

j In this class we have the meaning of the prophecies of Daniel and they are very complicated. Difficult but at the same time, I think, a very interesting subject. Possibilities for credit are four. Of course the regular thing in this course is two hours in under-graduate work and that would mean two hour in class and two hours outside for each hour taken in class. And if you are taking a graduate hour it would mean three hours of preparation. It will be perfectly all right with me, if you are not sure if you wish the course for graduate or under-graduate study and then I'll give you extra work later within the next five years. Now it would be helpful if you would let me know what your intention is on this matter. I will assume that everyone here is taking the course for two hours of under-graduate study--two hours in class and four hours of work outside; unless you give me a note to the otherwise.

Now this matter of the book of Daniel is one which is different from that of any other book in the whole Bible with exception of the book of Revelation. The book of Revelation of course harks back often to the book of Daniel. The author of Rev. was very familiar with the bk. of Daniel and he echoes his phraseology very frequently. Of course we are not necessarily to jump to the conclusion that the author of Rev. knows Daniel just because some of the phrases are repeated. He may speak of exactly the same thing, but there is always the possibility that familiar phrases which have a definite idea describe something which is similar but not identical with the similar matter discussed in Daniel. We must keep that in mind in the study of the book of Revelation. I do feel that we would get much more from the book of Revelation if we wouldn't spend so much time trying to get into the niceties of the bk. of Rev. but rather spend a good time in getting into the niceties of the book of Daniel we might get much more therefrom. Of course we have quite an advantage in studying the book of Daniel. A good share of what is said in Rev. is an outline, at least to some extent things which are future and we have no subsequent revelation referring to it. In the book of Daniel we have events outlined from his time and of course many of these events happened before the N.T. period and some doubtless during the N.T. period and we have the N.T. to help us in our interpretation of the book of Daniel. Thus we can stand on much surer ground on the book of Daniel than we can on Revelation. At least it is surer ground to begin on. Now there are two common attitudes toward the book of Daniel today. (1) One is that most widespread amongst students and found most widespread in colleges and seminaries--that is the higher critical attitude. That is the viewpoint which you will find in almost all

books written about ancient times who is not an intelligent Christian because naturally anyone writing on ancient history of ancient Biblical literature who is not an intelligent evangelical Christian will of course go to the "scholarly" writings of our day and accept their viewpoint on matters on which he is personally acquainted and these writings would all claim that Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees between 168 and 166 B.C. Some of the writers are very dogmatic as to when it came out even to almost the exact day when the book of Daniel was published. All your liberal writers are agreed that it was during this period that Daniel came out. It is not merely a question of who wrote it. Did a man called Daniel write it or did a man sit down and write us truths about Daniel? That is not the question at all. If it was written at this later period, it is written by a man who didn't know what he was talking about; it is purely imaginary. In fact there was not such a man as Daniel if the critics are correct. You might say that we could accept this view without going to this extreme and yet everybody who believes this at all goes to this extreme. In fact some of the strongest arguments for this view are that the history for the book of Daniel-- that the time of it is incorrect and therefore the man who wrote the book was unfamiliar with it. He is erroneous on his ancient history and on his predictions and yet he gives so much detail therein so that you know that he must have known most of it and then when he gets beyond the time of the Maccabees he goes completely hay-wire. Then he makes all kinds of suggestions for the future which never did occur and consequently the book is a very beautiful literary work which has very little in the line of truth and has great spiritual value for us but no authoritative value. That is the view held by the mass of the educated world today.

(2) As over against that we have that attitude which is taken by the great mass of the Christian evangelical interpreters. They accept the book of Dan. as from the time of Daniel and accept it as a true book. They thrill at the wonderful stories of heroism on the part of Daniel and his men and wonder at the wonderful care of God over his people but when it comes to prophecy they know nothing as it relates to the Macc. time--they know nothing about the prediction which relate to the time between Daniel and the Macc. time and they pick a verse here and verse there and lump a few verses together--they get ideas as to the first coming of Christ, a few ideas between that and the second coming and the second coming itself. Now this is not saying that they do wickedly in this matter but rather it is carelessness or lack of sufficient study but it is nevertheless the case that the great majority of our evangelical

students take isolated verses of his prophecy or taking selections apart from context and drawing from them certain ideas about the present and about the future. Now of course such statements may be taken and they may be correct but it is either accident or purely the grace of God. To interpret any book you must take the book as a whole and see the context of one part to another. You can't simply pass over a whole lot of problems and say that since we don't know anything about them and then pick out two verses and then feel that you have a certainty about them. You may hit upon the right answer but you want to know just what the right meaning is. Now our purpose in this course is the study of the predictions. We are interested at this point as to what Daniel tells us about the future. Our purpose here is not the study of the critical problem but it is impossible to properly interpret the predictions without a fair amount of study of the ~~crit~~ critical problem. It is impossible to do so, because in Daniel as any other book the study and understanding of the statements of the prophet is vitally related to the background and just what is that historical background. If you don't know it you are not on the solid ground for interpretation. The destructive critics have one idea of the historic background and the fundamentalist has another idea. The predictions are what they try to get the book of Daniel on. If you take the higher critical view the predictions are purely erroneous and simply don't make sense. But unfortunately if you take the approach which many conservatives take you get the same result. They don't get principals. You get a few wonderful teachings here and there but if some of them were taken to a logical conclusion you come out with the same result. It is therefore our purpose to take time to get the # 2 principals and to get what the interrelation is of the different subjects and sections of the book are.

Of course we can't do much of that until we are familiar with the contents of the book. I want to read a good deal in commentaries and examine the exact statements of what commentaries say and see where they go off the track and get what light they have given which might be helpful but for this week I am not asking you to look in commentaries at all. It is always best to come to the Bible with a fresh mind and see what is there--after that go to ~~an~~ a commentary and see where you will have change. A commentary after all is just what someone else said and you may overlook something that he ~~saw~~ when you approach the Bible first. It is very important that we realize what is contained in each of the chapters of Daniel. It would not be very helpful to take one chapter and try to understand every detail of it. Before we do that it would be far better to get an over all picture. After that we are in a position to take up

So our first task is to take the book and look at it as a whole. After all it has only 12 chapters, it is a brief thing and yet these chapters are long and they contain a great deal of material. Of the twelve chapters five of them are what one might call historical and yet they are not historical in the ordinary sense of the word. They do not tell us of a king or kingdom which arose and what happened to it. They don't tell us about the downfall of this kingdom. They don't give us the story of a family and show us how this family went from one place to another and how God sent them on their way. We don't have these steps in the career of Daniel. The book is not a chronicle of the life of Daniel. It is an account which simply takes up separate incidents, mostly from the life of Daniel but some things mentioned from his ~~friends~~ friends. Daniel is not the primary subject of the book. The primary subject is God dealing with His people and the primary subject is not how God dealt with His people during this period because Israel during this period is of little significance. It is Daniel or his friends--individuals are dealt with. In ch. 5 it is even Belteshazzar that is dealt with instead of Daniel--the purpose is not to show us how greatly God worked to bring things to pass. Its purpose is to show how God deal in those particular cases. In Ex. we have how God deal with Moses and the children of Israel and how they were led from Egypt. In Samuel we have the story of David but it is ~~not~~ all a part of how God dealt with Israel and delivered them from the Philistines gives the story of an independent kingdom with David as their king. But Daniel gives us no such thing described. It is all a series of incidents. It makes up all of five chapters and a good part of the sixth chapter. The 2nd chapter of course has as much prophecy as any other part of the book but it also has incident recorded. If it weren't for the 2nd chapter you could divided Daniel into two parts exactly--six chapters as incidents and 6 chapters as prophecy but the 2nd chapter makes it more than half of the book as being given over to prophecy. Its primary purpose is not to show us what happened at that time but it is for the future. Of course there is much in it which ~~Daniel~~ ^{Isaiah} could use for His own situation, that is in the book of Isaiah. God caused that that part of Isaiah's ministry--much of it be used for his own time. But in Daniel a comparative large portion of it--the great emphasis is upon a future time. The book of Daniel is in the Bible to prepare God's people for something that is future. It is a unified production and if we are going to understand the book of Daniel, it is necessary that we understand it, not as a collection of proof texts but that we think of it as a book given with a divine economy and with a plan of God to bring certain blessings to His people--certain specific messages for His people.

These messages in the ~~first~~ first part of the book would certainly have as their primary purpose the bringing to the people a preparation to with stand in the time of persecution and difficulty. There is no question about that. The first ch. third and fifth chapters all show us that men have been true to God in time of persecution and in some case He has chosen to give deliverance out of the ordeal but as the three men said to Nebuchadrazzar, "Our God is able to deliver us and will do so, but if not, we still will not bow down." It is up to the people of God to be true to God knowing that He can deliver if He chooses, and He desired them to glorify Him either by coming through the persecution successfully or by bringing a great victory. The purpose of chs. 2, 4, and 6--we see the hand of God over rulers; the outstanding purpose of these three chapters is surely to indicate to the reader that God is supreme over the nations of the earth. That He accomplish His purposes as He will and that He may choose as in the case of Belshazzar to bring an immediate destruction to him, or He may choose to rebuke a king as He did in ch. 2 with Nebuchadrazzar and though some kingdoms might last on for generations, yet the time will come when the stone without hands will come and wreck the great image and will an end to the reign of human individuals who are not ruling in submission to Him. The purpose then in these first six chapters is to show us that God is greater than all circumstances that we find in life and that man should be true to God. This is useful at any time but certainly the ~~purpose~~ purpose of it doesn't specifically relate to the time when all things are going smoothly. It relates specifically to the time of trouble. The purpose of Daniel is to prepare people who are standing true to God in the midst ~~and~~ of great tribulation. To the believers who are standing in tribulation this book should be of great blessing. Of course we would say that this is not the sole purpose of the book. Was the book to prepare for the Christians at the beginning of the early Christian era or to prepare the Protestants for the Inquisition? Is that the purpose of the book. That certainly enters into it. Daniel was of tremendous value to those people and God certainly had that in mind, but if we say that ~~applied~~ ^{applied} and if this ~~applied~~ ^{applied} to later events, surely it must have a purpose for an earlier time, because we read in history of one of the greatest persecutions in history occurred between 200 and 150 B.C. There was a time then when it looked as if the worship of God would be completely wiped when a very powerful ruler, not the greatest ruler in the earth, but a man of great power with a strong kingdom which included Palestine, set to work to destroy the Israelites--that is their worship of God. They paid special honor to those Israelites who

would deny their religion and tried wherever possible to do away with the ~~p~~ worship of God. He set up statues of the Olympian Zeus and claimed that he was it and put these statues throughout the land and made people all over worship them. He put one right up in the temple and caused heathen sacrifice to be performed in the temple there in Jerusalem and at this time we have those books of I and II Maccabees, which are not inspired but which gives us information of how they eventually succeeded in gaining their independence from this man. We have these books and they tell us how if these attack had succeeded, it would have put an end to any people who were seeking the Lord and destroyed the very means through which Christ was to be born. Even though we don't accept the critical view about the book of Daniel, that it was written in the Macc. period, we can't understand the book of Daniel unless we understand the tremendous importance that the book of Daniel has for this time and that the preparation for preparing the people of God to go through this ordeal and it can fit well with our understanding of the book.

3 These chapters much have a relation to the time of the Macc. Does the Macc. period exhaust the meaning of these six chapters. I do not think that we could say that it does because in the 2nd ch. that God is going to destroy the great image and the stone without hands destroys this image and certainly the end of the Macc. opposition did not mean the end of the Gentile domination. So that 2nd chapter is enough to show from a Christian viewpoint the time of the Macc. does not exhaust the meaning of the book of Daniel. It has the meaning of ~~times~~ times later on and we believe that it is a divine book. If you believe that it was written in the time of the Macc. and written simply to encourage people in that time, you have much the same purpose which we must put down as one of the outstanding purposes of the book and yet you have this prediction made in the 2nd chapter--and you wonder how did that happen. It didn't happen at the time of Christ--was the writer mistaken or is it something which is yet future; there is a recent commentary on Daniel which claims that the stone without hands which strikes the feet of the image is the first coming of Christ which comes in the time of the Roman empire--you have the four world-empires which is the Roman empire. It brings out that some people claim that the Roman empire will be revived but since there is nothing in Scripture that claims such a thing, it is the Roman empire which is spoken about and when this stone cut out without hands topples this image, that must refer to the first coming of Christ and therefore what it means is that the Roman empire was destroyed at that

time and the kingdom of God began with the outgoing of the church but of course Dan. 2 says that it filled the whole earth and that would seem to me to require a post-millennial view. I don't see how anyone could get from this the amill. and it would seem rather strange to me if that is what ch. 2 means unless you had not had the many years of Gentile opposition from time on but it ~~is~~ is a view that must be taken into consideration and we must reach a conclusion upon it. Many godly commentators have held this view and we must decide whether this view is true or not. The basic things to decide whether this is true or not is to ask ourselves if the facts fit in with the rest of the book and then if it fits in with the rest of the Bible. If we find the great teaching of the book of Daniel is that Christ introduces that which eventually destroys the great world powers, then we must either find that the rest of the Scripture is post-mill. or you must say that the book of Daniel is wrong. We are interested in this course to find out what does Daniel teach rather than what the rest of the Bible teach. I don't see how it possibly could be taken with an amill. view.

Now it is true that the first six chapters have a great deal importance for the Macc. period and that God had the Macc. in mind when this was written--that God was preparing this book for the people that would later have to suffer, though it has relative value for all other periods of persecution but there is no doubt that one of the great purposes was for the Macc. period. Then we should certainly expect to find some reference in the last chapters with a reference to that period and we should not be surprised if we should find a great deal of reference in the last six chapters to the Macc. It is an absolutely wrong approach to the book of Daniel which makes it out that it is dealing entirely with the ~~the~~ last times and has nothing to do with the Macc. period. That is going from the opposite end. The true approach is to begin with the thought that a great deal of it was written for the Macc. period and it would be strange indeed if we don't find predictions dealing directly with that period. Let us find the predictions that are dealing with that period and see how they are to be interpreted and see how they relate to the history of that period and then let us see if there is that which points forward to another time. We should not say that this is all for a later time and perhaps there is some relation to the Macc. but rather let us start from the known and go to the unknown and see what there is that has relation to that time and so you see we have a good deal in common with the critical approach to the book. They see that the book is written during the Macc. period and we must recognize that the Macc. period is very important in the writing of the book but then we must ask--how much has particular reference ~~to~~ the Macc. period and is there

Daniel # 3 (cont.)

anything that cannot relate to that period which must relate to something else. Of course all of the book will have blessings and messages for us but are there predictions that must of necessity relate to that time.

In view of all this it seems a good place to begin our study in the book of Daniel is in the 8th ch. of the book. We have to understand and relate these chapters and our first task in this course is to get an idea of what is spoken about in each chapter. The first six chapters are used so much in Sunday School that anyone who has ever been surely is familiar with these chapters at least. The last six most of us don't know anything about except a few verses here and there. That most wonderful and very important 11th chapter is one which most Christians cannot even tell what is in that chapter. In a way it is the whole key to the whole book of Daniel. I almost began with the 11th chapter but then I decided to take the 8th ch which probably is easier to understand. As you pick up that 8th chapter you find that it begins with God speaking to the prophet Daniel. This vision was given him and in it he was in Shushan, the palace. Now the discussion whether he was really there or simply in a vision, but it doesn't make a great deal of difference in our purpose of study. We can see how he could easily have gone over to Elam and he certainly could have been there and it seems to me that it was just as possible that he could have been over there as to have the vision of being there. That was one of the of greatest capitals of the Persian empire which had not as yet begun in the third year of Belshazzar and then we find that he was by the river that flows by the city there. There he sees a ram with two horns and one horn was higher than the other and the higher one came up last. Exactly what he saw there is a littler hard to understand but we have a situation--we have a ram which pushes north and south. Was this Napoleon or is it speaking about Hitler. He went west, north and south and in the verse you perhaps couldn't be sure of exactly of whom it was speaking but when you get on in the chapter you have no doubt. Does this refer to somethingⁱⁿ the last times? The ram pushes west, north and south and none can stand before him. And he was great--how long was he great--for a few minutes, for some days, three years for maybe two or three centuries but this is not told us. It sounds as though he was great for a period. And there arises a he-goat and he came to the ram and ran into him with the fury of his power and smote the ram with the two horns. Then the he-goat waxed very strong--note vs. 3-8. You have a series of events described. This ram with two horns and one is higher than the other. The higher one came up last. You have it causing every thing all around it pushing west ward, north

ward, and southward. Then you have a he-goat and you are told what direction he comes from. We wonder if this stands for some great idea or does it simply mean that it comes from the west. He rushes and he doesn't touch the ground. He has a horn between his eyes and when he comes to the ram, he runs into him in the fury of his power. Here we have a series of events in which it is difficult to put in many situations in the world's history.

Daniel # 4.

Mention of Napoleon's great empire. Was it divided into four sections? How about Hitler? Was the US the he goat and Hitler the ram? If so, who were the four horns that came up out of the US? A long series of events and it is hard to find something in history which they will fit. It seems that we would be safe in relating it to some definite events in history. Then we look to v. 20 and see what it says there and it relates it pretty definitely for us. You know exactly what this part of the prophecy means.

except Revelation.

Daniel is different from any other book of the OT or even of the NT and consequently to some extent it will have its own principals. We must determine those principals from the study of the book. We cannot understand any book of the Scripture except by studying it. We cannot gather out just isolated verses here and there. Study it as a whole and see what is taught and then see what is meant. We have two great groups of study books today--the liberal group which say that these were great reformers interested in social conditions in their own day and with no interest in predicting the distant future. Then we have many who pay little attention to the topics of their own day and grab a verse here and there which tell about Christ in His first coming or in His second coming. These verses do, I believe, predict His first coming and His second coming. We don't understand them properly if we just grab them out of context. We have to study as a whole to see the prophet's attitude in regard to his own day. Then we can see how their predictions of Christ in His first coming and in His second coming were vitally related to their events of that day and to show God's answer to situations and human attitudes. Only as we study it this way can we understand the wonderful predictions God made. It is a difficult study but a vital study too. We notice Daniel is not history in the ordinary sense of the word. It doesn't tell of the nation or of the career of an individual. It tells simply of isolated incidents in the life of Daniel and doesn't relate them together to show how he became great or what he accomplished. Its purpose is meant for the future--to bring blessing to the people of God. It is different too in the combination of two types of material, historic

and prophetic. The historical has its purpose to bring us wonderful, great lessons about the future and to show how God dealt with Daniel. He may want to show us through it how He wants to deal with us. We have all heard the wonderful stories how Daniel and his companions were true to God and how they trusted God. Very few of us know much about the last six chapters of Daniel except for a few verses here and there. Yet the last six chapters are especially related to the first six chapters. God has given them there to show the real meaning and understanding. The critics agree without exception that the book of Daniel was written at the time of the Maccabees between 168 and 165 BC. If you take that view you notice that it makes the book incorrect as it is wrong in its predictions of future and the statements of the past. It is based to a large extent that it is based- incorrect in its ideas as to what actually was the situation at that time. Archeology and linguistic study have made great advances. /The biggest problem seems to be if the Book of Daniel was referring to the Maccabee's period. The usual evangelical attitude is to ignore it. The critical attitude is to relate everything to this period. Both attitudes are wrong. The Maccabee's period is right in the Book of Daniel and you can't understand the Book without understanding the Maccabee's period. There is much of it that cannot relate to that period. If we are going to understand this correctly, we must see how they relate. The 8th chapter is not particularly well known in the Christian world today. It is one of the easier chapter to understand. It is a good place to begin in the book. It is fairly easy to understand. About the ram in v. 3-8. If you held that this described Hitler it would be rather difficult to fit in, but if you said that this meant the Medo-Persian empire --as empire in which the Medes were the great power but later the Persians became dominant and it became known to us as the Persian empire for centuries after that and the law was known as the law of the Medes and Persians--they were tied together in the empire and we might be able to fit this with other historical events and we notice that over in v. 20 the explanation is given. The prophecy here is sure and this is a picture of that empire coming forward and becoming great conquering the countries around about and to get this into the critical view--one has to get all these events fitted into events that happened before that time and so they have to say that the book of Daniel pictures four great empires, the ~~first~~ second being Medes and the ~~second~~ third Persia. Babylon being the first and then Greece is the fourth. This part of Daniel is one of the great stumbling blocks to the critical theory of Daniel. If you prove that Medo-Persia are one empire you have gone a long way in destroying the foundation of the higher critics. This is the Medo-Persian empire. Now in v. 5 we see this he-goat that

he comes from the west and this goat had a notable horn between his eyes--now all this would be a wonderful description of Alexander the Great coming and attacking the this empire and there is no doubt but that this pictures this. The ram is the Persian empire and the he-goat had a notable great horn--in v. 21 it mentions that this is the first king to spread out and conquer, though not the Greeks first king. Note v. 8. Alexander established a great empire but he died fairly young and his ~~generals~~ generals fought amongst themselves and eventually his empire was broken into four parts. That has happened in the career of many nations, that the generals have fought amongst themselves but the part usually have soon afterward disappeared but in this case we have Alexander conquering and then we have his successors establishing four permanent empires which lasted a long period of time. So we have something that corresponds exactly with what is given here. # 5 Alexander's empire is divided into these four divisions. While there were these four, there are two which are of special importance for us. These two are the empires of the Ptolemies and the empire of the Selucids. The empire of the Ptolemies was set up in Egypt and begun by Ptolemy, one of the generals of Alexander. Egypt of course was a part of the Alexander's empire but when he saw how some were trying to garb all of his empire, he showed remarkable foresight by going down and seizing Egypt and Egypt was a section easy to defend and hard to attack, very powerful and rich and he established the Ptolemic empire in Egypt which last for at least three centuries. So it was a long and powerful kingdom that he had established which included Egypt and for a whole century it included Palestine. The other of which we are particularly interested is the empire of the Selucids. Seleucus was another of Alexander's generals who worked with Ptolemy in Egypt for a time but then left his service and went up into Syria and there he tried to establish an empire of his own. In 312 B.C. Seleucus seized the city of Babylon and all subsequent dates began from that date--that was the first date in history that was used for as much as a century--before that dates were figured from an emperor, but when he dies they began all over again. There was never a time before that in history when dates were computed for any length of time but when Seleucus seized Babylon in 312 B.C. they counted, even as much as a 1000 years later, hundreds of miles away from Babylon and under entirely different rulers, you have Hebrew MSS of the Bible copied and the date put on dated from this date--312 B.C. That is why it is a very important date. It established a steady series of numbering and we can say that we are safer in figuring any date from 312 B.C. on than with any date before that. All dates before that time have a lot of guess work in them. We have the Assyrians which had a system of naming each date after an

individual or some prominent man in the Assyrian empire and we have a list of Assyrian dates which go from 1200 B.C. up until about 600 B.C. so we can date a good many things pretty accurately between 1200 and 600 B.C. but from 600 to 300 B.C. there is a dark period and in that period any date in that period is somewhat questionably and there are even those who say that the whole period is nearly a century shorter than is general conceded. In fact in the Talmud it speaks of it as though it lasted only forty years and the Talmud is written around the time of Christ so that shows us how much this period had been forgotten. You can see what doubt then is cast on any date before 300 B.C. You get back to 600 B.C. and then you get pretty accurate again. Back of 1200 you have a good deal of guessing. 312 B.C. is when they began dating 1, 2, 3, 4, right along until the Romans finally decided why should not we date from when Rome was founded but the trouble was that no one knew when Rome was founded and so some would say this was the 300 year after Rome was founded, or another would say the 500th year but it was all guess, but they followed Seleucus method. In the 5th century A.D. there was a monk named Dyonisius who said, "Why on earth should we date from when Seleucus conquered Babylon or when when ^{Romulus} and Remus founded Rome--after all a far greater date in history is when the Lord Jesus was born, but the trouble there was that no one knew when Christ was born. So he figured it out, and some mighty good figuring he did and he got to what we believe today within four years and so he said that we will call this date in which we are in 460 A.D. and so in 1900 there was quite a dispute as to whether the century began in 1900 or 1901. Some people had a big celebration in 1900 and some in 1901 and people now are wondering whether we are in the first half or the second half of the century and some of our magazines came out with the idea that there was no such date as zero and therefore the century should begin with 1901 instead of 1900. The fact of the matter is that with the best of our reckoning today the date that was figured was actually four years too late, so we are really in the year 1955 --after all difference does it make? It is just a convenient way of reckoning time. This wonderful system which we have for reckoning time goes back to Seleucus when he conquered Babylon in 312 B.C. That is an important date to remember and that is the date when Seleucus began his empire and he had no idea that that date would stay but it was very convenient and his empire last for over two centuries. He had Babylon, Syria but for a full century after that the Ptolemies held on to Palestine. Then around 200 B.C. the Selucids succeeded in taking Palestine away from them and after they had held Palestine for some time, there came a ruler

of the Selucids who decided that he would like to have all the people of his empire worship him. Of course that was quite common in Alexander's time. It was not merely that the people substituted a Persian god for a Greek god but they adopted Greek culture as their foundation and even to this day a good part of our culture is founded from Greek culture. This Greek culture which the ~~Persians~~ ^{Alexander} introduced was furthered by the Ptolemies and these were actually Greeks and not Egyptians and Cleopatra was actually Greek. They spoke and read Greek and were thoroughly Greek controlling a great mass of people. They controlled them in their culture right down through. This ruler decided that he would like Greek culture really dominant in his area, and because in Palestine they seemed to have accepted the culture the least of any, he was the most anxious that they accept it the most. He wished that all the people would worship Zeus and that they actually would believe that I am actually Zeus, that would be a wonderful thing he thought. His name was Antiochus Epiphanes. (Comes from epiphany--outshining.) He called himself Antiochus, the manifest god. And most of the people of his empire didn't mind doing it and they thought little about it. But the Jews weren't used to worshipping Zeus and many of them didn't want to worship him and the Jews had the greatest time of persecution, the greatest misery and greatest oppression at any time in their history at this time. The critics say that at the time when the Jews were fighting for their lives, some Jew wrote this book of Daniel to encourage them and we are going to examine the evidence carefully to see what is the truth. That is necessary though the major portion of our work is to find out exactly what the prophecies mean. Nevertheless, even though we don't find that the book was written then, we believe that God had the book written 400 years earlier and one great purpose was to prepare the people for the time of persecution that was coming up at this time. It could be for any time of persecution and it is not at all strange if we would a reference to this precise time. We find in v. 8 and 9--this horn waxed exceeding great toward the south, east, and toward the pleasant land. We think of Antiochus up there is Syria and he no doubt did carry on expeditions southward toward Egypt and he tried to reduce Palestine--out of one of these four ^{notable ones} ~~horns~~ came this little horn we notice. Would it be proper to say of Napoleon that he came out of one of the four--one of the four horns that sprang up after Alexander? One might have come out of that geographical area--it would seem that this was picture ~~which~~ which came out between the Grecian and the Roman empire and it seems to speak quite explicitly of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Daniel # 6

Then in v. 10 we find that it waxed great even to the host of heaven and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground and he stamped upon them. What kind of vision was this that Daniel had? How could you see in a dream this ram with one horn broken and a notable horn and out of them a little horn comes which casts down some of the stars. It is rather difficult to see this whole thing happening. Daniel saw something which he attempts to describe here. Does this mean that he takes some stars literally from heaven and casts them down to the earth. There are some who say that all prophecy ~~xxx~~ has to be taken literally and that is utterly wrong. There are other who would make it all figurative and make anything mean anything. This no doubt is to be taken figuratively. Surely a conqueror who becomes very powerful and tries to destroy all who oppose Him could be spoken of in this way. But the fact that we take it as a figurative expression doesn't mean that when we see that the he-goat comes from the west, that west is a figure. There are some who would make the whole book of Rev. simply symbolic and soon you just make it all mean nonsense. The vital thing as in reading anything that is that is to get the vital meaning. Here we have a figure of the pride and boastfulness of this man. Is this man Antiochus? I know of no other man in that period that would fit the situation. There are some who say that this is a type of the anti-christ and a recent commentary on Daniel says that is absurd--how can you say one or the other? Something may be a type of something else but the point to decide is to know what is it? It seems to me to fit exactly this man.

In the 7th ch. of Daniel you have a little horn mentioned. I don't think that one symbol can be dogmatically classed as always meaning a certain thing but each context has to be studied. So we have here in v. 11 how he magnified himself. In the history of Antiochus we have how he opposed God. He declared that he was Zeus, the Olympian --god manifest. Then we notice in v. 12 how this one transgressed in the sacrifices. We know that Antiochus had his men take possession of the temple and in the temple there they put up a statue of Zeus and made it an abomination to the Jews and there was a discontinuance of the Jewish sacrifices for a period of about three years and one month. That would fit exactly with this that this is Antiochus here described. V. 12 is rather ~~ft~~ difficult to understand and we want to look at the exact words as it stands in the original. I think ^{one} of the great causes for misinterpretation of Scripture is the taking of one verse and trying to explain everything found therein. I think rather, the best thing is to find that which is clear and go right through and see that

which is clear and then one is ready to take the more difficult things and explain them through the relation of that which is clear. Our assignment for next time is going through the book of Daniel and getting that which is absolutely clear and explain that which is unclear later. That doesn't mean that we can't explain some verses alone but we should always realize the context. It was only a few days later after three years and a little over that the Jews succeeded in reconquering Jerusalem and the soon after the sacrifices were again begun. It was just a little over three years that the sacrifices were done away with. We will have to look into the exact wording of this 13th verse later on. Note v. 14. The A.V. says 2,300 days and in the R.V. it has 2,300 evenings and mornings. Of course in the Hebrew it says evening-mornings--does that mean a day or evenings and mornings? Most interpreters say that since ~~since~~ evening and morning make a day, it means 2,300 days. But Ephraim, the Syrian, suggested that it rather meant 2,300 evenings and mornings and a few others have followed him. The R.V. follows him. We don't have to come to any conclusion right now, but it is interesting to note that the sacrifices were made in the evening and the morning and that this sacrifice was done away with for a period of little over three years and that would mean that approximately would cover 2300 morning and evening sacrifices which would be around 1150 days. It would fit very excellently with the idea of mornings and evenings but to say 1150 days it would sound rather precise though 2300 would sound more like a round number and this thought is at least worthy of consideration--the time with sacrifices were taken away from the temple. That fits very well. This all came to pass at least around 165 B.C. We will look into this more thoroughly later on. We want to see that Antiochus Epiphanes is actually predicted there. Is our Lord Jesus Christ simply grabbing something from an old book that was already out of date and He uses it and quote from it or was He quote a book that really belonged to the O.T. canon and giving a true prediction. We shouldn't jump to conclusions though we know what our Lord said was right but we do want to see how Daniel fits in the prophetic scheme and how to go on and get further truth from the book. Edward Robinson was the minister of the Christian Pilgrims who went over to Holland and then came over to the U.S. though he himself was not able to come but shortly before his death he said that he felt that God would cause new truth to break forth and make things that were previously not known. Now I believe that this book of Daniel has truth vital for our progress which we do not fully understand because we are satisfied to grab a verse here and there out of context instead of getting into the solid understanding of the book and see just how it all

fits together into an integral whole. We must take that which we are sure of and stand on that and then try to fit in that which we are not sure about and then try and fit the relation of that which we are not sure about into that which we stand upon. Our aim is to get that which is clear in the text and then later we'll go into the obscure things of the text. Do they carry through their principals consistently. I am a very strong believer in the inductive method of Bible study, the same method that is used in any science. What are the facts and see what there are in relation one to another. One of the great virtues of John Calvin was that you get your great principals from the Scripture and he always said that if you do draw an inference from Scripture, always label it as an inference. Every point must be checked from an inductive approach and that is the way that I believe the Lord wants us to get His truth. This number fits very closely with the number and since it fits so exactly I am a little bit at a loss why so many interpreters take this as meaning days. Of course the big argument is that in Gen. we read that it was evening and that it was morning that was one day. Evening and morning can be used as meaning a day but that doesn't mean that it is always used thus. It doesn't say evening and morning, but merely evening, morning. It is not to be labeled one of those things that we are sure about but it is something that we can keep in mind. It is either one or the other--we can be sure of that. I found that when I was a student at a pagan college, I found many of the professors in philosophy and Bible that they would present a certain viewpoint and show the great uncertainty of that thing and they would point out how you just couldn't be sure of this or that and you could show many reasons why it couldn't be this and yet they never would get specific and say that it must be this or that and both of them would fit in with the Christian viewpoint. When we get too dogmatic about somethings that we can't be sure about they are bound to push us into a corner. If you take it though with the idea that there is a possibility that it could be this or that, and which of the two you are not sure but it is one of the two and we could stand on that for sure. One of these two does fit very nicely. The critics say that we have no proof that the book of Daniel was known between Ezra's day and the Macc.--The trouble is that there is so little that we do know about that period that silence is no argument. If someone named some king for Persia during this time and told me that I didn't have reason to say he didn't reign, that might be so. But I have absolute proof that a man called John Smith never was president of the U.S. The argument from silence is a good argument at times but with plenty of evidence around about it doesn't hold water.

On the other hand it is easy to build on the argument of silence and this is a period between Daniel and Antiochus Epiphanes when we are not even certain of the date. Even our calendar was made at a later time by someone who just made guess through astronomy and between 300 and 600 B.C. we have only guess work there. To say that Daniel wasn't known at this time is foolish. True, we don't have any reference to Daniel for that time but you might read the whole life of Franklin D. Roosevelt and find no reference to Daniel in the writing, but that wouldn't prove that Roosevelt didn't know about Daniel. The argument from silence if used correctly is a strong argument. Someone pointed out that in an eight-volume work of the history of the U.S. there were only three references to Presbyterians--does that mean that there were only a few Presbyterians? Not at all and on a history of the church in America you might read very little about the presidents of the U.S. Our knowledge of this period is very meagre. If the book just was written at the time of the Macc. but it would seem rather strange that they would believe that this book which was just written but supposed 400 years old to be a comfort to them if they had not known it right along. In the books of the Macc. we seem to find echoes of the book of Daniel.

Daniel #8

Purpose is not to tell you what I think the book of Daniel means but to work with you and then to find with you the right methods of interpretation. To see how strong or how weak the evidence is in connection with these points. Consequently, it is very important that you have an idea of these problems as we discuss them. There would be a certain amount of value to anyone to sit here and listen if they knew even a little about the book but if a person does enough studying to be able to follow our discussion intelligently there will be real value in it then. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -4 is explanation of credits) Since our purpose here is to study Daniel then we must find out what does Daniel mean. Our primary purpose is to find what the predictions of Daniel mean. Daniel is a book in which you cannot take a chapter and study it by itself. The book is mostly an integrated whole. Your interpretation of many problems will be interpreted by your interpretation of many other problems in the book. The way you interpret depends on how you have interpreted in other places. It is not the thing to do to adopt the supposition but to make positive the certain view point and if it doesn't work out abandon it and do a different one. You will find all through life there are things on which you haven't enough evidence to have the full interpretation. The things

that have just the one interpretation serve as a basis for the others. With the book of Daniel hanging together in that way we will be interested in looking at various parts of it that I think deal with other sections of it. I would rather look at it in feature by itself as much as possible. I would like to say first there are three general view points of interpretation of the prophet. It is possible for one to take one of these three view points or it is possible for one to try to combine two of them. They are taken consistently but one taken by the great interpreter of the book of Daniel--according to this view point there is nothing in the book that can be properly called re . According to this point of views someone who lived in the time of A saw the great need of the people for encouragement in that of the greatest places that the Jewish religion has ever faced in all its history. As far as the Jewish nation was concerned it was a petty plight price compared with the opposition of Hitler. As far as the Jewish religion was concerned it was a far greater plight. It was a crisis which threatened Judaism, the existence of a belief in one God and threatened the whole foundation of that which God had prepared. Therefore this was one of the most important things which had ever happened in all of Judaism or in the world of Christianity and its history. Let us say that if Christianity were blotted out today in America still there would be many other Christians in the world who have possession of it so Christianity would go on. If entirely blotted out of Europe it would still go on. In those days that was the center of the worship of one god. All would have been completely destroyed as far as its influence in the world was concerned. However all was not successful in what he tried to do. If he had succeeded as it looked for a time that he would they would have abandoned their old customs, etc as did their leaders. If he had succeeded in doing this it would have wiped out all that God had succeeded in introducing to the world through Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc. It would then have been necessary to start all over again. According to the view held here by the majority of the interpreters there was a man living at this time who realized the great nature of the forces and desired to encourage his friends and he wrote a book and the first half of the book is well suited to encourage the people in a place like that. It was undoubtedly the primary reason for the giving of the Book of Daniel. An application of great ideas and ideals and it has been of similar value to the church and to the Jews although there never has been a crisis in Christianity which has been so great. In the last chapters he made certain predictions to encourage the people and according to

these predictions somebody 400 years before- in the time of the great Babylonian ruler, Nebuchadnezzar had seen what would come and had predicted that he would come and do terrible things against them. As you look at Daniel 8 and 11 it is hard to get any other conclusions than that something is very definitely predicted to come in Israel. Thus far then we have no quarrel with this interpretation. According to this it was not a prediction of 400 years before but someone imagining it was predicted then and then giving the history of the time before as it was known to them. That history on the whole is correct and the nearer he gets to his own day, the more correct it is. He gives it right up to his day and then he does not know what is going to happen in the future. So the great instructions of God entering in and putting an end to the great images are man's imagination as to how Antiochus is going to be destroyed. There are the great vital teachings that the kingdom of God is going to overcome. No actual proof of all of these fine attitudes and standards. That is one viewpoint and it doesn't fit with our whole Christian background with its interpretation. It is true that we cannot hold it and our study of the book of Daniel and we must ask what points ask toward it and what points go against it. We want to ask how much is dependent on Daniel and on the other for our viewpoint.

Daniel #9

Much that he didn't just make up but was of actual history, it does seem. ~~Unbelievers, Dr. Montgomery~~ Practically all scholars would say, I think, that this was written in the days of the Maccabees. Dr. Montgomery wrote the commentary and I don't think I am exaggerating when I say that I think that this is one of the finest commentaries ever written and it doesn't mean to say that you have to adopt his viewpoint--he has taken up the different problems and he has studied them through and you may utterly disagree with his points but when he makes a statement of fact, he has gathered the evidence. It is a mass of very valuable material and it is not a book for the general reader as he would generally be lost in the material although there is much that he can evaluate. The other side is that he so definitely takes the liberal view point and it is alright for the careful student. It is written at least 500% better than most of the commentaries as it is far more accurate. Dr. Montgomery wrote a commentary on Kings and they wanted a portion cut out and it had to be although it was a portion that he had put much work into it. That is one view point when and most of the books of the scholars are written from this view point.

Now there is a second view point on the Book of Daniel. A view which might say that Antiochus Epiphanes ~~Antiochus~~ is not in the book but I don't think it will say that because anyone has to say that he is in the book but this view will say that there is not a great deal of emphasis on Antiochus Epiphanes ~~Antiochus~~ but on the coming of the Kingdom of Christ and when it says that the great images will be destroyed it will mean in the days of the Roman Empire not any revived Roman Empire but it points to a fourth empire, the Roman Empire. Now in the days of the Roman Empire a great stone strikes the image and of course Jesus Christ was born in the days of the Roman Empire and so they say it was the coming of Christ and the beginning of His Gospel which is the destruction of the great image and they say therefore that the primary thing here is the coming of Christ's Kingdom coming into the world and overcoming by its wonderful teaching the great wickedness of the world empire. That is the thing here predicted and of course there is a large element of truth in that. But is this the whole purpose of the book of Daniel? Is it possible to interpret a great many of the statements strictly as referring to this? It is easy in this view point ~~to~~ to say in ch. 8 and 11 that you have Antiochus Epiphanes. Then you get other passages which those who hold this viewpoint don't think relate to Antiochus. And then they call this speaking of the Anti-christ but how do they reconcile the passages with this viewpoint of the book. In general they haven't been too worried about trying to fit it together because they have been so busy trying to answer the critical attack which is so very powerful and that has been their main attack. Typical of this viewpoint is Pusey of the Old Oxford movement--the Oxford movement of a hundred years ago--it was a movement that emphasized high church ceremonies and apostolic succession and that movement logically lead many of its leaders into the Roman Catholic church--some of them actually became cardinals in the R.C. but some stayed and became quite an influence toward a high church movement. Pusey was one of this group but basic to all that high church etc. was the death of Christ. He was a thorough believer in the great facts of the atonement and Pusey in his commen. on Daniel takes up the critical argument that it is Macc. rather than at the time of Daniel and goes into them at great length and does a very good job and shows that it actually is written at the time of Daniel. Then he tries to show the whole of the book is turned towards the birth of Christ and that it is Christ alone on which the book ~~is~~ is focused which is the focus of the whole Book and he tries to show that is the focus of the book of Daniel. Pusey therefore is a very good exepplar of this certain viewpoint.

