

to "and her son" and basis that on the ancient translations from the Syriac and Latin which render it that way. "He that begot her" render it rather as "the one that was begotten by her", her son, who was killed along with her. Whichever way you take it, it fits with what happened.

No. 3. We go down to Egypt. Ptolemy III. And vv. 7-9 say, Out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate. "His estate" suggests that it refers to her father's death, "he that begot her." He shall stand up in his place, a branch of her roots, i.e. her brother. And he made a great attack as we read in vv.7-9 in which his armies went through a great part of the Seleucid empire and he took a great amount of booty and carried it south with him and he continued ~~four years~~ more years than the king of the ~~north~~ north. He outlived Seleucus II, and even Seleucus III.

Then we have the second Son of Seleucus II, namely Antiochus III. And as I mentioned last time Antiochus III was one of the great conquerors of antiquity. Eleven verses are devoted to the history of Antiochus III. As far as we are concerned the interest of these is that though it would be pretty hard to tell in advance what is predicted, from the history it is easy to see that it touches upon most of the great events of Antiochus III's reign. It touches upon them in the order in which they occur. We will not take much time for that now.

By the way I have been asked if someone would like to look further into this particular matter. On this material up to Antiochus IV there is no difference of opinion. Conservatives believe it is a remarkably accurate prediction that Daniel makes of events up to the time of Antiochus IV.

And liberals believe it is a remarkably accurate picture of what occurred written by someone who already knew what had occurred. If you are interested in details on it beyond what we have time to go into in class, almost any extensive commentary on Daniel will give it to you. Whether it be a liberal commentary or a conservative commentary, there will be no difference on this particular section.

Any good commentary will do that. There are a number of books on the history of the Seleucids. One of the most extensive I know of is the one by Bevan called the House of Seleucid which I have used a considerable amount. He is an English scholar who gave a great deal of attention to the ancient sources about this period.

But we had better not take much time on the history of Antiochus III (these 11 verses). I must point out two or three matters about it. I believe I mentioned last time that the Palestine and Southern Syria had belonged to Egypt for 150 yrs. Antiochus III in addition to his spending 15 yrs. conducting expeditions to the east and reestablishing control that Seleucus III had made over the area that Alexander had conquered right to the borders of India-- in addition to that he fought with Ptolemy, of Egypt, and he took away from him Syria and Palestine. Palestine and S. Syria. He took them and annexed them to his territory.