of Christ* is very highly regarded by many, he has written a commentary on Daniel that is written from this critical viewpoint that the book was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

So it should not take long to briefly state the theory, but it is very important to have it in mind.

The second question was: Discuss the meaning of the words "Thou art this head of gold." There were a few students who gave some interesting words about the importance of gold and the importance of Nebuchadnezzar and that sort of thing, which is rather obvious, but not what we discussed in class under the discussion of this verse.

I pointed out at that time as shown on the sheets of facts of ancient history that I gave you, that Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by Amil Marduk who was succeeded by Nergalsharezzar who was succeeded by Lahashi Marduk who was succeeded by Nabonidus. So if the head of gold means Nebuchadnezzar himself personally, then there are three kings after him before the next kingdom comes. You can't say that the next kingdom is his son who reigned only about three months! And the third kingdom the next king who reigned for four years! And then the next kingdom his son who reigned about three months! That of course would be absurd, so it is clear there is a break between Nebuchadnezzar-- an unmentioned interval between him and the second kingdom which it says will come after thee.