There is a recent commen. that has just come out--The Prophecy of Daniel by Edward J. Young, now at Westminster Theol. Seminary and Dr. Young has done a very good piece of work on this book of Daniel and he has gone into the details of it very carefully and gone into the historical background and has attempted to deal with the evidences to show that the critical viewpoint is wrong and that Daniel actually wrote in the days of Nebuchadrazzar rather than in the time of the Macc. period--that Daniel actually lived and wrote and takes a very conservative viewpoint towards it all--in general he takes the prophetic sections as Pusey takes them and he says that there is no revived Roman empire--it is the Roman empire. The critics of course say that there is no Roman empire at all but just the Greek empire which is the empire of Antiochu Epiphanes--he tries to prove that the fourth empire is not the Greek but the Roman empire but he says that it is not a re-establishment of it and therefore when the stone cut without hands hit the feet of the image, that is Christ being born in Bethlehem and dying on the cross--that is what destroyed the Roman empire. In his book Dr. Young states that there are two things which he is opposing. The first of these is the critical approach and the other he calls the dispensational approach and he lumps together practically all who disagree with him under the term of dispensationalist. If you believe that the destruction of the world empire was not done by Christ at his first coming, but is something that is going to be done at his second coming, of course Dr. Young makes you a dispen. per se. So he calls that the dispensational interpretation. It reminds me of the time when I was teaching Hebrew--I asked ^{someone} ~~him~~ the 3rd. pers. sing mas. of the Hiphil of Katal and he said Hicatal instead of Hicktil and when he said Hicatal, half the class laughed but one of the fellows sitting next to him said, O that is the premill. point of view. Maybe a man who has a wrong view on some Heb. verb might believe in the premill. return of Christ and he may have a wrong view on various other matters which are not related and the exact same thing is true about dispen. A dispensationalist viewpoint that is harmful is when one says that anyone was ever saved through another way than the death of Christ--that has nothing in the world to do as to whether empires are going to be destroyed by his first or second coming, nor does it have anything to do with the time of rapture--it is unfortunate that Dr. Young lumps these views and he includes all under Ironsides and Gabelein but he is interested in showing how they are wrong. Now there might be others who might have three or four ~~things~~ things which might coincide with what they teach but that wouldn't mean that all things which they said others would agree with.

The view is that the book of Daniel is interested in a Divine intervention to put an end to the wickedness in the world and dispensations is not a proper term for that and Premilenial is nearer but is not still the proper term for that. The third view is not a direct anthesis to either the first or the second view. The first view is that it is all about Antiochus Epiphanes and that leaves it as written in his day and not later. It has untrue predictions of the future that lead to it and grow out of it but our big problem is if it is justifiable. The second view says it is alright to leave out Antiochus but any intelligent one will have to say that Antiochus is important in the book but in addition to Antiochus there is great stress laid upon the Firstcoming of Christ and that is the thing looked forward to when there is any length of time given that is what it points to. The third view is a big stress on the Divine intervention in the affairs of this world to bring the wickedness to an end and to set up the Divine Kingdom in place of the evil one. You can think of it any way that you want but it is a Divine intervention by force to put an end to the powers of this world and that is the primary end. I do wish the name ~~intervention~~ dispensation would be omitted altogether as it has nothing whatever to do with this particular section. It doesn't relate to these particular points. On any one of these views you can go to extreme. The other view is not a new one by any means but under a new name. There are more points of view and books written on this third point of view than on the other two put together and there are apt to be more books written on the third view because anything written in the book concerning the future could fit in with this third view. They may read Daniel and then let their minds wander and include other material. There may be interpreters who go to such an extreme on this third view that they try to get rid of Antiochus Epiphanes altogether and there are some who go to the extreme of saying that he may be spoken of but he is a type and not at all important but if they talk of him at all I think he should be included and I think that we should recognize that up to the present time no crisis in the Juda-Christian religion as important for the question of the very continuance of that religion as the Maccabean attack was and consequently it would be very specific with that. Ques. about Dr. Young. His great emphasis in the material he has is on the combating of the view number one and I think that is extremely important and his treatment of the third view is very incidental but through the book he does point out quite often the dispensational view here and say why it is utterly impossible. There are three or four other places where he does deal specifically with pre-millennialism. This third view could be held with the pre-millennial

or an amellenial view. I think that the attacks he makes would properly apply against any amellenial view. The end of the introduction of the problem as a whole. Ques. The ~~2nd~~ chapter of Daniel describes a great imagery representing the four empires. A stone without hands hits the imggery and destroys it. The most natural way to interpret it is to say that it happened when the Roman Empire was in existance and we know it didn't. Then there are two interprestation Perhaps the ^Roman Empire is to be established but if that is the case or not is not essentila to the question. The thing we're interested in in going through the book is to see what there is that is established and what is not included. Some try to discard the third view and then they say the Roman Empire is not included, etc. I don't think you can do that but even if you do prove it it still doesn't prove that the third view is wrong. We are not going through the chapters so you'll get my view on the different things but we're going to take the different principals and try to get evidence on them. It is necessary that we examine some sections in quite detail at first and then more detail on them later. It is extremely important that we all have the idea of the general content of the book. The basic content is important. The book is divisible into two main parts--the first half is history and the second half is prediction. Really the first half is not history in the true sense of the word but it is a series of unconnected events. The first half is a series of six stories and it is properly six chapters because it is six stories and the second of these is the story of the great predcttion. The last six chapters of the book are far different. The first six speak in the third person. In the last Daniel says "I" and he tells us what God revealed to him, not to some other man. The last six is made of visions Daniel had. The last six chapters do not form six sections but they form four sections--first, second and third are separate distinct visions and the fourth, fifth and sixth in the second half belong together and it is very unfortunate that they are divided into chapters as it is confusing. Four visions in the last half of the book and the first of these visions is very similar and closely related to the second chapter. Chapters 2 and 7 belong together and must be studied together eventually. Ch. 8 is a unit by itself, 9 is unit by itself. Ch. 9 requires more decesion from the others than any other chapter does and is less of a foundation for determining than any of the others. Ch. 11, v. 1 is part of ch. 10 and that is a vission Ques. and the answer is that I am mentioning these three views and they are different in area and for us to consider and I would say that every view in the book would fall into one of these three catagories. We are going to look at the book carefully and see what is the best view to hold.

God might have given a book with such a purpose to Daniel and the ideas based on this book and this view is generally united in disbelief. United often with the idea that there are inaccuracies in the book. This view is one which I think is very definitely wrong. The second view points to the coming of Christ and states it as having no other view and the question is if that is the reason for this particular book. Does this book have other events that are of significance or this is all? The views and the dispensations have nothing to do with each other. Ques. about dispensationalism. We'll take a few minutes on that right now so it'll be clear. By dispensationalism we mean ~~it-is-mean~~ there are different periods in history in which God dealt in different ways. Certainly God deals with His people differently since the coming^{of} Christ and therefore every ^{Christian} ~~person~~ must be a dispensationalist in the sense of believing that God divides the history of the periods. Any person who is not a dispensationalist at all is either not a Christian or else knows nothing about the Bible at all. There is a group to day that goes to the extreme of having a great many dispensations and they say that the only thing in the New Testament vital for us is the three because everything else either relates to the views or the time of Christ on the earth or relates to a future dispensation, etc. There is then a harmful dispensationalism that divides the Scripture up into many dispensations and gives application only to one period. We believe that all the Scripture has value for us in all periods but that does not mean that some of it does not have much greater value in one period than in another. Cp. Leviticus and John and why we don't spend as much time in reading Leviticus as John. The value of L. then is that largely of history and of how God wanted the people to do in dispensation. Also a foretaste of great spiritual truths which we should get but that we find more often given more clearly in other books of the Bible. Therefore it is altogether right that we don't spend as much time studying L. as John or others that deal with our present dispensation. A hyper-dispensationalism which carries in many little sections is something that rests on no clear Biblical evidence. Another aspect of dispensationalism which is quite apart from this one. This one is the idea that the people in the OT were saved because they accepted the law and people now are saved because they believe on Christ. It is definitely wrong but it is not the most important thing in the whole world but the important thing is not as to how Abraham was saved but how can we be saved. It is very unfortunate to have wrong ideas on how Abraham was saved. It is too bad that there are those who do not strike the important aspect of salvation by grace and this has been missed by a great many ministers as they have put their stress on the law of God and the law of God is vital for our leadership but not for

such emphasis. Ill. of chapel speaker--a student, saying that he was trying to save himself in the Lutheran Church by doing works. How shocked Martin Luther would have been. In many cases the preacher doesn't understand and then he preaches that and it is no wonder that the people get that idea of salvation by works. On the other hand there are Godly men who know that is the way of salvation but they give the idea of works to their people and then too there happens that many times people think only of the Salvation by grace and forget that we are told in the Bible that we are to do good works too. Abraham was saved in exactly the same way that we are so there is an error that can be called a wrong, harmful dispensational error but that is not as harmful as making people think today that they can be saved through their works. It is most vital as to how we're saved today and then important too to instruct people as to how the ones were saved then. It is proper that we give them the correct attitude toward the law of God. Now there are these two aspects of harm in dispensationalism and they are unrelated and one could have one of these harms without the other one very easily and I don't think either is as harmful as the opposite extreme would be in saying there never were any dispensations. The people who believed in great future events are apt to be the same ones who get excited about the Gospel of Grace and they have ceased from listening to wonderful presentations of the law of God and found the wonderful teaching of grace and then have gone to study and they find that Christ is going to come back and we don't need to think that we can set up a wonderful time of peace and happiness on this earth as God has not promised us that but He is going to and we don't need to get discouraged about making the whole world Christian as God is going to take care of it in his own power. There is no reason why belief in future events should have any connection with either of these two aspects which we have spoken of as harmful in certain types of dispensationalism and it is a thing unrelated to them. I'm sure that Gabelien and Scofield Bible and Ironsides would be very strongly opposed to the two and they would be far nearer to the view.

Daniel #12

When one reads of the salvation of grace and then as he reads, he reads of the coming of Christ again, etc, he wonders how they fit together. There is no where in the Bible that it says there is going to be 2,000 years before Christ comes back. There are various ways to try to fit it together. Dr. Young seems to criticize what he calls the

the dispensational view on certain grounds. One thing he doesn't like about it is that it talks about Antiochus Epiphanes is a type of the antichrist. Dr. Young says it isn't anything of the kind. I would agree with Dr. Young except I wouldn't state it quite so strongly. I see no harm in saying that he might be a type of the antichrist but I do see harm in a book telling us of Antiochus Epiphanes and then thinking that tells us what the antichrist is to be. It may be a type in the sense that ^{it} is similar and you can get some illustrations from it but you can not prove a single thing from it. I think typical teaching in the Scripture may be very useful for illustrations but I don't think it is anything to build a doctrine on. I quite agree with him that you can't build a teaching on the end of the age upon the belief that one thing is the type of the other but we find, I think, valuable and interesting illustrations. He speaks rather strongly against that and also against what he calls a gap theory. Dr. Young says you have 70 weeks ^{the dispensationalists say 69 weeks to place before the death of Christ and the 70th week is postponed until long in the future and he says this is preposterous. He says a continuous period is a continuous period and there can't be a gap. There cannot be a parenthesis} The illustration spoken of a bit ago about the prophetic clock having stopped and it is of course the popular way to present the idea of gaps. Can there be such gaps? That is a vital question. Dr. Young speaks very strongly against them in certain places. If there can't be such gaps, let's stand on it and apply it logically through out. We cannot assume there are any gaps without proof but is there proof that there are gaps? Discussion of Christ coming the first time and then His coming the second time. We have to recognize that there are gaps, there are parenthesis at different places in the Scriptures. Let us see if we can interpret the book of Daniel logically and consistently without assuming any gaps or parenthesis. Let us see if it is possible to hold to the second view as to the first without introducing principles of interpretation which require the third view. The first view is a consistent one but it is a none Christian one as it assumes the book is full of mistakes. If the second one is a true one, how far can you go? Do you have to stop there at that one? Can you hold the second view and not accept any gaps? That is what Dr. Young does--he says you have four great empires and he says the fourth is the Greek empire of Antiochus Epiphanes and it says this fourth empire is here and the writer says the Jews are fighting against this empire and God is going to destroy this empire and therefore it is dealing with the destruction of that empire and the setting of the kingdom of God. The second view says no but that the fourth kingdom is not the Greeks but it is the Romans and Dr. Young says "the stone cut without the hands is the Gospel of Christ. "

be

and it does- doesn't say a revived Roman Empire but it is the Roman Empire so it must/the Roman Empire that is struck by it and therefore it is the first coming of Christ and can refer to nothing else. That is taking the gap consistently but does he carry the view through consistently? Do you find in some other chapter that he takes the principal in opposition to the first view which logically will provide for the possibility of the third view all the way through. That is a question which we should examine carefully and come to a conclusion. The first half is to encourage people in times of persecution and especially in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The contents of the first six chapters--chapter 1 is where Daniel separates himself from the wicked life of the king's court. He risks his life for a separated stand and even though you may suffer for it, even die for your faith, He will honor you for it. In ch. 2 Nebuchanezzar is the great dictator--he calls in men and tells them to tell him what he dreams. Daniel gave the meaning of the message here and he tells the king the meaning. God is going to triumph in the end --it fits that time as well as it fits our time too. It is not a book of history in the proper sense or it would tell us what happened to Daniel --it is simply a series of incidents and we are left to guess what the meaning is. Ch. 3 gives no mention of Daniel refusing to bow down to Nebuchanezzar's image but we have his three friends saying that they will not bow to the image and Our God will protect us. Even in the fiery furnace God brings them forth safely. What an assurance for people in Antiochus Epiphanes's terrible persecution. God was able to protect even in a fiery furnace. In the 4th ch. we have Nebuchanezzar with another dream and he is told that there is a greater monarch and God can intervene and touch some little spot in Nebuchanezzar's brain and he goes out to live and eats grass and then he comes back and gets his kingdom back. If God can do that, why do you need to be afraid of persecution?

Nebuchadrassar

Daniel #13 In the 5th chapter ~~Daniel~~ simply has disappeared and we are not told what happened to him since it is not a history--it is not written to tell us a course of events but written to show us certain individual happenings to show us special happenings and show us how God worked these various things out. In this 5th chapter we have a new king mentioned--Belshazzar and this new king gives a great feast and he does blasphemous things with vessels from the temple and uses those sacred vessels to drink liquor from and there a hand writes on the wall and no one can explain it so Daniel is called into his presence. Daniel tells him that his kingdom will be taken away from him and be given to the Persians. Belshazzar stands by his word and gives him great honor even though he said such terrible things about himself. That certainly

is very honoring of Belshazzar to stand by his word after he had been told such things as that and I am afraid most people would have killed Daniel instead of honoring him in this situation. That very night Belshazzar was killed and Daniel lost all the honors that he had been given. It again proves that God reigns and controls and therefore why should they be afraid of Antiochus Epiphanes. God will always take care of his people. These names are mostly Babylonian names which honored the chief god of Babylon--it is like here they changed a fellow's name who was Hui to Timothy though it would be a lot simpler to say Hui than Timothy but Americans are more used to Timothy than to Hui and so they thought over there in Babylon, those queer barbaric names like Daniel they would change to Belteshazzar. This writing fits pretty well with the Heb.--it is a play on words. In the six chapters Daniel doesn't sit down and say that He is going to proceed to tell all the interesting things about himself, because he would tell us where he came from and who his parents were--it is not like Joseph and we are told a history of his life, but in Daniel he simply takes outstanding illustrations of his life which God lead him to put down that would help the people in time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is altogether possible that Daniel wrote another book, "A Story of My Life" but his was God's book. It is done as a prophecy and not as a history. It doesn't say what purpose he wrote it for so we have to conjecture in any case. If it simply to give us a history of himself, he would say something of where he was born and tell about the events connected with his history and tell us when he died--it is simply isolated incidents. Take a man who write a book on the presidents of the U.S. that I have known. The characters in the first part are ^{the rulers} ~~Darius~~ and not Daniel. Of course the first chapter is very much about Daniel but the 3rd chapter never even mentions about Daniel. His friends are mentioned there but they are not mentioned after that and we don't know what happened to them. It is not a history but a series of events. In the 6th ch. we have a new ruler, Darius and of course the critics ask who is Darius, the Mede and nobody knows. Now since nobody knows, what makes anyone think that the book was written during the time of Ezra. Why would anyone at that time even imagine a ruler that didn't even exist? But if someone wrote 400 years later it would be quite easy for him to get mixed up and so they say that this fits very definitely with the idea of a late date for Daniel. Of course the critics used to be able to say that there never was a Belshazzar or a Darius so of the three great rulers two of them never existed and therefore it was only someone's imagination. Unfortunately for them we have since found out all about Belshazzar and now we know that the statements about this king are remarkably accurate but we still are in a position that we don't know about Darius the Mede so they still have an argument as to who this

man is. If there wasn't ~~any~~ such man, then of course that would prove that the book was written later but half of the argument is gone and for anyone to say that there never was such a man is pretty difficult for anyone to say. We can say that we have no evidence aside from the Bible, but to say that if there is such a man we would surely know about him and since there isn't then there never was such a man--that is what all the critics say so they make the book as unreliable but of course we don't have follow along with them in this. In the 6th ch. we have told us how Darius the Mede was fond of Daniel and a trick was put over on him. That is one trouble with these great arbitrary dictators. They may be very wicked men and then it is terrible and all have to look to God for any help but some would wish for a good man and say how wonderful that would be. Here we have Darius the Mede and he wants to do that which is right but if he does he has to be consistent and so it was quite easy for the wicked men to tie him up in his word and get him to give his word in something wherein he didn't realize the implications and the result is whenever you have a dictator that is wicked it is terrible but even if he is a good man, he still can get into a situation where he does a lot of evil and that is what happened here. In this case the result shows us that when he was put in a position where he couldn't help himself, there came a case where Daniel would have been killed for his loyalty to God and when he knew he was in danger of his life, he knew there was nothing that Darius could do about it, he went right ahead and prayed just the same. Yet many a person today who thinks that he is a very fine Christian and loyal to the Lord wouldn't bow his head in a restaurant for fear that some might think him fanatical and would recognize in a public way for fear that some might make fun. I have been told about foreign missionaries on the boat who tell people that they are going into educational work, because they thought if they told the real purpose people might look down upon them--I hope that there are not many like that but the book of Daniel is written for all of us. Daniel didn't hesitate to pray with his window open and though he didn't parade in front of people and didn't flaunt it, yet he continued with his regular devotion to the Lord, in spite that it didn't mean people looking down on him or ridiculing him but it meant death as far as he knew. In this particular case God delivered and God can deliver but he didn't know that God would deliver him and God may not choose to deliver you but to know that God is able to deliver if He chooses is surely a sufficient reason for encouraging one in his loyalty to Christ in any time of persecution or trouble. Now we see all the first six chapters look to Antiochus Epiphanes and none except perhaps the 2nd chapter has anything to do with the first coming of Christ. Do they just look to Antiochus and the Roman persecutions--doubtless that enters into and the persecutions in the Reformation enter

in also, but nothing has come which fulfills the whole of the image prediction as given us in the second chapter. According to the view of the critics, the vision of Daniel has four kingdoms and the fourth is the one under Antiochus Epiphanes and the result was that they knew that God was going to deliver them and God was going to send the Stone right in their day and wreck the empire of Antiochus and according to this they must have been mistaken, but this all is supposed to fit in better but as a matter of fact when Antiochus died the Jews had to fight another 20 years before they regained their freedom. The critics believe that it was around 168 or 166 B.C. that Daniel was written but the conservatives would say that it was written 400 years before.

14 This sheet that has been given out is a history of the background of the book of Daniel. Now you notice at the tip the Neo-Babylonian empire rather than with the Assyrian empire but it was destroyed by Nebuchadrezzar and so he reigned from 605-562 and then his son came Amel-Marduk (562-560) then came a general--Neriglissar (560 -556) who was quite an old man by this time; then he was succeeded by Nabonidus and then Belshazzar came along who was co-king for some time with his father. Cyaxares, king of the Medes cooperated with the destruction of the Assyrian empire and married Cyaxares' granddaughter and Daniel did not teach a separate Median empire and then came along Astyages and one of his subordinates, a Persian named Cyrus established the great empire of the Medes and Persians and Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539 B.C. Now the dates of the Persian empire are not particularly important except with consideration of the 11th chapter--This empire last from about 539 until about 323 B.C. Then we have Alexander the Great who conquered the great and yet peaceful empire--for 200 years it had established practical peace over the whole and gave a chance for people to develop without fighting all of the time. He married a Persian woman and decided that he was great like the Persians but he died in a drunken bout when he was only 32 years of age. He left these generals but no one close to him. His ~~son~~ half-brother was half an idiot and this woman whom Alexander had married was expected to give birth to a son, but he was rather young to have much to do with the ruling and some thought the illegitimate son should be the king and all want so and so to be a ruler that he could sway so in the end it broke up into four divisions. But we are interested in two of these--the Seleucid and the Ptolemaic empire and these rulers have been named up to Antiochus Epiphanes. At last there was the eventual conquest of both empires by Rome during the first century before Christ. Caesar died in 44 B.C. Charlemagne was crowned at Rome 800 A.D. and the end of the so-called Holy Roman Empire was around 1814. I give you these dates not because they are so important but because it shows what a long time has elapsed since that time of Antiochus. (7-12½ is testing of machine.)

We noticed last time that there are three general attitudes taken toward the book of Daniel. To some extent these attitudes are combined some times with the person not caring one of them through consistently and if you have an ironous view and then you can't. Of course that is a good way to find the truth on a matter is to carry it through consistently. Naturally we don't have a complete understanding of anything in this life and therefore whatever our view is we're going to find the apparent differences and the apparent difficulties. There is nothing in all science that if you will study into it you will find apparent inconsistencies. This will be because of your ignorance of some of the factors that enter in. You will find that you can not carry a view through consistently without coming into some difficulties and at least one should try another method and see how far he gets on that. The view of the book of Daniels that they take is that the book was written by a pious view in the time of the Maccabees and at this pious view at the writing of the time of the Maccabees wrote a book encouraging his people to fight valiantly against the oppressors and in order to write it he imagined wonderful things that might have happened ~~things~~ 400 years before in the time of the great emperor and he got some very good stories but naturally some of his historical background is erroneous when he tries to reconstruct situations that far back and then he pictures these people that long before as having predicted events regarding the future and of these events he had predicted until he gets up to his own day and the predictions he makes up to his own day are quite accurate on the whole except there is error on them as would naturally be expected when a man in those days when a man is trying to give summary of history of a long period. He does make some bad mistakes but on the whole his history is good. He continues with his predictions telling what is going to happen after his day and he makes some guesses and they all go hog wild. Some say that when he comes to future predictions his details are not literally accurate but the great principles of them are true and the spiritual truths are true and very valuable for all ages. Even if he does say one thing and work out another way there is still a great truth. If some one takes the view that he makes some guesses and they are all wrong ~~so~~ if they take the rather pious view that though his guesses are not literally correct they involve beautiful theories which are beautiful spiritual truths. As far as prediction is concerned it has no value for any time subsequent to the Maccabean period. It is easy for us to overlook the fact that the book as a prediction did have a very great interest in the time of Daniel. There is no question to that. An outstanding purpose for the book is to prepare the days for Anti----- . It is written with that as one of its great purposes in mind.

Daniel #15(cont.)

It really doesn't matter if it is written earlier or later. The predictions don't matter as they could be either earlier or later and so we donot accept this first view. We are anxious to know why. The second attempt is that like held by Pussey and others. It takes the book as dealing with Antiochus--- and with the first coming of Christ. The book does not give us valid information about the end of the age but it does us about Antiochus correctly and it does tell us about Christ's coming to preach and the destroying of the kingdoms of wickedness. The 70 weeks of

Daniel run up to the time of Christ and end there. Some would say that they end at his birth and some would say that they end with the destruction of Jerusalem but in any event they end around the first coming of Christ and the stone cut without hands is the beginning of the Gospel which fills all the earth and destroys all the kingdoms. This is the view which is taken by the latest scholarly commentary which has appeared on the subject.

The third view is that the book has its primary purpose dealing with Antiochus Epiphanes but that it also has an almost equal purpose of importance to give us some information that is of value all through ages as we look forward to the end of the age. Certain attitudes, certain viewpoints which will helpful in dealing with the forces of iniquity and also to give us certain understanding of some certain specific things to help us and encourage us is given for the end of the age. Now those who go to extreme on this third view will simply forlook Antiochus and make every related to the anti-christ and we must not do this. Does this look forward not simply to the first coming of Christ or even primarily to the first coming of Christ but refers also to his completion of destroying sin upon this earth. That is the view of which Dr. Young speaks as the dispensational view and some places he give one or two views of men who he doesn't like and and then sometimes he will give the same view from another man and not categorize him as a dispensationalist and then will agree with him under a different heading. I do not think that it is right to speak of any view as the dispensational view because the particular error that may come from the view does not tie up specifically with anything in this book and I don't think that is at all a good view to use. In fact I am not sure that there is a view that would tie up with the details of the second coming which is particularly different from the view which has been held by many through the ages of the Christian church. As among these three different views, one cannot study any of the three without examining all three. You could look at the first and third without the second view. You cannot consider the thrid to the second ~~with~~ without equally considering it to the first. The question is--Are you able to deny the first view

and hold to the second or in denying the first view into these principles of interpretation which carry you beyond the second view inevitably into the third view--that is a question that I think will become clearer as we look at more of the details of the book. One thing that we must ask ourselves in the books is, To what extent are technical terms used. It is always possible for anyone to use a technical term. When I use the word D-day I mean the day that there will be an invasion of Normandy but if we attack Italy and someone says that is D-day, you say NO--it means specifically the day that Normandy is attacked. VE day is the day of ending the war in Europe and J day is the day of ending of war in Japan. You take a technical term and this is what it means but when you take a term like that it is best to take some word which is specific and not just a common word. If you take just a common term it will be very hard, inadvertently to use a word in another sense. We must be very careful not to assume that anything is a technical term unless we have proof of it. I think e.g. that often the Day of the Lord is used as a technical but in its later uses it seems to be used as a general term. In Daniel when you come to a term, "A little horn shall rise" it is quite natural that you take it as ~~the~~ a technical term. Let us not assume that it means the same person every time that it is used. Couldn't someone see a little horn and then why ~~he~~ couldn't he again see a little horn and why could these two little horns be different things? You go along the country and see a little house and you say that is the little house where so and so lives and another time you see another little house and yet it is a different one. Why do you have to assume that the little horn is the same person unless you have proof? That is one way we can easily run into difficulty if we simply assume a technical term. Young also criticizes very strongly the idea of making something a type of something else and maybe his criticism to a certain extent might be justified. We must be careful not to make types per se as proofs. A type can be very valuable as a means of expounding something. Just as that happened so this will happen. It prepares you to understand how a thing is going to be--it is very useful for illustration but it doesn't prove anything. You need something other than a type to prove anything. Let us not say that a type is a proof--let us say this is this and that is that and then you but as for a type, that we should leave until later. He discusses the ~~the~~ idea of gaps and shows how absurd. ^{When} You have a continuous things there is no chance for gaps he says. Well, do we have such a thing as gaps in prophecy? Can we jump from one to another thing. If you have had my course in Prophets you will very often see how the prophet looks at this and looks at that and doesn't

mention that there might be gaps in between. But that would not in itself be proof that you have gaps in Daniel but it isn't right to say that it would be absurd to think that they were there without proof. You can't assume it though unless you find proof. According to the second view do you find in gaps in Daniel or can you hold the second view and go straight along? I hope by this time everybody is quite familiar with the contents of the book. In the first division there is the 2nd chapter which is quite different from all the others in this first division. According to the third view I would say that it was about equal--the emphasis on Antiochus but on the first view it has to do mainly with Antiochus Epiphanes. I think both the Maccabbean and last days are both transcendentally important. Your second view would hold that there are two foci--the Macc. period and also the first coming of CHRIST. The third view would hold that the first coming of Christ is not emphasized in this book--it is the end of the age that is emphasized. The general purpose of giving strength to those going through persecution would be of help in any period at any time, even from the first view. If it were done in the Macc. period it would be of comfort in all future ~~xxx~~ periods. The way that God blessed the people here would be of help to all future generations. As to whether it has particular predictions about the future--does it predict the end of such a situation. You can know that the persecution is not going to destroy the church so as to the prediction finds sufficient fulfillment in the time of the Macc. period--this can be entirely secondary. As to whether a primary purpose of the book is to inform us about things that are going to come at the end of the age--that is the question between the ~~first~~ ^{the first} second and third views and of course the attitude generally of the second is one which we find rather commonly. It is the attitude of taking every prediction of the birth of Christ and hold to that very literally and be very insistent about these but when it comes to something beyond the first coming--to take the attitude that everything is very vague and that we cannot get specific information as things at the end of the age. The first half of the book has a chapter of extreme importance in the prophetic field. There is nothing in the 2nd chapter with reference to Antiochus Epiphanes. I saw a letter that spoke about the head of gold still to be set up in the last days. It says specifically in the book that Nebuchadrazzar is the head. This head of gold can't be anything else. There then comes the body of silver but that is explained that it is not Antiochus Epiphanes. How about the next portion of brass--it says that he will rule over all the earth so that couldn't be he. Could all the earth mean all the land and mean the land of Palestine--it could but in this context it surely could not because he is speaking with Nebuchadrazzar who is far away from Palestine and Daniel is telling him that God

has given him dominion over all the earth and after this will arise another kingdom that is inferior and the third kingdom of brass will rule over all the earth--it doesn't have to mean the whole world but a world-empire is in mind. Antiochus had the whole land of Palestine but in the end it broke away from him. Then the fourth kingdom will be strong as iron--Antiochus Epiphanes is not one of these four kingdoms--he is referred to later in the book as a little horn that comes out of one of these four horns--he is very definitely not the whole kingdom. Some may say the third or fourth kingdoms are related to him but neither of them are a direct prediction in any case. In the picture of what is going to happen--it says in v. 34 that a stone cut without hands smote the image upon his feet. If he is part of the image he is broken but not specifically. There is no definite statement that could be related to Antiochus Epiphanes and then it goes on to say that a kingdom will be set up which will not be destroyed. It shall stand forever--there is nothing in the 2nd chapter that can be related to Antiochus. Of course anyone reading the second chapter during the time of the Macc. would be comforted to know that Antiochus would be included in these world empires and forces opposing Christ and this is all to be destroyed. Nothing is told about his rising or about his specific downfall in the 2nd chapter.

Now over in the 7th, 8th and 11th chapter according to the first viewpoint you have the downfall of Antiochus Epiphanes specifically related and according to the 2nd and 3rd view you have Antiochus Epiphanes. That doesn't seem to be generally realized because they see only a great deal about the anti-christ in Daniel and that is quite natural because we naturally are a great deal more interested in things to come than what has already gone by 2000 years ago. We can say that Antiochus is a good type but it doesn't prove anything about the antichrist. The Scofield Bible does point this out.

17 There are a few things in common that might lead you to think that ch. 2 and ch. 7. Both are talking about world-wide empires even though they use different figures. There was one image and here four beasts--how are they similar? These are four kings and the other empire is speaking about four kingdoms--they are both speaking about world powers. If I talk about the rise of the Manchu regime in China, the rise of Napoleon's European empire--I am talking about empires that cover tremendous territory and the subjects are related and you will find the methods used have much in common and the results in many ways are similar but the thing is not the same. In this case what reason do we have to think that the general thing in ch. 2 and ch. 7 are the same?

You might say that you saw a chute in which coal comes down and you saw this coal coming down and simply flooding over and I said there was a great world conquest that covers a tremendous portion of the world and I had a dream you could say, and I saw a group of Indians come out of the woods and they rushed across a great territory and they over-ran it--this is a description in each case of a large territory covered you could say. The conquest could be the same though the pictures might be very different--they both might describe Napoleon, both the Manchu conquest of China and one might describe Napoleon and the other the Manchu uprising--they both would be similar in that they both described the establishment of world empires but what makes you think that the same empires are spoken about here? The first important thing ^{is} to notice that they both are speaking about world-empires and the second is to notice that in both places he is speaking about four world empires--if you had two you might have a little reason for thinking thus- you might say you had a dream of the north and the south have a great contest and then you say you had another dream of the north and the south and the first might refer to the American civil war and the other might be the struggle between north and south China in the 1920's--two are so common that it necessarily doesn't mean anything but when you have four in both cases it certainly suggests a similarity--the use of the number four in both cases is extremely important. Of course in the fourth beast it says that he has ten horns and in the image it doesn't say that he has ten toes though that could be assumed. There is a supernatural destruction that takes place both times with the fourth kingdom--in the first case it seems to refer to this time and in the second it doesn't. We don't necessarily infer that it is but it would seem likely. I could tell you about Napoleon and then I could tell you about Manchuria but when you have four kingdoms predicted, you have many similarities --it would seem to strongly suggest that it was speaking about the same thing. If we had the 7th ch. alone we couldn't be sure when it began but when we have the first one specifically told to us and the other similarities I am sure that few would even question about the two being equal. The great sea to someone in Palestine would no doubt refer to the Mediterranean sea but to someone that had left Palestine while a boy and he gets over to Mesopotamia and he had the Persian Gulf right below and the Caspian sea to the north, I am not sure that one could draw too much from that. I think it would be just as good an interpretation if you think of the book as written in Daniel's time to say that he saw a great sea or in a dream you might think of the Mesopotamian idea of the world having a great sea around about and in a dream he sees this great sea. This does stress the universal nature but if you were sure that this was written in the time of the Macc. it would be quite right that this

referred to the Mediterranean sea since that was about the only sea they knew anything about. One possible interpretation of this 11th verse is that here you have four beasts and the fourth one is destroyed but the first three are allowed to live on--I would suggest that an equally possible interpretation of v. 12 is that he saw four beasts come up one after the other and one had its time of supremacy and then a second and then a third and now a fourth one is destroyed. Each one has lost its dominion to the next one--but that it had continued for a season would refer to the second chapter--you have the head, the shoulders, but while you have the shoulders the head is still there--you see the image as lasting --then at the end the whole image is destroyed. If an atom bomb would come and destroy the United States we might say that the glory of Greece passed ^{away} but the country lasted and the glory of Rome passed ~~away~~ away but the country lasted and the glory of Napoleon passed away but the country lasted. We might say the the U.S. was utterly destroyed but that wouldn't mean the country passed away but that it came to the end of its glory. The other would seem to fit in to the general pattern. (Quite a bit of class discussion interspersed throughout the record.)

213

We have noticed that the two chapters- 2 and 7 are so similar that we can say that they are pictures of the same thing. When you have a book of 12 chapters and if you have as much in common as these two chapters have with each other, you are in a different position altogether than if you had a chapter here and another that spoke about Guitar or other book entirely and had just this similarity--in any two religious books you would ask whether they were speaking about the same thing. But when you have a book of 12 chapters like this, I don't think there is any question. A man in the Macc. time might be trying to encourage the people that they would be delivered from wicked oppression or he might go further and tell them that He actually was going to send His Messiah but from anyone of the three views there is an integral part of the picture that there is something that is going to be after the image or beasts are destroyed. Is the book stressing that there are going to be four kingdoms and then these be destroyed or is he saying that there are going to be four kingdoms and after these are destroyed this righteous one will be set up --is there something more than simply a negative but a positive establishment of something good--one can't escape that there is, at least in certain places in the book and one of the things we should do in the book is to see how much it is stressed and what it can mean. When he says that a kingdom will be established which never shall be destroyed--how are you going to interpret that? Are you going to say that it is a kingdom that lasts for a certain length of time and then there is some change made in its general form or does it rule out any such continuation

Or does it have to mean some eternal state when it uses that kind of terminology. That is a question that we want to look at before we finish this course. Is Antiochus Epiphanes spoken about in the book--that is one thing which I want all of you to determine and in this 8th chapter I don't think anyone can get away from it. Now what reason do you have to feel reasonably sure that Antiochus Epiphanes is referred to here in the 9th chapter. It comes from the Grecian kingdom which destroyed the Medo-Persian empire and one that is split into four kingdoms and those are specific points that just wouldn't fit any country. Hitler overcame the country of Greece but he didn't overcome Medo-Persian--Germany was split into four zones--you put them together and there is a pretty definite allusion to that kingdom of Greece and his Alexander. Out of it comes this little horn and then a description of what Antiochus Epiphanes did. When you get back to v. 9 you have another fact. He led ~~his~~ expeditions down south against Egypt and eastward towards Persia but never went westward since the Romans made his father promise not to cross a line westward and Antiochus never did try to go westward or northward--the pleasant land all agree is a ref. to Palestine and of course he was very powerful in the land. V. 9 is quite specific and you have a lot of points that ~~it~~ fit Antiochus--when it tells about his coming out of the country of Greece it is getting pretty specific and it can't be Nero, Constantine and there ~~is~~ has never been anyone yet who has fit it except Antiochus and it is very difficult to say that all things are yet going to happen in the future. It is pretty hard to think of it meaning anyone else. In v. 25--he will magnify himself in his heart. It says that he will be broken without hand--that sounds like the image that was cut down with a stone cut out without hands so this statement might refer to that which was spoken about in ch. 2--stone cut without hands but not necessarily. Stone cut without hands means that it is not a human projection but is a supernatural thing--he ~~will~~ shall be broken without hands suggests very clearly that it could refer to Antiochus not being killed by an army--that it is not a great expedition or conquering thing but is something that is quite insignificant that will affect this man. Suppose that one of the janitors in his palace were to get very angry at another janitor and were to pick up a stone and hurl it at him and just as he did so Antiochus would come around the corner and it would hit him and kill him. It would be the janitor's hand that threw the stone but surely it is something that would fit this passage. He is broken without hands. Suppose that he were to receive a message and the message were to say, "We don't want you to beat us anymore and he would become scared and upset and give up that which he was trying to do. That would be broken without hands, even though it was the fear of some great expedition that would come if he didn't lay off.

This statement, broken without hands doesn't say very specifically what happened but it does say that a great conqueror who magnifies himself but in his downfall it is not the great nations of the earth that cause his downfall as they did against Hitler. You couldn't say that Hitler was broken without hands even though he did kill himself--he was broken as a result of half the world gathering against him, but it would fit Antiochus Epiphanes. As far as he was concerned--the Macc. revolt was a pretty small thing. It did threaten one portion of his empire because it threaten Egypt and it was the border area that he wished to keep in first class condition; that is why it is referred to as thus. He used to take the treasures out of the temples and one of the time in a small temple he was killed in a tiny skirmish--something that would come through accident. One of his generals came with his son that was nine years old and made an attack against Palestine--he didn't care much about Palestine. How about ch. 11? Is he spoken about anywhere in ch. 11? From vs. 10 ff. there are historic events described--is there one that very specific that refers to Antiochus. Did anyone think that verse 20 refers to him?

19 Alexander--that is something that he never had to do--that was raise taxes. Alexander had plenty when he started and after he conquered the Persian empire he acquired tremendous booty--I'd like to go through ch. 11 and look at the particular verses referred to. I believe that most interpreters unless they think it is speaking about anti-christ and there aren't many who do, interpreters of either the first, second or third views agree that v. 21 describes Antiochus and from 21 on for some distance we have Antiochus described. For a number of verses we have a description of things that Antiochus did and it fits--in his estate might suggest that someone came 2000 years later would come but hardly. Ch. 11 starts at v. 2 and this seems ^{11:2,4} about the worst chapter division in the whole Bible as v. 1 should not be included here. It was done because someone was very, very hasty and there is no similarity as the two verses are utterly different. Actually there is no ch. division but there could be a paragraph division. Then in v. 4 we see how his kingdom is broken to the four winds of Heaven but not according to his posterity or according to his dominion which he ruled. His kingdom would be plucked up besides those--Alexander died leaving an ill. son, a rather idiotic half brother and a child who was born a few months later. All three of these were used as excuses by men who came later and wanted to rule. Sometime during the next ten years someone each who had these different ones tried to make them the ruler. Alexander was the ruler and they all should obey him. In the end they all three were killed, either poisoned, murdered, etc. and none of them ever had any power. One of these kingdoms destroyed and one of the generals took it over and another one was destroyed so in the end there

were three. Then we have the kind of the south and the king of the north. We read in v. 5 the king of the south--now there were three kingdoms parallel on the south-north and the one on the south.

Talamy was strong and one of his princes -- Talamy had a governor named Philucus and rushed over to Babylon in 312 and seized it and it recently had belonged to him and established an empire which was the greatest empire of all four--it wasn't the richest as Talamy's was perhaps the richest and in a way Talamy was the strongest as it was the best protected and one thing you can't get away from is the description of Talamy and Philucus and the relationship of their sons and up to v. 20 there can be easily found an explanation to the relation of the Philucus and Talamy. Almost any commentary will give them and they will agree on what they are because there is very little doubt and there is critical argument as to what they are and here you have event after event in the course of dozens of rulers and it is interesting to go through it. Up to v. 20 there is all this specific detail about these people and we wonder why we should be told about each separate king who has ruled in the world history and we wonder why we should be told all of this about the Greek kings. It seems that perhaps the reason we're told is that we might point the finger to v. 21 and this shows what has happened and how it came up to the coming of this one. That is the interpretation that most people give to it and from v. 15 to v. 19 you have a description of a great ruler who was Antiochus's father -- Antiochus the Third and he turned, stumbled, fell and he was killed. That finished up his reign and his kingdom was ruined by the terrible wars that went on. One war was ended with Rome and forced him to reach a certain level and forced him to give up Hannibal who had been one of his great supporters in the war and then it goes to v. 20 and there it shows to us what has happened. The kingdom was bankrupt and he did the only sensible thing by cutting the budget and increasing the taxes and he got the country again on a sure, stable foundation and he did an excellent job at that. When Antiochus the Third was defeated by the Romans one of the conditions of peace with the Romans was that he should turn over to them his son to live in Rome. When Antiochus the Third died Selucus was allowed to go and become his successor. The youngest son was kept for a time and then released. Antiochus was a most remarkable man and many of his features were very outstanding. When Selucus, the first one was about 60 he took a young wife and then his eldest son, in his middle twenties, became quite ill and after much care it was discovered that he loved his father's young wife and Selucus told his son that he could have his father's wife to be his wife, have half the kingdom, etc. The people disapproved as they said it was contrary to the law and they then decided that what the king did was all right.

He was a man who arose by his ability and Alexander saw him and how he turned his back on the mere morals and did what he pleased as he was the king. You hear here of the most degrading things that you have ever had under any king--people cutting up their children, poisoning families, etc. Much wickedness. Antiochus had the background of this and his father a great conqueror who overran all the nations around ~~and took~~ until the Romans attacked him and took away most everything he had. Here is the son with that as a background and he goes to Rome as a hostage and for 15 years he lives in Rome and the young men are the sons of the Roman aristocrats meet this young prince from the East and they learn from him as he learns from them about Roman rule, etc. He is brought up with that and he learns Roman life, Roman rules, etc and when he is allowed to leave that he goes to Athens and he made friends with everyone there and he is a great lover of Greek culture, and he was elected the chief official of Athens and they made coins with his picture on them and then his brother died and there was a kingdom of Peridum which was near them and they saw a chance to get hold of the enemies of his father and so the kingdom of P. sent to Athens and he asked young Antiochus if he would like to take over control of this kingdom and Antiochus was much interested. The king of ~~Peridum~~ furnished the money and let him get into the country and he went about telling the people that he is the one who should be king. In a little while he had control and in v. 21 we read about the kingdom. Antiochus ~~Upifanese~~ was very proud and he had all that education and also plenty of money his brother had raised there in that place and he went and built temples all over and wonderful buildings and in a great extent impoverished his kingdom. V. 25 tells of the great army he took and went on two expeditions into Egypt and the great army came against him but his sister was wife of the king and he was able to be successful there so he tried to take control there in Egypt. There was much conspiracy between them and among the different leaders and in the end they turned against each other. V. 27 shows us how they do. They actually were conspiring against each other and in the end they turn against each other. What happened was that he went down for a second expedition and the son had made up with the brother and the brother was now in power and the son had been married to his sister but when he fled and been in his uncle's hands and the people had made the other brother king of Egypt and he had married the sister who had been the wife of the older brother so now the arrangement they had made was to bring this fellow back and to give this wife again and the two sons would rule jointly so they had the two kings ruling jointly now and really the three in the family were ruling. Antiochus comes down and the brother refuses to give anything to the ~~brother-and-the-broth~~-uncle and the uncle comes with a big army and he gets right to the border of the city and he is just about ready to take the

city of Alexandria and he has taken most of the rest of Egypt but the ships of the west will come against him and he will be turned and have the indignation against the holy covenant. He began his trouble with the Jews after he returned from Egypt and it was right after this time. The Romans were doing nothing about it as they were having a last great war with the last of the Macedonian Empire --it was quite a long war and while it was going on the young son of the Egyptian sent word to the Romans, "Come and help us." The Romans did not do anything about it as their hands were tied but now the war is finished and a Roman official who has known Tallamy came down there and there was Tallamy who had taken two-thirds of Egypt with his army and he was just outside of the last great city of Egypt and here came the Roman ships and according to the story the Romans love to tell--this counsel came up and Antiochus saw him coming and greeted him and ~~saw~~-said how glad he was to see him and the fellow put on a very stern face and told him that he had a letter for him from the Roman Senate and it was that they wanted Antiochus to get out of Egypt, take his army and go back up to Asia and not come to Egypt again. That was the Roman desire and of course there was no Roman empire. It was the Roman democracy that ruled the western world but did not get to rule the East but they put their nose in the East whenever they felt like it. Antiochus took it as somewhat of a joke but the consul stepped up and drew a circle and told Antiochus that he must give an answer before he stepped out of that circle. Antiochus told him he would leave and then the consul's entire attitude changed and they ~~had~~ had a banquet together and Antiochus covered his disappointment with a smile and then he left. He hoped the Romans would have a war again and then he might be able to do something and some turned against him and then he was afraid others would do that so he said they must turn away from old-fashioned worship and begin to worship Greek gods and then he went and spent money in big games, exhibitions, etc all over his empire and all this was done to try and forget his disappointment and he returned and had indignation against the Holy Covenant and most interpreters have felt that his fit exactly with Antiochus and there are a lot of things here that do seem to describe the way that he behaved. His young son became sick and this says here that ~~his-young-son~~ he shall die in Palestine and actually he died in the East and not in Palestine and actually the latter part of this is not true and some critics say this describes part of it and then some of it goes off into things that never happen. There is a gap and the writer looks forward to another one who is going to do this and that there is a jump forward. Some say there is a jump between v. 20 and 21 and more have said that some gap between 35 and 36 but if you have a jump forward then you have the definite principle of the gap in the book. If there is no jump I don't know how you get away from the critical view that

erroneous and you could imagine what is going to happen and what did happen. You have to have a jump somewhere it seems to me and if there is not a jump how will you explain it. If you have a jump forward someplace you may have one some other place.

Daniel 21

In Jeremiah we have it sometimes Nebuchznezzar but usually Nebuchreuzzar. The actual Babylonian name is _____ and you can see this would easily contract into Nebuchanezzar and so according to the spelling of the name _____ would be more correct but we wonder how it would get from _____ to _____. It seems more likely that Nebuchanezzar was the more natural way for the people to speak a word. If that is the case it does seem that you would have Daniel in the court and Jeremiah living across the desert in Palestine knowing most about Nebuchanezzar by the official writings and in those declarations but- he would read those names _____ but Daniel, not writing in the Babylonian language but in the Hebrew language which is a different type of writing anyway he would not simply put what had been written but he would write it the way you would pronounce it and so the idea writing it as it sounds is very much that way instead of writing it and in later writing he is referred to as Nabuchanazzour or something like that. The argument about the name of Nebuchadrezzar would not be an argument to prove either the lateness or when when the book of Daniel is written. Farrar feels very very strongly that Daniel was written at the time of the Macc and feels that it is an authentic product of the time of the Macc. He was the grandfather of General Montgomery and is the author of the very well known work of The Life of Christ and has written books on many phases of Biblical studies and on phases of Church history. There were some points of the Bible that he accepted very strongly such as the divinity of Christ and this he held on to very strongly. He is represented of the English school right in the transition period when they are living in the light of the old conservative view and have a tremendous love for Christ and are very sure of those points and adopted then some of the higher critical points. Today you find people either having given up the whole supernatural viewpoint or else they have given up the old critical viewpoints of the O.T. It is a transition period when you find a group of English writers who were very rich and fine in their devoted pious attitude and yet very much convinced that the higher criticism was somewhat questionable. It was this attitude that Driver had but logically their successors have gone on and ended with the higher critical position throwing over all that hinted of the supernatural character. The difference between O.T. and N.T. miracles is pretty hard to prove. It is like Smith, who wrote

In the Days of His Flesh--the preface was one of the most peculiar things I ever read in my life. He is absolutely convinced of the synoptic criticism but yet when he reads the book of John he feels there is something in it that proves that it is true. He is sure that we can depend upon John even though we have to give up everything else and of course it is better to believe in John Gospel than to believe nothing but it utterly illogical. With that influence of that background--love of the Lord and for the Gospel--he gives into them and yet tries to cling to some of the old truths and is quite inconsistent. Of course the Barthians ~~try~~ try to find lessons in it all but at the same time they reject the historic teachings in the New as well as the Old Testaments. George Adams Smith is wholly unrelated to David Smith. A man once told me when I was in Palestine and he told me how he had studied in Scotland. I had been in Germany the year before and had planned to go back there the next year because they were looking at things there from the factual viewpoint. They might accept the higher criticism but they want to know what was the evidence and what are the facts and that was what I was trying to get--what is correct and what is not. You could get that better in Germany at that time better than other place I knew of. But this man was trying to persuade me to quit Germany and go to Scotland. There he told I would get that which was beneficial. There you have the old Calvinistic background and the old Scotch background and then you have the influence of the Moody meetings which were so wonderful and then you have the higher criticism which has spread all over the country which made everyone keenly alive and intellectual and when he got through I thought that he had the most terrible sort of hodge-podge and I much preferred to get the higher criticism straight and get the Moody influence straight and of course the higher criticism originated in Germany. I remember one of the Scotch students in Germany remarking how some of the German prof. who were envying ~~that~~ the people in Scotland because in Germany so many ministers would hear the higher criticism and then they would go off and forget it and teach the Bible was true while in Scotland the higher criticism which was all wrapped up with this devotional life and then mixed in with this intellectual denial of all the teachings of the Scriptures and it made a very attractive combination but one that wouldn't last and the result is that if you go to Scotland as I was there two years ago, you would find the railway station just like a tomb. Sunday afternoon, not a person around and absolute quiet and now just since the war two or three might come up from England and only recently have any through trains been put on. There is a great deal of the old tradition but in the great bulk of the churches there is higher criticism. The result of it is that you can go into these huge cathedrals which 40 years ago were packed to the doors and today you might

The people just don't go to church because there is nothing there for them. Out in the country districts the people still go. I was up in the north part of Scotland and a man told me not to speak over 20 minutes because the people will get so restless after that they will want to leave. In the morning he spoke a bit on a nice little philosophical discourse on why it is worth while to believe on the hereafter and the people sat very quite and after he got through most of the wondered what he had been talking about and filed. I spoke that evening and I am sure they had difficulty understanding me--at least I did them and I just gave them a simple presentation of the Gospel and after taking 35 minutes you could have heard a pin drop. People were simply hungry for spiritual food but weren't getting it. But here was a man that had all these things that the man spoke about from Ohio Wesley. He has the old Scotch Calvinistic viewpoint, that is ^{Geo.} Adams Smith and has a keen mind and great imagination and often he will give a very good interpretation of difficult passages but he will rearrange chapters all around and when you go through with what he says about all you have left is what Geo. Adams Smith theories are. It is extremely unfortunate that this is the case.

22 Farrar points out that Daniel is on a lower level than the other prophets because he doesn't use "thus said the Lord"--Daniel is in an entirely different position. He is in the land of oppression and God is giving him visions of things that are going to pass--we read that the angels said that that he was giving the Word of the Lord. We must come to this conclusion and that is not to expect people to be logical. When I was in the Presbytery of Phila. someone presented a resolution right after Pearl Buck got out her book praising the book--Rethinking Missions--it was suggested that we have criticism of Miss Buck because she was one of the missionaries on the board. They put it up to the Committee and they got in touch with the Board in New York and they passed a resolution praising the board and then at the end of it they suggested that it might be a good thing if they would put an end to the circulation of her book--I got up and mentioned how illogical it was to pass a motion praising the board and include in it a condemnation of one of its missionaries--it seemed to me it had to be one way or the other and how could one vote either for or against and they accepted my suggestion. They divided it up into two and then proceeded to pass both. You needn't expect people to be logical but I think the Lord expects us to do our best and then in dealing with others we recognize that though others might be illogical we will be logical. You will find some very clear thinkers who will get their emotions aroused and then will become illogical in their thinking.

Farrar was straight on the great doctrines of the Bible but illogical on higher criticism and he lived simply at the time when there was this transition. You don't have to attack a man wholesale just because he gets off in a few points. Ellicotts Comm. on the whole Bible and the Bible Commenatary are very good and fundamental. They are quite brief and not extensive. There is no commenatary that can be recommended unqualified but there are some that are better than others naturally. I was quite disappointed on this commentary of Young on Daniel. He is quite good on the the historical passages of Daniel. Dr. R. D. Wilson on his picture gives a summary of the evidence and on the whole it is pretty good. He will give the dispensational view on it and he'll give the view of a certain thing and then he promptly give a reply. He'll give a view on the thing, the view of the church. Quite disappointed in some of his interpretation while it is somewhat good he does not give a good strong presentation of any view but it is not at all clear. You can pick up three or four verses here and there that would present a very good view but when he comes to a problem he simply dismisses it and doesn't bother really studying it ~~thru~~ through. He will say of a passage for instance--this applies to Antiochus but then he will say these verses cannot possibly refer to Antiochus and proceed to say they explain the anti-christ. I think that it might be worthwhile to read some from this book of Bevin- he has written this book about the Jews in the inter-testament periods. He wrote the book, The House of Selechus and this book is called, Jerusalem under the Highx Priests**he tells about the development of the persecution that lead to the Macc. revolt. He shows how upset the Jews were and from Min. 13 - 15 is reading a couple of paragrphs from this bookx. He shows how this was the first organized persecution for religious reasons.

23 There doubtless were individual instances but there is no evidence of a large scale form of persecutions. He thought nothing of asking the Jews to bow and worship him as Zeus and those who were used to many gods thought little about the new arrangement but Antiochus wishing to have a unity in the empire found the unity broken by a group of people who refues to conform to what he asked and all this was not a matter of conquest since he already had conquered Jerusalem and a great many of the leaders had already adopted these customs and were ready to hand them on down to others but now they were going out among the poorer people in the villages and giving the people the choice--they had the choice of worshipping Zeus as their god or else be punished. He says that paractices so irrational and uncouth--he thought all this would soon give way to that which he wanted. The Christians were prepared for persecution but the Jews were the pioneers in this role but how did the verses of the happy death of the righteous sound now?

There is a continuation of the reading of Mr. Edwyn Bevin's book (Min. 1-4) He contends very strongly that this was, that is the book of Daniel was written at the time of the Macc. and of course he says if we had the testimony of God as to when it was written that would be final but where there is strong evidence in one direction, it is very sure that what is alleged the testimony of God really is the testimony of God. He is right. Don't let anyone just say the N.T. says this or that and that settles the matter for you but look the thing for yourself and see what it says. Get the exact evidence--if Christ definitely takes the position that settles the question for us. It, that is the evidence should be gotten for oneself and not just take someone else and be sure that is really the testimony of God. I think that is very vital but he has not done that. (Min. 5-7 is again quoting from Bevin's book) Here is where he is right when he says the book of Daniel came just when those bewildered hearts required. The book of Daniel had the very message which they required and written in the first instance to bring those people of that time comfort in that vital and most crucial situations--in the whole history of the world --it put wings under thier feet. If this book, as he claims put wings under thier feet to predict and make out that it was predicting things to come to pass 400 years in advance and was just now being written, it was a pretty mean sort of a fraud--somebody then might have written the book and pointed out the situation and told them that God would help them etc.--it is such a fraud that it would be pretty hard to see how it could put wings under the feet of the devout people of that time. They would be the wings of fraud and deceit while people in the generation think of Daniel as a wonderful person--it would certainly be a pretty weak expedient. Most of the writers don't put it as written at this time but two or three years later, when the little band was fighting for their lives and of course in that time the book would be equally valuable but if it was written then, it would hardly be much comfort. To think of someone writing a lot of lies to be encouraging- it would be written right during that time and of course that would require pretty speedy writing. A few years ago they said that it mentioned Belshazzar but they said there was no such person and it would be something that one who was hastily writing a book would be likely to do but of course now we know that Belshazzar was known and though others had forgotten that there ever was such a man, yet what is said about Belshazzar has proved true. You may say that pious people in the days of Josiah wrote the book of Deut. and of course that is a pious fraud. But there is ten times the amount of fraud in the book of Daniel because after all it would be far easier to have someone make the laws of Moses than to suddenly make up the story that all this had been predicted 400 years ago and then expand how he loved God and His Word--it is ten times harder the religious

The thing that I was trying to bring out was the fact that Bevin brings out--it put wings under their feet and the book of Daniel and Rev. have been a source of comfort to people that loved the Lord all the way down through the Christian church. They are the two book par-excellence for people in the time of persecution and the book of Daniel had this as one of its chief aims. If it was written at that time it destroys the whole spiritual terror. Certainly it had that purpose, we certainly must recognize that God did it 400 years earlier.

24 --

We shall now look in ch. 11 in a bit more detail. We'll look at the 2nd v. as v. 1 we have said is part of the previous ch. In this ch. we have evidence that Daniel was so interested in the Maccabean period. I don't think this proves at all that this was written in the Maccabean period. It was written with a great purpose of the preparation of the people and written by the Lord. Some of you feel that Dr. Boswell has a different interpretation on this passage but after a night's discussion we reached an agreement and it doesn't matter if there is a certain alteration here and there. He recognizes the possibility of v. 21 meaning Antiochus and v. 31 . O hope to discuss the chapter further with you. Ch. 10 is not a ch. which any of you mentioned in your papers this morning and this ch. does not make predictions regarding the future. Ch. 10 is the introduction to ch. 11 but in 11:2 he says "now I will show you the truth----" Does it mean that there will be only three more kings in Persia? The fourth is to be far richer than they all and we ask who the 4th one is--Cyrus the great is the 1st one and the third one would be the fourth one of them all. Ch. 10 says in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia. Many commentators take the view that the third of these three kings would be the fourth one in the ruling of the kingdom. That thing of giving one number and then going on to another is quite a common thing in Proverbs and it does seem parallel here. In line with the usual reading of Scripture it would seem that the 4th would be the 4th after these three and not the 4th counting one that is not one of the 3 who is already here. That is not an extremely important matter. The important matter is that there were actually a dozen more kings in Persia but he is writing in the days of the first king and he says there will yet be three and the fourth will be richer than all of them and then in v. 3 " " and I think that all who read it feel it is Alexander the Great. We ask how you can get Alexander the Great after three more kings of Persia. Montgomery has a very simple answer. He says in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah you find four kings of Persia mentioned all together. No other kings of Persia are named and thus the one who wrote Daniel was familiar with the parts of the Bible already written and he could only find the four kings so he thought that was all there

were. Actually he was mistaken but you can't blame him as the Persian empire was ended 150 years before the time of Antiochus and it would be perfectly simple for a person to be in error on that point and think there were only four kings when actually there were a dozen. If this was written in the days of Antiochus it was an easy mistake for a man to make and it fits in with the idea that it was written at that time. Young in his commentary discusses who the king is and I think his discussion is quite good but he passes over with no question whatever what this vital problem is and makes no discussion on it. He says that it is true that there were more kings and he leaves it. It is true that it is a problem and we wonder how it is going to be answered. It is an important enough problem so you look at various commentaries and see what they say. What is your attitude going to be? One commentator does say that four is a round number and he just means there will be a lot. Ques. Ill. of Pres. Washington in US. and how the writer says there will be three more presidents and there will be a president who will send his army and conquer the Japanese Empire--why would he say three? Ques. It is not the matter if the book is genuine but what is the interpretation of the prophecy? If we interpret the book of Daniel in such a way that to escape the argument for its being a product at the time of Antiochus we must introduce principles about the futuristic interpretation of the book. This is a very good verse, I think, connected with that. Ques. about the archbishop. He thought it all sounded the same--the beginning of each ch. as he made them thus he made the ch. divisions. Actually it is continuing the discussion of the previous verse. It is a mistake of the archbishop but looking closely we see it is a mistake and it is not correct. Calvin takes the view that there are three kings after Cyrus and he says that one of the three kings is an usurper so we will not count him but leave him out and then Xerxes is the third but fourth and he is the one mentioned as he would be the fourth after Cyrus. Others agree that it is Xerxes but they don't agree that he will be counted as three here. Upold? on Daniel--a good commentary and well worth publicity. He is Am. Lutheran. It is my opinion that of the Lutherans you have the Concordia--the Missouri Lutherans who are very conservative and the United Lutherans who have much modernism in them. In the third verse, everyone might conservative and liberal agree on it. He was mighty and he ruled with great dominion but so did many a man who had an empire far smaller than Alexander the Great and there is nothing said here of his conquests at all but it is only from the context that we decide it is Alexander the Great. We have brief mention in the verse before and in the verse after we have his kingdom divided but everyone agrees it is Alex. the Great. The description of the conqueror who comes from the west and destroys this great land. Right there I find

a very ^{Leupold} unfortunate thing in Neopold as he says in ch. 8 here the great horn is broken and he says that is not Alexander the Great but it is the whole unified kingdom through him and his immediate successors but in ch. 8 it does say the great horn is the first king so it does seem he is departing from the precise ch. and I think that is unfortunate and I think that is a tendency of Neopold to interpret things as forces or movements rather than as individuals.

Daniel #25

I think it is worth noting about v. 3. Here is a verse taken by itself it could mean any one of a hundred things but in context I don't know anyone who thinks it is someone other than Alexander the Great. The verse before --about stirring up --Montgomery thinks it means the last king of Persia, Darius but all conservative commentators think it was Xerxes who made a great effort judiciously Persia would be like the Philippines resisting the U. S. --along distance to get over but a great force to do it and if it had not been for all sorts of natural catastrophes it would be hard to see how the people could possibly have been prevented from overcoming Greece though beside all of this there was a tremendous valor on the part of the Greeks and the readiness to fight. There seems to be a big space if this is Xerxes, between v. 2 and v.3. Of course if someone holds that it was written at the time of the Macc. one could say that they knew nothing about Xerxes. 539 BC is when Cyrus and Cyrus conquered Babylon and 331 was when he died--there is about 130 years gap. It is an interesting point but not one that is very vital. Let us look on to v. 4--now this verse uses rather vague language--stand up could be taken up as shall stop--stand in the Heb. often means to stop. It is a general picture--looking at history in a general way you see this man stand up--it isn't a kingdom that suddenly rises up and stays for a period of hundreds of years and he did conquer a good deal of the Asia clear into Asia, conquered all of India but in the course of the following ten years the empire gradually broke to pieces and 22 years later his generals decided to call themselves kings, but looking it up as a perspective when he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken--over a period of years. The four horns again is rather general--Ptolemy breaks off from this that is tried to be kept as one and then Seleucus, and then we have two more break off--in the end there was three though there was a time when there was four Macedonia was one of them and for a time Asia Minor was separate, and Seleucus himself conquered Asia Minor and while he was there he went off to look at a monument and while there his young nephew Ptolemy--his close friend that worked with him--he simply assassinated him and that put the end to dream of conquering the rest of Europe so the whole thing could have been united except Egypt

if Seleucus had lived another few years--so we would say that the four winds there was pretty general. You have three main ones though at sometime there were more and other times less. This 4th verse is very accurate but not to his posterity--they tried to keep the kingdom to give to his half-witted brother then when the son was born, they said he should be ruler and all the time they were really fighting whether this general or that general should be ruling and then they killed the two sons of Alexander and killed his half brother so that none of his posterity had anything for any length of time so that it was not divided to his posterity nor according to his dominion which he ruled because this whole area which he ruled broke up into sections--who are these--isn't that his posterity which is the most natural interpretation. Young says no, these mean other sections which break off but I don't see how you can get that out of the verse, but that is only a very small part of the verse. V. 5--the king of the south shall be strong--that is Ptolemy shall be strong and one of his princes--naturally he had many princes but this one shall be strong would of course be the strongest general that Ptolemy had. This was Seleucus was his name. When Alexander died he asked to be ruler of Egypt, that is Ptolemy and he was very wise in that--he picked a territory that easily could be defended and he never made any attempt to be Alexander's successor but simply took the empire of Egypt and ruled that for 300 years. The other generals tried to be Alexander's successor and in the course of events most of them got killed and they had terrific wars and fought for nearly fifty years back and forth but Ptolemy simply grabbed Egypt and held it. He was the only who did this. Seleucus was made governor of Babylon and after a time he saw how his life was in danger so fled from there into Egypt and took service under Ptolemy and so the Bible is giving an accurate statement but not giving the whole truth. After he had chance to get Babylon again, Ptolemy gave him some troops and made a rapid forced march up there and seized Babylon and became ruler over a tremendous area but not an area that could easily be defended like Egypt. This very accurate how Seleucus became stronger than Ptolemy and he had much more wealth and his dominion was indeed a great dominion--in v. 6 you read that they will join themselves together--who are these. Could it not mean a later king of the south. You can take the statement as with what precedes and have it refer to these two or you can take it as with what follows which I think is better and you find how Seleucus doing this. You find Antiochus II married Ptolemy II and this of course was a marriage made for political reasons--the daughter of the king of the king of south will come to make an agreement--the grandson of Seleucus married the grand-daughter of

Ptolemy and this girl's name was Bernice but the one trouble with this marriage was that Antiochus was already married. The people did not believe in polygomy and they did not usually resort to it. If they wanted several wives, they would usually take one after the other. So when Antiochus married Bernice he already had a wife and in order to make this political arrangement he divorced her or just put her aside just as Napoleon wanted to do when he wanted the daughter of the King of Austria for his wife and he just put her aside. Antiochus did the same thing. Ptolemy was an old man and he died and when he died Antiochus said there was not much use in trying to make a friendship with the king of Egypt as that king is dead and that young boy who is becoming king what does he care if his sister is married to me or not so he put Bernice aside and went back to his first wife. He did not reckon with his first wife's attitude and she was a woman of character and of determination. She said she was not going to take any changes on being put aside again so she poisoned him and you read here that she will not stand and neither will the strength of his arm ---- and who all is meant by this we do not know all together but Laodicea encouraged her son Velucus to kill Bernice and so they killed her, her child, and all of this to make sure Velucus would be king and they murdered the people standing with her. It does fit pretty well with this statement but it is not given in too much detail-- he that begat her would literally mean her father who died before she was set aside and some say with a little change it is not he that begot her but he that was begotten by her and of course, if you took it that way it would mean her infant who was murdered. Bernice's brother, the 3rd Ptolemy of Egypt, did not altogether like what Ptolemy had done to his sister so he took an army and marched into Assyria and he attacked Velucus the 2nd and he defeated and he overcame and took a lot of booty away. He wasn't a man of much character or of much force but he was evidently aroused in his anger by this time and showed a great deal of determination and he succeeded in doing what he set out to do and then he went into riotous living. Then we read how he will come into the kingdom of the south and then return into his own land. Velucus made another attempt--he made an attack against Egypt but it didn't succeed and he came back. It all fits in with the history here. It step by step leads up to the one who is the subject of discussion here. Some say it has nothing to do with Antiochus but it is all leading up to the antichrist. If that was the case we would not expect it to start with Alexander the Great. No one could say but what all these things might yet come to pass but they fit with that period. It is hard to think of all this in any other way than leading up to Antiochus. Quite a discussion here about v. 9 and the different translations of it. About two years later, about 240 when Velucus gathered together again power against the

terrific loss he had had and marched against Ptolemy and this seems a better rendering as it fits with an event which actually occurred though the other is a possible rendering of the word. Ques. about the standing of many years and since there is not the adjective it is easily possible to take it as standing years away from them. It can be taken either way. If you take the next verse as recapitulation and the next one is an attack upon him. He could have taken all of Antiochus's kingdom and the Egyptian people were all stirred up about the way their late king's daughter had been treated and they said this was unconditional surrender to such a force but the king said no when he had a tremendous/^{amount}booty gained and he was smart to realize that when you have a large empire to defend you can get into all kinds of trouble defending it. It was a part of wisdom on his part to not over extend it and so he will stand at this part and not go farther. He will last longer than the king of the north. All of these men had some other name--like the lover of his father, or the lover of his mother or some such. We cannot get this ch. very well. We should go on and look at the details in the ch. so study in commentaries on these different views. Get an answer to the critical statements. Decide with what events the writings are concerned.

Daniel 27

At our last meeting we were discussing ch. 11 and a very interesting ch. indeed it is but a ch. that is the ⁴clux at the viewpoint of the book. Whether you take the unbelieving view, the inconsistent view or the Biblical view you will find matters involved in this ch. which will affect your decision. I perhaps owe an apology to those real Christians like Canon Frear who believed that Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees and yet I called him an unbeliever. He may be a true Christian believer but I think that as far as his attitude toward Daniel is concerned it is an unbeliever's view. The book has so much in it that claims to be prediction on the face of it but it is someone at the time writing it as if it were prediction and that is getting pretty close to unbelief. Then when Jesus spoke about it and referred to it as the book of Daniel and then to say a later man wrote it and put Daniel's name on it. I can't then feel we are unjust in calling it an unbeliever's view and then of course it is true that the great bulk of ones who hold the view are unbelievers. Now the 11th ch. has difficulties from the viewpoint of a believing view to so great an extent that a German writer, Ziffer, in his understanding of it says the ch. include an interpolation and all of this detailed material is interpolation and he does not believe this is in connection with the Divine prophecy and there is a very brief statement about it originally and someone in the time of the Maccabees added in all of this precise detail. That is the view that

Ziffer presents and then such a fine man as Wright, the commentator on Daniel and on Zechariah, has adopted and maintained this view. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was careful in dealing with the difficult problems and this may be one case in which it did not impress him as a difficult problem and he cast it aside rather briefly and he said there was nothing contrary about it. Dr. Wilson usually went far into the difficult details. I don't think we should condemn him for having cast aside this problem so briefly. We do wish he might have dealt with it more in detail as it is a real problem. It is valuable to know about Antiochus as he is one of the important figures in history and he was one used of Satan to threaten the whole testimony of God and among all the enemies of God's work in the history of the world there is none more important than Antiochus and some say they are an interpolation while others say they show that Daniel did not actually write it. The liberal scholars say this is clear proof of the facts of the events of the Persian Empire and a brief summary and then when you get into the years of the century preceding Antiochus and there is so much detail here that that shows that the writer was writing at that time and that he knew that detail. If he did he is making out that somebody has predicted it and for someone to write and claim that someone predicted it when he did not is either a deceit and a fraud or certainly could not be effective in inspiring and encouraging people. Ill. of the confidence which Washington had. If they thought what Washington had said was not true then he would not have been able to encourage them. Regarding the difference between the second and the third view that also enters into this ch. Then he says there will be three kings of Persia and a mighty king shall stand up. Que. of student. Quite a discussion here --7-9 about the seating arrangement in the class, etc. There are three kings of Persia, a fourth king of Persia, a strong king stands up, and when he stands up his kingdom is broken. If you hold the first view you say there are four kings of Persia and then they say they don't know if there are more. As further evidence they point to the fact that the Talmud[?] we have evidence which shows that the later view started the whole Persian empire. The facts of the Persian Empire were forgotten among the Jews so it is natural enough then that they wouldn't know the facts in the writing of the time of the Maccabees. Here we have an evidence of the writer's ignorance of early times and so this is an important point as relates to the position. Is this a part of the writer's ignorance or did God actually give it in this way? Those who hold the 2nd and 3rd position insist that this ruler is Xertes and not the last ruler of Persia. They say it refers to Xertes as the 4th ruler and whether he is the 4th of the 3 or if he is the fourth after the 3. In either case I think all believers take it as

Xerxes as the ruler. Those who hold the first view usually say this is the last one. The ones who take an a-mel. view or a post-m. view, they insist that the book does not contain gaps and it gives things right straight along. How can they do it here and yet say it is absolutely impossible elsewhere? If they are going to say it is possible here why don't they say it in between. That is what I call the inconsistent view. They will take the same things and when they attack the futuristic view they will wax eloquent in the fact that such a thing is utterly impossible.

Ques. of student. It is entirely about what the views are and it doesn't make any really particular difference as I can see if it is the 3rd or 4th king. The first king is Cyrus, the second is Cambutton, and then there was _____ and he only reigned a few months. He killed his wife (not clear on the record right here). Darius, Xerxes, etc. I think it is more logical to count Smerdus and not to count Cyrus simply because of the parallels. I believe that all conservatives believe here that Xerxes is the one meant here as the king. The liberal interpreters say no.

Daniel 28

They say in the Bible you find a king named Aruxertes and a king named Ahasaura and they say they must take the kings mentioned elsewhere in the Bible and that way get four kings. If you get four kings that way which one will you take as the fourth? Since v. 3 speaks of the man who destroyed Persia it is natural to think it is the fourth one. That came from the time of the Maccabees. All will agree that there are a number of other kings after Xerxes--between Xerxes and Alexander. They will say Xerxes is remembered because he is the great king who tried to conquer Greece by his great forces. He made many attacks against the Greeks and if it was not for the remarkable valor of the Greeks united with remarkable good luck, as far as weather conditions, etc, were concerned, the Greeks could never have kept their independence against Xerxes. Early history is filled with Xerxes attacks on Greece and all that Xerxes tried to do with them. Then it is quite natural to say there is a Persian king who stirred up all the realm of Greece and then a Greek king comes along and he goes to conquer Persia. It is a logical rather than a chronological relation. A number of the Persian kings were passed over and you come to this one who stands out because he came to attack Greece. So in Greece and then suddenly the one stands out who went to conquer Persia. There are these gaps and it is alright to have gaps in prophecy. That is how every conservative interpreter takes it and then they accept it as part of something which Daniel could have written instead of believing it is the mistaken view of the man who was writing two centuries later. That being the view you take on this, it doesn't say there are gaps later on but it does not say that you cannot say that there are not or cannot be gaps later on. You can't say

say then that there can't be such gaps. Be ready to examine the evidence and see. V. 2-3 is a very important matter from the viewpoint of the criticism but it is also very important from the viewpoint of the interpretation of the prophecy. Once you admit the critics are wrong on this point you cannot deny that there may be gaps in parentheses elsewhere and all of this scorn which is cast by certain people upon the idea of the parentheses view in the church or any thing like that. All such scorn, if they are logical they must go ahead and say Daniel did not write Daniel and it is a fraud from the time of the Maccabees. Whether there is a parentheses or not must be determined by a study of the passages but if you do take the scorners view you must say Daniel, the book, is a fraud at the time of the Maccabees. We go on and we notice the mention of Alexander. He stands up and we notice that his kingdom is broken and divided to the four winds of the heaven but not according to his posterity or according to his dominion. "plucked up for others besides those" and surely the those means his posterity. Some try to make out it is something else and thus make it a problem but I see no problem to it. As we look at the two principal divisions into which it is made we know the king of the south is strong and one of his princes and he is strong over him and has dominion which is great. Ptolemy Logus, king of Egypt--he is strong but Selucus comes with one of his generals for a time and then with his help goes and conquers a great empire in the north, a larger empire than Ptolemy has., a stronger force and you could say he has more acute strength but less strength--more temporary strength but less lasting strength. Ptolemy was very clever and he seized Egypt which was not one of the main large divisions but it was a sizeable division, one easy to defend and he established a kingdom which lasted a hundred years longer than any other section of Alexander's empire. He got into various troubles and parts of his empire broke off and there was fighting all of the time and eventually it was destroyed a century before the Ptolemy one was. This 5th verse is true and then in v. 6 they shall join themselves together. The kings of the south and the kings of the north--the king's daughter of the south --the grandson of the king of the north first mentioned here and they make an agreement and his daughter goes off and marries and then "she does not retain the power or the arm -----he that begat her, he that strengthened her, etc." and we cannot expect to explain all of this in precise detail. It shows that she comes up but she does not stand and Antiochus divorced his wife in order to take Bernice and then after her father died he no longer feared getting on unfriendly terms with her father so he wanted to get rid of her and get his other wife back again. Then the other wife poisoned her husband. She put her own son on the throne and then she reigned in his name and they are a

series of unpleasant events that do not really deserve too great a place in the history records.

Ques. of student about who Celucus really is. Alexander was succeeded by his son but the son was not yet born. They all said that they did not want to wait until the king was born but they wanted to make his half-brother king. They fixed on one of the generals to be the protector of the half brother and to have charge of the administration. They wanted to appoint governments.

Ptolemy went to Egypt and became governor of Egypt. He acted supreme there and did not pay any attention to what anyone told him and 20 years later he began calling himself king there. One of the young generals was Selucus and he wanted to be made governor of Babylon and he was. He set out to try to make himself independent and then the one who was in charge was killed and another one came forward and tried to be ruler and when he took over one section and then another and when he saw a general who was powerful he would get the man to come visit him and then give him poison or something in order to be sure that he was the strongest. Selucus saw he was next on the line so he fled from Babylon and went to Egypt and became a general for Ptolemy and then when this man came to attack Ptolemy Selucus was his general who drove him back and helped keep Egypt safe from him. Selucus then got back into Babylon and he was established as ruler over the empire. There is constant fighting back and forth but it ends up with Ptolemy holding Egypt and Selucus holding nearly half of the empire and with another one of the generals holding Macedonai and another one holding Asia Minor and at one time it looked as though Selucus would get all of them in his hands when he was about 80 years old. He had the son of Ptolemy who had fled from Ptolemy and after much commotion this son wondered why Selucus should have it and why he should not. The people did not all rally behind young Ptolemy but what happens is that when it settles down you have these four different kingdoms instead of one. Ques. about what would be good books to have on this.

Daniel 29

If you find any place where there is trouble and then a year or two after it has happened if you ask someone to write up what has happened you will find it is very difficult to get two people who would write it at all alike. They would be apt to write exactly opposite. Also in connection with the things that stand out. There may not be anyone on hand ready to write the details of the events impartially. As we look back it is often the question as to how much we do know about this and how much can we be sure of in connection with all of this. So for the purpose of our course I think it is good for us to know that here we have a brief account of all the

things that have happened. Alexander the Great conquered Persia and his empire broke up into four separate kingdoms which were not ruled by his posterity. More detail is interesting and you can spend months studying it but it is not especially necessary for this part of Daniel. The main thing to know is that when the empire did break up there were two very important kingdoms. One was more southern than any of the other ones and one north of these this southern kingdom and the largest of the three northern kingdoms and thus could properly be called the kingdom of the north. Ptolemy the king of the south and Selucus the king of the north were closely bound together from the beginning and from this time on the two kingdoms are closely related because they touch each other. The only kingdom that the Ptolemy kingdom touched was that of Selucus and in addition to that Palestine is right on the border between the two. Whenever they would fight they go across Palestine and the kingdom of Egypt is absolutely self-resistant ^{existent} except in one regard. They had all that they needed--good supplies, wealth such as no other nation had and it was the easiest area to defend. Egypt had no wood and in the north of Palestine, in the cedars of Lebanon you have good wood and so it was ^{important if} possible for Egypt to hold Palestine and Ptolemy held Palestine the first century after the time of Alexander --that is the only thing outside of Egypt that Egypt held and that was Palestine. You see then how very important for Biblical history these two kingdoms come. We have the account of the first two kings and then we jump to their grandchildren, the son of Ptolemy ^{and his daughter marries} married the son-grand of Selucus and from those days these events are remembered in NT history because there were cities everywhere named for Alexander and Antioch was a great city and in fact there were several of them. There is the disagreeable episode of the murder of Bernice the daughter of the king of Egypt and this called a great bit of stir so it was put in here. In v. 7 "out of the branch of her roots--" and how can you better describe her brother than out of the branch of her roots. Continue beyond the king of the north and we wonder if that means live a little longer than the king of the north but that is not just what it seems. He will probably continue longer than the king of the north. In other words he will do this, takes a lot of property and then comes back to settle and then settles down into luxurious living which that climate in Egypt is apt to produce. Then in v. 10 it is very interesting in the Authorized Version we read "that his sons shall be stirred up" and one shall come to overflow. One here is in italics and we ask why it would be in italics. Why did the authorized interpreters do a thing like that? You could leave out the one and it reads just the same as smoothly but does it read as accurately? Yes, the last part says he will return and be stirred up to his fortresses. They put the one to show the tense. The Revised Version did not do that. The RV says "His son shall make war and

shall assemble a multitude of great forces which shall come out and overflow-----". There is a footnote which says "they will come on or he!" ~~and they~~ That gives you the choice of they or he. The AV says "one" and the RV says "they or he!" Why do they give you the choice? In the footnote they give you what the Hebrew says and then in the other they change it and make it a smoother sentence. It is smoother but it does not fit the Hebrew or it does not fit the fact. The fact of the matter is that you have the two sons of Selucus the 2nd, 3rd and Antiochus 3rd and the two sons assembled a multitude of great forces. The older of the two sons Selucus 3rd reigned from 227 to 223 but in 223 he died and his brother Antiochus the 3rd took over the realm and ruled from 223 to 187 so the two brothers are the kings and the carrying on of the war and then the older one went on as the younger one had died and the full details are not given of it as the Bible does not set out to give the full details. I don't know if this would be holden by someone with the Maccabean theory or not. It is not extremely important in the relation of God to his people but from the view of the history of Palestine this is a very important verse. He is such an important person that he is often called Antiochus the Great and the reason we call him great was due to the fact that he was a greater ruler than any ruler since Selucus the First. He was a man who accomplished great things for his kingdom and a man who if it had not been for the intervention ^{of} the Romans he would have succeeded in establishing a powerful empire but the Romans interfered. They had to fight pretty hard but they did it and that is interesting here as it knows nothing of the Roman Empire but the fourth is Greece and yet we find here Rome already at this time overcoming the greatest king except for Selucus the first. They put a stop to his efforts, made him destroy his navy, his elephants, etc. They treated him very much like Germany was treated after 1942, not entirely so but pretty much so. Antiochus is described from v. 10-19 and there are many details of the empire given here and it is important because of his greatness in the Selucian kingdom and it would have been very great if the Romans had not interfered and stopped it. Mention of Hannibal here and what he did. In the end the Romans killed his brother, threw his head over into his army and in the end attacked Africa right in the end. Hannibal killed himself so it is interesting to tie it together with that great event in Roman history. In Biblical history Antiochus 3rd is very important because he conquered Palestine from Ptolemy and that the Romans let stand and so Palestine up to this had been controlled a whole century by Egypt now is no longer controlled by Egypt but is controlled by Seluciac?

Daniel is a big subject here and a very interesting one it is. Daniel is a clux in many different discussions. Between those who think that Daniel is a book of human ideas and view points and those who believe that the Bible is inspired message and they try to fit everything in the Bible into their system. Instead of going to the Bible and trying to get the system out of there, they try to fit the Bible to their system. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson used to say that the book of Daniel is about the most difficult book in the Bible to understand when it came to the dispute between the Bible believers and the modernists. He said it was the most difficult one from four different viewpoints and I think it is valuable in our study to keep these four different phases in mind. These views are history, miracles, prophecy and language. I don't know if it is strictly accurate to say that from every one of these four there is another as strictly accurate as Daniel but there surely is no other book which has as many difficulties in all four put together. In view of these Daniel is surely one of the very hardest books in the Bible from the viewpoint of the Christian and yet it is vital to study the authenticity of the book because once you admit that the book is not what it claims to be-- a book which represents the messages that God gave to Daniel and the way that God interfered in the life of Daniel and his friends--logically, after you have admitted that much, you must go on and say that the Lord Jesus Christ was mistaken when he predicted certain things and said they would be as described in the book of Daniel and then he spoke of it as the book of Daniel. From either view, if Christ didnot know about it or if Daniel didnot wrtie it then we would have to say that we didnot have a Divine Christ. If Christ thought it was written by one who did not know about it or from either view then we would have to say He is not a Divine Christ, and the Creator of the universe. So it is vitally connected with the integrity of our Christian religion. Is the book of Daniel a genuine product of the time of Nebucanezzar written by Daniel as it claims to be or is the book of Daniel a product of the Maccabbean period? Is it a book in which it gives actual predictions of what is to happen centuries later and these predictions were fulfilled exactly as prescribed or is it a book written in the Maccabbean period of events occuring previous to that time and then they are given as predictions. and if they are predicted before when actually they are known to the man who had seen them happen or heard of them. He goes on and gives predictions from then on and between these two positions there is no middle ground. It is vital for the Christian to know which is right in connection with the book of Daniel. We shall look into the four views now a bit and we shall probably take the least time on language so let's start with that. In order to deal with the language properly you have to either take a great deal of time on it or deal with it but briefly and so we shall give only a brief summary now

If it was a course in ~~interpretation~~- production of Daniel instead of the course in interpretation then we would probably give half of the course to the study of the language. It is vital that we know something of the situation regarding it even though we shall not go into it in detail in this interpretation of the prophecies. In the older book from the critical viewpoint it is stated that the book of Daniel contains Greek words or words that would not have been known at the time of Nebuchanezzar and of course this is a positive and a powerful argument from the viewpoint of the language. If it contains words not known at that time but known later it is a pretty good proof that it was not written at the earlier time. If you have a book written about George Washington and it has the word garage, chauffeur, etc, which has come into the English language in the last half century we would then have pretty good evidence that George Washington did not actually write it. It is a powerful type of evidence. In this case about 100 years ago the evidence from this viewpoint looked very strong but then examination of new material in Mesopotamia brought to life proof that in the time of Nebuchanezzar there were Greek musicians at the court of Neb. in Babylon and these particular terms are largely terms dealing with music and if there were actually Greek musicians at the court in Babylon there is no reason why a man writing in the court should not be familiar with the Greek words. They might not yet be known to the people of the land as the Greek civilization had not yet penetrated through that area but Neb. was in a position to import the best of the culture of the nation and at a great distance from the court. Not only was he in the position to do it but we know that he actually did do it. Thus no reason why a man right there after it happened should not be able to use these particular words so that argument is not one that is much used now. That is the strongest type of a language argument.

The other phase of the language argument is much less tangible and is much more difficult to canonize. The language used is not such as the man would have written at that time. That is very hard to prove. You must have a great deal of evidence before you are in the position to say. For instance someone could read from Queen Elizabeth's time with all the "thee's and thous" and then you could read from Gen. Eisenhower's and there would be no thees and thous there and you would remark on the difference. It is in the grammar and the usage of the English language. When you find something with thee and thou in it you say then it comes from the early period and not later. Occasionally you hear a pastor go into the thees and thous in a sermon and it is the effect of the studying of the King James version. Anyone knowing Eng. history as it might be known as a German would know it or to a Frenchman would never dream that anyone today would actually use thee and thou today in conversation. Ill. of visiting a family in Germantown and the woman asking

if "thee" would like some pie. Many would not know that there is a religious sect that keeps up the use of the "thee". They use it in all common speech within the family. Language/^{evidence} can be very important but it must be handled with great care. In the book of Daniel the argument was based largely upon the view point in the development of the language. The Aramaic language is what half of the book is written in and there is a very interesting problem. You have the first ch. and the first four verses/^{of the 2nd ch.} in Hebrew and then the rest of the 2nd ch. starting in the middle of the verse is in Aramaic and you go on in Aramaic until you get to the end of the 7th ch. There we go to Hebrew. Why Aramaic up to this point, etc? There have been all sorts of efforts to work out a reasonable explanation why it should be this way and perhaps the best argument for it is when he is talking about the four nations ~~had~~ he uses Aramaic and when he talks about Hebrew people he uses the Hebrew language and yet this does not work out either. The 3rd ch. tells of Daniel's companions and how they stood up for their faith and how God protected them and it is dealing with the Israelites and how God protected them. Thus it does not work out. Why should the 11th ch. be in Aramaic when it is dealing with great world events? There is just no logical reason from that view point and it is an important thing to know in studying the Bible or any other subject. If you go to something ^{an open} with ~~hope~~ in mind you are then apt to go away with an empty mind. An open mind, in the sense that you have no theories is a mind that never accomplishes anything. I have known people who have taken a verse or two from the New T. and drawn a belief from it and then with that in mind they will go to other verses and explain them away to fit that particular one. Then it should not be used to say that this is what the Bible teaches but it is an hypothesis. If finding a verse that does not agree do not explain it away but think over your interpretation.

Daniel #31

Let us not take it alone and explain away the rest of the Bible to fit it. God wants us to start with the easy passage wherever they are and then go to the hard passages thus we are given the inductive method, the method given as the method of progress in any field of science and a progress in any field of study. If you try various theories and you don't find any that work and then you grab at just any one and say you will use it anyway. Let us recognize the fact that there is not a theory that accounts for the use of Aramaic in one place and then not in another place. ~~Riddle~~ of miller with white hat. It is true that the color is not especially important. I know some people who will try to take off the number of the fish drawn up in John 21 and make a big thing over the specific number. Actually why does or should the Bible make any particular differ-
ence

as to how many there were--why can't the Bible just tell us how many there were. Now in this case why couldn't Daniel have written in a way that was natural to him and writing in that way, he dealt in way that was natural to him and the Holy Spirit kept Daniel from error but that doesn't mean that every word he said had significance but it is this word and not a different word that is used. How can this language be two. I was much interested by a man whom I assisted for some time and under whom I studied while at Princeton Theological Sem--Dr. R.D. Wilson--He was a great student of O.T. and studied in Germany for quite a while before he began teaching in Western Sem. in Pittsburgh and Dr. Wilson has a very dear friend, Prof. Sachau who was one of the greatest authorities on Aramaic and I ~~want~~ to visit Prof. Sachau a year before he died but as I looked over some of the correspondence of Dr. Wilson with Prof. Sachau it was very interesting how one would begin writing in his own language and then he would refer to some that the other had said and then he would change into the other language and then he would write along in that language for a while and then something would occur that would cause him to go back to the other language and when you get to the point when you can speak two languages with pretty nearly equal facility, you are pretty apt to use the language you began with until you come to something that would cause you to change and then you would go along in that, and you don't stop at every sentence and ask yourself what would be the best language to use. I remember when I was in Germany, there was a young fellow there from America and as we walked we got to practicing our German and it seemed to be quite an effort to him, and after a while I asked if he would care to go up and visit this friend of mine and say Hello to him--we will talk to him in German just for practice and I kept on in German--Herr so and so and these two were having quite a time getting their thoughts into German, and neither realized the other knew English--they were rather disgusted in the end that they had used so much effort but all this had gone on without my realizing it. That is the way that Sachau is use to talk to Wilson. He would keep on with one language or keep on with another language. Daniel wrote in Hebrew but when he was at the court of Nebuchanezzar he spoke Aramaic and he probably talked it more than he talked Hebrew and in ~~the~~ v.4 of ch. 2 he tells how the people came before the king and it was natural then to go into Aramaic as that would be what they were speaking. I find it is easy when I am talking to someone and I say that he said something, it is very easy for me to go into German as I am telling of someone who speaks in German. Often it is difficult to make a translation but you can see how easy it would be in this case. In ch. 8 he started telling of another vision which he had had and it was most natural to

go back into that language. It was a natural development rather than one that has specific meaning. I think it is even a further proof that it comes from the time of Daniel and it is very significant that at this time he would use some Hebrew and some Aramaic. It would be so natural to switch from one to another that he would not notice while at the time of the Maccabees they were all talking Hebrew and Aramaic was a dead language and to use it would be of a definite effort and thus you would not do it in the middle of the book. (A discussion here of the naturalness of talking in the language with which you are most familiar.) The argument here has been based upon a philosophical theory that the Aramaic language has developed in a certain way and in developing in this way you have the eastern Aramaic and the western Aramaic and in the later times we have the eastern and the western and we have specific difference. We had nothing from the time of Nebuchanezzar until fairly recently. So they say the book of Daniel has some characteristics of eastern Aramaic and some of western and the ~~sig~~ characteristics of western Aramaic are sufficiently common to indicate the book of Daniel is not an example of just one or the other. Some say the characteristics of the western Aramaic are so prevalent that it could not have been written in the court of Nebuchanezzar in the east but must have been written in the court of Palestine in the west. That was the theory presented and maintained by Dryver and others but in 1912 in a volume of study by the faculty of Princeton Th. Sem. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson wrote an article on this matter of the Aramaic language. It was not just on a theory but it was an induction of facts and he was in the position to have the facts. Prof. Shau-- was only a bit older than Dr. Wilson but when he would get new documents dug up in Egypt he would send copies of them to Dr. Wilson and then he had the first chance to study them of anybody. They are open and published now but when he would get a new document he would make a list of all the words and then study the facts in these and got the use of the Aramaic earlier than any previously known Aramaic in Egypt. He came more and more to the conclusion that the difference between western and eastern Aramaic had not yet developed. So Dr. Wilson advanced the theory that there was no division to the east and the west at the time of Daniel and he brought forth evidences to try to prove it and the scholarly world was so amazed that they paid little attention to it. It is alright to have theories but label them as such. Test the theories. It looked as though people were going to ignore this article until 1928 when H. H. Rowley of Un. of _____ issued a book on the Aramaic of the OT and he began the book with practically these words, "This book is long over due. It is already 16 years since Dr. Wilson -----" and thus he set about to answer Wilson's arguments and he wrote his book trying to prove Dryver was right and Daniel is west Aramaic and not eastern Aramaic and there is

not such a unity of the two and if Rowley had written his book ten years earlier it might have had a greater influence. Dr. Wilson, the last thing he did before his death was to make preparation to write an answer but the answer was not so important for the simple reason that Rowley was already out of date. Prof. Bomgardner had written a series of articles ^{in 1927} on the Aramaic of the OT and in this series Prof. B. does examine the evidence.

Daniel 32--R.D. Wilson has proved his point --the idea there was a difference between eastern and western Aramaic is false and so he admitted that that argument which had been put forth by liberal scholars and that which Rowley put forth in 1928 was out of date and the further papyri discoveries fit in with Wilson's argument. It is rather odd that Rowley includes Bomgardner arguments though he does list his work in the bibliography. Of course that doesn't mean now that Bom. admits that Daniel was written at the time of Daniel--from the liberal viewpoint no one can believe that, so he built up a brand new philological argument to show how the Aramaic doesn't fit with Daniel but he did give up the previous argument altogether. Right after that R.H. Charles, noted prof. at Cambridge, author of the great set on Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha--in 1928 he also issued a commentary on the book of Daniel and in this he quotes Baum. quotation of R. Wilson but in this case he says though it is not the usual thing for Baum. to agree with a man like Wilson, but he admits that Wilson proved his point and then R.H. Charles evidently did not think so very much of the brand new argument of Baum. because he ignored it and made up another one of his own. So the whole three hold on linguistic grounds that Daniel is late but hold different reasons. When you find people who are convinced that a certain argument is sufficient to prove a certain point and you find various intelligent people agreeing with it, you might have reason to believe it but when you people who agree in a conclusion but think that each other reasons are no good it makes me wonder whether they are not just looking for various arguments to buttress up their conclusion and not actually reaching it with facts. Today it is pretty well disproved on linguistic grounds through the work of R.D. Wilson. I don't think you can examine the evidence of Dr. Wilson carefully and not come to the same conclusion that he did.

Now for the argument from miracles: This is a point which may be greatly affected by the general viewpoint. If you believe that a miracle couldn't have happened then it couldn't have happened at that time. If you are going to take a theoretical approach to something of course that settles the matter. In 1910 people in U.S. were convinced that a machine heavier than air simply couldn't fly and the Wright brothers in Ohio were flying as much as half a mile--their

plane would go off the ground and land and though the street-car line went right past the place, but everyone said that such a thing just couldn't happen so there was no attention paid to it whatever and when people asked the government to look into as to its value from a military viewpoint -- they just laughed at them since it was impossible, and it was only after Germany and Russia were already interested in seeing whether they could purchase--it was only then that the govt. gave a very critical examination to seeing whether the outfit was worth looking into. Here was an actual thing being done but people paying no attention since it was simply impossible. That is what happens when you go to anything with a preconceived theory. It is a good way to prevent progress. Go to the facts and see what they are and see where they lead and when you find a great many facts which evidence a certain thing, naturally hold to that tenaciously and you should have pretty strong evidence to dislodge that and you never make in progress simply on theories. In this matter of miracles you cannot prove it from an objective viewpoint since there is no way we can go back to prove. We can't make you believe that miracles can't happen no more than a person can't fly except that some day you might be rudely awakened with bomb dropped from a plane and if you want to believe that miracles can't happen, you have a rude awakening when the greatest miracle in the history of all the world happens--when the Lord returns to this earth and puts an end to wickedness and puts up His kingdom on the earth. Aside from that you can look at the miracles from this extent. Why is it particularly important to a liberal scholar not to believe in the miracles of Daniel. They are quite different from those in other books. They tell about miracles that happened off in some obscure corner of the world somewhere but these happened in the court of the greatest monarch of the earth. Abraham was mere desert shiek and no one cared as to what happened to him. But here is a book that claims that the miracles happened right there at the court. You couldn't have the story that great miracles were happening at Washington, D.C. without getting it known pretty well. So the liberal, if he doesn't believe in the Supernatural can't believe in the genuineness of the book of Daniel. Prof. Montgomery was very much influenced by Dr. Wilson's evidence, he said that may be a part of it did come from two or three centuries earlier and I think there was criticism of his saying that. Rowley criticized him for it. There were at least six times that I heard him myself--which was written during the time of the Macc. he would emphasize. The miraculous, I think has a lot to do with it. Of course when you open the Bible you don't find a miracle on every page. You find that they come in four great periods and the book of Daniel would present the third of those but there is reason why there should be a great period--the very existence of the God's testimony was at stake and it is very reasonable

that God would interfere even though He ordinarily doesn't do it. So in a Supernatural God there is no reason why we can't believe in the supernatural miracles--this is a particular argument in which we cannot prove inductively.

~~History~~--The argument from the viewpoint of prophecy has two viewpoints. (L) That a man living at the time of Daniel couldn't have put down with such remarkable accuracy but if you believe in a Supreme God there is no reason why it should be rejected on that score. The other phase is that the predictions are given with remarkable accuracy right straight up to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and then they go haywire. Then after that it tells of things that are going to happen and they didn't happen--he says that there is going to be a resurrection, that the whole earth is going to become the kingdom of God and this hasn't happened. It says that there will be a great expedition against Egypt and it continues talking and it sounds as though it is still speaking of Antiochus, but he didn't have an expedition against Egypt. They point this out as a very strong argument --there is only one way around it and that is that God predicted in the time of Daniel and that he predicts up to the time of Antiochus at the great crisis and there is a big gap to the time in contrast to Antiochus who tried to destroy the Gospel, God is going to destroy the wicked forces. It is very interesting how some believing scholars deny the idea of gap and then when they get to this point they just try to avoid it. They say that Antiochus Epiphanes is a type of the antichrist, particularly after such and such a verse and when you get to such and such a verse, he says this verse couldn't possibly apply to Antiochus etc. The reasonable way to take it would be up to this point is to take it as having the gap unless you want to be a liberal. Those who try to deny that Christ is going to come back to set up His kingdom get into all kinds of absurdities and making false statements. If you admit this gap you can say that Daniel wrote it but if you deny it you practical have to take the liberal view.

33-- If you think that it was written at the time of the Macc. you can't very well hold to a Supernatural God because your predictive prophecy is clearly a fraud. Up to that time he claims it to be prediction and then it is history and then there are other things that are to happen and they haven't yet happened. You better throw the book of Daniel out of the Bible, and say that it was written at the time of the Macc.

History--The argument is that an unknown writer in the time of the Macc. made up all this and he naturally got the history quite twisted. Then when he got to his own day he got more accurate but nearly as ~~many~~ many mistakes as before. Cf. the story of Nabonidus and Belshazzar. Forty years ago it was pretty difficult to defend the history of 5th ch. of the

book of Daniel that Belshazzar ever lived. Subsequent investigation has ironed all of this out. Prof. Dougherty of Yale wrote a whole book on this, Nabonidus and Belshazzar. It is almost fantastic that anyone would have the details down so well that didn't live at that day. There were many details that didn't seem accurate at first but on investigation it has been shown that they are true. Of course the big problem historically is the mention of four kings--from the liberal viewpoint it is very easy in the time of the Macc., that if the Persian empire had disappeared 150 years before he would think that there were only four kings--of course in the Bible only four are mentioned and this fits in with the idea that it was written at the time of the Macc. but if you take the view that there can be gaps in history, then he could say that there would be four kings--and call him Xerxes and then after a gap of eight kings then you have a great Greek king coming and destroying the Persians. If you admit this gap there you can have something that might have been given there and it would be true prophecy--there are two possible views in the book of Daniel. One--that it is a fraud and just made up. (2) The truly supernatural view--that God enabled Daniel to know about Antiochus, and that some day God would send His Son in the clouds of heaven. Then you have the Amill. or Post-mill. who have it refer only to the first coming of Christ--cf. Young's commentary. Many places in the book it ridicules the idea of gaps. Next time take ch. 2 and 7 and compare the two chapters very well.

We have taken the first view of the book--that it was written in the Macc. period --there are problems, one or two in them but there are none of them that are the really most important argument for the Macc. date though they are very vital subsidiary arguments. The most important argument is the purpose of the book --in fact, I. M. Christ's book Monuments on the OT which is on the whole a conservative book and a very excellent one. Some say it was not written then but he says there is no reason to say why or why it could not be written and it fits the needs of the Macc. period. The important point is if it is directly applicable to that purpose or not. As far as there being no need of it in the time of Daniel but the fact described in it actually occurred in the time of Daniel and there was great need of giving the people those facts and giving them the faith by it at that time. The taking of the people from their land into another land and giving them every opportunity for success and for advancement which they had not known in their homeland and then tie this up with the worship of false gods and they must have been subject to great temptations of a different type than they had been used to having and if the things described here there must be real purpose in giving them at that time even tho the primary purpose would not

be for giving to the people of Daniel's day but would be for the purpose of preparing them for that which is ahead. To prepare Jews and Christians for what things would take place in the future. The relation to the time of Antiochus Euphines is a very important relation but if one can believe in predictive prophecy then this relationship is not a sufficient evidence to compel us to believe that the book was not written until that time. One of the arguments must have been more final than that one and at that time. The argument about Belshazzar has been an important one but it has been about shattered. It would be good to collect all references to Darius or to the Medes in the book of Daniel.

Daniel 34

The three views, the one Young calls the Dispensational viewpoint, the one that Young tries to hold in his commentaries that Daniel is trying to show the coming of Christ and then the higher critical viewpoint. Now all of these views are profoundly affected by our attitude on Daniel 11. There is no point in going into some of the details at great length because they are matters of history which all interpreters agree as to what they mean. When you get along a little further there will be points on which there is not near that agreement and on those points there will be real value and worthwhile to go into much detail. My present purpose is to show what is quite definite and well agreed upon by interpreters of the book. We have noticed how it tells about three kings of Persia and how the fourth will be far richer and then it mentions no other kings-- does this prove an inaccuracy in the book or does this prove that there is a gap in the book? I don't see how it fits in with the second view--Young simply slides over it without comment and I think it is very unfortunate. Then he discusses the empires of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids and after he has discussed this at length he starts to discuss Antiochus ~~Euphines~~ (the Great) he begins with v. 10--it mentions sons so some say it must be they but the Heb. says "he" and you wouldn't use the sing. for two men--it is quite clear that it changes from the plural to the sing. You might say Mr. Allan began a book-store in Phila. and she is still carrying it on. We might not say it exactly that way but in a prophecy you might say it that way--He began a bookstore and she is carrying it on. You will find his name in the Bulletin even to this day, though I guess he has been dead for 20 years. In this case it says that the sons will come and will be stirred in the multitude of great forces and one shall certainly come and overflow--it is describing the first attack by the kings of the north and the younger one, Antiochus the III is ruling. King of the south is mentioned in v. 11 who is Ptolemy and he will fight with anger--so often I wish that we would go back to the Latin Bible or else get a new translation of the English because this

translation has so many words that mean nothing to us today that it is very deceptive. This was Ptolemy Philopater, Lover of his father. So Ptolemy IV was aroused to anger with his fine atmosphere and strong barriers around it and with absolute power and his voluptuous and sensuous pleasures of Egypt--for them to arouse themselves and make a big military campaign, would be something to take strong incentive--Antiochus III was making a strong attack against him, so Ptolemy was filled with anger and he shall set forth a great multitude out the multitude shall be given into his hand. Who sets forth the multitude and into whose hand is the multitude given. Naturally it doesn't start out to give us an account of all the details--one of these kings raises a large multitude and the multitude was evidently given into the hands of the other one and we know in this case that Ptolemy was victorious and overcame Antiochus and a large portion was taken into captivity. The account doesn't tell you here who beats who but there was a tremendous battle and it all fits into a certain line of events. If someone would say in the days of Geo. Washington, there will be a great war between the people of Europe and America and they will have a fleet of submarines and they will try to stop their source of supply--he wouldn't say which side had the submarines and which side put an end to them but anybody now looking back to World Wars I and II would know that the Germans tried to put an end to the transports from here to Europe and that the Americans eventually worked out means to put an end to them and if we read that today we would be amazed how this was predicted. He wouldn't have said which side, and if he had we would be able to think of plenty other questions and your predictions can't be complete unless you wrote a few encyclopedias and even then you could think of some further questions. All the events are just too many. He just picks certain events --one is going to conquer and take the multitude away from him and that happened. Then we find in v. 12 that after he has taken away the multitude his heart will be lifted up and he shall cast down tens of thousands, but he shall not prevail. Now Ptolemy did succeed in his victory but he got very proud then, and gloried in how he was able to defeat this army--he settled back to his banqueting and voluptuousness and forgot about it and let the defenses fall into disorder and thought he didn't need a big army anymore and the whole more or less declined. The result was that some years later Antiochus III had again got hold of a tremendous amount of supplies and trained another huge army and we see in v. 13 that the king of the north shall return and send a multitude greater than the former. This implies that he had sent an army before--and he shall come on at the end of the times, even of years and in those days shall many stand up against the king of the south. We find at this time that Antiochus did not come

alone but other kingdoms joined with him, particularly from Asia Minor and in addition to that there were some uprisings in Egypt because in Egypt there was always the danger that some disaffected relative among the Ptolemies would want to be king and this would be used as an excuse to start an insurrection and sometimes there were some kings that were a little kinder hearted than the others who would let their brothers and sisters live--so many shall stand up against the king of the south and there also we read an interesting phrase--also the children of the violent among thy people shall lift themselves up to establish the vision but they shall fall--who would thy people mean: would they be the Seleucids or the Ptolemies?

35 --It would be Israel wouldn't you think? What vision would these cause to stand? In the context it would seem very reasonable to infer that when the king of the north had made considerable progress against the king of the south, it would seem that some Israelites who were interested in motives for getting something for themselves rather than in the glory of God, would think that they had a vision, a message from God or a derived revelation, and as a matter of fact we find that Palestine had been under the control of the Ptolemies, for over a century, until the time of Antiochus. When Antiochus III made this great attack against Egypt, people in Palestine said, Here is our chance to get liberty from the Ptolemies. It is a very common thing that when you are against somebody you think that you are a friend of anybody that has your enemy as their enemy. It is a very foolish attitude but a very common one. ILL. of when in college they had no national fraternities but we had two local ones. They had all the evil qualities for which they are noted--One was the Owl and Chi, founded by a missionary but it had degenerated down to a very very low moral tone. When I would enter their house I would see all kinds of lewd signs and pictures. The OMA had a ~~much lower~~ somewhat higher tone and didn't do quite so much for the husky athletes--they were called the Apes--they went in more for leadership in other lines than something that just depended on brawn and they had a very close knit fraternal attitude. I had a friend that had one of these glowing personalities and came from a fine Christian family. The Apes were very anxious to get him in their group but he didn't believe in them and didn't like the evils that came with them and didn't think that he as a Christian should be joined to unbelievers and he declined, though great pressure was brought upon him to join. A year or two later very bitter opposition arose against him from this fraternity and there was a particular place where the other one was at fault--he came out with the idea that the Owl and Chi are a good fraternity. From any reasonable viewpoint

what ever the evils were of this one, were somewhat worse than the other. I thought that it was a good example the way in which a person in opposing something is apt to take an attitude which is friendly towards something that may be worse yet but which doesn't happen to come into your own per-view, and it is a danger that we should steadfastly avoid. We should keep our sights fixed on the true emphasis. We must oppose the harm which some do but our attitude should be quite different from our attitude towards those who are definitely enemies of the Christ. In this case the oppressors of the Israelites had been the Ptolemies for a century and they haan't been any worse than any nation, autocratic, than any such nation is apt to be but any such control is apt to be disagreeable. There were many who said, Why should we be subject to those thugs down in Egypt and now when the king of the north came down clear through Palestine and drove back the enemies clear back--there were people who evidently thought they knew God's will on the matter so here is the vision of getting independence so let us get out and establish our freedom and so they got out and tried to win their independence. Now I am not against anyone gaining their independence and it is a good thing if there is any chance but a very foolish thing if there is no hope--here in this case it was only a forlorn hope. They tried to fight against the Ptolemies but they failed in that. We don't have much historical evidence upon this but a little, and it may be ~~correct~~ that some of the evidence was caused by this particular statement. We have the Israelites brought in here for the first time. Here are the Ptolemies oppressing the Israelites and some say, O let us help Antiochus--why should we help the Russian bandits fight the German bandits: if we found it needful to fight one of the groups we could fight one and be neutral to the other but there is no point in making friends with one group of thugs in order to fight another group of thugs--in the end you would be worse off than if you had stayed out of it all together. This was a case of a small nation and they tried to make an uprising but failed, but Antiochus succeeded so the king of the north shall cast up a mound and take a well-fortified, neither his chosen people or selected troops, --his S.S. troops but he that cometh against him shall go according to his own will and none shall stand before him and he shall stand in the glorious land, and in his hand shall be destruction. The glorious land of course is here used to mean Palestine. He get control of the other force and destroys. We have Antiochus III here, and before it happened it would have been difficult to tell just what it meant, but afterward it is very easy to see how all these various small details came to pass. Zeokler followed by Wright makes all this out to be interpolations, put in by a writer at the time of the Macc. but most conservative scholars say if you are going to put one interpolation here there is no place to end. I don't see why the

Lord shouldn't have given this much evidence but of course the critics say that this was written by a person that ~~knows~~ all these facts. If he knew them, then he would have stated them more specifically. Very evidently he was trying to state it in such a way that it would look as though he had gotten from something given long before. I wouldn't say one nation is going to fight another nation and one nation is going to use submarines--I would say Germany and U.S. and would use specific names but looking forward you might do it this way. If this ~~man~~ were in the times of the Macc. and setting it forth as prediction then of course it is not a divine book and certainly shouldn't be in the canon of the Bible. Note v. 17--he shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom--he goes against Egypt and succeeds and forces Egypt into his will and he shall give him the daughter of women --who is the daughter of women? She shall not stand neither be for him. We know that when Antiochus III conquered Egypt, he gave his ~~son~~ daughter Cleopatra and that is how Cleopatra, the name got into Egyptian History--there were dozens of them after this but she was the first. It was a name that was in the Seleucid family and as one of the terms of the peace, Cleopatra had to marry the son of Ptolemy which of course was indeed a very clever scheme. That was how the king of Tyre did with his daughter Jezabel married to Ahab and you remember how she corrupted the whole land and about got control it all. Athaliah ruled the land despotically and killed all of her own children. In this case, here was a clever idea and that will be a sign of friendship between our nations and it seemed quite usual when one nation conquered another nation to have a spy right in the midst but in this case it didn't work out that way. After Cleopatra got to Egypt she turned her loyalty to her husband instead of to her father. She was a loyal Egyptian after than cast her influence on the side of Egypt and instead of having a spy down there, there was simply a family relationship but it didn't mean anything. So Cleopatra said, I am glad you are my father etc. but when it comes to politics I will stick by my husband and she is not the only one that has done a thing like that. But it was rather a shock and surprise to poor Antiochus but he had more shocks coming to him. V. 18--After this shall he turn his face unto the isles and it is sometimes used of the isles in the Mediterranean Sea but by this time Antiochus has taken over Palestine. He thinks that everyone will be friendly down there in Egypt since his daughter is down there but now he wants to extend his empire to the west and so he takes an army into Asia Minor and goes towards Greece and makes great conquests--this is an episode that could well occupy a chapter if Antiochus were one of our characters of primary importance. He is only being given to lead up to what follows. He turns his face to the isles and takes vengeance.

He was very successful and established the greatest empire that had been since Seleucus I had established or Alexander the Great. "but a prince shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease: yea moreover, he shall cause his reproach to turn upon him." That is not particularly language, but here is a prince for his own behalf. He doesn't say that the isles are going to fight back but a prince--certainly it is a probable interpretation that a third party will say that it is to my advantage to interfere here. You know that Hitler conquered Czechoslovakia and conquered Poland and Great Britain said "stop"/-They said that we will take action if you touch Poland, but did England do that for the love of the Poles. The very year before N. Chamberlain had said how absurd it was that we should dig trenches and put gas-masks on account of people in Central Europe of which we know nothing about. They let Hitler take Czech. and didn't think of Poland anymore than they did about Czech. and they prove today that they didn't because the Poles are under a tyranny far worse than Hitler ever thought of giving them today. The British have done nothing about it--simply they insisted before they recognized Machioldvich--he went over from London and became one of the cabinet members and then all the other members that went with him were killed and he would have been also except that he escaped with his life. The British didn't enter the war because of their love for Poland. They entered the war because they figured that some day they would be the next on the list and they had better put a stop. Britain did intervene but not for the sake of Poland and when we were in the this past war, people didn't say, We are fighting for Poland or Britain. Many said that this was a war for self-perservation and if Hitler conquers Poland, we are next on the line. That is exactly what is expressed here--a prince for his own behalf would cause the reproach offered by him to cease. Surely that would fit the case if far away Italy would have powerful rulers who would say, Look here--if Antiochus conquers Macedonia, he will be so strong that before long he will be right on us. Let us attack him now before he gets to us; that is exactly what happened. So the forces of Rome fought against Antiochus and there was a long bitter war. They had fought war 20 years before that, and Carthage had been forced to surrender to Rome--Hannibal had fled for his life and he was with Antiochus, a very very able general. The war went on for quite a while. "Yea, he shall cause the reproach to return upon him"--Here is Antiochus who has conquered Macedonia and he has conquered Greece and he had this tremendous empire--The Romans look across the sea and they say, This is going to be a real menace to us. We must stop it before it gets too large. The Romans make war on Antiochus and at the end of war the Romans draw a line through Asia Minor and beyond this line they told him, he must never go

They told him that that was the end of the territory which he dared cross. They told him to destroy all of his elephants and your navy and your sons must be sent to Rome as hostages. You must make you self subject to us here in Rome and you must pay us a lot of reparations and when you get through with it all, the reproach that Antiochus had put upon the Macedonians when he conquered now comes back upon himself. The Macedonians are now an independent nation and now there were two medium strong nations in the East rather than one powerful one. Of course you realize that the Roman Empire was unknown to the author of Daniel, and the fourth

11:19 empire is Alexander the Great but here Rome caused the reproach to cease. Now look at v. 19. The he shall turn his face toward his own land; but he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found. The Romans give one of the most potential conquerors of the world a terrific set-back. They destroy his elephants and navy and of course he naturally felt pretty badly. One of his associates plunged his dagger into one of the Roman officers and another man, a rhetorician wrote a beautiful ode in memory of him and showed what a wonderful hero he was, who killed the Roman tyrant--the two men were then sent to Rome. Antiochus went back, having lost all this money, ships, territory and so he went back to his own land to try and raise money. He went into a small temple and there was trying to take a little sum, about half a million dollars and one of the people there just came out and killed him--so he stumbled and fell--he died not like Hitler in a tremendous battle, not like Goering who was trying to put it over on the people but here he died in a petty skirmish. A man in the time of the Macc. might say I want to show all of this is predicted and write this, or God could have given this which fits the facts.

11:20 Then shall stand up in his place one that shall cause in exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle. His son took over the kingdom in bankruptcy. They made him leave his sons in Rome but the brother of Antiochus went back to the kingdom and of course while there he could have new sons born. There is a description here that in his place a raiser of taxes will be raised up and he tried to establish the land on a sure fiscal foundation--in the course of doing it, he sent his fine administrator Hieladorus to try and raise taxes and if you go to the Vatican in Rome you will see a picture there--you will see an angel taking this man out of the temple there in Je usalem and that is a story which we read in II Macc. It shows the reputation that Hieladorus had for raising money, but he saw a chance to advance himself so he poisoned the king and took the little baby and said this was the king but the people didn't take to this idea very well.

He set himself to raise taxes and set the kingdom on good foundations so we see how Seleucus reigned only 12 and in comparison to Antiochus he did reign only a few days since he reigned 46 years. It is quite natural to say that in a few days he will be destroyed. We might say that Roosevelt had a long reign--three full terms and part of another and that is a long time for a President but when we compare Edward VII we say that he reigned only a short time, though it was ten years because his mother, Victoria had reigned around 60 years. It is a comparative matter. In a few days he shall be destroyed and when in anger and in battle he didn't fight but just worked out a good idea to get rid of the Kingdom. After Selucus IV the next person was Antiochus IV who reigned. The description we have in the next few verses describes Antiochus and practically all interpreters are agreed it is Antiochus but not all. St. Jerome said it was the anti-Christ and a few have said that but most say it is Antiochus IV. Ques. about who was the brothers, etc. Take a paper and please write this ques. 1. When is the image destroyed? 2. When is the 4th beast destroyed? 3. Does the image have any toes? 4. How many toes does the image have? 5. Is there anything on the 4th beast which might perhaps correspond to the toes of the image? Work on these questions and some of them you may know the answers to them and some you may have to study. You may use your English Bibles. I don't want your opinion but mainly ch. and v. about what the Scripture says on the matter.

It might all lead up to the anti-Christ and take then the future things which are just like these things and you could say then that is what is going to happen in the future. It seems extremely unlikely to me that v. 21 is talking of anyone but Antiochus IV and it does have statements which fit Antiochus exactly and they tell us exactly what happened. Use of the word "vile" seems pretty strong language and then when you think of what he did to the Jews vile may not be too strong a language. Does vile mean wicked or just what? One who should not be king? Antiochus did not mix in the line to be king and he had a son who would reign and then his son would naturally reign and his son was about 9 years old when his father died and he told the Roman Senate his father had died and he felt he should be sent back to be king and the Romans did not do anything about it but there he was and he had a right to be king. Then his father had a younger son, a little baby. People did not like the idea of ruling and doing it in the name of this baby but in Rome was the man who would logically be king. His uncle was Antiochus. They didn't give the honor of the kingdom unto him and they didn't invite him in but he came in peaceably. He raised up his great forces against Theodore and killed him and took over. All this

time and friends were made and then he was able to conquer much about him and he wanted to defend Palestine but in Jerusalem they said that they had their law, their God, etc and wanted to have nothing to do about it. So sometimes there are phrases that don't fit Antiochus and then again many of them seem to describe him. It is difficult to say all of this is about Antiochus and in v. 37, for instance we ask just what they mean.

Daniel 38

When we get into these later verses we have no way to fit them with Antiochus although the earlier verses seem to describe him. V. 21 on fits Antiochus very, very nicely and up until 35 most interpreters think it is a very excellent description. It is quite plain from 36 on it is hard to fit it with Antiochus and you have a lot of things described here of the characteristics and you don't know anything about Antiochus and we have a lot of acts which he did and we know nothing of Antiochus doing them and in v. 45 we are lead to believe Antiochus died in the East. Some try to make the descriptions fit Antiochus but they have no proof that he did or did not do them. They try to fit it all in and then the description goes crazy when they see he did not do them. Something from the west that brought Antiochus out of the east and what this would mean we know nothing about. The recapitulation theory gets rid of a few of the difficulties but not many. Ch. 12 is the beginning of an altogether artificial division, Here in these first verses we have pictured the resurrection and we ask if it comes at the end of the time of Antiochus. It just throws a big gap anyway you word it. Your history here goes from the kings of Persia and Alexander the Great to the Resurrection and that has not yet come so there must be a gap somewhere ~~er~~ and he then describes the time of Antiochus and then jumps forward to the Resurrection or he describes the people up to the time of Antiochus and then suddenly jumps forward to the Anti-Christ or he describes up to an including Antiochus and then jumps forward to the Anti-Christ and most interpreters say that somewhere between v. 31 and v. 45 and most interpreters say it is at v. 36 but you don't have to be dogmatic on that. You take the second idea that says a gap or a parenthesis is foolish and there is no such thing as gaps or paren. then how are you going to get around the difficulty of the Persian kings --you have to have a gap or you find the man in utter ignorance in regard to the Persian kings and so it would fit with the first view and not the second. It is interesting how Young in his commentary takes up this idea of a jump or a gap and says it is completely wrong and then some say that Antiochus is a type of anti-Christ and he says that is right--he is a type particularly from v. 36 on and then

from verse after v. he says it cannot possibly apply to Antiochus and they go on to say there must be the difference there. You can't say it is Antiochus and a type of anti-Christ and vice versa it does all seem nonsensical. Antiochus as a type is an expedient which some have used but I don't think it works but actually what he does is give all the ground work for a gap. It may be a gap after the Resurrection. The big thing I'm trying to bring out here is not where the gap is but that you cannot consider this as God's work without saying there is a gap somewhere. Where the gap is we don't know. There is the definite start with Alexander the Great and a definite end with the resurrection and not all that happens between there are given. Thus you are driven to either the first or the third view. You have to say either it is written by a Macc. author who described the things up to his day as is he was predicting them from then on and from then on let his imagination run and it didn't work out that way. He thought maybe the Resurrection would come in the next ten years. Young doesn't see that but assails the dispensationalist and says there is no such thing as a gap but then he says here--we have Antiochus Epiphanes as a type particularly after v. 36. He is a type or isn't a type. If he is a type, he is one all the way through but how is he a type particularly after v. 36. How is a type at all. You might say that Adam is a type of me--he walked on two feet, heard and saw and probably was saved and so ~~am~~ I--maybe Adam was a type of me--that sort of argument gets you no where. If a thing is going to be a type of something else, there must be an important reason why this certain thing is given to give you a certain fact about that --there must be a special reason. It is my personal opinion that you can find wonderful illustrations but you cannot find specific teaching from types. You get your truth clearly stated and then you take this as a wonderful illustration. The idea of Abraham sacrificing Isaac is a wonderful illustration of God sending His only Son but it is not taught there but elsewhere and we can take it only as a beautiful illustration. You can't say look here is Antiochus so that proves how the Anti-christ is going to be like this and that--it is Antiochus that He is speaking about--it is one or the other. If all of it is a type of the anti-christ you must find characteristics all the way through to prove it. But if you say it is a type particularly after verse 36 is to say something that simply doesn't make any sense. If it is Antiochus who is a type of the anti-christ, then everything after 36 should also mean Antiochus. But he has just said that this cannot possibly refer to Antiochus--why then say that it is a type and if Antiochus never did this or that, why not say that it isn't Antiochus but the anti-christ and put in a gap or parenthesis.

Of course we might point out that the word dispensationalist has no relevance to the whole matter at all of gaps. It is very unfortunate that there is an attitude of taking a whole body of belief with a thousand points in it and take this body of belief and name it the dispensationalist viewpoint and if any of these meanings mean that, and there is no reason why that term should be applied, but in addition to that, this is the only way to interpret the passage if you take the Bible as divine Scripture and not the erroneous ideas of one who tried to make it look as though it ~~was~~ were prediction. That is briefly the big argument here about Daniel 11. I didn't expect that it would take us as long on going into details on which all interpreters agree since it will take three or four times as long on material on which they disagree. Of course it would be valuable for all of you to take time and do some study upon it and it would behoove us to take some time on some other important matters.

Now let us look into the comparison of ch. 2 and 7. You were to have this well in mind and tell what corresponds between these two chapters. (I won't be here next Monday and of course the following Monday will be vacation so I will have a test for this coming Monday.)

39 For anyone taking the course for one hour, a 1 hour test and for two hours undergraduate work it might take an hour and a half and for two hours grad. work it should take the two hours. The test will cover everything that we have discussed in class. In ~~the~~ grad. credit you should have all the Heb. in the book of Daniel. (For undergrad. for next time have the 12th ch. in the Heb. For the use in the test you may use your Heb. Bible. How many here now think that ch. 2 and 7 are dealing with entirely different subjects. How many think that there is a very close resemblance--one has an image and the other has four beasts--the interpretation seems to most interpreters to produce a very close resemblance and it is interesting to note in Young's Comm. in the first part, finds the resemblance very very close and then in the last part he gets entirely different results--that of course is an interesting question. Are the two visions parallel all the way through or just in the first point. What does the image stand for? It stands for the great world empires and the beast stands for the ^{four} great world empires. The first one stands for Nebuchadrazzar. We are not specifically told what it stands for and yet Young agrees that both the head on the image and the first beast stand for Babylon. Young mentions that we are never told how many toes the image has--I think all interpreters assume that the first beast is the same as the head of the image. We are told that the first beast is one kingdom, then there is a second, third and fourth kingdoms. As far as I know all commentators

that agree on this point. There are some who try to make out the first beast as being Assyria and they make out that a story was written at that time--at any rate the beast and the head of the image are agreed by everybody that it is speaking of the same thing, though nowhere is it mentioned. Here is an image that represents four kingdoms and the first is Nebuchadrazzar and the second is the body and the third is the legs and the fourth is the feet and then it says that a stone strikes the fourth ~~king~~ kingdom or the feet and it topples the whole image. This Babylonian empire included all of Egypt, Palestine, Assyria, and Mesopotamia--that was a tremendous empire. The actual territory covered was actually greater than the territory covered by the Persian empire though the Persian empire might have been more wealthy. You have four empires in each one and you have a stone cut without hands in ch. 2 which hits the toes and topples the image. Some take the fourth beast to be Alexander the Great--this empire will be destroyed by a stone and the empire given to the saints of God and since it didn't happen, the man who made it up was simply a liar. In the second view Young says that the Stone cut without hands is the coming of Christ at His birth and he says that this meant the end of wickedness and this was the beginning of the kingdom of Christ. He points out that the dispensationalists say that there are ten kingdoms but the image is never told us that it has ten toes, and therefore he says that there is nothing to this and says that it is all speaking of the Roman empire but when he gets over to the 7th ch. he says the fourth beast is the Roman empire and goes beyond that but the spirit goes on--he is quite dogmatic as to how many toes and how it doesn't say. You might have an image and not have the toes sketched on it but this mentions specifically that it has toes. (Min. 13-15 are very indistinct.)

40--If someone had said that the four beasts had nothing to do with the image there might be some argument along that line but if someone comes along and insists that the four here are same four as the four kingdoms mentioned in ch. 2, and are only parallel in some portions, then you have no system at all. (A long quotation is read from Young's Comm.) He brings out how the stone comes and topples the whole image. If you would want to wish the image to fall, would you strike it on the feet? The feet would be one of the last places that you think of hitting it--that is what one gets into when they try to reject the critical position and at the same time are so dogmatic on their views against the so-called dispensational view.

We want to see what the facts are. It is all right to make hypothesis but we should label them as such. We have noticed that there are three main hypothesis for the interpretation of the book. The first of these we have called the hypothesis of the critics. The book is written at the time of the Maccabees; it has no value for us beyond the historical value at the time of the time of the Macc. and this interpretation seems to have a good many points where it seems to fit in with the interpretation but we have found also that most of these points can be fairly well explained and most of the problems are not insurapable so that we would have to deny that Daniel wrote the book and now the question is--what are the two chapters that are the crux of your whole problem? Ch. 11 and 7 are vital in this conection. There are statements in these two chapters that prove that it couldn't have been written at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes because they simply don't fit with the facts. If I were to make a statement about a man coming 100 years from now and say I was writing a 100 years ago and tell about a man that was going to win a re-election and he was quite a piano player and if I had done this it would be foolish for my to insixst that it had been written in 1850 and yet just bring it forth now--no one would believe me. If someone said that this man is going to fly around the world in something that is faster that sound--it might be so or not but if I were to describe this man and tell about his playing the major legues and that he would tak part in big legue games occasionally --no one would think that was written in 18950 because everyone knows better than that--everyone knows that is not true. Now when you take up ch. 11, the situation leading up to him would describe him perfectly.

41 It would be difficult to see how any book would be accepted that had obvious errors included therein. Certainly someone living right at that time wouldn't put down that he died in Palestine if he died away out in the East some place. It is a problem--are you going to say that it describes the anti-christ, but there is a jump we would have to say. There is a gap--up to a certain point you can say that it

it speaking of Antiochus and then it seems to pass over to a man that is similar in some ways but is different in other ways. The idea of a gap is something that is seen elsewhere in Scriptures, and if you do not assume it here, it is either an incorrect description of Antiochus and so it makes it mighty hard to accept the critical interpretation. Right now we are trying to deal with point No. 1, though it is a little difficult to keep them distinct because they do overlap with views 2 and 3. If you have a description of someone that comes a great time later--that is the only explanation that I know of that fits. It would seem absurd for someone in that day describing someone that hadn't yet lived and trying to make him out as having done so. That seems the greatest difficulty of view # 1. Another difficulty is that of comparing ch. 7 and 8. There is nothing in ch. 2 that refers directly to the Anti-christ or Antiochus though there might be a place where we might think that he fits in but there is no direct reference to either one of them. In ch. 8 we have a description of Antiochus Epiphanes and it is perfectly clear that it is somebody that comes out of the Greek empire and the description fits perfectly with Antiochus Epiphanes--that is your little horn of ch. 8. But we might ask ourselves if this little horn is the same as found in ch. 7? Does ch. 11 simply talk about Antiochus or does it jump forward and talk about something different and does ch. 8 describes Antiochus as the little horn. In ch. 2 we have the four kingdoms which preceded Antiochus and we ask what these four kingdoms are and then we get into ch. 2 which gives us four kingdoms before the destruction of the great world power. What the four kingdoms are is a tough problem. says there is nothing that is more definite from the viewpoint of exegesis and that the fourth kingdom is the kingdom of the Macadonian ; the first is that of Babylon, the second the Medes and the third the Persians. He is very positive and he gives his reasons for his positive stand on it and that is the stand that is shared today by all who take the Macabean view. There have been other views to take these four kingdoms as other than these certain ones . The ones who take this first view say that the fourth kingdom is the one of Antiochus. Ewely, one very important in the history of Pentateuch criticism, said there was a story written about Daniel who lived in the time of the Assyrians and so the first empire was the Assyrian empire and then the second is the Babylonian, the third is the medo-Persian empire and the fourth is the Macadonian empire and that fits perfectly as there are the four empires . The difficulty is that it explicitly says in

ch. 2 "Thou oh King, are the head of gold.?" So the book of Daniel fans says the first kingdom is the kingdom of Nebuchanezzar and there is no question about that. Daniel was in the time of the Assyrians and then it went through a new revision and somebody connected him up with the great king Nebuchanezzar instead of with the Assyrians and what it says about the first one is actually with the second. So thus the Assyrian empire is preceeding the Babylonian and the view of the Assyrian is not in the book as it stands. The view of Ewald requires there be a very great editing of the book and it would be a hard thing to try to get around this thing and you only have three kingdoms around Nebuchanezzar and Antiochus. Then Hipsees made the second event. Hatig (spelling indistinct.) ^{German} another noted commentator said the first kingdom is that of Nebuchanezzar, the second is that of Belshazzar and the third kingdom is the kingdom of Neo-Persia and the fourth is the Maccadonean. The difficulty in that is that ~~it~~ that it speaks of them as kingdoms and the last two are kingdoms that have a long king and it is hard to see why Nebuchanezzar alone would be one and Belshazzar would be the second one and it is pretty well given up and not adopted by scholars today. This then was the second attempt which did not work and was not accepted and they said the first was Babylon, the second neo-Persia and the third is an empire of Alexander the Great and the fourth one is the successor to Alexander the Great -- that is Antiochuses and the Seleucids. There are those who adopted this interpretation but that also does not fit and many will hold that the fourth kingdom is that of the Macedonians and they hold that the Medes and Persians have two different empires -- you do have Darius the Mede and then also Cyrus, the Persian. You have in ch. 5. when Darius the Mede, took over the kingdom when Belshazzar died. In ch. 6 we have Darius the Mede mentioned again and that might suggest that he had a great kingdom would it not. So taking the facts by themselves, it would seem that the Medes and the Persians had two distinct empires. There is less difficulty with this view than any of the other views, and therefore I think that we can say that all critical scholars accept this view. Of course there are some who would disagree such as Farrar etc.

42. I think that we must be very careful about making theories without enough facts. I remember reading in LIFE magazine which mentioned about a man who drank rye whiskey and ~~soda~~ soda water and was drunk, then brandy and soda water and he was drunk and then Wed. he drank some other alacolic beveridge and soda water and was drunk--here is a variable and

yet each day he was drunk, yet he drank soda water each time so that is what made him drunk some might argue. The article was making fun of a superficial scientific method because something happening just three times in a row is not enough to prove anything at all. I heard a hissing sound a little bit ago and at first I thought that it was connected with this machine, instead of the water pipes over here, but unless that happened every time that I turned on this machine, I would have no reason to think that the two were connected, You have to get all of the facts and find out then what is in common with them all--~~that~~ there was another common factor, and that was alcohol but that might not at first be obvious to one that had examined various factors and found the common one. Now it is easy to simply pick out a fact here and there and prove that the book of Daniel teaches two distinct empires, but that is not taking all of the facts that are shown. We do find some facts that look in opposite direction. Someone might say that in the image in ch. 2 the man has two shoulders and that proves the duo-idea of the kingdoms, but no where is that stated. But in the 7th ch. or 8th, you find that this horn came out of the he-goat and then another horn came out which was higher--it was quite evident that there is some meaning connected with where the horns came from and suggests that there are two different parts to this kingdom--that there is one that comes into prominence later than the first and it is the more important of the two. You know that this empire was first a Median empire and then the Persians took over--it fits the facts and there can be no questions here but that here it is speaking of a duo-empire and then in the 8th ch. it speaks of the kings of Medo-Persia. It uses the two together and is spoken of as a unit. It speaks of the law of the Medes and the Persians cannot be broken and if the next empire is the Persians, why would you talk about them as though they were together. There are a few isolated facts that one could take and make out that . Just because Darius is spoken of as the king, doesn't prove that he was the emperor. Napoleon made his son the king of Rome and it has been quite a common thing when someone is emperor to have several kings under him. Of course Darius might have been one of the emperors of the Medo-Persian empire but the difficulty with that is that we have no historical proof outside of the Bible that he ever lived. Of course the critics make much of no empire of the Medes being found and they would like to prove that Daniel was utterly wrong and of course that means that the book was not written by Daniel but by someone living at the time of the Macc. that didn't know any differently, and of course if history doesn't matter and the facts don't matter, but just the great spiritual truths,

then it doesn't matter, but if it is God's Word, then we would look for another answer. Then we would contend that the Medo-Persian empire is one and counted as one in the book of Daniel. There are two places it speaks of this man Darius as having become king. It is interesting that in those two places there is unusual praise used about him. The first of those in Dan. 5 and there we have the reference as becoming king. "Darius the Mede was received the kingdom". It is a bit unusual the use of this word. It does not give the impression of being seized. The other the other reference is in 9:1. When it says made king, it is an unusual phrase to use. It does fit with the hypothesis ^{not} that there is a great Median empire established by force after the Babylonian and before the Persian but it does fit with the hypothesis that Darius is the ^{sub}son-of-the king under the Medo-Persian kingdom--the one conquerors and then he makes Darius ruler over it. We have this other evidence of the Medes and the Persians in the books. Taking the book apart from any outside history, it is highly questionable if there is taught here any separate Median empire but instead it goes the other way and it is taught instead that it is Medo-Persian. The book as it stands has another purpose and it does not fit with the critical idea that it is all about the Maccabean period. That is one thing it is looking to but it is by no means the whole view point. In ch. 2 it tells of the stone cut out of the mountain. This stone breaks in pieces the iron, gold, etc. and this stone makes sure what is to come to pass in the future but we find that the great world gov. continued after that and continues until this day. The prediction in ch. 2 does not fit with Antiochus unless there is a great gap. In the 2nd ch. we have four kingdoms and things cut without hands seems supernatural. In ch. 7 we read of these four animals. He then says that he beheld until the body destroyed and there was one like the Son of Man. The stone is cut without human hands and then the fourth beast is destroyed and burned up and there is one who comes with power supernaturally. The two will thus correspond. This latter one has control and power over all kingdoms. *This being the case then it seems to show this is the end of the 4th kingdom and then there is set up the eternal kingdom and it destroys all other forces. We find that Rome is not the 3rd and 4th kingdom and we find there were Jews who said the fourth kingdom is the kingdom of Rome's not the 3rd of Paul but is the 4th. In the middle ages you had the great Turkish empire which was bigger than the Roman had ever been and the Jewish Rabbi said it might be the 4th kingdom. Calvin devotes about 9 pages to

* DANIEL #43

this view in his commentary. I wish you would take Calvin for next time and outline those pages and get this view. See what the big arguments are. See what Calvin gives an answer to this and about the stone cut without hands. We are not so interested now in the Turkish view. This is then the difficulty in ch. 2 and now as you go into ch. 8 you have the king of Medo-Persia which is the two horns and you are told of Antiochus who stands up against the prince of princes and was broken without hands. The Romans came and told him to clear off and he did and went out and soon died and thus no hands broke him. In ch. 7 we see the 4th beast is destroyed and there might be room for a kingdom to come in here. Same difficulty in ch. 11. The verses here do not work out in perfect description of him as there are many details that do not fit Antiochus. The Maccabean view does not explain the facts of all the book alright. The question comes up why anyone would talk of 4th kingdom in Antiochus's day. That is no great question when we realize how he was told to get out and he did immediately and the 4th kingdom was in close view. The Macc. view does not quite fit but in handling that view as to deny the Macc. view, it is then a little hard to stop with the 2nd view. He will stop on passages and then on other passages he will give views that are inconsistent. Why should he attack it and at the same time admit the views. Discussion here about the views. When there is something that looms large then there is no reason why there can't be quite a many things that can loom large also. It becomes a question of examining what becomes large and what does not. The destruction of these kingdoms has not yet occurred. and it is important to determine what has happened and what has not. Dis. again about the kingdoms and just what ones could be destroyed. Now we have been looking at this first view that all had application to the Macc. view. The view that it was written at the time of the Macc. a Christian cannot accept because so much of it is a fraud and misrepresentation. Although if it was written at the time of Daniel it had many historical statements that did not work out that way. So I think we can say it is strong enough to give us the opinion that it denies the accuracy and dependability of Daniel but it is also sufficient to us to prove the opposition of the primary interest and so I think it is sufficient to us to give up the critical view of the denial of the book of Daniel. There is at least one more focus in the book of Daniel which is of great interest. Things that are going to come to pass we must find evidence if they are going to come at one time or later on and their relationship, etc. If we do not take the first view then we would take the one that the book is talking about the Macc. period but it is

also looking forward to the coming of Christ--that greatest event that has ever occurred in history and will ever occur. There is no greater thing than this. Thus it would be entirely proper for the book of Daniel to have two important things--first to tell us about Antiochus and then secondly to tell us about Christ coming and dying on the cross. The question then comes if that is the case or if there is still the third view in the book.

Daniel #44.

The question then comes as to how great an extent this second view enters into the book. The thing is stressed ahead of the Macc. or behind everything else is the question also. Is there another focus different from this that is vital in the book? Intro. of Dr. Young's book and there you would not get the impression that there is much beyond the coming of Christ. I'm not sure that you would get the idea that there is more than one coming even involved. Quote from p. 17. "although the exile did bring to an end the outward organization of the people at the establishing of Sinai and also introduced a new period and it may be regarded as transitional, etc, etc." The exile was the last great repentance before the coming of the Lord so you see there are two great views in the book. Antiochus is before the coming of the Lord. The awful things that happened to Antiochus and the period of indignation--in fact you might almost say there are three dispensations--the period of Sinai, the dispensation of Sinai and the dispensation of the coming of the Lord. The period of the dispensation of indig. begins in 586 and when the days begin to run their course God reveals the facts to Daniel and gives him the times, etc. Withing a period of 600 years you have the one great event you are looking forward to. The indig. begins with the exile. The first ten years would have been the ones and it is hard to think of them as important when the entire time is 600 years. You look forward to the great event of the persecution of Antiochus and it comes at a certain time but in there there is a gap of years. It is very peculiar math. and it is an inference from the book. It is an attempt to picture the history of that time. The coming of the Lord, the trouble of Antiochus and the setting of the kingdom are the things dealt with here. As you go through the book the general impressions fit with this description but every now and then he takes an opposing and critical viewpoint. He takes a view of dealing with something that has not even yet happened after over 1900 years since the coming of the Lord. It is an inconsistent sort of view and not much taken today.

In dealing with views as you study into them you may find where you think the man is most inconsistent. There may be an important phase overlooked and maybe he does not have the points

connected and when you find something that does not come to your views and then you should put it up on the shelf and say that there may be a vital factor which you have not considered. They take up these points one by one in context of material. If they would put them aside and then compare and contrast them you would see more to it. Ill. of Newton and what he has done with the facts here. In the book of Daniel we should not condemn the writer's intelligence if he has overlooked some of the facts but we should look at it bothways. Then the second view gives forth the book as it stands. You do not have here a great prominence given to Christ and the sacrifice him- himself. We should see if there is a problem and see then how the writer has dealt with the problem. The second view has very little that deals with Is. 53 and John. There are many things which are brought out which are very different. We are living in the shadow of ^{this} these-great events and sometimes we look for other things and then again we don't as we should. We should not overlook this great event. The difference between v. 1 and v. 2 then is the coming of Christ to die on Calvary. / and then in v. 3 is the coming of Christ to set up the kingdom. It might be said that way but it is not necessary to say it that way. According to the 3rd it may be prominent and it may not be at all. There are events of either a third great focus or a second great focus. We are interested in seeing if the book if properly interpreted from this 2nd viewpoint. Take the second ch. and there we have no mention of Antiochus whatever. We ask then where he is concerned and where he does come in. We must be careful to not drag him in.

Daniel 45.

We ask why the 2nd ch. was given. Did God give it to the Jews? Did He give it to Nebuchanezzar

It isn't important to Nebuchanezzar that there will be an anti-Christ but it is important to him to know that his kingdom will not be the only one but that there will be others after his. It is important to him to know that God is going to sometime bring all the kingdoms to an end. It is written down for the Jews but it is given in the first instance for the king--the vision he has is interpreted by a Jew. There is no indication here that it is in opposition to God. V. 38 recognizes that Nebuchanezzar's kingdom is a diving kingdom. Quote v. 37. The beasts of the field, fowls of the air are in his hands. In this ch. he is not talking about the opposition to God but what is happening just at that time. As we take just those verses we ask how many empires are represented? How many sections of this image have connection with different empires? There is a definite difference in the

various parts of the Beast. There is no statement to say there is clay in any other part than in feet. Thus from these verses you must say there are either 4 kingdoms or 5 and you cannot tell which. You have no right to jump to any conclusion either way. If there are five empires taught here then it would seem there is something of a change here in the 4th one. Then you have five changes in the material and you might say the eyes are beautiful, etc. but you would get in alot that does not have any meaning. Several commentators just pass that fact over but it does seem to me that they do deserve notice. How is the Medo-Persian kingdom inferior to that of Nebuchanezzar? The Medo-Persian empire conquered the Nebuch. empire and it was larger. Some say it was inferior in wealth, some say in duration, etc. Nebuchanezzar's lasted for many years and so on about the length of the empires. The Babylonian empire was wicked and the Medo-Persian had even alot more wickedness. In the Greek there is more and in the Roman there is far more yet. I don't know what proof we have in this respect, though. Some just say it and think it but it is not proved. Young say it was inferior because it was divided. We then ask how it would be inferior because it is divided. I don't see then how Young's answer helps any then either. It is a perfectly valid thing if you have the evidence to back it up but you don't seem to have. I am inclined to think that the word inferior as it actually means lower down and of less importance although originally it only meant entirely lower down. I don't see why it has to be. That which comes after wards is not necessarily of less value but I don't see why it has to be of less value and lower down. It seems to me that is an entirely valid interpretation taking the word generally. To avoid saying why it is of less value, I think we cannot use just that meaning. Ques. of student about all of this. Something about being lower down at the shoulders, etc. Could start with the feet and go up or start and go down. Then you can say a kingdom at the head and then one lower down.

Daniel #46. Now here it mentions that there is a kingdom inferior--first the head of gold is mentioned and then wouldn't it better to say instead of "inferior" lower down. It would be quite natural to say that starting from the left side of the room, to the left there is an eraser and then another eraser and so forth. I think that it is Leipold that says that gold was typical of Babylon and then silver represents commerce and then bronze was typical of the Greek empire and then the iron was typical of Rome, but I would think that he would have to have a great deal more evidence to show that all these other metals were a whole lot

weaker. I don't know but that bronze is almost as strong as iron, depending on what kind of alloy is used. Certainly gold is stronger than silver--at least they use it more for filling teeth if they expect it to last longer. I think it is Calvin that takes the clay as typical of the weakness in the democratic organization and you have all this organization, and we would say that the clay did show a definite weakness, but as to just what it is, maybe we can't be so sure. We have a right and duty to make guesses but no right to make dogmatic assertions. It is Daniel talking here and speaks to the king and tells him that after him a kingdom will arise that is inferior to him but we would also add that, since he is speaking the Word of God whatever he says is true. I think that it would be mighty hard to prove and if it were a moral issue at stake, I am not so sure how flattered Nebuchadrazzar would be, since I am not so sure how moral his kingdom was in the first place, and the Medo-Persian empire had a very high standard of morality which I am sure was not inferior to it. Of course it is true that when the Greeks came along, they just did about what they pleased and left the morality of the Medo-Persians right behind and of course it might be an idea to bring in anything that would flatter the king provided that it was not going against the truth and most commentators try to find this way or that in proving how the kingdoms were inferior but I have yet to see a satisfactory explanation. Now we have the 4th kingdom of iron but in v. 41 we see that the kingdoms are going to be divided and that the bottom of the image is going to be mixed with iron and clay--What does he mean that the kingdoms are going to be divided. Does this mean that its nature is going to be divided or that the kingdoms will be divided--doesn't this mean that a division takes place in the kingdom. In v. 42 it mentions the toes specifically--that would seem that there is a definite progress from feet to toes. V. 43 is a very strange verse and I know I don't know what it means and I doubt whether anyone else knows what it means. I have never come across any interpretation other than it just seemed a bunch of words. Listen to Young's interpretation which he gives on p. 78. He makes fun of Ironsides' view and then mentions that no where are ten toes mentioned. He then points out that the fourth kingdom here is not connected with the other kingdoms--where else wou'd one strike the image to make it fall than on the feet. Apparently he had never done any boxing. He says that the Lord then comes and sets up the kingdom, which is at His first coming--that is in general what Leipold and Calvin both hold, for the 2nd ch. But the question is how much of

ch. 7 hold and the question as to how it fits in with ch. 2 is not answered at all. Calvin the image very very gradually disappear and then very very gradually the stone without hands comes into its place and he could easily have given us that idea but here is the image that is suddenly raised up and when it is broken up the wind blows it away and the stone ~~with the~~ cut without hands comes suddenly--it sounds like a sudden thing that takes place. Look up Calvin on this passage--especially chs. 2, 7, and 8.

47

We want to find out to how great an extent these three are definitely supported and we saw a great deal of evidence against the first of them, against the the idea which makes it dealing simply with the Maccabean age and also considers it written in the Macc. Age. ~~rather~~- In the first ch. as you remember we have Daniel standing against compromise with wicked habits and refusing to use good food which had been offered to idols and asking them to give him a test and he passed this test and God thus stood behind the face of His servant. This is of course an interesting story and the purpose of it being in the Bible is not simply to tell us an interesting story but to give us an example of the time of the Maccabeans and they tried to force them to give up their religion and to follow the other gods. It is given as an example for us to resist temptations and to ^{not} cut down the barriers which separate Christianity and non-Christianity and it is an example all through the age but it does have a very marked relationship to the Macc. period in its example. In the second ch. we have the story of Daniel being promoted to a great position and despite the fact that Daniel had been tempted he did not yield. The events had perhaps more to do with another period instead of that one. You notice as we look at this we have an image and you might say we could divide the image up into as many sections as you want. It may be divided into many divisions. It is a question exactly where the divisions are to be made and there are rather sharp divisions on the point of material. From the view point of the material we have three sharp divisions and then too there are four suggested divisions which are divided into four parts. The image is represented as a

continuous thing and we find that the image is struck by a stone without hands and all the image is broken up and the stone becomes a great mountain. You might say here is a slow moving picture, the stone coming down and the image being broken little by little until it completely disappears and in the meantime the stone that hit it has just started gradually and then pretty soon the whole earth is filled with stone. If you were to think of views of the future as three types, pre-mel., post-mel. and a-mel. and we wonder if any of the three could fit with the viewpoint of the stone. How many of the three would? It very definitely would not fit the a-mel. view and it is as contrary to the a-mel. as to the pre-mel. The pre view holds that the earth is to be taken over in a very sudden way and the act will come at the end of the age and there will be sudden destruction of the world powers and the post-mel. view holds that Christ is coming and there will be the process of a gradual spreading of the Gospel in order to fill the whole earth and it is then completely Christianized and all that is anti to God's will has completely disappeared. That is the slow motion. The a-mel. view is that there is no mel. either before or after the coming of Christ and thus the end of the age is supposed to be cataclistic so that does not fit with this slow motion interpretation. Thus it does not fit with either the a-mel. or the pre-mel. in the least and it fits a post-mel. interpretation very nicely but is that a very good conclusion from this picture. The idea of leaven going into the loaf is supposed to show the steady progress of the whole world and that is what is intended by the parables but if that is the thing it depicts, it is a good picture and it is a sort of gradual growth and extension. God could and did pick the things that would give us good pictures and He makes them clear. The impression anyone would get from this picture then is not a stone that would just gradually keep coming until it disintegrates and then disappears but it is a stone that goes on for a long time and then it suddenly does it. The picture here shows a great and sudden terrific act and the picture does not seem to suggest a stone cut without hands in a gradual process. The impression you get instead is that the stone quickly destroys the

image and then takes its place. I don't think this is the point where you could be most dogmatic in it but I do think you can be mighty dogmatic in the point of the destruction being a sudden thing even if some say not.

It could have been picture with the wind hitting upon it and gradually, bit by bit doing it away and there are many pictures which could have been used to show the slow process --for instance the wind hitting upon it and other pictures too. If you take it as a slow gradual process it would then fit the post-mel. The picture is not one of slow process. I don't know of any view that would fit with such a question and that the great world anti-God world powers disappeared at a time of the coming of Christ and to have been God ever since would have been something for them to hold. Young's idea is that what Daniel is doing is looking forward to that time when Christ comes to this earth and God substitutes the kingdom of God for the kingdom of man and this is the view and it does not seem that he holds the post-mel. here and yet by only a certain amount of twisting can it be made to represent it. It doesn't fit an a-mel. view at all as I can see and the post-mel. is doubtful. It would certainly be post-mel. rather than a-mel. and if you had a sudden great destruction of the forces of the wickedness and Christ's first coming and we have had the kingdom of God ever since. There would be some who would say practically that--I don't know how they can but they do. That would certainly be a post-mel. view and not an a-mel.

Hexenberg thought the conversion of the Germans ~~but~~ and I guess there is no authority that Young thinks more highly of than Hexenberg and the later tells about when the Germans and Charlemagen conquered the Saxons about 800 AD most of them marched through the river and they considered themselves to be baptised and thus Christians. They say the thousand years of righteousness began then and he began to see signs that looked like the loosing of Satan for a little season and so it looked as though the mel. was coming then. If you can take a view then and make it not 400 A.D. but 40 A.D., then you have the sudden great destruction of evil right then. The Roman Empire was beginning and not ending then. Roman Empire claimed its greatest power a hundred

years after that and the Roman Empire became a great force and it is hard to consider the Roman Empire was destroyed when Christ was born in Bethlehem.

#48

Up to Antiochus and God is going to utterly destroy. Judas came with the army and drove them back and they won for Jerusalem and the rest of the world lay in the lap of the evil one and it was only Jerusalem that was free and Judah. In that area the descendants of the Macc. soon went into the world but within the nations the Mosaic teachings were taught and the bulk of the people attempted to follow them and so it was indeed a far better condition than that which Antiochus tried to introduce but it is hardly reasonable to call it the kingdom of God and then the kingdom of God would be covering the whole earth. The Macc. picture then is this refers to the Macc. as many of the critics say, then it was not fulfilled and the idea of some wild dreamer of that day who thought God was going to visit them and set up the kingdom. If you take the view of those who do not take the premel. view then you have this occurring at the first coming of Christ and if this occurred then it would seem the image must have been destroyed at that time instead of its being a gradual process and its being destroyed ever since. It must have occurred then and it did not occur then. We find the Holy Spirit is in the world taking out a people for His name, of every tongue, kindg etc. He is selecting here and there those who believe on Christ and those who will be members of the body of Christ but He has not permeated any lands with Christian teaching to the extent that every individual in it is a Christian and in the lands which are supposed to be most Christian we find that in a period of a century or so we find Satan succeeding in permeating a good portion of the lands with this teaching and it is a up and down and a constant battle field of this dispensation and it is not a constant gradual growth into one thing. Italy was one of the first regions perhaps and it is long ago that Italy was completely won for a nominal

Christianity and there were many very fine Christians there and many martyrs but today it is solidly in the hands of the pope and when it comes to ethics and Christian ideals you will find that the level is very, very low. It is clear that the civilization of Italy is not based upon the Christian level, and its ethics. In England after the Reformation it was most essential that there be the Christian ideals and points but today we know there has been a tremendous decline. Ques. Theoretically there is no reason in the world why-we- or I should say there are very few of the a-mel. view point who have thought through these reasons very carefully and they seem to devote instead a great deal of their time in trying to find inconsistencies in absurdities of the pre-mel. and they try to show pre-mel. is impossible instead of trying to build up a system and so it is rather hard to tell what the a-mel. believe or even what an a-mel. does believe. Take Pussey, for instance, I'm not sure what his view is but it is interesting that in his great book on Daniel he devotes a great deal of his faith in the book trying to show that the critics is wrong and that the Macc. is wrong and he does some very excellent work on it and then he devotes a good deal of space to taking up the 9th ch. of Daniel and trying to show it all points to the death of Christ on Calvary. I have glanced through his writing and I have not come across anything that gives me any very definite ideas. The general attitude of this second view point seems to be to slash out in two directions and to say the Macc. view is wrong and the four kingdoms do not end with the Macc. but they end with the Romans and the claim of the critics is wrong and then they slash out the other way by saying the idea that this begins a pre-mel. kingdom is wrong as it says here the kingdom will not be destroyed and the thing they are pointing to is the death of Christ on the cross, and this idea of ten kingdom--why Young points out four or five times in his book that no where does it say that the image had ten toes. That is entirely a negative approach if it said nine I would say nine and if it said eleven I would say eleven, but when it says ten, I say it might be around number. Here is a beast and out of

it arise ten ~~xxxx~~ horns and these represent ten kings. Maybe that means the beast has its great period of existence, but then it is followed by a period when the empire of the beast is broken up into ten-subdivisions more-or-less and there is a period when the unity of the empire is broken but the general tradition and spirit of the empire are continued and that period is represented by the ten horns--ten kingdoms--it represents a continuation of the viewpoint of the empire but which comes after the unified empire. But if you are going to take that interpretation with ch. 7, is it not reasonable to take the same interpretation on ch. 2? In ch. 2 where it mentions ten toes, you might say that it represents a round number, but it represents as the body comes after the head, the toes come after the legs and there is a period of time when a series of kingdoms come after the four main kingdoms but Young says it never says how many toes there are and to elsewhere say that the ten horn represents ten kingdoms, it just impresses me when you have two prophecies so similar--two and seven, that if one interpretation is clearly correct, it is reasonable to try and fit that into the other, rather than trying to fit something else into it. Of course there is this about it--it does mention toes specifically. When it mentions the toes, it shows it had them, why should it not have ten. If it had toes at all it would be strange if it had any other number. Young says that after the last beast comes, then there is the destruction of the last beast, but when it comes to "in the days of those kings" he says we don't have any reason for saying that this refers to the ten toes because we don't have any reason to know that there are ten toes. Those kings must mean the four of them, but how can it be in the days of all four of them. That doesn't seem to make sense. Of course he is quoting that from Dr. Allis with approval. He says that the stone hits it on the feet and he point out where else would a stone hit the image to make it totter and fall and that seems to me a very silly statement, because if it almost any place it would tooter and fall, but I doubt that if any of us if we were trying to knock over an image, would deliberately hit it on the feet

to make it totter and fall. I don't think that it would even occur to us to hit on the feet. When it specifically says that it hit it on the feet, it is a little element that is unusual, is not just a part of necessary scenery. Under those circumstances, this would seem something that was so unfortunate about this second view of interpretation--it takes a chapter which doesn't give us so much detail and tries to insist the detail of it should fit with the first coming of Christ, and anything about a great cataclysmic destruction of the natural powers and the setting up of God's kingdom is not here pictured they say. Their view taken in the 7th ch. doesn't fit all. If you are going to be consistent and say that it is the coming of Christ the first time that is the great thing looked to, and ignores the 2nd coming altogether and here it speaks of Christ dying on the cross and the sending out of the Gospel, that is as far as he goes and if that is the case, then you might as well go through the book consistently and try and apply this to the 7th and the 11th chapter and when you get to the 11th chapter, Christian comm. who reject the Macc. view unanamously, or rather most of them find anti-christ there. There is one interesting exception--Philip Mauro, a lawyer and consistent --He wrote some excellent things such as Life in the Word and he took over general dispensational teaching and accepted it along that line but then he began to question it and he found certain inconsistencies in what he had been given, and he found certain points that were not in line and he found certain problems that had not been worked out and he took a strong attitude against dispensationalism and he like Young slashed out at premill. but unlike them he proceeded to work out a logical interpretation and so he says here that this great one that raises himself up against God is King Herod. He is the only one that know of that is consistent in this 2nd view and tries to make Herod the little horn. As far as I know there is no one else who follows him because it makes too many difficulties. Young criticizes him for taking this view--who else could it be. To be consistent it is either Antiochus or Herod, but Antiochus came out of the Greek kingdom and not the Roman so it must be Herod according to 2nd view.

It seems to me with the idea of progressive revelation, that in this 2nd chapter God reveals certain facts about what is coming, and we must remember that there is that which is necessary to present the picture, but which has nothing to do with giving details of the future. But that which is peculiar in it, must have been put in for a purpose. So we take ch. 2 and realizing that some of the details are machinery, we try and see what it is portraying and then when we get over to ch. 7, I think that it is absolutely clear, that we find the same picture as we found in ch. 2 but with additional materials given. We are given a certain amount of truth and then over in ch. 7 we are given more truth and to say that ch. 2 is one thing and ch. 7 something entirely different doesn't make sense. If ch. 7 looks forward to the second coming then so does ch. 2. Now there is nothing more important in history than the birth of Christ not the death of Christ at Calvary and everything that may occur in the world and ~~xxx~~ all the blessing that we have or ever will have is a result of Christ's death, but that doesn't mean that every chapter in the Bible is talking about that. In the 2nd chapter I see nothing that I feel must refer to His first coming. It seems to me that it is an out-working of Calvary. Ch. 2 is given to Nebuchadrazzar and ch. 7 is given to Daniel and naturally we have a little different viewpoint. It flatters Nebu. but it is also shown him that God has given him a kingdom and this that he has is what God has established. It, the image, is not simply given to show you the terrible things that are coming against God and how He is going to wreck them. That sort of dualism is not the picture here. We must remember that Satan is under God's control and he cannot lift a finger except God permit him. I have heard it said very well--The man that curses God could not do it, except that God gave him the breath. You can do nothing against God except that he allow you and God does permit Satan a large amount of rein during this period and it is Satans wickedness, yet is under the control of God. Now in this ch. 2 it is shown that Nebu. had this kingdom from God, and when we suffer under Satan's attack, and suffer under the tyranny of

wicked powers, which is part of the continuation of Satan's control in the world, we must recognize that these are ultimately under God's control and could not exist for a minute if God didn't permit it. He has given them the power and strength and Satan's dominion is under God and this a very important thing that we bring to people. It was very helpful to the Macc. The other thing that is proved by the image is that it continues for a long time and how long the fourth kingdom continues we just don't know. God does not choose to give us the answer. He wants us to be ready at any time when He decides to bring the great consummation. It was of great encouragement to keep going forward and in the end God will work His plan. This 2nd chapter then I think is a very important ch. but I don't think we should read into this ch. Ques. about these days. In those days it was believed that God would set up a kingdom that would never be destroyed. In the days of these kings God would set up the kingdom and we ask what does it sound like. You might say in the days of Emperor Wilhelm and Hitler--no, not that. In the days of Jefferson, Washington, Madison and Monroe, Buchanan and Lincoln there shall come a Civil War which will nearly disrupt the US. Would that be fair? It began in Buchanan's time and it did not begin in Washington's time and you could say, of course, in the days of these early presidents, there did develop the days of destruction and things that will lead to a Civil War. In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom that will not ever be destroyed and in the days of these continuing kings, God will be gradually setting it up. It might fit with that but that is not the picture here. The picture is of a sudden attack and not one that has been growing gradually. I don't see much sense to the picture as it is given here and I don't really like to say that as there are others who do see much sense to it. Someone in Wheaton told me that he couldn't understand the bitterness of some of the American Council men and he said they must be out of their minds to make such statements. If you're going to take it as bitter to criticise someone's logic it is pretty strong language and I think better be careful what I say right here as I don't mean any animosity toward these men. I find some very fine

intelligent people who think like that and get off into some line. I cannot see that they are using their head in reasoning like this and when they say it happened in the days of these kings. Quotation--"Dryver refers to the phrase in the days of these kings shall the Belucis and the Palmade and then we can see that would fit perfectly if the fourth kingdom is that of Alexander the Great and it would fit fine on that supposition. Others find the reference to kings of the Roman Empire in the days of these kings. Keil applies this to the kings of the world kingdom last described. The view adopted by the Scofield Ref. Bible is ~~the view adopted by~~ that these refer to the kings of Daniel 24-27. Thus it is argued that the time of the prophecy is fixed at not being the time of the first but the second advent of Christ. In that day the iron of imperial powers will be mixed with socialism and democracy and will not be fused together". Christ will then come for His saints the Church will be caught up into Heaven and the stone will fall and from these words of Young, we see his summarizing. This view must be rejected as being exegetically untenable. It makes too much of a symbolism and not expressly told but then the ten kings can only come from this portion in Daniel 24-27. Furthermore the image was not smitten upon the toes but upon the feet and the feet and legs are to be taken together and the blow would fall ^{if} ~~when~~ the dispensations are consistent and it would be at the time when the kingdom is divided into the eastern and western empires. Lastly the phrase of in the days of these kings cannot refer to the ten toes for the toes are nowhere identified as kings nor does it refer to the king of the fourth monarchy for no such kings are mentioned. That is the problem. The only kings mentioned are of the four empires and yet it is said they refer most naturally to the kings of the empire and it is clearly involved in the symbolism of the image and while distinct yet these four kingdoms were in a sense one.

Medo-Persia conquered and incor. Babylon, and while Rome never conquered all of Alexander's empire it did conquer and it was while the image was standing the blow was struck so we may say it was in the period of those four empires together representing the Gentile world but in the days of the last of the

Daniel 49 (cont.)

four and the kingdom was given up. It seems to me to be a not very reasonable argument. It must come before the Roman Empire--before 400 and any way. Young says the striking of the feet is symbolical and does not have anything to do with 14--the image is struck on the feet because such a blow would cause it to totter and fall. There is then a very involved argument. It is a view which could not possibly be fitted with the a-mel. view point.

Daniel 51 (#50 was left blank)

It is a phrase that fits perfectly with the post mel. inter. It is while these kings are reigning it is that the kingdom of Heaven is built up slowly and gradually. It is of a gradual destruction and that being the case there is the gradual setting up of the kingdom and the picture that is presented elsewhere by this verse and if this was the only verse it would seem like a good picture of the post-mel. view and the teaching of the chap. and it is a gradual, slow process and that is the picture presented elsewhere and it seems reasonable to be interpreted that way and planning for a long series of kings and it is gradually setting up the establishment of the kingdom especially as you find in the later part of the verse and it is a statement that fits in quite definitely with the sudden cataclismic idea. It will break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms and it shall stand forever and of course the phrase that it will consume all these kingdoms is an interesting phrase as it is coming one after the other and there is only one of them when the stone hits the image. It is going to consume all these kingdoms but the way it says it will break in pieces and it does not sound as though it is going to gradually permeate these kingdoms and so the post-mel. interpretation is the most natural of this verse but it does not fit in with the rest of the text. and the man like Young does not take the view point and so we are left with the situation which we have quite frequently in the Scripture where we have a little bit of a suggestion and then we are left to try to fit in and explain its meaning. It is strange there is so much stress on the toes and you ask if it does mean something and we do have the two legs and it might be the dividing eastern and westward is what some say. Do these ten toes indicate not a precise matter but a general view point of the Roman Empire and the Empire in itself loses its unity and breaks up into groups and later is divided into 10 divisions. It may mean 10, 12, or even 15. The unity is broken up as a combined political control but there is the general spirit and attitude contained in a number of the divided sections. There is

the stress that it will be divided but even so it is composite. By composite we mean it is in some way different from the Persian Empire which is not described thus. The way in which this is different is that there is something that has less of unity to it and very possibly there is a breaking up of that unity. You ask if that is so from the toes and we cannot reach that conclusion yet. We must not build on that mere mention of the verse in the chapter but it has to be put up on the shelf to see if we have further light on the subject. In Daniel 7 there we have ten horns coming up and the ten horns are ten kings and there we have a definite teaching that there is something that has ten which comes after the main body of the four kingdoms and which makes it reasonable to say the stress on the toes was not accidental but it does fit with the further element which is not yet explained and so here when he does not say "in the day of that kingdom" the God of Heaven sets up a kingdom but he says "in the days of these kings". The toes are partly of iron and partly of clay and the kingdom will be partly strong and partly weak and this would suggest the possibility that this one great kingdom has become something which could be spoken of as a number of things. It lays the way clearly open to find it taught in ch. 7. Of course in Luke Christ seems to look forward to a time when these things will come to pass and after his day and until the time of the Gentile people. Ques. The characteristics of all of these continue on into the separate ones and their characteristics are involved and you find them continuing on and you find the image of the human government. These kings must be either successive or simultaneous and with the kings that are successive you cannot speak of something sudden coming to pass. In the days of the last of the four kingdoms is not an easy version to hold. Ques. He stresses over and over that the ten toes are not the kingdoms but in the 7th ch. he says this shows there are ten kingdoms which come after the end. The critics say the four kingdoms that end with Alexander the Great and there is a whole section on the four kingdoms to show that the four kingdoms that end with Alexander the great but then they say they end with the Romans but to me it does seem rather inconsistent but in ch. 7 it does say the division is after the Roman Empire and then he says the little horn is anti-Christ who is yet to come and all of that in ch. 7 so his argument in ch. 2 and 7 is really to try to show the non-parallelism but when he comes to dealing with the critics and trying to disprove their arguments that the fourth kingdom is at the time of the Macc. and he draws the whole ch. from ch. 7 and ch. 2

and gets material from there. His attitude from the critics causes him to assume 2 and 7 are talking about the same thing. In the one talking about the dispensational view he tries to show they are different and ch. 2 he says can have nothing to do with it. He is admitting everything that is important in ch. 7 so there really is not much point in it. Those who want to attack a futuristic point on Daniel will have the 2nd ch. to quote from and probably won't notice in ch. 7. His admissions are more or less incidental and his attacks are straight and it is the same that he does over in ch. 11 when he is discussing v. 36 and he says there you have about 6 or 8 different views and the first of these is the view of the critic that it is Antiochus and this view does not fit and in everyone of the verses he shows it could not possibly fit Antiochus and then he gives the view of Calvin that it is the Roman Empire and then he goes on and shows why it applies to a definite individual and not to an empire. Then he says it is the dispensationalist interpretation that it is the anti-Christ and that is the view held down through the ages. To make a division here we then repudiate the dispensationalist view and it is really rather illogical. Ques. When I first looked in the book I was very well impressed and he has on the whole done a very good job but then I was surprised to find that some of the rather strong arguments he just passed over. I was quite disappointed in that--rather strong ones that are not very easy to answer. He says in the front that his book has two purposes--one to attack and- from critical view and one from dispensational view but as he goes through he picks up things like this and he does not say how many proofs there are and he does not go into these things but it is my opinion he is fundamentally inconsistent. It is something that he does not work out--about the coming of Christ.

Daniel 52

If it means a sudden destruction or a continuous process for the post-mel. view then it might be reasonable in the days of the kingdom to refer to the kingdom and you must think of the smiting of the image as it began in the days of Nebuchanezzar because the coming of Christ did not come until the fourth kingdom so you can't very think it is the coming of Christ and not have it be in that time of the four kings. Awelis takes what is called the dispensational view on this and said there is no such thing as ten kingdoms and also it does not say how many toes there are so there are not necessarily ten toes. He then ends up by saying it is in the period of the four kingdoms but in the days of the last of them and then the whole point is gone and we're right back where we started. At the time

when this would happens he does not say how many or who will be reigning and for someone to be dogmatic this is wrong. It is then saying more than is in this chap. definitely. Some will do that and then Young and Alford will come along and say now absurd it is. We have a suggestion in our phraseology and I don't know why the Holy Spirit should not do that. Ill. of when I teach, I often use phrases that imply something which we have not yet had. I use a term and go right on with it. When we have here "in the days of those kings" and we ask what it does mean and we wonder if there is more than one king at the time when this does happen. The cn. does not tell us what it means but it does raise the question. In ch. 7 you find the question answered and it is a good method, I think. The Holy Spirit does it a great deal in the OT. In Is. ch. 2 we read of the one coming who is the branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth. How can one be both of those and it is a very peculiar thing. How can they fit together and we wonder just what it means. If it does not mean anything why is such a peculiar phrase used in Isaiah? You go into Is. 9, and you find the parallelism and it is more readily understood. It suggests them but it does not prove them. You begin then to put the two together and soon you say this Wonderful One who is coming has actually two phases or two aspects and one is closely connected with God and one with man. Then you might find many phrases which teach the perfect humanity of the Messiah, that He is indeed the Son of David, the Child of Abraham and born of Israel. You don't have the thing clearly explained in any one place but you put the two together and you have a pretty definite picture of one who is coming and one who is both God and man and then you get to the NT and you find it is so true. When the time comes, it is my guess, we'll find where the suggestions fit in with the reality. To advance some of the suggestions and to repudiate others does not put us any farther along the line of the suggestions and it is an unfortunate point. With Dr. ^{Alis} Ewelis it is easy to see how he would get into that approach. He spent a great part of his life attacking the critical theories and seeing their weaknesses and their errors and he did an excellent job of it except for this one phase where he does not have the tendency to see all of it. In the detail he did a very excellent job and he goes to pre-mel. which he did not have much contact with and he saw some errors into which he studied and then had to expose them. Then he went on to attack the whole business. He takes up detail after detail trying to prove erroneous the foundations of the whole pre-mel view and I think he gets into many arguments of the type of this one here where he speaks of many kings and it does not mean at that time at all. Ques.

It would be easy to say in the days of the Gentile world power but to say in the days of those kings I don't think it seems impossible. He ends up by picking the days.

In ch. 7 we have the picture which God gave to Daniel and giving it to him He gave him certain insight which He had not given to Nebuchanezzar which was not especially appropriate to give to Nebuch. but which were vital for the Jews to know. The picture is very different from the other picture and it is hard to miss seeing the unity between them and Young does say the four empires of ch. 2 or the four empires of ch. 7 but he says the 4 empires of Daniel. All critics seem to agree that these are the four of Daniel and they end with the Macc. and they assume one of them is an empire which never existed but which the Empire does. Many say these definitely end with the days of Rome and it is the only reasonable way to interpret. Ch. 2 and 7 have a close similarity and that is unavoidable--each has four kingdoms and the fourth is a mighty supernatural intervention which establishes a new kingdom at that time and it is a kingdom which will last forever and so you have the similarity of the general teaching of the two. The description of the four beasts is given here and it is hard to see the similarity of the three and then the other and to see how they are like the image. When you come to the fourth beast, it is dreadful and terrible and has great iron teeth and you find it is stretched and it breaks in pieces and stands in pieces. The horns are mentioned last and it does not say how many there are. I considered the horns and there came up among them another little horn and they were struck up by the roots. Eyes were like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things and this is new. V. 8 has no parallel in the ch. V. 9 is interesting. Here then we have God intervenes and judgment was ~~said~~^{et} and books were opened and in v. 11 we it was beheld the voice and the body was destroyed and concerning the rest of the beasts they had their dominion taken away but their lives were prolonged for a season of time. Surely that would indicate that each beast lost its dominion to the fellow succeeding one but yet they continued a great deal of their life and their view point and things taken over from the other and their life was prolonged but now the last one is destroyed completely and puts an end to the remnants of all four beasts. V. 13 is interesting and it says "I saw in the night visions-----" If you are going to take ch. 2 as leading up to the birth of Christ logically then you should take 7 and 8, it would seem to me. The difficulty would be the little horn and the little horn is ~~held~~^{held} together and the little horn then one of Palestine who comes up and among the ten different sections of the Roman Empire and conquers three of these sections and ~~and~~ had eyes like the

eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things and that would describe any dictator or despot and of course that would fit Herod and some say it fits him and then others say it is surely false and that he would not have killed the children and so if that were the case it might be logical to apply that to the first coming of Christ but when we look at the picture it is hardly reasonable

Daniel 53

Most interpreters do take ch. 7 as leading up to the coming of Christ and one of the things concerning the first coming is that in v. 13 we have the statement that "one like the Son of Man come with the clouds of Heaven and come to the ancient of days" and he put that about himself and He is here the Son of Man spoken about and it goes to later on and when He does that it goes on to rule out what is to come and it does seem impossible in the 7th ch. of Daniel and so the moral is going against the NT but most of the interpreters are inconsistent and they try to make most of the 2nd ch. follow the 2nd view point but in ch. 7 they admit the futuristic view. It would be impossible to say what there is to do --an answer to a question asked in class. The difficulty here is that the peace is utterly destroyed and in v. 11 there is the difference. It is suggested here a cataclismic change and there is a strange thing about ch. 2 and there is much strange in this verse and the stone coming and hitting the image makes a strange event and many have taken it as a picture of Christ's first coming and while in the second one there is not so much about His coming and yet they say there is that much admitted about Himself. (Much of this record is cut incorrectly and some of the sentences are not distinct.) It was predicted in Daniel and it was said that much which was said would be thus done and you notice that the high priest took it that way and there was witness to the blaspheming and the Son of Man has come and it might be made figurative and then say that it was the Son of Man coming into Bethlehem--being born there. Christ definitely says it is going to come and so ch. 7 gives forth

and looks forward to the second coming of Christ. Ques. Some specific knowledge is given in this ch. and about future events. You can put in machinery in description and you might say it is part of it and all but this is specific unusual things. It must then have a meaning--in ch. 2 and in ch. 7 there is great detail on some points and then on other points he just does not go into it, Ch. 2 shows us there are two phases of it. Ch. 7 gives two phases also--the ~~very~~ great beast and then his ten horns but to make something peculiar about the horns but there could be part of it and part of something else and when you hear part of it repeated several times there is no point in having it all repeated. You have then conservative pictures and you must recognize it as the second coming of Christ and so if the second coming of Christ is leading up to here. There is nothing in this 7th which would seem to refer to the first coming of Christ. The great events of Christ's second coming, the establishment of a kingdom that cannot be destroyed, His overcoming of iniquity and the overthrow of Satan's power is something earned by his death on the cross and it is an important to deal with this event. It is an important one in history and it is said both of them are looking forward to the second coming of Christ and the second view seems to have no resting place in ch. 7 or in ch. 2 either. Ques. That would mean he is giving the sketch of it and not featuring the exact details. It is a round number meaning ~~one-unified~~ meaning in general and not necessarily unified. We don't know if there might be 8 or 10 or 15 or whatever. The empire of Alex. was never broken into four parts but Ptolemy claimed to be a ruler of the empire but in actual practice but he did not let the region about have authority over him so he broke away and so on. We use terms in the sense of round terms. The question always is how large the unit you are using is. We can't go back and ask Daniel what type he meant. The rest of the record goes on with the discussion of the round number it might be used. The national Gypsyian co. and you might say it

it his kingdom and the man who owned it ran it with an iron hand and just what he said occurred and then Montgomery Ward wanted Avery to take over their co. so today he does the same with both places. He may hire five vice-pres. this year and fire them next year--he still runs it with an iron hand.

/#54

Explanation of the assignment--for two hours of graduate credit all the Hebrew is involved. There is nothing saying there are ten toes and so it must mean that the whole four kingdoms are not of the ten kings represented by the ten toes if there were toes. It is interesting that Young says the best commentary on Daniel is by Keil and I looked up the days of the kings in Keil's Commentary and the ten kings it says there were represented by the ten toes which I think is rather interesting. Ten horns especially mentioned in the 7th ch. and Keil does take the view that the toes and horns run together. In the 7th ch. we have the four beasts which come up out of the sea and it is an entirely different sort of a picture than the picture of a great image but we have every reason to think that ch. 6 and 7 are parallel. They are in the same book and they present the coming of Christ in the same book and the image represents the great empire and at the time of the 4th part of the image there is a destruction. There are enough parallels between them to cause them to represent different things and there is some statements that picture four different things and there are things that are alike and I do not think any commentator takes the four beasts to be anything different from four parts of the image. Those who hold the Macc. writing of the book contend the fourth beast is the Kingdom of Assyria hold to it. They say the first kingdom is the Babylonian Empire. Most then agree that the fourth part of the image is the same thing and that being the case, where in one we have the destruction which utterly destroys the image and we are told this is the kingdom which the Lord is going to set up and in the other case we read the body of the image is slain and the kingdom is given to the saints of God and there comes one like the Son of Man in the clouds of Heaven and gives dominion and glory in the Kingdom and all those of all languages should serve him and it is hard to get away from the destruction and the setting up of the kingdom as two. It would be possible they might be different and in such a case there should be some pretty clear indications. The natural inter. would be that they are the same. In the 2nd ch. the picture given seemed like a quite a sudden destruction. Ques. It would seem to me if the preaching of Christ and the going out of the Gospel into the world is given in one it is given in the

other also. We need definite proof to say one is one view and the other is view of something else. In the second ch. the evidence is somewhat stronger for the second coming than it seems to be in the 7th ch. In the 2nd ch. the picture as given seems to destroy suddenly and it is pretty hard to think of the preaching of Christ and His death on Calvary and His resurrection as being a sudden destruction of the world empire and a sudden filling of the earth with His Kingdom. It is possible to think of His kingdom as coming and passing through the world until it has conquered the whole earth and the result of the spread of the Kingdom of God is that all the wicked powers are destroyed. That is an entirely possible concept. If that is the concept the Holy Spirit had in mind it seems strange to take the picture of the stone suddenly falling and causing the image to fall over. It does not give the impression of the image gradually decreasing and the image gradually increasing. You don't want to press each detail of the picture and you can't do that. The pressure of it seems to fill the whole earth. There are many other pictures which could be used if the Lord wished to convey the other idea. Then in ch. 7 we have the picture of the cataclismic nature of the destruction and there is nothing there that suggests a gradual change. It sat there and the body was destroyed and the Son of Man came near to the destruction and He was in dominion and power and glory. There is no suggestion of a gradual thing. It sounds like the Lord said and then it is done. It would be easier to interpret this then as a gradual spread if it were not for the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of the Heavens. It does not give the impression of that yet it would not be utterly impossible.

Daniel 55

I think that it would be fair to say that in the second chapter both the post-mil. and amil would say that this was the first coming of Christ that was described but we would say that the first coming is not alluded to especially in the 7th ch.. Christ refers it to His second coming when He alludes to it, and I would say that it was highly questionable whether there was any word in either ch. 2 or 7 which one has the right to say is an indication of the first coming of Christ. Of course God did not reveal everything at once and there are places in the O.T. where God speaks to us about His first coming with no mention of the second and vice-versa. For him just to talk of the first doesn't mean that the second is not important and vice-versa. There is nothing as important as the first coming of Christ and in all history that will ever occur there is nothing more important than that Christ died on Calvary but that doesn't mean that either of these has to be mentioned in any specific

section of the Bible and it is highly questionable whether there is a reference to either one in ch. 2 or ch. 7. I am not at all certain that you would find commentaries referring the 7th ch. to the first coming, but of ch. 2 we find a good many bringing the first coming in and that I fail to see is justifiable. Philip Mauro has written a good deal on this subject. His idea that the anti-christ is Herod the Great is hated by no other interpreter that I know of. He swung from an extreme futuristic view and making everything fit the second coming to the other extreme of making everything fit the first coming. I think it is taking the second view logically. A young fellow was telling up at Cornell Univ. He told about being in a Club there which was heavily endowed so that the members are selected because of their ability along scholarly lines and the emphasis is particularly on intellectual standing and most of the fellows in the Club are anti-Christian in their viewpoint. He told ~~how~~ ministers are brought in and these were sent around to the various clubs to speak and not so long ago they had a minister that was sent down to this club. He spoke there and told them that he wouldn't mind being interrupted at any time. He spoke in quite a vague and general way and stressed the importance of religion and so one of the fellows asked him what he meant by religion and he told him that religion was a search and after being asked what it was a search for--he told them that it was a search for the highest values but then the question was put the minister--how was that any different from what the students were doing in anthropology, or economics and as the fellows questioned him, he practically admitted that there was nothing to religion but simply searching and trying to make a better life and then this Christian with whom I was with spoke up and he raised some questions from the opposite viewpoint and there the poor fellow was in the midst of two fires--unbelievers asking questions from one side and and then people who believed that there was a Supernatural revelation which he utterly denied asking question from this side and the next day one of the students expressed to this fellow with whom I was, how he appreciated the way they had asked questions thus showing that there were two positions which were rather logically coherent--one, there is no Supernatural and the other side which claimed that there was a very definite Supernatural in the universe as revealed in the Bible, but this man stood in between and was neither flesh, fish nor fowl. In this case of course it would be possible for the Lord to give us a picture of both comings in it yet the interpretation which is logical is to

make it all fit the first coming though I think you would have a hard time do so and thus contradict what Christ said in Matt. 7:13. I think that many commentators would say that ch. 7 refers to the second coming but when they come to ch. 2 they don't altogether relate it to ch. 7 and I don't think that they have thought the thing through fully. They will make statements as though referring to the first coming but then they will mention other things which seem to show that they haven't thought the problem through.

After the resurrection of the dead there is the general judgment in which all are judged and the wicked are sent into eternal judgment and the righteous are sent into eternal bliss. The Amil. view as to what happens at this time is not very clearly stated. It is largely inference or guess that is used. Of course we have those beautiful pictures in Rev. 21 and 22 but which some take as highly symbolical. Milligan takes the New Jerusalem as coming down from heaven as the church in this age and has nothing to do with the saints at the second coming of Christ. Zahn says that it is a picture of the mill. but others say that it is a picture after the judgement of the wicked. Many premil. and amils. say that. It is a highly symbolical picture and it is not very clear as to specific details and I think that it is not a passage that should be built on but rather to fit into a scheme. The impression that I have is that God all through the Scriptures reveals that things which is important to direct our conduct and things in the next general phase and that he gives us certain glimpses of things that are far distant for our encouragement and my impression is that He has revealed much to us about the mill. and then there are a great many things that He has not revealed. After the 1000 year reign, Satan is loosed for a little season and after that the hosts of wickedness are finally destroyed and then all the unrighteous dead are raised and they are judged and cast into the lake of fire. It may ~~be~~ be that the mill. kingdom under-goes a change --I feel that it is something that just don't know too much about after the judgment. There is one verse which seems to suggest a rather marked change--Cf. Rom. I Cor. 15:22 ff. At that time will the kingdom be delivered up to the Father, for He must reign until he has put all enemies under His feet--that is a passage which we wonder if we have all the facts so that we can fully interpret but it would impress me that it was extremely probable after the time of judgment that he is speaking here--there certainly is death at the end of the mill. when fire comes down out of heaven and the wicked are destroyed. It would seem to me that this happened to

to the wicked, that is after it has happened, the Kingdom will be delivered up unto God, even the Father. It seems hard to understand that part of Christ being subject though always in way He has been subject--What does it mean to say that God may be all in all. It would seem that it doesn't mean that God would be different but rather there is a period when Christ will give up some of the leadership in the kingdom--a reign in His own particular reign in his own person that this particular relation will come to him that God may be all in all. This is the only passage which seems to suggest quite definitely a rather vital change at the end of the mill. but whatever it means--it speaks of a time when Christ will deliver up the kingdom--there would seem to be a time which would be the reign of Christ and then there would be a time when God the Father takes over and God is made all in all. I would think of that as being the end of the mill. kingdom. If it is not at the end of that--it would at least come at the judgment of the wicked in any case. According to a premil. view this comes at the end of the 1000 years but with the amil. or post-mil. view it would come at the judgment and they would say that all were judged at the same time--wicked and righteous. Only one general judgment when the Son would give up the Kingdom unto the Father that God may be all in all. They would all agree that this comes at the judgment of the wicked. Of course mill. it can't be says Young because it calls it everlasting and that means that it will never pass away and this won't be restored but I don't think that conclusion follows these statements. I think when you say an everlasting kingdom--I don't think that there is word in Scripture that means absolutely without end. I think that various words used that way mean a stretching on to along time. You get the idea of endlessness through expressions--where the wom dieth not or forever and ever or ages upon ages. If forever meant without end there would be no point in repeating. I am not sure how much right we have to draw on the metaphysical concept of absolute endlessness. I heard a man last on this subject--Prof. of History of Religions--Presby. minister in which he told how nice it was in the Middle Ages when Christians believed that earth was the center, then the sun and then the planets and then space and around that we had God and thus you had that wonderful feeling of security with God all around but then along came Copernicus which proved that that the earth was not the center of the universe after all and we know now that the earth goes around the sun instead of the other way and the sun is only a little speck

and so space goes on and on and there is no limit and so we lose that feeling of security that we used to have. He then went on to say that Bisoph Usshur made a study and found that God created the world in 4004 B.C. on Oct. 21 at 9:30 a.m. and then he point out how the geologists show how the age of the earth goes back and back millions and millions of years so that time doesn't have a start like that so that there is no place for God at that end either so we lose our security that we used to have about a Great God who sorrounded time and space and then he went on to say that we used to think that man was created special from the animals and he was made in the image of God but now he says that Darwin has shown that man is only one of the animals and it is only the survival of the fittest and so he is not a favorite of God's either. It was a well presented discourse which he gave there. But the idea that space is absolutely limitless--that you can go on and on and on and never come to an end seems to be rather sharply contradicted by Eistein's present view that there is is a limit to space. Of course if you believe in an infite God on the borders of space, it doesn't make must difference if your spaces are 2000 miles across or 2 billion billion miles across. As a child I used to puzzel over this idea. I used to look up at the sky and think--Could you go on and on and on and is there no end absolutely or will you come to a wall and that is the end. You can't conceive coming to an end and yet you can't conceive of going on without an end--the human mind simply can't understand it. This philosphic concept of something going on without end, if that is what God wanted to reveal to us, He would have to expain it rather specifically, because you can't expect a word just in common use in any language to have a ~~quantity~~ concept like that--a word for which we have no use for except for a specific idea. Therefore you have no right to take a word in a language and say this word means this particular thing--no common word can be expcted to mean it. The only way that it can have that meaning is that it be invented for that purpose. I had a very beautiful paper sent to me once by a very godly man and head of a great mission work and this book he sent to me 13 years and he asked me to run over it and suggest anything that might be of help. The book was on eternal punishment and what he said was that the word olam meant absolutly endless and there fore eternal punishmant is endless. He stressed the fact that there was no other word in Hebrew, and therefore that is what this word meant. It was very beautifully expressed and I hated to disagree with such a fine Christian man

but I pointed out to him that though the teaching that he was trying to present seemed to be the clear teaching of Scripture and seems to be taught in various passages in the Scripture, nevertheless his whole argument was built on a word that was not justifiable and I gave instances specifically where the word olam is used for 1000 or 2000 years or even used for 700 years and the word is often used without the concept of endlessness in it. It is a word that means a long time off and when it says here, an everlasting dominion it is not saying that there is no end to it but is something that goes on for a very long ways. There others are kingdoms that have a very definite limit--one conquers the first and that one is conquered by the next etc. and God destroys the last one. They are temporary but this one is not temporary. They are kingdoms which pass away and passes away ~~as~~ when it is overcome by a stronger force. This one can never be overcome by a stronger force--they are destroyed but this is a kingdom that shall not be destroyed. That is not to say that the One that directs and controls it is not sometime going to change the form of it. The emphasis here is that it doesn't pass away because of something greater that comes along and I don't think that anyone can say for sure that there is not a change after the 1000 years. It doesn't say that there is and it certainly doesn't say that there isn't. But it does say that no stronger force is coming along to destroy this kingdom as the others were destroyed and that is very definite. There seems to be a time when it specifically is Christ's kingdom and then there is a time when it is given over to the Father that He may be all and in all. It would seem to point to a specific time when this thing happened even though Christ would still be part of the Trinity and we would be as close to Christ as we ever. The relation of believers to Christ is given in a temporal sense also--Christ, the firstfruits but here it says, then comes the end--it impresses me that it is a temporal relationship. In vs. 14 I don't think in any way contradicts the idea of a millennial kingdom. It might mean the kingdom of Christ as set up at His first coming and that this kingdom which begins with the apostles and spreads throughout the earth will not pass away but that it shall be everlasting. If that is correct, then at the end there is a vital change--there is no everlastingness of the kingdom of God in our hearts which is more everlasting than the millennial kingdom. That is a perfectly possible interpretation of it this verse.

It is given to Christ an everlasting kingdom that shall not pass away and it would be interesting to note pre-mil. interpreters and see which of the two they think v. 14 here is and then see if they have a clear cut idea which of those two and see also what they do with a similar verse in ch. 2. V. 44 of ch. 2 "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Now that is quite parallel to our reference in ch. 7, to v. 14. Young says "Dryver refers to the phrase in the days of these kings to Celsus and Ptolemy and others find the reference to the kings of the Roman Empire and also deals with kings of the world organs." The world kings last described and the description is for the kings last mentioned. According to the Scofield Ref. Bible these ten kings refer to the ten kings of Dan. 2:24-27. Thus it is argued the time of the Prophecy is fixed as the ~~first~~ second and not the first advent of Christ. It would seem to imply that this kingdom is one that starts at the first coming of Christ. In the next paragraph he says the kingdom of God is of divine origin and of eternal relations. For this reason it cannot be the mill. which is but a 1000 years in length. Since the kingdom is divine, therefore it is eternal. It will furthermore not be conquered by others but will ever be in the hands of the same people through Israel, God and the Church. On the other hand it will break in pieces and ~~break up~~ ^{destroy} other kingdoms. This kingdom which God establishes is the sphere of His sovereignty among men. That seems to make it specifically the first coming of Christ. He takes the view that this kingdom is the kingdom which begins in the hearts of the apostles and gradually spreads throughout the world. That is the kingdom which will ^{ever} be in the hands of the same people to do the will of God. In ch. 2 he doesn't say it in quite so many words but that he intimates very definitely that this kingdom began in the first coming of Christ and that is the kingdom that is established while the kingdom is still standing and is a kingdom which is eternal and divine and unconquerable but it will ever be in the hands of the same people. Now of course, if you believe in the eternal world, that would fit in very nicely but certainly there are some great changes at the coming of Christ. I feel that there is a great deal that is said in Dr. Young's book that fits with the premil. view and is inconsistent with the other facts which he states. The one passage doesn't prove the point, but if he

let down on this passage, he would have to change over in other passages. Now in 2:14 he doesn't make clear about what kingdom is there described--whether it is the kingdom that is now going on or if it comes after Christ's coming. Now we would say that Dan. 7:14 is either the beginning of Christ's first coming and continues through this age and if that is the case it is an everlasting dominion which will not pass away and will never be destroyed--either this means that Christ puts an end to it at His return so that is no more valid than having it relate to the mill. kingdom and having it end there ~~and~~ and it thus could be held to the mill. kingdom or it is something that begins in this age and continued and continues after the coming of Christ and if you take that interpretation then you cannot object ~~it~~ to reject to the mill. kingdom and it continues on despite some change that might occur in it at the last judgment of the wicked. There is then the possibility that it begins now which is the interpretation that Young takes. There is the second possibility that-it-begins-now-which-is-also-Young's-interpretation that it describes the mill. kingdom and in that case there is some change in it perhaps at the end of the 1000 years. Perhaps it is given over to the Father that God may be all in all. The everlastingness is sufficiently expressed in this period of a 1000 years, or it may be that it represents something at the beginning of the mill. kingdom and continues on indefinitely with some change there at the judgment of the kingdom. Of course there is the third interpretation that says that it begins after the coming of Christ and the judgment goes on for the righteous and the wicked indefinitely. That would be the most literal interpretation of the English though I don't know about that interpretation fitting in with the Hebrew. Now there are these three possibilities. Now we must note its relation ^{to} ~~at~~ the verse before it. Cf. v. 13. Christ told the high priest that here after he would see the ~~high~~ Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven--that would suggest that v. 13 means the second coming of Christ--that it must begin with the coming of Christ, whether it means the beginning of the mill. or whatever follows the last judgment of the wicked. In either case it would seem pretty definite that v. 14 doesn't describe a kingdom now going on. (1) Vs. 14 is at the beginning of the mill. kingdom and this mill. kingdom is never destroyed and it can never pass away until Christ voluntarily makes a change in it and this change might be the giving of the kingdom over to God the Father,

In that case, this verse in I Cor. could be related to the end of the millennium. But if this is the last change that ever occurs and then this kingdom begins--if that is the case, then I Cor. 15 does not refer to anything subsequent to it, but refers to that very time. It then means the coming of Christ and not a 1000 years after that. If that is the case you have something in direct opposition of figuring because here you say, Then comes the end when he should deliver up the kingdom even to God, even the Father and then over here in Daniel, One like the Son of man comes to the Father and the Father gives him dominion and glory and the kingdom. It would seem rather to say that this was the Father giving the Son this Kingdom and that this was the same as the Son giving the kingdom up to the Father that He may be all in all. It would impress me that the two would then be considered different things. It would seem to me that Christ will mean as much to us as ever--He is the Lamb of God and is God but that here He becomes in a special sense subject ~~at~~ to the Father that He may all in all. That is somewhat of a hypothesis but it would seem the best way to harmonize the two statements.

58 It would seem that v. 14 would refer to Christ at his coming being given by God the Father, the kingdom over all the world and then that Christ reigns over all the world and then during that period of course God but there is a special way in which Christ will be ruling as the Messianic King--the one who is reigning over all the earth--but at the end of the 1000 year period there is an insurrection but it is put down and after that last insurrection Satan is cast into the lake of fire, the wicked dead are all raised and brought before Christ and they are judged; after the judgment of all the wicked dead, then there is a change in the administration of the kingdom, which is represented by the statement in I Cor. 15--that would then be the time when everything would be put under His feet--the final insurrection having been put down and then death having been destroyed--then the kingdom will be delivered up to God the Father, when he will have put down all authority and power--this would be a change in the administration but what happens from then I don't think that we know the details particularly but simply that there would be change of administration. I think that fits it very nicely with Dan. 7 and the mill. and seems to me to be a very reasonable interpretation of the relation of I Cor. 15 to this. Whatever happens in I Cor. 15 has to happen at the coming of Christ and not a 1000 years later if there is no mill. kingdom and that means at the coming of Christ, according to I Cor. 15

He gives the kingdom over to God the Father--that He may be all in all. In Dan. 7 the Son comes in the clouds and He is given the kingdom and puts all nations under Him--thus you have two opposite presentations of the description of what occurs at the second coming of Christ. That is a particular matter of the relationship of these two passages and I think that these must not just be thrown aside but considered and fit only into the premil. scheme of last things to come to pass.

The order in Dan. 7 of presentation is rather peculiar. It again raises the question about logical and chronological arrangement and here in Dan. 7 it is a bit involved. We first have his dream given. v. 3 fff and then in v. 8 he considers the horn and then v. 9 he mentions the Ancient of Days, whose garment is as white of snow etc.--that would hardly seem a description of Christ but rather of God the Father. Cf. Rev. 2:13 and 14. In ch. 7 in Dan. you have two individuals mentioned--He, the Son of man comes to the Ancient of Days--the two are different in ch. 7. It is interesting to note how similar the picture is of the Ancient of Days here is with Rev. 1. He is clothed with a garment bound with a cloak and bound about the chest with a golden girdle. His head and hair are like wool. Here we read that the Ancient of Day's garment was white as snow. There is some difference. Wool is never red though sometimes it is black and doesn't seem to be a very good picture of whiteness. Pure probably means washed would you not think. There is nothing about the throne in Rev. 1. There are certain characteristics in common but there are a good many characteristics which are distinct but I think that we would not have to say that the two are equated. Here in Dan. we have the two distinguished. The N.T. teaches us that Jesus is Jehovah and He is the second the Person of the Trinity but in the O.T. we have the declaration that Messiah is coming and very often He is spoken of in such a way as you think of Him as a man and then in a few places it is made clear, that the Messiah is going to be God, but in general the O.T. picture of God is distinct from that of the Messiah while in the N.T. both are equated with the Godhead but in general the OLD Test. speaks of God without differentiating persons but there are cases where it does as in Isaiah, but only in few cases is it very clear and right here I think would be an example of a good case. When it speaks of the Ancient of Days here, if you took v. 9 alone, you can't be sure but I incline to believe that it refers to God. In the light of the contrast to Christ later on, I am inclined to say that it is God the Son who is referred to.

But as far as v. 9 is concerned you would say that is God that is mentioned there and certainly God was included, that is the Father whether it includes the Son or not. Then v. 10 pictures God in symbolic language--a judgment was set, and the books were opened. This could be taken as a picture of the great general judgment but it doesn't have to be. It doesn't have to be, but just the bringing to pass of the great events of History by God. Now note v. 11. Does he mean that he fears what the little horn will do or that the little horn has already spoken--it would seem to me that it would be possible to say that vs. 9 and 10 are simply saying that He is looking at earth here and sees the horn and little horn and wickedness coming to a climax but then he sees God's sovereignty, God's throne, God's setting up the judgment and He is about to intervene but God has not yet carried out this great work. As he see the little horn speaking great things he becomes aware of the sovereignty of God and he wonders what is going to be the outcome and you have the little horn clearly brought to his attention.

59 --There might not be any more judgment than is the usual thing but there would not then be the books being opened. It might refer in v. 11 to believers being judged and then it might not--there is a possibility but that is all. Thousand thousands ministered unto him might be a general expression of the sovereignty of God or countless incidents showing His power. V. 11 behold the great horn sapke. Daniel sees here the horn speaking and give blasphemy against God. At the same time He sees God in His sovereignty--God sending forth His commands and thousands and thousands ministering unto Him. God is supreme and back of it all. Here is God ruling and here Daniel wonders what is going to happen--then the beast is slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame. So here is the beast put away by the faithful interposition of God but then he says concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a and a time--that surely would not to be saying that he simply takes away the dominion of the beasts because other beasts have lost their dominion to the great beast. If that is the case, he is simply harking back to the other beasts--they have had their dominion taken away as they were conquered but they were taken up into the new kingdom--they continued that is their lives for a season but now the great beast is not going to be absorbed but is the end of the whole empire and it is destroyed --the end of anti-God and end of control of human government.

I think that we should glance at the Hebrew. Speaking of tenses I came across a very interesting thing just yesterday. A young man came to me up at Cornell and asked me what I thought of the New Revised Standard Version of the N.T. I told him that I thought in many points it was very clear though there are points I don't like the way they have rendered it but I think in general. I told him that they did a very good job. He then asked me if I had seen the review of it by _____ Weekly from Northwestern. I told him now so he got the book out of the library. It was written very shortly after the R.V.S. appeared. It was written by a prof. of Greek there at Northwestern Univ. Some Christian had told him that _____ was a great Greek student and that may be true or not--I am not familiar with the man. But the article was not written from a Christian viewpoint but written from the standpoint of classical Greek and he ~~was~~ said that since this was in the field of Greek in general, it was proper to review it in the "Classical Weekly" and he took it up and he mentioned how they got their tenses all mixed up and mistranslated words and he mentions why these translators didn't get a Greek grammar and learn something about Greek language before making a translation like this--he was absolutely unsparing of it, so it caused me to naturally react somewhat against it and made me wonder with just how much authority he had to speak anyway--it was very interesting and I know that it is true that some profs. will use some of the most scathing language against someone else who have just as big a standing as they have but the fact that he says they don't know anything about Greek grammar doesn't mean that they don't but I thought it was very interesting. I would like to know in the light of very good Greek study, what the light would be that would be thrown upon it. In this case we have a matter to look up in the Hebrew. Dan. 7:12.

It really is written in Aramaic. There was given to them a prolongation--that is simply the imperfect that is used and simply indicates that it is a completed thing--had been I would think could be used. Dominion--like Sultan or ruler was taken away. That is a perfect also in the Aramaic. I personally would feel that there would be no difficulty in saying the rest of the beasts--their dominion had been taken away but their lives--they had been prolonged. Of course when you are speaking of something in the past tense like this it is a little hard to know if it is a true perfect--does it mean after what had happened before.^{1b}

I think it is pretty hard either in the Hebrew or Aramaic ~~that~~ to know whether it means or before but I incline to think that this is a possible translation. "Their dominion had been ~~taken~~ away but their lives had been given an extension for a season. It would seem that these kingdoms continue right up to the coming of Christ and though something else might be a possibility, yet there is nothing mentioned in the context and it is questionable if you would be allowed to bring other beasts in where they are not mentioned and I think that this is showing the contrast of this great beast that is destroyed completely while the others sort of merged one into the other. I think that it would fit in with the parallel that the whole image is destroyed at once--it all is one image and one Gentile world government. You might say that Russia was a wicked totalitarian ruthless power of Hitler and it was destroyed--His power and viewpoint have been taken over by Stalin. And now you have all these nations under Stalin today instead of Hitler. So the end of Hitler is by no means an end of Hitlerism. That was similar to when the Babylonian empire ended and the Persians came. Here in Daniel 11--we note about the change from the Ptolemies to the Selucids. There are other horns after the little horn is destroyed.

60 You have the fourth beast and that is the Roman empire. Now there are two possible interpretations. This is the first beast that is connected with the last time--it is in its day and not later on. That interpretation, that in the days of the Roman empire must arise these kings is possible from ch. 2 but not from ch. 7 at all and particularly as related to what Christ said and related to His second coming. It seems to me that one doesn't work.

(2) This one is very widespread--that the Roman empire comes and then there is a break and that some day it will be revived and there is a continuation. Such an idea is not impossible when you have gaps in the Bible--it certainly is possible that there be this large gap that simply is not looked at--you just see the two mountains and not the valley in between but

(3) which is just as possible in this case, that out of the Roman empire there come kings which continue afterwards and that there is a continuation after the ^{unity of the} empire is broken, there is the spirit and attitude of the empire which is possible of having a revival of the unity later on. That possibility seems to be what Young refers to in this 7th ch. This has a definite possibility of interpretation. If that is the case, it at least would be a great power and not necessarily cover the whole earth. The great Babylonian empire had the great Persian force right outside of it and the Persian empire tried to conquer Greece and

Italy at first and Greece didn't include Rome and the Roman empire did not include India or Persia so that no one of these great empires that are described cover all the known world but covers a very large portion of it. Daniel only gives us four kingdoms and the fourth one is the last and if we have something that cannot be considered to be the fourth at ~~the~~ the end we have a very definite problem. Between these two last views I am not just sure which is correct. Continue studying chs. 7 and 8 and also 11 and 12 some more.

We have looked at ch. 2 and compared it with ch. 7. Ch. 7 of course, speaks of 4 beasts and out of these beasts come ten horns. Then a little horn comes up and ~~destroys~~ destroys 3 of ten horns. Ch. 2 doesn't say how many kingdoms there are. It describes five different sections which are different in mettalic construction. The last two of them have the same element in common with them, but the second part has clay added--this surely is a very marked parallel between the two. The last beast in ch. 7 had --it was a part of the 4th beast and yet worked apart from the fourth beast. It would seem chronologically to come after the 4th beast and whether you have four or five stages it is rather hard to say. You have four main stages, in which the last has two stages--that is identiaal in both of them. Of course it is rather avoidable to go on with the fact that in ch. 2, as you go down the body, it is divided up into two sections and then into ten. It is pretty ~~not~~ difficult not to go on to that in view of the parallel case in ch. 7 where ten horns are mentioned. The toes are mentioned in ch. 2 and it is a human figure, and it might be drawn with no toes but it says specifically that he had toes, it would be rather strange if it had any other number. It would seem to me, instead of making over the idea that no where are we told how many toes he had, but rather that in no place is he mentioned to be abnormal. The no. 4 is definite. Now when you go on from the 4 to ten, ten toes or ten horns--it must be noticed immediately that ten is round number--you must notice that only certain aspects are given and only certain features are given. If you say you walk ten miles, --you might say that if you had gone 7 or 8 or 13 or 14. Now it might be specifically ten, but I don't think that we have any right to say that we are sure that there are only ten. I would say that it is divided up into an even number and it would be somewhere with the region of ten. Of course on the third beast we have how one horn disappears and in ch. 8 how the four horns comes up and we understand that Alexander's empire was divided into four parts--it is a perspective of history given over a long period and looking back and if you are going to make it exactly, you would say that Alexander dies and

the kingdom is divided into four parts. Of course that is not what happened at all. When Alexander died, his generals tried to keep the empire together and the generals tried to make regents and the empire was a unit for a time, but it wasn't long before each one of the generals tried to grab something for himself--Ptolemy, for example, it was 20 years before he called himself general of Egypt but he paid no attention to the regent and didn't allow any of the armies of the regent to come into his territory and you find that the empire breaks up into four divisions and then you find that one of them breaks and you have five divisions and then some of them are conquered and you have three divisions and in the end you have three divisions. It is a fair picture-- though sometime it was five and then three and no one need say that the prophecy was not fulfilled by saying four. That being the case, and knowing what happened, we have a canon there for knowing what happened and we have something there that we must take into consideration in interpreting other prophecies. We are entitled to ask if that is exactly ten but we cannot say that there are absolutely ten--instead of one main kingdom there is a division of them. It is characterized in some way by qualities which showed them to have come out of the first one. If you would go into modern Germany, at least 20 years ago, you would find the features that showed continuance of Roman culture and civilization. It has been continued up to this day. So it is fair to say that we are in the Roman empire period today though we are not ruled from Rome. Each country is carrying on Roman culture and not long ago many countries were claiming that they ought to be called the revival of the old Roman empire. One interesting case of round numbers--we read of Solomon's glassy ~~xxxx~~ see--that it was ten cubits across and 30 cubits around. You know that according to math, if you have a diameter and if it is ten across, you know that around the circle it is going to be 31.4159 etc. but that is the relationship between the circum. and diameter--if that was 35 around, $31\frac{1}{2}$ around the inside but there is a rim to it, and this is the outside figure going around, but it is the opposite direction here. If it is ten across here, the distance around is not 30 but the text says thirty. It is said to be a case where the Bible and science contradict each other. I say that the problem is easily solved if you say that the Bible is speaking in round numbers and when it is saying 30 here it means $3/10$. Whenever we speak of numbers we speak in some sort of a unit. Here your unit is ten. If you want to know the exact architect' measurement, you will have to see him since they are not given the exact figure in the Bible. It gives you

the general situation--it is approximate. Say that you wanted it more exact--you would get it down to $31 \frac{1}{7}$ but that is not exactly right. Then $31 \frac{4}{10}$ but that is not exact. 31.4159 and you could go on indefinitely and no matter how small you made your unit it still wouldn't be exact. There is a possibility of going on to another decimal figure. Of course there are things in life that we could say are exact. In this room at the present time there are 17 people in this room. --but that is an indivisible unit but when you come to a measurement you cannot measure so accurately. And in a measurement, the question comes up--just how accurately you ~~intend~~ intend to measure. If you say your age--you are ²⁴--near 24 are you. If you are 24 and 10 you are still 24. Maybe you are 23 and 6 months. You say so many years and months, and then how many days, how many hours, how many seconds--The question is not the degree of accuracy--not of truth or falsehood, but rather of precision. Very often it speaks of 40 years in the Bible and those periods, there may be cases when they are exactly 40 years to the day, but I wouldn't be surprised if a good many of them turned out to be 36 or 44 years. They are a period of 4 decades. Ques. about dealigg with the number of people or of the no. of years instead of with feet or whatever. Feeding the 5000. It may be just the exact number or it may be only an approximate number. Ques. The Roman Empire and then a period of ten kings which represented a revival of the Roman Empire and that is a possible interpretation. Young says there are no such things as these gaps or parantheses in Scripture and we wonder if there is the gap in the Romana Empire and the gap which constitutes the ten horns but it is just as possible that out of the Roman Empire it is broken up into ten kingdoms but the spirit of the Roman Empire continue and these represent a continuation of the Roman Empire and in that case your period of the ten kingdoms would be the period that had been going on ever since the time of the Roman Empire--it would go first from the Eastern Empire and then it broke up into smaller parts and these smaller parts are continually known to civilization as the Roman Empire and some would say here what right is there to consider it as such? The answer is that we have one empire which is Alexander's Empire and it is divided into four parts and it is still considered as the fourth beast and it is the 3rd beast that is there at the time of Antiochus Euphinese and it is three or four different kingdoms them but considered as the Greek Empire in attitude, etc. but divided up into smaller sections. It is entirely possible as far as ch. 7 is concerned that we have there not a revival but a continuation and that is very possible.

that at the end there is that which is called a revival. I am not at all sure to have to assume a gap here in ch. 7. It is entirely possible that he is looking ahead to the distant future and giving you a bird's eye view of it and the ten kings are right out of it and what he means is that it is broken up into a number of sections and people have tried today to show how in the Roman Empire there were ten kingdoms and it does not all fit and some will get a group of ten, some another, etc. If you put all into it, I don't think you would get over 12 or 13 and it does vary of course. The orders vary in the times of the other kingdoms and the Babylonian Empire varied and so did the Persian and so did the empires that came out of Alexander's empire.

#62

It is exactly the same as to say the great arm is broken and in the course of it you sometimes have three kingdoms, four etc, and there is a period when there is ten or so and it may be a brief period but it does in general average about four and that is exactly what happened then. It is entirely possible to suggest then that the ten horns have come out of the beast and they represent a period which has gone on for many centuries. You have changing boundaries over the period of time. The influence of the concept of the Roman Empire was most vital all through the Middle Ages and right up through the modern times and the idea of it--the word, Emperor, is taken over from the Romans, a general's name who made himself dictator and then the very name Czar and the name is taken over from Caesar and the general attitude of the period has largely been based upon that of the olden days and times. Ques. about making this clear then. He has not fulfilled the anti-christ and then the one who has not yet come. Ques. It would not fit with the tradition of the office at hand. V. 21 and 22--Ques. if they are placed at everything? In 23-27 he is, well, you have the same thing told there 3 times, or I guess four times, and in v. 8 you have the anti-christ coming up, in v. 9 you have the throne set and commandment is given for the judgment, the books are opened and it is hard to know if 11 is continuous with 10 or whether in a way it is a recapitulation. Ques. about the anti-christ persecuting the states. Which verses here tell of the taking away of the dominion of the beasts or of the anti-christ? First in v. 11, then in v. 13-14, 18, 22 "saints possess the kingdom", 27 and so we can see there is quite a bit of recapitulation there and the thing is stressed but it is not stressed that way in ch. 2 but here it is telling Nebuchanezzar of a long future for great world leaders but in the end the Lord takes it over and in ch. 7 we have more stress laid upon the end, the destruction and then ch. 8 looks to Antiochus and then ch. 11 gives still more detail. Ques. He might well be one who had wide power but he expressed it in a more or less indirect way except

in three specific area when he seized the direct part and put an end to their identity. That would be a vague possibility. There is alot we don't know. Ques. Even though things look pretty dark or black things are taken over by God in the end and He will give the kingdom to the Son of Man who will reign for a time until He gives up the kingdom. According to any interpretation other than a pre-mel. your v. 13~~3~~ would have to be the Son of Man coming in the clouds of Heaven and turning over the kingdom to God the Father instead of receiving it from God the Father. The pre-mel. interpretation is that he receives the kingdom ---. I would say that he strikes a real difficulty in v. 13 --he may just overlook that difficulty and he may not deal with it but it does not say. His dominion is one that is going to last a long time and cannot be destroyed. Very figuratively that could be interpreted Christ in His first coming. V. 13 is hard to interpret here and Christ himself quotes 13 as something future and if this refers to the second coming as most interpreters take it and would have to it seems in view of Christ's words, then Christ does not give up the kingdom at the first coming but receives the kingdom and that would sound like the beginning of the mel. instead of the end of the kingdom of Christ. Ques. What is the whole attitude of the Gospels-----?The kingdom was postponed ----that is going into the NT here and I don't want to go into it at this time. Simply when it comes to relationship in the OT this statement, "Repent for the Kingdom of God"--that is one possible meaning--for that is the Kingdom of God. Christ is the one who is going to reign over all the world eventually; Turn away from your sin and receive these wonderful opportunities and this is right at hand, a marvelous opportunity--take advantage of it while it is here--if you don't who knows? Ques. about external arrangements. Ques. referring to Matt. 24:15--when will this be fulfilled? We cannot go back to Judea and it wouldn't seem to pay to live there. Here is a case where Daniel and NT reference are pretty closely tied up.s We need to deal with the precise passage in Daniel and see just what we can gather from there. I don't want to get into that passage just now as it does not relate to ch. 7 but I do want to figure out where it does relate. Long ques. here and it is something about Jesus as Lord, etc.

#63 The power to hurt the saints has been taken away but there are still enemies. The mel. is not the absolute and complete triumph. Ques. about v. 14 being the conclusion. It does not pass away--there is only an attempt to make it pass away but it does not do so and it is not destroyed--given over to the Father. There is a sense in which the Kingdom of Christ is right here now and that is in the hearts of His people and those who nmas the name of Christ should be just

as subject to Him now as they will ever be in the Mell. The difference is that in the Mell. is that the fear of the Mell. will be far greater and in a way it will end. Neopold as king and today there are many who vote for him as such and the idea is that he is out of the country and he is sending word to them of just what he wants them to do but there are many who say they will not have this man to rule over them. There is a sense in which he is king and a sense in which he is not. He is definitely king over those who acknowledge his kingship and are anxious to do his will and he is not king in the sense of stepping into power and forcing submission and that is exactly the situation of Christ--Christ is not the one who sends forth a great command. It is carried out so far as we voluntarily choose to carry it out. There is a kingdom in a far greater sense in away and then you will be apt to say this is the kingdom and that one is not. There they are definitely under his control. The same situation in England--in any list of the kings they will tell you when Charles I died and when II became king--actually it was about 20 years after that when he, the II, was crowned in England but during that period he was in France and there were a Englishmen living in France and they recognised him as such. Many in England wanted him there as king and any word they received from him they would carry it out and obey it to the uttermost. The ones who had voted to have his father killed and tortured them and established his control over the whole country. His kingship was one over the hearts of those who chose him and we have exactly the same situation with Christ. This is entirely possible theoretically altho I think it is carrying spiritual language quite a distance and I don't think it is beyond responsibility at all to say this kingdom in which people voluntarily obey Christ and this is the Kingdom of Christ and this is the age and when Christ comes back He brings this phase to an end and then the eternal age begins and the kingdom of Christ is started. In order to do that you have to ignore v. 13 and as there are many verses in the Bible, people may ignore one or another, and I do not believe pre-mel. teaching simply because of v. 13 but I find it very clearly taught in many other places. I think this is a verse in our present ch. that does not fit in with any other inter. except a pre-mel. because it refers to two individuals --the Ancient of Days who sits on the Throne and who preforms judgment and brings to its death. That could represent the Divine intervention and the bringing to an end the anti-christ. Then it describes the Son of Man coming in the clouds of Heaven and to him is given a kingdom by the ancient of days and that would seem to indicate it. Is not this a suggestion of the difference of the Messiah who is God and God even the Father. If it is not a suggestion, why bring it in? Is it just a part of rounding out the picture--it might be but it is just a bit peculiar and it is enough out

of the ordinary to suggest it has a special meaning and if it has, it is that the Son of man is given by God a kingdom and that of course is the contest of the Messiah coming and establishing a kingdom and bringing it all to an end. Ques. I am not sure if we could say one way or the other. The phraseology does not intend to tell us all of the facts and the question is to see how much we can clearly draw from the statements. I am not sure if it says yes or no on that. I am inclined to think that in Rev. you would find evidence that he would but I don't think you find it here. Ques. I think it is reasonable to suspect that is the possibility but I don't know the specific verse in Daniel on which you would build it but in Rev. I would be surprised if there were not statements on which the conclusions could be drawn. Ques. I don't think at the time of Daniel it was revealed how large the globe was and there are those who try to show a revised Roman Empire on the basis of seeing what kingdoms are in the territory and thus satisfy the old Roman Empire and I question whether that is reasonable. Your Babylonian empire occupied a very large territory, your Persian Empire included all the territory and quite a bit more, the Greek empire included all the territory of the Persian Em. and quite a bit more. The Roman Em. included the bulk of the material of the Greek although not all. India, for instance was not ever in the Roman and also the Roman Em/ included a lot that was never in the Greek Empire. It was altogether possible this would include territory that was not in the first at all. I don't think it is revealed to us. Ques. I would say the Lord gave Daniel a view of certain specific things of the future and then there was a great deal that He did not give. There is much we don't find in either one. The widening picture over more area and the pictures in Revv that seem to cover the entire picture seems to show that all is included in it. The view as Daniel sees it is looking forward where he is and this certainly is of the ten kingdoms and there certainly has been in this period a culture of government and this is the era in which the Roman Empire was but just how that might extend out and develop into a comparatively brief period would not necessarily be revealed. If this would enter into the relationship or not, we do not know. It is being widely extended with the use of airplanes, type of time the Romans developed with the 12 hour day and with the extension of the calendar and there are many things such as that being extended all over the world. When I got down into Serbia, Bulgaria, etc. you just don't know what they say or anything and I felt so strange. Then I looked up and saw clocks and I could read them immediately and I could read the numbers. They were Arabic numerals--not exactly Arabic but numbers which came through there.

We don't need to think we can get answers to all questions that occur to us as we can't do it. We can find what the data does indicate and what the various matters are on which we don't have definite information. We can't go to the Scriptures and say there is an answer but we need to go to the Scriptures and see if there is a definite and positive answer to this question. We are more apt to find the answers if we have specific questions in mind. We need to have that attitude in relation to it. This ch. is most interesting in that there is overcoming power and in the end these powers are overcome by the Lord in His great judgment and then comes the time when the kingdom is established which is given to the Son of man and then it will last for a long time. There is further light on this succession of kingdoms over in Rev. and while I don't think we should take a lot of time on Rev. in this course, it would be interesting to note some of the statements which we just had here.

Daniel #64

Is the statements which we had in Rev. which lists the successions of the followers and which speaks of there having been in ch. 17, v. 10 and there are seven kings there, five are gone and one is not yet come and when he comes, he must continue and when he is here and there he goes into perdition--and the ten horns that thou sawest are ten kings, who have received no kingdom as yet; but they receive authority as kings, with the beast, for one hour. It is tied up with Rome because in v. 9 you have the "seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth and they are seven kings and the mts. and the kings would not necessarily have to agree. There is a wide spread characteristic and I don't know of any other particular spot that would necessarily fit. That would seem to suggest kingdoms and it is only a reasonable suggestion as a possible way to take it and if you take these kings here as kingdoms, then you have a picture here of a kingdom which would be the Roman Empire. As Daniel looked ahead it was of the time of his own day and he began with Babylon and it was not the first great world power at all but it was the one in Daniel from that day forward and by looking forward there are three great kingdoms counting that one and looking back from the time of the Roman Empire, he says you can think of him as looking back and seeing there the three great kingdoms and seeing the great Assyrian Empire and the great Egyptian Empire and they would look back and say there are five great kingdoms in the past and now are fallen. One is the great Roman Empire and then there is another which is not yet come and when he comes he must continue a short stay and then the beast is the 8th. There is this sort of a progress of empires and it ends with the one that comes up into this little horn. We can raise questions on the things as they fall and then we can think of them in

the course of our present thinking. It speaks of a figure here and not of a fact. Seven kings there are and the seven horns do not necessarily represent the ten kings. There are five gone, one in and one yet to come. The later one can be thought of in two ways. At various times it is said that they see the Roman Empire and then again it seems to be beyond it. The long period beginning is the loss of the Roman Empire and it has been going on and yet there is the development of the ten kings and it would seem that that would cover every bit of the world and it would center in a certain portion of the world. Ques. The seven kings are probably the seven kingdoms. Ques. about the 8 and the 7. You could call it in one way one kingdom and in one way two. You have an image of which you have the gold and you have the iron and the iron is rough and then you have the iron mingled with other--the question is then if you have one or if you have two. It would be like in ch. 7 where you have the one beast and the ten horns come out of the beast and the one as it comes out still could not all be separate. Ques. again about the ten horns and the ten kingdoms. The ten horns are the ten kings which have received no kingdom as yet but there is received one eye with the beast. It might mean the same hour of the beast that the beast has. They don't have it yet when he writes but they are going to have it. Different images to show different features and ques. about the seven heads and the representation of the 7 mts. and when he mentions the 7 heads then he mentions the larger part here. This is one and this is two perhaps. Here he does say there are seven mounds although I would think the seven heads would be the same as the seven kings. How many here can name the seven hills of Rome? It is a well known fact that Rome is the city of the seven hills. You will get a great deal of light on ^{Daniel} Rev. from different passages in Rev. and it does fit particularly with the material in ch. 7. Ch. 8 has a similarity to ch. 7 and those who take the Macc. interpretation say it must mean the little horn in 7 and then the little horn in 8 are the same. Others say the little horn in 8 is the anti- but they say it is typical of the little horn in 7 and now how do we interpret the word interpret? You might say G. Washington was typical of F.D. Roosevelt. My personal feeling is that it is best to say away from one thing as a type of another thing. I don't see any reason why we need to say in ch. 7 the little horn is a type of the one in 8 and so on. Daniel shows there are difficulties ahead and there are difficulties in the time of the Greek Empire, and in the Roman Empire, but to say one is the tupe of the other, I don't think it is particularly clear. Ques. There was a psychological pressure in Babylonia but in the Macc. period there was an actual wistful effort combined with the psychological pressure.

It is interesting in the time of Daniel God gave these miracles and then at other times He did not give miracles but He prepared them for later times by the teaching He gave to them.

Ques. about Daniel 7 and 3. Ques. about the firey furnaces and how God protected them there. Yes, God did protect them and bring them out safely. All this was in the course of His plan.

If the Macc. people had known it was God's will they would have to die and then it would mean they would have had to suffer valiantly and to die bravely. I think the ones who would die would think of the ones who would survive and God would triumph in the end. This would not have been necessary to give but it is the fact and it is given. It is not the case of an individual surviving but the case of an individual and eventually he would take over completely. In ch. 8 we have the interesting things about the time of Antiochus and He refers to the Grecian Empire and it is very true what He says and there are many things about the anti-christ which are not dealt with specifically and there is nothing here that you cannot say does not fit Antiochus Euphineses. There is one thing that is peculiar and that is v. 14. In v. 11-22 we read how the little horn cast down some of the host and stamps on them--referring to the ~~sin~~ saints of God. Ref. to Rv. It is an interesting thing that commentators have been puzzled and if you took 300 and divided into days, etc. Take 2300 and divide by 365 and you wouldn't get 7 yrs. would you? 6 yr. and one-third. Now just what is this interval and what does it indicate?

There is a lot we know about the Macc. period and then there is much which we do not know. There was a case where the daily sacrifice was taken away and just about exactly three years later it was restored. This comes rather near that figure if you take that as evening and morning and the whole day. It might be a certain period that would fit with this but we don't have it so stated and it just says evening and morning. I don't know how they can be quite that positive. It is judgment rather than which was fulfilled. It was about six years instead of seven years. It is almost three years exactly in the time of the stopping of the daily sacrifice and the time of the reestablishment of it when you take the figures in their simplest sense as contained in Macc. So it is a problem to know just how to fit this in--most commentators think this 2300, morning and evening is a day and thus 2300 days and that would be 6 years. There could be a time in the Macc. period when this would fit with that but we don't know. Some commentators say it must be day and it is never used in the sense of evening and morning but I don't know how they can be quite that positive. Some say it is six and a little short of seven so it would be judgment instead of perfection so you give a figure of about six years instead of seven. I

personally am a little skeptical of that type of reading.. He said "until 2300 days and then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" and that is the most obscure thing in this ch. It might be a valuable clue in understanding other periods of time mentioned if we knew just what it meant. Since it is not too exact it is hard to know just what it does mean. Suppose you took 2300 for years and that type of periods, that would take you up to 2132 AD and maybe that means when the Second Coming is. As you read the text it seems he is speakign directly of the results of the anti-christ. Ques. about what happens at the end of the three year period. Antiochus' men took over the temple and put up a heathen altar and made the sacrifice and then the Jews reconquered this part of Jerusalem and they took all the things out and cleansed the temple and started the sacrifice over again. Ques. about the obscure meaning. Not exactly--I believe that is about exactly three years and this would be three years and 55 days and if you want to get exactly three years, it has to be exact but to get approximately three years 2300 is a rather peculiar number to give. If you gave 2200 it would be much more exact than than 2300. If you should say 2000 it is a round number but 2300 is not a very round one. It does seem to me to mean it more precisely than just three years. Ques. Yes, there are interpreters who say the little horn is a type but my question is --what can you be sure that you learn from a type? It may be this is a type of the other and both are given and the attention is called to one another in the book. I don't think we increase in knowledge in this manner but it is apt to be more obscure. It is an idea of what is going to happen to Antiochus and if it is an indication that Christ is going to return in 2132AD then I will ~~fell ta~~ at that time that this did mean that. My present view is that it is not the correct interpretation but it relates to something specifically in Antiochus own day. Ques. about the Jewish year. The Jewish year is a lunar year and the twelve months of approximately 300 days and then every so many years it inserts an extra month. It keeps it then pretty near right but it does it by inserting an extra month every now and then and in the old days they had watchers in Babylonia to see if a new moon appeared and if it did, it was the first day of the new month and if it did not it was the last day of the old month and we have records from the Babylonians for watching for the new moon and seeing it or not seeing it and thus knowing if it was a new month. It is not too good a plan though as you couldn't tell always. They throw in this extra month when it does not fit the way it should and come out even. The Mohammedians don't throw in this extra time. They have a lunar years-but their year goes around. A certain date of the Mohammedians may be in the middle of winter in this year and next year in the middle of summer. They just follow the moon strictly. The Jews from early time, we don't know how

early, have had this extra month. It was figured out sometime in ancient times quite accurately and the years are fairly exact if you figure a number of them together. Ques. about how to figure it. 20 Jewish years would average mightly close to 265 days a year. They might be short ones or they might be long ones and it would be hard to be exactly sure. In the time when they would say it was in this certain month, that might be when the extra month would be thrown in and that might make up for this extra 55 days and it is a very interesting suggestion. Ques. about length. No, I think it is about 3 yr. and 10 days. Around 400

Daniel 66

2300 is only the round number for it. If he had said 2297 then I would feel it is exact but when 2300 is given then it is not so exact. An inter-calory month would help to solve it but without it it is quite a loss and it is hard to find out. If there is that would probably solve this problem and make it exactly right. If you could prove it, it would answer a majority of questions. Some say it is absurd to take it as mornings and evenings but it means days and if it exactly fits with what it shows here, it would seem the exegesis is completely wrong. That is an interesting suggestion. Ques. Yes, I think Mr. Lewis Clousky in his new book tries to show the new-year was 360 days back in the old days instead of 365 but not being an expert in astronomy, etc, I don't know. As far as I know from ~~esse~~ archeology I know of not any evidence of 360 days in a year anywhere. I have come across places that talk of the Babylonian year 360 days and I have never known of it actually anywhere. Mr. Clousky speaks of it and he is the well known scientist, has studied the human brain, etc, and he may have some evidence. Personally I am wondering how his knowledge of the human brain, etc, helps him to interpret Joshua's long day and the cosmic disturbances ^{AD} which he describes. Ques. I think most scholars say 3080, don't they, and ~~Ref~~ Prof. Omstead of the Un. of Chicago wrote a series of articles and he went into that matter quite at length and some of it was written up in the Sunday supplements in the newspapers and he claimed on this sort of figuring to give the exact time and Marshall got material from that source. It is true that he rather spoiled it, however, by jumping on to wild assumption as "However, Christ was actually about 45 years of age. He was not 30 years of age as the Gospels say because that statement is in the synoptic Gospels and you can't depend on them but only on John you can depend" and that is the opposite from all other liberal NT scholars and he said, "In John we have the proof he is not exactly 30 years old as Luke says but nearly 50--between 45 and 48" and the reason for that is that "thou art not yet 50 years old and hast thou seen Abraham" and they say it is saying he could not preach for he was not 50 and that must have been the age

recognized for preaching. And he goes on to say that he would not say that unless he was about 50 so he must have been up in his forties. The writer is jumping to conclusions there and with no actual evidence whatever. Even though _____ is a very great scholar and highly recognized and has done some very good work, I think probably his work on this date of 30 AD is probably correct yet when he says that it makes you just kind of wonder a little bit. Ques. about 355 days. Ques. about on what they based the year. 365 day year and the idea of 3 1/2 is given in ch. 7 in reference to the anti-christ and there is nothing to tie it with Antiochus Euphineses and the critics say that is Antiochus because you have this period of 2300 days and most days are whole days and not half and thus it makes it 3 1/2 years. It is 3 yr. and 2 months, however, and ~~all~~ along with the suggestion you made a few minutes ago if it should be that one of those three years was of the intercalary month when it was put in and then you have only actually a time of three years and a few days and so it makes it come out pretty close and so ch. 8 would bring it close and ch. 7 wouldn't and so the critical theory there just does not fit. Ques. How can you prove there is any such thing? That is what we should look into and there needs to be enough to prove the question.

You need to be objective but to be objective does not mean that you need to forget everything else you have known and take this something entirely by itself and work it up all along-- it does not mean this at all but it does mean you look into the field to see just what is there. You don't say this has to be that because my previous knowledge says it must be, etc, because life and thought are so complex that it does not matter what you know as there may be a new theory or something and then on closer examination may prove to not contradict it at all but will fit in with it. You know how it is easy to take something and go into the field and then explain everything away until it gets into obvious conformity and that way man has been hindered in his study in every way and the most obvious things have ~~not~~ been overlooked and simply this because people have looked at things through colored glasses. It is interesting to read commentaries on Daniel and then see how commentators approaching it will tear out this or that, push it aside and make it fit in with their theory but it is entirely objective. It is in this world of sin that each of us is bound to be affected by our previous view points but the way to make progress is not to say that we are prejudiced but instead try to look at this thing --~~the~~ apart from my prejudice and say that here are the different ideas and then try to see from these different fields if the ideas seem to fit with one another and we don't want to say they fit unless we are clearly sure the evidence is in that direction and if we find problems, as we are bound to do.

then lets examine them carefully and see if they fit with the ideas without twisting them and distorting them. Does it require some readjusting with my previous approach to see how they fit in? Some men take a tiny bit of evidence and with just that they fight for a verse and even in occasions where it does not affect this particular. I think it is no harm to get a little enjoyment out of it when we find it as it does not mean we are laughing at the man but we need to go to the facts and see objectively what they are. At the points where you are least sure of the facts, they are the ones you are more apt to talk about and this is a common failing of human nature. Prof. Omstead's History of Palesting is one of the greatest and one of the worst books ever written on the history of Palestine, Assyria, etc. Nicely done up, well published, etc. It is a history but he gives all through it facts and information that is dubious and there are interpretations that a few people think but there is no real evidence there about it. He has a dogmatic tone all the way through. Anyone not knowing the facts and just reading the book might get the idea that they are the positive facts and it is a terrific thing.

Daniel #67

That which is perhaps the right interpretation and the new idea which has just been arrived at, and then it should be labeled as very tentative. In the book of Daniel of course there are many things that are absolutely clear and some of these are agreed upon mostly by most of the interpreters and then you can see how wrong they are in pushing aside and not making it very clear and I think it is vital in seeing how wrong they are in pushing aside and I think it is vital that we see how wrong they are in pushing aside and I think an interesting example of this is Philip More and we have noticed how he tried to take the consistent second view point and he is about the only one of whom I know who does and if you read the introduction is about and you would never dream it has anything to say about an anti-christ or the second coming of Christ. The intro. indicates to us that it is only about the struggle of Antiochus Euphineses and the coming of Christ to die on ~~these~~ cross and the coming of the great, glorious kingdom of Christ immediately after His crucifixion and they are the three things stressed in the introduction to the book and you would think there was nothing else of any importance in the book of Daniel. Yet as you go on through the book you find point after point where Young mentions about the anti-christ. Point after point is interpreted that way. This deals with the great enemy of God, and point after point is definitely interpreted that way. He makes no reference to it in his intro. and he acts as though it did not even exist and he recognizes the Christian interpretation of these facts and the events comes toward the end of the age and to carry it out logically it should be

given in the intro. In fact he admits in the interpretation that he will give the third view instead of the second view and so ~~has~~ has tried to be consistent and lawyers are apt to be consistent all the way through. ~~and he is apt to~~ There is a view point of rather extreme dispensationalism and he carries that to extremes and it is rather an extreme in different ways and so he stopped one way and then went another. He attacks pre-mel. and he tries to interpret Daniel strictly according to the 2nd view point and when it is done that way, Herod the Great is the anti-christ and everything in the book has to do with the first coming of Christ and the setting up of the great and glorious kingdom, the church and immediately after the Crucifixion of Christ and he is the only one I know of who does that consistently and it just does not fit. There are too many points at which it is interesting--Young shows the Macc. view and then the areas of dispensationalism and he does show the error as he goes along and point after point he shows it does not work that way. I think it is important to try to see what is clear, what is definite, etc, as to the teaching in the book. It is said here it might be one way but it is probably another way and it had better go slow about it. You mustn't be dogmatic about it and there is reason in the book for the reason of being least dogmatic. In ch. 7 we read about the anti-christ speaking against holy ones, and in ch. 8 we read that Antiochus, the time of the discontinuance of the annual sacrifice will be 2300 even days and when you get the time of the evenings and mornings, then you ask if that is the same as the time and time and half the time in ch. 7 and naturally the Macc. interpreter is anxious to prove it is the same. He goes on to say the time plus time plus half of time, etc, is 3 1/2 years and then he says the end is . In ch. 8 he says 2300 evenings and mornings and we wonder just what he means and it is the time when the continual sacrifice will be done away with and then it is that the 2300 evenings and mornings must mean 2300 days. Then he says no, as that would give a period of six years and it is pretty hard to fit that in with Antiochus so he says 2300 does not mean evening and morning, it means days and then it is 1150 days and then ch. 8 is the same as ch. 7. He then says 1150 days are the number of ones that Antiochus came into the sanctuary and he gave the continual sacrifice. Right away there is a difficulty as 1150 days is not 3 1/2 years as it is nearer 3 yr. and a month. The critical inter. bound with this is desirous of showing these two are the same and the conservative inter. who says it is not the critical time and it is not the time of Antiochus and then the critics would say it must be wrong and thus it must be 2300 and you will find a lot of conservatives who will insist it is 2300. We must be aware of letting people's

authority sweeping us into this view. We must recognize that the scholars want us to do us and that does not mean that we don't want to accept the other view. It is hard to apply to the time of Antiochus Euphines. 1150 does not fit but they are not in the difficulty there that I think they are with 2200. If an additional month is put in, how do we know that month does not come right in this period of three years. The enemy out according to the book of the first Macc. It means exactly that length of time according to their calendar and it does not mean necessarily according to the sun and if their calendar put in an extra month, it might come pretty close.

Ques. Yes, what we would call the three years, would be exactly three years and a month. We don't know the exact arrangement of the calendar at that time and when it is three years and a month, why do we have difficulty in saying it may be exactly the time when we can continue the sacrifice? Over in ch. 12 we find another very interesting note and it is a strange statement. In ch. 12 it tells us the daily sacrifice will be taken away -----there shall be 1290 days. That is 140 more than 1150 and that is interesting. Then we read the next verse and it is--"blessed is he that waits and comes to the 1335 days" and then in Daniel 8 1150 and if you take 2300 as sacrifices instead of days and get 1150 then you 1290 here and then you have 1350 Why these three days? Prof. Gungel has an answer. He is a great German OT scholar and the writer of the book wanted to encourage the people in the Macc. time and he said the continual sacrifice will be taken away and will last only 1150 days and then you put that together. So he added the verse and he said the day of the sacrifice should be taken away and there would be the 1290 days and then 1290 passed and there was not any yet but it did look as though they would soon get the victory and they came to 1335 days and that way he kept pushing it forward. The historical situation did not fit what he expected but his faith never wavered and he just lengthened the time, every bit of it. That is the way the modernists get spiritual lessons out of the Bible all of the time and it is the same kind of lessons spiritually you could get out of "Alice in Wonderland", etc. Actually you would think if he is going to change dates that way he would then do it in the middle instead of adding it first and it is not a very satisfactory interpretation but the fact remains that we have these figures told here in 2300, 1150 or 1290 and 1335 and 3 1/2 and they are all sort of near each other but they are not exactly the same and we wonder just what the relationship is. We don't have the certainty of it.

We shall look at v. 4 in ch. 12 --I think it is out of order because the meaning in context is out of order and in the verses just before we have been told about the Resurrection and then it changes and here we see, "many shall run to and fro," . Issac Newton ~~and~~ was one of the greatest minds if not the greatest mind the world has ever known. Many think Einstein has proved Newton's theory wrong . The original principles are the greatest discoveries that perhaps the human minds have ever made. His Law of Gravitation is so great and Newton is about the greatest mind the world has ever had. It does not mean that all Newton said was right. Newton was very interested in the book of Daniel as a great work of prophecy and Newton refers to this v. 4. He says as far as many running to and fro, he said there are horses that go faster than any they previously had and there are the beginnings of mechanical contraptions that will go quickly about the earth. Newton turns his head to such ideas as they are given here. He thinks it is foolish that people will get such ideas that anyone can ever travel 60 miles an hour. He thinks it is terrible the place a man can reach when he gets to studying the Bible. Of course today it goes a lot faster than 60 miles an hour but then we have to ask if travel upon the earth has any connection at all with this verse. Even though Newton, one of the great minds of the world, says this is a prediction of the increase in the speed of transportation and yet is this the meaning of it? ~~It is too bad to destroy~~ what does it mean to run to and fro? We find the same word used again and it does not seem to make a great deal of difference to the sense. Ref. to Zech. 4:10 "these are the eyes of Jehovah, which run to and fro through the whole earth." Is that talking about transportation? Exactly the same thing is said in II Chron. 16:9 and there is a little addition to it there that make it even clearer. What does it mean then to run to and fro? Does it show the speed of transportation? Does it show an aimless going here and yon? The meaning of the ones in Zech. and II Chron. is of His eyes searching out and looking for these things. God is searching out His plans and His purposes and accomplishing His will and there should be a purpose for looking for something . Investigate seems to be a pretty good description here. They are searching for something and in Numbers 11:8 you find it there. It is not translated "the people went about," in the RV and they went about and gathered and so what does that mean that the people gathered it and went about and ran as fast as they could. Does it mean the people just aimlessly wandered? Does it mean they went over here, and over there, etc.? They didn't go in a straight line but they went to and fro but they went to and fro with the purpose of finding something --does this word imply that you are finding that for which you are looking or not? The word means to look for and to find and the word means to look for without saying

The word means to go back and forth--it doesn't mean to go fast and the method of travel is not involved. It means to go back and forth--but all the cases that we have looked at has a definite purpose in mind. That does not mean that you won't find it used another way but you would have to find it. From the present references it means to go back and forth, or it may mean to wander back and forth but with a purpose. It means to look for something but before you can say that the word simply means aimless wandering around, you would have to find instances of that. Everyone will remember that my course in Isa. last year--Isa. 25:11--it mentions swimming and B.D.B. mentions this has the same root shute, that is used to swim. (Minutes 12-15 reading of this verse in the Heb.)

69 --I didn't look up the verse ~~of~~ that is mentioned here and I don't know where the Concordance ~~got it~~ from, but it is trying to do something--there might be an error in the ref. but it would seem strange that Mr. Gustafson would have the same recollection. It is translated "to row" in some case. Cf. Jonah 1:13. If it is used of swim, in this case swimming is certainly purposive. It would seem that B.D.B. was looking at another MSS since this root is not used here either. They both have the purpose of going, and one is supposedly translated row and the other is translated swim--it is not just a mistake on their part. In Dan. 12:4--some interpreters take that as meaning some secret that no one will be able to understand it, but there is no idea of secrecy in it but rather of careful preservation. ^{careful preservation} Moffitt puts in his translation of what he thinks it means. The Heb. makes it ambiguous so that it would be said that he seals it either to keep it from people or keep it safe. Moffitt selects one of the possibilities and then puts into his translation--either is a possibility and I think that most commentators have come to the conclusion that it means to preserve rather than keep secret. There may be a certain element of secrecy involved, even if you don't fully understand the words written. Even if Daniel didn't know all that he was writing down, keep them so as the day approaches, people will begin to understand them better. In I Pet. we are told, how they sought diligently what manner of things they wrote, about the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. It is important to keep the exact words because in addition--as the day approaches there are things that are discovered that aren't at first obvious to the ones living far away from the time for when it was written. It is not a matter of trying to keep people from know what is written. It means keep what was written carefully and not secret.

The time of the end is used in two ways. It is used after the period of the exile--the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and it is also used for the very end of the age. You cannot always tell immediately which end it is speaking about. It ~~xxx~~ may be speaking of things that happen right after the exile and then stretching in perspective clear to the end of the age. Ques. about having a verse to show it means the end of the exile? Ch. 8 is something of that type. V. 19 of ch. 8 and then he goes on to talk about Antiochus Euphineses and in that ch. you have then the same idea that is over here in v. 4. Does it mean it will be available? There is much of it that noone understands and much of it only comes through the study and it comes back and forth and they have to investigate it. Ques. Ezekiel 27:8 and 26 and in 27 you see the purpose and the reason for going back and forth. It has a definite purpose and you are looking for a way to avoid the rocks and to get out of the harbor safely. In v. 26 we have they rulers have brought thee into great places and to avoid the rocks and it does mean then going back and forth with a definite purpose and they are looking for someone or something--to avoid the rocks and to get the ship out and to get to the harbor safely and then in v. 26 "They rulers have brought thee into great waters " and then we know they got out of the harbor and made their way safely and they avoid the rocks. Every instance under which I have looked and about a dozen and fifteen and each one has a purpose in it. Job 1:7 we find that Job asks Satan from whence he comes and Satan says, from walking up and down, going to and fro upon the earth and we ask if he was going aimlessly here and there or was he really looking for something? He definitely was going out and looking for evil and wickedness upon the earth. If he was looking for something, did he find it? It shows us he is purposely looking and hunting for something and we find the same idea in Amos 8:12 and there we find that they run to and fro looking for the word of Jehovah and shall not find it. Does it mean aimless wanderings? Or does it mean definite wanderings there? It is hunting and looking for something and they are looking in order to seek the Word of God and they shall not find it. It is unsuccessful then. In some of the phases it is successful but here it is unsuccessful. It means to look intensively.

They search and they do not find it. It is the going to and fro in order to find something. Then you turn back to Daniel 12:4. Go back and forth and search it out. Now I think we should discard the idea of the fast plane or train and I don't think that the going to and fro has that meaning at all and I feel that most commentators are correct in thinking of it as investigating and searching out but is this searching a successful searching? Ref. to Amos. Daniel 12:4 seems like a gradual increasing and it is a definite finding. Then he shall run to and fro in order that knowledge may be increased. Does that mean then that they may not find it? Is it the opposite from Amos? People are going to investigate and they are going to find what they seek. Ques. They are different contexts and quite different. Amos said they would send a famine--not one of food or water but one of the knowledge of the Lord. They will hunt and not be able to find the Word of the Lord. There are those things which he did not understand at all and there are those things which are sealed up and kept safely to the end. The time will come when people will study into this Book and gain more truth out of it. They will begin to see this truth so you should not feel too badly. Don't get too dogmatic about it. As the time draws near more people will have more facts available to them and they will see the meaning of it. Quotation from Leupold--teacher of Biblical exegesis at Capital Univ. at Columbus, Ohio--He says that Daniel is told to seal the book and many shall diligently pursue it and knowledge shall be increased. He says that since it is the intensive form of the verb that is used and that is why he uses diligently pursue it. You find Calvin doesn't go into that problem in a very great way, but he does say that it should be translated investigate. Many shall investigate and knowledge shall be increased. The Lord will someday allow people to understand it. He says that this event did come to pass when God increased His Church. Now Montgomery in the I.C.C. takes the thorough critical position. Young refers with great praise to the philological work and he mentions how sorry that he is to differ from him so often. That doesn't ~~mean~~ mean that whatever Mont. says you are to accept uncritically unless it happens to contradict your particular viewpoint--we shouldn't take that attitude but we should consider what he says. He usually gives a lot of evidence but on this particular thing--he takes the waw to mean that --many shall run to and fro that knowledge may increase. He says that it refers here to Amos 8:12--they shall wander from sea to sea and from the north to the south--they shall run to and fro and seek the Lord but shall not find Him.

He says that the parallel interprets the passage for us--that there will be a vain search until the book is published--that is until the writer in the Macc. time write the book in the end. He says that the most common interpretation is that of Jerome--that is to go through the book and understand it by studying it. He says that there is no evidence for Jeromes' view but it would seem to me that he was simply brushing the evidence aside. He says that the verb doesn't mean seek. That is rather typical of Montgomery--he gives this man and this man and this man's view and by the time you come to the end you hardly know what he himself believes. It is interesting to notice that Young here seems to take Montgomery as the last word and it seems to me, that he was affected by it because of the feeling that is vital in Daniel--that which is important is that which deals with the first coming of Christ. He tries to get that out of this verse but it doesn't seem to me that he does a very good job with it. He says that the words are just what Daniel has been given but the book contains more than that. Daniel is to seal the book until the time of the end. He himself has completed his ministry--the end therefore he says is not the end of the reign of Antiochus --many shall run--this is a very difficult phrase he says. He says also that this verb means just to wander about aimlessly but the instances that we have looked at show a looking for something with a purpose. He says also that it refers here to Amos 8:12--it is for the sake of increasing knowledge and he goes on to say that this verse means for Daniel to seal up the book and though they go to and ~~for~~ and seek for knowledge, they will not find it; thus it is unwarranted to consider that the increase in education and speed in travel as a result of this prophecy. There is a strange sadness in these words--there is the Word in the world but men heed it not.

71. --I don't see that there is indication that they won't find what they are looking for. It is connected with a purpose and I doubt that you will find anywhere in the Scriptures--they shall run about that knowledge may be increased but they don't succeed--it will be told if they don't succeed. They run about and do increase knowledge. If it means that, it means that their search is successful. So his interpretation differs from all other comm. except perhaps Montgomery and it doesn't seem to ~~take~~ any particular sense in the context because the context is giving us the purpose for perserving the book.

It seems that God is telling Daniel to preserve the book well and as the time draws near then what is written will be understood and so we are not to be too worried if we come across parts that we don't understand. Let us study them and see what they mean, but not become dogmatic, and it may be that God will open up to us in our generation as to what the 1290, 2300 or 1150, 1335 days fit together but let us not jump to conclusions and be dogmatic about it. Nor should we go to the other extreme and say that these are so general that no one can understand it--these numbers are simply periods of time and is just the general idea of wonderful progress--that is we know that God has put these specific things in the book for a specific purpose and just because we don't understand them, doesn't mean that they don't have a purpose. Let us study and see if we cannot find their purpose and perhaps God will give us the knowledge on these things. Young says that the time of the end mentioned here refers to the time right after Daniel. Of course it would have been perfectly easy for the Lord to tell Daniel to seal up the book for the end and in the meantime there will be all kinds of ways tried out to seek after knowledge but that is not the thing that is said. I am a bit disappointed in Young's comm. He will often say that philologically this or that can't mean so and so but then he doesn't show or give any evidence why. What he means is that Montgomery says this or that but if it fits in with the critical position then he disagrees with him. Montgomery may be right or may be wrong on certain points and he is always worthy of consideration. It seems he has made a contradiction here--it says that many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased but he interprets it to mean that knowledge will not be increased--that way you can get just about what you want out of the Bible. Here it would seem that it had the opposite meaning of Amos--there they are looking for the Word of God but can't find it but here is the place to find it and knowledge will be increased. It shows that the prophets wrote things that they did not understand at times. That enabled them to get that which was clear to them and also it would be that as the time drew near, people would get more understanding and light on what was written. It is used of Satan going to and fro through the earth--it is used of going to and for with a purpose and usually getting that which is being looked for and if the thing is not successful, it says so. It would seem that "the time of the end" could be equally well interpreted with the first part of verse as well as with the last portion of it. The Massorites take it with the first part.

It doesn't say and many shall run to and fro but just many shall run to and fro, so that it would be entirely possible to take it--seal up the book and this knowledge shall be increased. Of course after the first coming of Christ we received a great insight into the O.T. It might refer to studying the Scripture and seeing what it means. It says that knowledge will be increased but not when the great increase of knowledge will be. If you applied this to the end part of the verse it would definitely exclude the idea that people won't be successful in finding knowledge. But how much there is in the book of Daniel that refers to Christ's first coming is a very interesting question. Of course Young is very strong on the idea that the stone cut without hands that came and destroyed the image is Christ coming at His first coming.

In ch. 11 we have seen how the first portion of the chapter refers to Xerxes and then on to Seluchus IV--that father of Antiochus IV. Vs. 20 seems to refer to the brother of Antiochus IV.

72--You can't get away from the idea that one of the great purposes of Daniel is to prepare those people in the time of the Macc. It would seem extremely probable to me that v. 21 is describing Antiochus and if that is the case you find no difficulty in having him described right through v. 36. Now I don't say that there might not be places here and there where it suddenly jumps forward to a future age but it would seem that he is described very nicely in this section. I think it is Jerome who says that v. 20 suddenly jumps to the future--from 21 ff. it describes the anti-christ, but in the course of the description of the anti-christ, it also describes Antiochus and some of the verses fit the anti-christ and the ones that fit Antiochus we can see that they are completely fulfilled and the rest are to be fulfilled. That is an interesting idea--that after you have the brother of Antiochus described then you have two men described simultaneously and back and forth he goes. Young translates this section of Jerome in his commentary. It is too bad that the rest of it has not been translated into English from the Latin. Young seems in general to adopt Jerome's view. Young says there are no gaps in Scripture. I don't know how he would explain about the kings of Persia in ch. 11--you have a jump from the four kings of Persia to Alexander or else the history is wrong. But how are you going to get away from the fact that you have don't have a gap here.?

This description of vs. 36 ff. Jerome takes to refer to the anti-christ and has some suggestions of Antiochus. Young says that gaps are absolutely unknown in Scripture and he takes up a number of verses that the dispensationalists take up as proving gaps and he shows that these don't prove that at all. It isn't considered any place as a gap or a parentheses and the verses go from 21 up to 35 on practically all of the places. Practically every thing that has come Young says this is Antiochus and he credits everything from 21-35 to Antiochus. When he comes to v. 36 Young says he is not talking about Antiochus but he is talking about anti-christ and from practically every v. on Young says it much fit anti-christ and it could not possibly fit Antiochus. If he describes Antiochus first and then anti-christ, I don't know how you get away from saying a gap or parentheses in between the two. I don't know of any other way of possibly interpreting the two and it is a guess as to how it is. If there isn't a parentheses or a gap there, how can he then say all of this is the anti-christ or Antiochus, to the end of ch. 45 and this is how the people of the first view did. To say all of this refers to Antiochus, they have to go through all sorts of twistings and turnings and I wish we could get a letter written to some of them and ask how this could be Antiochus. He didn't do this or that but we know he must actually have done it because Daniel said it. It goes king by king by king, up to Silius up to Antiochus and it ends with the Resurrection and between Antiochus and the Resurrection there is a gap. If it Antiochus all the way thru, there is a gap from Antiochus on and if you take Jerome's view you take a lot of gaps. There is a gap and a parentheses and no way to get around and it is typical of dispensationalists to say there gaps in Scripture and there can't be a gap here. Macc. view is not right as that would make Daniel a book full of mistakes and then others say it is the anti-christ. Ques. about the gaps. A gap or parentheses should go from one place to another and the fact of the matter is that you cannot possibly interpret OT prophecy without recognizing that at point after point in OT prophecy he discusses something we ought to know and then he jumps forward and then there is a gap there and that type of OT cannot be understood. If you have to jump right into the second coming, you have no indication that there is a gap or a period in between. Ques. about v. 41, etc. Is there any place in the Bible in the OT or NT where it says the anti-christ is going to persecute the Christians? It is a time of suffering and of Jacob's trouble such as never was experienced in the world. ~~but~~ The saint's were the most

persecuted of the people it is said in Daniel. Ques. about Edom and Moab in Egypte. Yes, I certainly think it is talking about Palestine--Edom is a specific area which is right there today, Moab, and Egypt are too. Today the people of Edom and Moab and the children of Ammon are today controlling half of Palestine. I heard the other day of a suggested trip to Palestine and people told not to get a visa for Israel as they could see the places in the Bible mentioned without a visa for Israel and if you do get a visa the people who hold the staff will not let you into Palestine. On the other hand, if you go into their territory the people of Israel will not let you in there there. Today there is a line through the city of Jerusalem--if you want to go to the Am. School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, not over three blocks away is Israel and a line over which no one is allowed to cross and it is only about three blocks away and you would have to go about 500 miles around. Now those people are the ones who control the land of Edom and the land of Moab. They control that area and they come from that area and they are today holding half of Palestine. For anyone to say that this cannot mean today is not correct and cannot be done either and it means the enemies of the church and it is the attitude taken to prove the Word of God as our source and our stay. Now we don't want to say "here is this and it means this and so." It is a definite meaning and has a definite purpose and a few years ago Dr. Young discussed Gog and Megog and then said it did mean this or that and then it is said that it can't mean that, etc. Actually it means the church is not going to have great enemies and that is all that it means. Two ch. describing what God is going to do and it has no specific literal meaning and that is a type in itself. Dr. Young's commentary has the pictures of Assyria in it. It has some very fine material in it and in some ways it is very excellent.

73 -- For today you were to study into Dan. 9 and look the various viewpoints up in various commentaries and I am sure that you have noticed that each commentary will sweep aside with great sweeping statements their particular problems and bring out that their idea is the only that could sensibly be held. Many are like this. Then there are men like Young that are absolutely sure that the 70 weeks follows to the day of the death of Christ and in the middle of the 70th week He caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease but when did that 70th week end. Does it end 40 years later? There is nothing to end it. There are some strong points in favor of this viewpoint and it would seem that the A.V. was translated by people with this viewpoint, but it would seem that in some places like this, the A.V. is a very poor translation. Young feels that Keil is perhaps the

best commentator on the Book of Daniel, and there is some which he quotes with great approbation but then there is a great portion with which he seems to disagree quite vehemently and on this particular point Keil is quite sure that the A.V. is quite impossible and that the one who cuts out sacrifice and causes oblation to cease is Christ's death on the cross of Calvary. Many godly people hold this view and they have some verses in the A.V. and some even in the Heb. that would uphold their point of view and you can't dogmatically say there is nothing in these verses that allude to it, but they make everything allude to it. Then there are those who hold that the 70th week is not in the time of the Macc., nor in the time of Christ's first coming, but it is at the end of the age. You will find that most of them also are very dogmatic with their conclusion and the utter repudiation of any other view that the particular one which they hold. There is something to be said, when you try to convince someone of a view to show that there is evidence this way and that way but people are apt to say they would rather hear someone that was dogmatic on the thing that they believe--to the great mass of people, if you get up and say that this is the way and the other ways are absolutely foolish, they will follow you, but if you don't take such a dogmatic view, then people simply are not interested. There is a place to be mighty positive of what you believe, but it will ~~appeal~~ appeal to the more intelligent person if you show the various possibilities--after all they in end are the ones that are apt to influence the mass--I regret that so many of these commentaries are so certain that they are a 1000% right and so sure that others who might differ from them are absolutely sure. In this class I am not interested in showing what I believe, or even what Daniel means but rather to get practice in getting the right approach to the Scripture, which is the same approach that is taken in any science. Get what the facts are and see what the different possibilities are for different interpretation and see which is positive and definite. The wrong approach is to come to the Bible and say does it teach this view or that --does it teach A or does it teach B--but rather what does the Bible teach? Is the Rapture going to come in the evening or the in the morning, or midnight--the Bible does not say, and if someone from the Bible thinks that he finds evidence as to what it is going to be, I am going to say to that person that he is going to examine that evidence very very carefully. Here is a fellow that is sure that the rapture is going to come at 12:03 noon but I am not going to tell him that I am sure that he is wrong without examining the evidence

I feel that it is important not to be dogmatic where the Scripture is not dogmatic and where it is dogmatic, be there dogmatic. It would seem that there are some places in Scripture where it is absolutely clear, and I regret to see some interpreters pass it by but I am sure that it is important that we understand that which God intended us to know. I think that there are three sorts of matters in Scripture--that which is absolutely clear and then there are matters which God has not revealed. For example at Cornell they were told that Archbishop Ussur had said that the world was created Oct. 25, 9:30 a.m. in 4004 B.C. but I doubt if he ever said such a thing--I think that someone would have done a great Christian service if he had squelched that at the beginning and show that the Bible said no such thing--you might be told that you were disturbing people's faith but if you can make it look as though Christians say that, but then if you can find evidence looking the other way, then people say the Bible is all false. We know that the world was created at least 4004 B.C. but we have no idea how much further back. The Bible does not tell us what time of day the rapture is going to be, though I can't get away from the feeling, that the Rapture is something that is going to be so unexpected that no one would say that it wouldn't be next week--I may be wrong but that would seem the teaching of the N.T. passages, ~~xx~~ that we never can say just when it will take place. It certainly doesn't say what part of the day He will return. Then there is a great body of material of which there is a question--perhaps He has revealed a certain thing--let us look into the evidence and see what it teaches. We can't be dogmatic on this portion--we have to be more cautious and let us examine the evidence with care. I think that it is important that when you find something that is clearly taught, then to stand on that and not be afraid of the consequences. There are too many who are willing to take someone else viewpoint and then they try to fit everything else into that--the result is that I believe that God has revealed many things in the Bible, of which we are still unaware. I think that if we used the scientific approach to it we would find much more in it. And when we find absolute definite evidence, we should stand on it, and go from the simple to the more complex ideas and not try to base some doctrine on something that you are not sure about. ~~it~~.

There is a certain amount of material not understood by the church because it has not been God's will that it should be but it is His will that it should be understood at some time. Looking at the verse at the end of Daniel last time and ~~then~~ He said, "Many shall run to and fro and seal up the book and knowledge shall be increased." What do you translate many to run to and fro as? That knowledge may be increased is a permissible rendering of that and in either case it definitely means things are going to be discovered from the Word and as the time ^{draws} draws nearer it is going to be God's will to give more light from His Word. It fits exactly with what John Robinson, the great pastor ^{who stayed in Liden} said to them as they departed for America in 1620--"I believe that God is going to cause more truth to break forth from His Word" and that showed that it was his conviction and in the Word there is truth that God wants the people to find and it had not yet been found. It was ^{not} simply because people had been too slow or too lazy about studying but because God had this particular truth of them and He did not want to come forth with it yet. God causes it in His time to break forth out of the Word and how does He do that? He may bring events to pass in the world and they can enable us to understand the significance of the phrases which were not understood before. He may cause new light to come on the meaning of words and He may cause new discoveries to be made and this by throwing light on the understanding of Hebrew expressions or words. He may cause various things to happen and then passages can be understood that were not perfect. The only commentary I have found denying this view point is Young's and he says, "Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased." That means that many run to and fro that knowledge may be increased and also it means that many do run to and fro without knowledge being increased. That is about as large a jump as I have ever seen to get the logical outcome. I don't know any other commentary that agrees with it. The way for misinterpreting in that way is due to a dogmatic presupposition as far as I can see and there is nothing in prophecy that we can learn about the future that has not yet been known. The things in prophecy that are important are the things that relate to the first coming of Christ and regarding them we may have nothing concrete given and when we get to anything after that it is all symbolical language and nothing that can give us precise information. I think that is a very unfortunate presupposition and which affects a great many different interpretations. No where does it result in such a twisting aside the meaning of the Scripture as in this particu-

lar verse and it takes the exact opposite of what the verse says. I don't know of any other commentator who would do that and he says that it is many running to and fro and knowledge shall not be increased. That is taking black and making it white as much as any modernist I ever have heard do. It is on a small verse but it does have dealings with the question-- does God have truth with His prophecy that He intends to have break forth from His word? I think that verse clearly teaches that He does and I think that I Peter teaches it also-- "The prophets were searching what and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify the manner of Christ and the suffering of Christ and the glory which would follow." On the sufferings of Christ Young and other commentators of that viewpoint will go to great length to show that statements in OT are literally and concretely depict events in the first coming of Christ. There is the glory that should follow and we should not go to length to twist things around to give the idea that we have a future event but we should examine them to see if God will cause more truth to break forth and then the events that are to take place in the future. In a case like this matter of the 70 weeks, it might have been that the prediction was in the first class. It ~~might~~ might be that here is definite information that we should know exactly and accept it. It would be possible it would be in the 4th class but rather unlikely as why would he take four verses on it? You must be very careful to say that here is something not yet revealed and there is a lot revealed in those four verses. There is much that is not clear and there are some matters in it that are not very clear and then we should stand on them and not try to push them aside. There is the preconceived idea of the meaning as a whole and then in this 70 wk. prediction it would be very reasonable to expect factors that were not clear when Daniel wrote and he tells us at the end of various ch. "I did not understand." etc. Daniel was mystified by much that was revealed. The question is when does the time come? When will the time come when ^{people} God will know certain aspects which God has made clear. If we are so determined we will even know what the whole 70 weeks prediction will mean. We have to force everything into one construction or another and we have knowledge that it is exactly this or that and when this comes to light we are not then able to see its full meaning and we are apt entirely to overlook the importance to the new evidence and thus to miss the blessing God has in store and so I feel it is very important to take ~~and~~ a view and whether to fit everything in with it or not, I think it is important to take the statements and ask what the facts are that clearly stand out and what is here definitely stated and let us stand on those matters and on the matters that

are not clear let us say that we do not know and when it is time for people to know this, then God will make the knowledge available. It is not everybody that figures out the 70 week's prediction. It is some people's duty to spend a certain amount of time and to see if new facts and new evidence is available and if we look at the different views of the 70 weeks they said that the thing that disturbs me is the dogmatism of practically every commentator on certain phases and he will explain away certain phrases and twist them around and they should say that here and there are points that are very strong and that involve certain difficulties and I don't think they are sufficient but they show them as wrong. I think we must think of the difficulties that are there. If we say that we must say the answer must come and prove our whole construction to be right and come and show the necessity of modification in it and that which is clear and definite should not have to be changed. Ques. about the Jews becoming a nation and waiting five years to see if that is what it is and if it has actually come true. He didn't say it would or that it has started then. A very unfortunate thing to make so dogmatic a statement unless your evidence is absolutely overwhelming. If the evidence is overwhelming then it would be important for the whole Christian world to be watching for that time. I don't see anything in it that says when Israel becomes a body and the only thing it says is about the beginning of the 70th wk. and it just says that "He will make a firm covenant" at the beginning of the week and we ask who the He is and what is meant by a firm covenant. It does not seem to me that that is Israel becoming a body but it does not seem that that is the beginning of the preaching as some commentators say or of John the Baptist beginning his preaching. Those are very far fetched interpretations and to think of the fact that He will make up for himself. It is unreasonable and as you quote it it seems to me that you made a very unfortunate deduction. Ques. The proper thing to say is when the covenant is made and not when Israel is made a body----- . We must be careful in quoting a man like that as they often get the little if, and, or, but in there and we easily pass over in reading and then we get a false interpretation. He may have guarded himself from that view and yet it may be one that we can very easily get. I find that it is easy to get impressions and when I look back it is not quite accurate. Ironside covers much material and he is a splendid popular writer and with many subjects he handles them very excellently and I would think he would guard himself against them. It is often we get general impressions from the way people write and they are impressions often which should not be gotten. Sometimes you will find they have guarded themselves. and Daniel 11 and 12 cause us to notice

that it seems to be very difficult to avoid the conclusion and from v. 21 on, it is Antiochus spoken of and I don't see how we can get away from it. Jerome said it is anti-christ and he jumped right forward but with the great importance Antiochus has in the book he tells of all his ancestors and then he leads right up to them and it does not seem reasonable to them. Now he deals with Antiochus as a type of the anti-christ and that does not seem to me to be a very reasonable approach. You are talking of one or the other and you do not expect two men to be identical and you can give both in such a way that you don't ordinarily do it. Describe them both in such a way that they look like one man and then describe them as both. When you come up to verse 35 it fits very well with Antiochus, 31, 32, do also. They that understand among the people shall instruct many, etc. "They that understand among the people shall instruct many; yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days."

Daniel 75

They imply here that they do exploits and they are strong and they do not fail and a purging is had but not a failure but in v. 36 after talking about the people of God for a period, you come back to the king again and after speaking of the character of Antiochus and the action of Antiochus and the reaction of the people of God against him, now you come to an individual again and you tell of his character. It is altogether possible to talk about a man's character, then his deeds and again about his character, etc. It does not seem the most natural way as when you start again with character and deeds there is a natural suggestion that you are talking about a different man. If you find what is told about the character and deeds, it is somewhat inconsistent about what is repeated and it raises the question if it is a different man about whom you are talking. Young is very critical for dispensations and of saying this is the little horn of 7 and he says the view of the church from 36 is on is the view of the anti-christ--Antiochus is spoken of as a type of the anti-christ. Of nearly every verse he said it could not possibly fit Antiochus. Although he never makes the statement of the passage as a whole but every verse he says of 36 on that it could not possibly be of Antiochus and so it is a very reasonable view that from 36 on as a great bulk of Christians have held, you have Anti-christ described instead of Antiochus and if you have Antiochus described specifically and definitely before and also after and the two men have much in common and then you can say one is the type of the other and by your dealings with one and the general view and then you learn principles and the objects are different and you

have the two described and you have the one and can write up to 35 and then can jump to the other, how can you get away from the idea there is a gap or a parentheses. There must be or else I see no sensible way to say it is Antiochus before and the anti-christ after and Young waxes very strongly against the idea of this and yet there is nothing unnatural against a gap and this does tell every little detail that does happen every time and still it does not tell everything and yet you can't as it would take forever but you are dealing with certain things and it does not always turn out that there is an interval in between, as you go from one subject to another. I think there were many times during the time of Isaiah when he did not know if the Messianic kingdom would come immediately after that time or if there would be a long time in between. He did not know but He could in his own mind have assumed they would come immediately after but as we get to the end of Isaiah we find that which deals with difficulties of reestablishment and that is after the return. The return does not seem to mean immediately the coming of the great Messianic age predicted but a period of substantial time. I am inclined to think the prophet would be gradually learning more as we are all ~~are~~ and there would be more and more that they could understand and like Isaiah who wrote and wrote for years and pondered and had a much greater understanding than a prophet given a short ministry and did not have so much material that God had revealed to him. There may have been ideas about which he was utterly false as to what he thought in his mind. Young tries to make out there is no jump and the Roman Empire comes and immediately there is the great universal kingdom and he tries to make that out and he does not do it in ch. 9 and in ch. 9 he recognizes the anti-christ is God and he recognizes that anti-christ comes a long time after and so there is a jump in 7 and he passes over it. In ch. 11, v. 4 either there is a gap or the critics are right--either there are four kings mentioned or the others are passed over in silence and there is a gap or a parenthesis. He might be ignorant about the history which would not be strange if he was writing 400 years later instead of predicting as God wanted him to predict. Young looks strongly against that view and the only way you can get away from that view is that there is a gap. There is a gap in 11:4 and you have gaps and you have parentheses and if you were to say that ch. 11 was all about Antiochus and if you were not to say that you would then be in the problem that ch. 12 follows immediately ⁶ after and so you have to have a gap somewhere. If you don't have it you are supposed have it after Antiochus Euphines and so there is a gap one place or the other. There are

gaps elsewhere in the Scripture and they are easy to show and they are either gaps or else they are a lot of nonsense and Young takes up a ^{few} verses and someone says they are gaps and there are no gaps anywhere in these cases. They are very positive against gaps and this is a principle we have to stand on and you cannot put in a gap anywhere you want to and not at all. Unless God says this happens and the next day this happens, you do not know if it is immediately or if there is a period of time in between. You have to have evidence in between before you can be dogmatic one way or the other. The idea of a gap or a parentheses is the idea that it is there everytime we speak. There is not everything told in it. Either the critics are right and the period refers only to the Macc. period or else there are gaps in Daniel and if there are, either this is entirely fallacious about the Resurr. in ch. 12 or there is a gap or parentheses somewhere along the account of Antiochus and the anti-christ.

Ques. Ques. if the revelation of the anti-christ described in II Thess. is after the rapture or before is one on which interpreters differ and there is one particular view is given. Ref. to article in Bible Today and it is said that it comes afterwards and the rapture is first. There are a great many who hold that view and there are others who hold the opposite and I wouldn't wish to be dogmatic but I would wish to be fair in the view. I don't think we can get away from it that there is a gap somewhere. Jerome would have a gap between verses 20 and 21 and most interpreters put it between 35 and 36 and we notice here a strong reason for putting it in between is that due to 36 on you have things do not fit Antiochus and we have had a description of his character and of his activity and of his action to the people in relation to him and again we go back to the character and ~~he~~ then to the activities. It is not impossible to discuss a man's activities, character and then to come to his opponents and go back again. It is a reasonable place for the change to occur and here you take up v. 36 and certainly Antiochus is that and an everyday dictator does that and still it fits them all. He shall exalt thme and it fits them all and magnify himself above every God. He does not magnify himself above every god. The god Jupiter, etc. is magnified and the one who claims he is jupiter and he is a manifestation of Jupiter but he does not magnify himself above Jupiter. This does not fit Antiochus as he does not magnify himself above every god. The rest of the verse does fit Antiochus. About magnifying above every god would not fit him and still it might fit many modern men today. Antiochus did not hold that attitude. Neither did he regard the God of his fathers. Some try to make out that the god of his fathers was Appollo and Antiochus did not worship him and did not regard the god of

his fathers. Some try to make out that the god of his fathers was Apollo but the idea that he did not worship the god of his fathers is pure imagination. There is no evidence for it whatever. Young says the true view is of the official anti-christ. The false views are that this is the anti-christ from Judas and the other view is that it is an anti-christ that comes from Christianity. If he does not regard the gods of his father, it would as though he comes from either Judaism or Christianity but we can't say until we find evidence suggesting he comes from one or the other. He comes from the Christian background and then turned against it is a vague possibility. He fits much better as an apostate from one of these two groups. We find evidence that looks quite definitely in one direction or the other and we should be able to find which way. If Antiochus did not talk about him much does that mean that he does not regard the desire of him? Ref. to v. 37, "the desire of women."

#76

There are various things it might represent and you might take it as that what women desire and you might take it as some individual or some culture. There might be some figure followed by women and he turned against it for that reason. That would be possible. You would not know until the time came and it might represent some relationship, some attitude toward marriage and it might represent a man who held himself strictly aloof and there are these different ways to interpret it. It might be that when you see the situation and then when you see the character you might not be sure what it means and how to regard it. The desire of women may mean that he won't care for women, or women won't have a desire for him. Hitler is said that they, the women were to give attention--the Children, the Kitchen and the Church--he cut them out of the professions they were taking while over here they were put ahead in things--and some people said that Hitler was ignoring the strength of half of his nation. He is losing out while in America they are utilizing the force. Whether this caused his downfall of course I don't know. The desire of women might mean the taking away of their desire to have a job--that is not taken out of the sphere that isn't ordinarily thought of as the sphere of women. It is a phrase that might mean many things, though there is certainly a definite amount of things that it doesn't mean of course. It could be that when it comes to pass, it will be perfectly obvious, without our not knowing in advance what it means. Some have suggested that Christ is the desire of women--I tend to be rather skeptical of that. I believe there are a few commentators that call Him that.

The fact that it is between the god of his fathers and he won't regard any god--you might say that here is a man that is not going to take any interest in law, nor is he going to get married nor take an interest in any intellectual field--that is sort of jumping back and forth, and putting in between might suggest that it refers to Christ, or the Church, but I think that we should be careful not to go off on a tangent--that it is something in the deity line rather than just an aspect in daily life, that would be suggested but not really proved, by its being between these two phrases--nor regard any god. I do not think that it would be true of Jewish women today looking for the Messiah and just how much we could say that in that day they were looking forward to Christ being born--we don't know. As a matter of fact, it would seem to me that our N.T. is one of the best sources to tell us about the Jews at the time of Christ. The Talmud was written a couple of centuries after the Jews had gone through all sorts of turmoil and the time of Christ, and doubtless their ideas on many things were greatly altered. Note v. 38--He shall honor the god of forces--very appropriate for a materialist. He will honor a god that his fathers did not know. Yet we have just been told that he will not honor any god--at first sight it seems like a contradiction but it might be that it might possibly refer to something that was put in place of a god. You might say that here is a person that makes materialism his god--yet he doesn't believe in any god. Here are the Marxists in Moscow in their positive opposition to religion and their anti-god museum in Moscow, and yet they take the body of Lenin and enshrine it and almost worship Stalin--in a figure of speech you could say that they honor God with all these things and also you could say that they oppose all gods--that would be much easier to reconcile today than in earlier periods. We would say that it would refer to the god of forces--the one which his fathers did not know to honor. He honors power, war--something other than any actual god--vs. 39 is still telling about his character. The phrases in this verse are rather general but beginning with v. 40 you have the deeds of anti-christ--for purpose of expedience he could align himself with followers of a god in whom he actually didn't believe in. It is said that Mohammedans that the emperor of Japan was secretly a Mohammedan and they built a wonderful mosque in Japan, and before that they had been given to understand that Kaiser Wilhelm was a secret believer in the same religion, and I think that Stalin has allowed some of his

people to make pilgrimages to Mecca when ordinarily he didn't favor such a thing, but people for expedience sake allow that sort of thing. I heard 20 years ago in France that a French politician was saying that he nor any politician could get ahead unless he was known as an atheist and one that has no use for the Catholic church, but if you are appointed on a diplomatic mission, then it must be known that you are a very devout Catholic and you maintain that the French are the great supporters of Catholic Church and in North Africa it is said that they brag up the Church--while in France they flaunt against the pope. They, when going outside try to surry the favor of the Pope--it is something that is found quite often among people who have no special faith. I remember a fellow I ran acorss coming over on the ocean--I was assigned to be a roommate with him, though we had nothing in common, and naturally we talked a little bit--he was studying how to get along with people and he did make friends with practically everyone on the boat and I am sure they had quite a different impression of him than he had given me. He told me that it was a remarkable thing that he had no use for the church or any sort of religion yet one of these days he claimed that he would be a pillar of some church some day. He told me how essential it was to make contacts with the world and a great many take that same attitude--it is possible that^y is what this means. V. 40 are his deeds again. Does he get attacked from both sides --no it would seem that it had only one other power in mind in the south and he goes down to attack it.

77. -- Much of this will doubtless be quite clear when the time comes but until you have them, you have to say it is easy to see what possibilities there are in these situations. I would think that the ground refers to the source of wealth and source of political exploitation. V. 40--tells us that it is the king of the South that will cause him trouble and it would seem that it is the king of the north who is the antichrist, and if so he is a type of Antiochus Epiphanes who was king of the north. It doesn't seem that the antichrist is attacked from two sides--either is possible. When did the king of the south ever push against Antiochus--he practically conquered Egypt and then the Romans told him to get out. There were other times when the Ptolemies made terrific attacks the Seleucids and some of them are referred to in the earlier parts of the chapter, but there is nothing, particularly at the end of his life that would fit this. After the Romans

told him to get out of Egypt. certain' Egypt didn't go up and attack him. Egypt was pretty well divided up with two brothers and one sister--both used her as their wife--she would hate one and be friendly ~~at~~ to the other and vice-versa--it all was a very sordid history. They were not sort as some of their ancestors or even some of their descendents--one of the sons prove to be rather a wily sort of person. While Antiochus was living neither was in a position to do anything that is described here. The king of the north, it would seem comes in response to what the king of the south did--Antiochus never did this ~~at~~ this time. Soem claim that this is a campaign that our history doesn't tell us about in the career of Antiochus--to say that a person there at the time of the Macc. wrote this down and though we don't know about it from other sources, yet it must have happened because he wrote it down--it seems to be getting into rather devious reasonings. If it did happen at the Macc. period, we would expect to have some other sources to tell us about--in fact there is some very strong evidence against it because the Romans ordered him out--he went to a lot of expensive building--went off into the east and there he died. There is no place for this evidence at all. As Young says in his commentary very truly it does not fit Antiochus. There is nothing there to fit with this verse and it must be a prediction of something in the career of the anti-christ. It is a great victory in which he goes to the south and then in 41 he shall enter into the glorious land--that undoubtedly means Palestine and these will escape out of his hand. Ques. Something in Zephaniah that would look ~~to~~ like a tremendous destruction and it would result in perpetual desolation. That fits with the situation and that is have the nations completely disappeared? If this suggests three nations in the future and they are quite ready to occupy the place in the future and we ~~ask~~ if they are figurative and representing great kingdoms at that time just as in the days of Christ which they called low Eden or do they represent that particular area which was divided and established in those days? It says "and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over!" Cavalry was very important in the first war and in the last war not so much but it does seem unlikely ~~it~~ would come again but maybe it would. Ques. They are strong forces of war and similar here Edom and the chief of Moab does not mean the same ones living then but it refers to the same people-living--area. V. 42 tells us "He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries ~~near~~; and the land of Egypt shall not escape." Antiochus was getting near that altho I

don't think he actually attained that before the Romans built them up. Antiochus was driven from Egypt--the Romans told him to get and he got. In this case it seems to be tidings from the east--it seems that there is some difficulty up there--it was like when Hannibal was in Italy, the Romans sent an expedition to Carthage, so that it caused him to return to Africa and it is always a possibility of overextending your lines so that you can't defend what you already have. It seems that is what this means, but it didn't happen with Antiochus as far as anybody knows, but it will happen in the time of the antichrist. It seems that he is going to be destroyed in Palestine but Antiochus was not destroyed in Palestine and does not fit him. There is a clear gap somewhere between Antiochus and Antichrist and if you say there are no gaps in Scripture--you would still have a gap between this and v. 1 of ch. 12. That verse would seem to suggest the great tribulation and the time of Jacob's trouble when Israel is saved in a day--that certainly would fit very well with that interpretation. Cf. v. 2--it speaks of the resurrection and though it doesn't mention two different stages, yet from other passages we know that there are two resurrections. It doesn't speak just of a general resurrection--and that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. Then v. 4 shows that the book should be carefully guarded and when the times comes, people will understand more from it than they do now--in that day--would seem to be speaking of that days of which he is speaking. I don't think there is anything that would prove against their being a gap between v. 45 and v. 1 of ch. 12 though I don't think there is one there. . Vs. 40 seems to be the only verse that would even suggest that the antichrist might make a treaty with the Jews to serve their god but that would not be proved from that.

78 **I think that we can positively say that from v. 21 on it is Antiochus and I think that we can say most likely it is Antiochus if. but from v. 36 on it would seem that it is speaking of Antichrist--we definitely then have a gap, though I would not be dogmatic about it coming between v. 35 and v. 36/ Somewhere in that passage we do have a gap and that impresses me as the most reasonable place for it. I don't think that we can be dogmatic about the king of the south as referring to Egypt--it would simply mean some king that ruled in that area, or south of Palestine. I would think that whoever is meant, would be dominant in Egypt--Today we speak of Anglo-Saxon nations, but we don't know what will develop but at present as you look at the Egyptian hatred of the British, it would seem hard to think of

of their be rulers down there. But during the last war, England forced the king of Egypt to drop his prime-minister because he was so anti-British--I understand that England even pointed but the man he was to have succeed him to be prime-minister of Egypt in 1942. Or else he told him, he could hand in his abdication as king of Egypt--at that time the power of England was great enough so that he did it. Fifteen or twenty years ago we still had terrific anti-British feeling as we have today and who knows what may happen--all that this passage would seem to show would be that a region there in the south is in mind. All it teaches us I think is that it is a force southern to anti-christ and it covers not only Palestine but also of other territory and the statement that says "He will come into the various lands" suggests that he has not necessarily been there before and so his seat might be somewhere else. This could be someone properly spoken of as such and southern in relation to him. Ques. It does not even say ~~that~~ that, does it? It says between the seas and between the deserts. Actually I think it means all of Palestine and there the term seems to be extended to the whole of Palestine and perhaps it is near Zion. In ch. 12 there are a great many things interesting to go into. I personally would say that I do not know what is meant in v. 11 and in 1290 days. In v. 12 there are 335,000 days and I don't know what is meant by either one of them. I think it will be clear when the time comes however. Times, times and a half are spoken of here and we don't know what it means by times, times and a half but it hardly means $3\frac{1}{2}$ years he said and it does not fit and the time means that the anti-christ starts in slowly and not just for a time. Half a time means that all of a sudden it comes to an end and that is ingenious although not especially original and still an interesting suggestion. I think we best say it is just an interesting suggestion. We cannot be gnostic about such things. Ques. I don't think the context does show exactly what it is but I can't say if there was anything in the Macc. time to represent this but I don't think necessarily that it is wrong. You can add the postscripts and it is like the Russelite that say Christ is coming this month and then when He does not they add another month, etc. to the time they have set. Their predictions never work out but that does not stop them and they just go ahead and make a new one. I don't think there is anything like that in Daniel and I think there is a definite meaning to it. They could be symbolical numbers. We don't know if they mean something specific or not but they could be in general. Why should they say day to mean year and of course they are right there but it is still not impossible that this

did not happen. It is not the most probably thing but still we can't be dogmatic about it.

Ques. It does depend on what it means. You are holy if you are set apart, you are holy if you are entirely sanctified. To call himself holy in the sense that he is freed from sin would be quite presumptuous and then anyone who has been set apart by the Lord could certainly then call himself holy. We should bring our state up to our standard. What God has set apart He will use for His purposes. From the sound of it it is referring to the entire people. Ques. Let's try to see now if we can see a few things that are rather definite as we look at the 70' weeks. Daniel understood, he said, whereby the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet and here is the word came and from God and He would accomplish 70 yrs. from the desolation of Jerusalem. There are those who say the prophecy was made that the kingdom would come in 70 years and it did not work out and the ones in the Macc. period said it was not 70 years but it was 70 years. We should take it on the basis of just human thought and rather weak at that. It has no relevance to the one who believes in God but that does not mean that you are to say there is no relation between the two 70's. Mutal (?) is on the whole I think a very good commentary and he has a background of an anti-pre-mel. attitude and he has a very fine approach and once in awhile he gives something dogmatically but not as a rule and the quickest thing is that he departs utterly from the viewpoint and this is a description of Calvary but one thing he is against is calling these weeks as years. He says that weeks is never used in the Scripture for the meaning of years but that cannot be said too dogmatically and you cannot speak of it as positively as that, certainly. There then are the years, the Sabbatical years and the year of Jubilee, etc. He says they are not days of weeks or years but they are . There are the Greeks and the Hittites. That is sort of a problem and if you want to say they are periods of indeterminate length, you cannot give them as they are. It is more possible to have them as periods of indeterminate length rather than definite lengths. It does not seem the most likely interpretation. It is more probably that they are periods of general length rather than specific lengths. They may be periods where one week is a year long and the next one a week long, etc. It seems there would be a closer relation than that but perhaps not. Take it then that 77 and it does seem alright if you want to use the 7 but the "77s are determined on thy people." What does it mean?

It does not seem to me that we can be very dogmatic on this. It does seem that these 70 weeks go to the end of the time and it is suggested but we cannot say definitely--everlasting righteousness was brought in and it does not say universal righteousness but everlasting. It is not impossible to take it this way and it can be said that it does go to the end of the time. You could say it does or not but I would not be dogmatic on that. Going forth to restore the Jerusalem the people are very dogmatic as to when it was. From this time to the restoring and building of Jerusalem it then shall be 70 weeks and 62 weeks and the streets shall be built again and then go on from this time. Why does this happen? It makes me think that then there are three periods and there is where I think McClain is very inconsistent and the 7 weeks and the 62 weeks and then descend to the 62 and the 69 and so it happens. Most interpreters take it to mean one period of so many weeks and the other ones many have different views. It does not say after the 69 weeks but after the 62. That is a very interesting suggestion and that is the time of the anti-christ, it is ~~said~~ said. To say the 7 heptoids is about 700 years and then 62 heptoids is about 6 centuries and then the 72 about 2 centuries, 1 hept. about 7 yrs. It is pretty much added proportion but that does not say what the anti-christ is and we don't know from his interpretation. If Christ came again about 5000 AD they would say there are 7 heptagogs in succession. It might be a century but it would seem that is it but it would be pretty hard to be dogmatic but that could be the proper interpretation. If they think 7 could be that, then they probably think 62 could be so contracted and they don't say Christ will come back in 5000 AD but he does say it is of indeterminate length and Montgomery says it is between the ^{destruction} ~~return~~ of Jerusalem and the return of and it does seem to me that is worthy of consideration. It does not sound to me like a reasonable way to say it and first they explained it with the 7 and then they had what followed and it does seem a reasonable way to take it. When you have the statement that after the 62 weeks they will be cut off. that is not for himself but it is what it will be in general. The not for himself is not the natural expression given and it is of Christ's atonement for our sins and that is not the Hebrew way to say not but it is the way to say they have nothing. It means they have nothing to him and then after 62/a sign is cut out ^{weeks} and the covenant will be confirmed with many of their needs. It will be a year or 2000 years and it sounds like all of them. It does not have to necessarily be but it sounds in that direction and that does mean Christ dying on the cross and then they did not see it for 40 years afterwards and it could possibly mean Christ but it does not fit with the covenant. I don't

see that at all. I think that Leopold and the dispensation is so corrupt in this being called the time of the anti-christ. With this 77 refers to the end of the age and if this is the end of the age, either the 62 weeks is transcribed to that time or not. There may be certain facts to include and then other points not to include. There must be the facts before we can be dogmatic about it. It seems to me to be quite possible.

The prophecy of the 70 weeks is one of the hardest things in the Book of Daniel. It is one of the most difficult things in the Scripture. It is not at all strange there should be something in the Scripture that would be difficult. It is not strange that there should be----- It is from the Scripture portions on which there is much disagreement and the thing that is bad is that so much doubt has entered in and they think they know what every part of it means. If you do not pay any attention to the teaching of I Peter there is then much more told by the prophets than what is understood and they tried to understand some of the outsets of the messages they gave and of the teaching of Daniel the messages much of them for times in the future and they feared as those times approached and yet you don't take that into account if you figure everything has to be perfectly clear right away. Then I suppose something of an excuse could be given in trying to say that everything is to be forced into a definite pattern and something of importance has to be determined just what it does mean. In style he denounces anyone who differs from our interpretation and thinks nothing of it. If you believe that God has revealed His Word to us in human language and a language which is a difficult medium for anything, He has done much in what the critics say in giving up a perfect Scripture. It does not mean to say that the words in the Scripture are perfect as there is no such thing as perfect words. It means that it is a perfect selection of human words--it means it does as much as can be done with the limitation of human language and it does what God specifies. An omnipotent God--how can He be bound by the imperfections of the human language? Why can't He do anything He wants to do? I suppose that He can but He does not want to and God chooses to reveal Himself to people in their imperfections of human life and He chose to have His own Son submit Himself to humanness and to their imperfections and then to live here within the limitations of human life and then to give out the revelations within those limitations. We may be told one thing which is absolutely false but it is good for us to believe at one time and then we are told something else later in and that will be helpful at that time. That is not what we mean by suggested revelation but we mean that gradually we are given more truth, more light and more understanding but the principle is given here and even if not fully under-

stood.

Daniel #80

Then it is not at all strange if there is not much in this picture that is clear and obvious and ~~is~~ there are some matters in the Scripture that become clear only when the time occurs. There may be some things in the Scriptures perfectly clear but we do not understand them and we do not have the data in them and we don't have the background to see just what is meant by them and it is perhaps not too important for us today that we understand those particular details. So we can then expect certain parts of the Scripture clear at one time and then obscure at other times. In my opinion it is far more important ~~than~~ to get what is clear and then standing on that and if someone says, "Yes, but it does not make sense to me." But if it is God's word then we should stand on it. If we find obscure passages we don't understand then we will recognize them as obscure and take them as such. One very important thing is that when we look at a passage under two or three important interpretations, we see then what is common to these different passages. This part of study is very important for our growth in the Scripture and for our understanding and in our increase in the knowledge of the things the Lord wants us to know. I think it is an extremely important approach forgetting material part of it and forgetting that so that our preaching will be worth while. If in our preaching ~~and~~ we give out the purpose we will then make clear the obvious things then we can go on and study the obscure passages. Someone has said to preach your beliefs and not your doubts. I don't like that because it says even if you are an unbeliever and a doubter, don't preach your unbelief. If a person doubts the truth of the Scripture then I don't think he should preach. There are the things in it that are the food for the soul for the people. I don't know where that knowledge ends and where He has started on. Of this and this I am absolutely sure and that is very interesting to look at the different commentators on this and to see how very dogmatic they are at various points and we have our three main views again. The first one is the Macc. view and the critics are absolutely dogmatic. The 70 weeks of Daniel as written by the man in the Macc. times like that what is predicted. In his day he will win a great victory and the kingdom will be set up. Consequently he gave these things to encourage the people and he took the old prophecy of Jeremiah that the land would be desolate 70 years and he said that there they were still under foreign impression and then it goes on to at the Lord explains it as 70 weeks. Even then they run many years old and in Jerusalem 586 they

run quite a bit old and if they make it Cyrus's command to rebuild the temple, or if they make it Artezerkes or any of these later ones they insist it must be one of the earlier ones. They give it as the original statements of 70 years and they make it as early as they can. Even then 490 years is too long and they say the writer is simply mixed up and he was actually 100 years off on his dates. In other words it does not fit with those interpretations. Then when you go through the wording of this command of the 70 years it then does not work out either. Various points they try to twist in but it does not fit the Macc. time and they say the interpretation is one that is for the book and it does not fit. The second view is that the book is looking forward to the first coming of Christ and that is the big thing in the book--the first coming of Christ and these four verses here as Pusey and Young and various others say then these four verses here are giving the various predictions and they point to the crucifixion of Christ and the end of the weeks. From the point given here again they have trouble with the chronology and to fit it in is much easier to make it fit the Christ than to make it fit with the Macc. time. Again there are difficulties in chronology and in arrangement in order to make it different. A good presentation of this view is given by Cowles in his commentary. He has some excellent material in it. It is much clearer than Young's and he goes into details more fully to show what he means. It is not so involved and it is easy to quickly get an idea of what he means. Turn in Hebrew Bible to ch. 4, 27 and then let me read you the statement--first he says I propose to give first a translation and then a paraphrase and finally such special comments as might seem necessary. "77 years are determined in reference to the people and to the Holy city --to set up sin and to seal transgressions and to cover iniquity and everlasting righteousness and to seal up vision and prophet and to anoint the Holy of Holies. No one understands from the going forth of the decree for restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem under Messiah, and the covenant shall be made effective unto man. Down upon the son of the abomination comes the desolator even to the point of destruction. That is his translation and then listen to his paragraph and then give an explanation and paraphrase it 77 of years and equal to the future time and of the people for the Holy City and the end of which provision shall be made for the sin and it shall be out of my sight as a thing set up, sealed and covered and will bring in a system of everlasting righteousness whereby sinners may become righteous and give visions of the prophet which respect the Messiah to come. Then will I make my choice ----- . Now then and consider from the issuing of the decree from

Artizerkese and of the building and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and it is under the public ministry of Messiah the King shall be 49 years and 434 years. When they say this 49 and 434, 70 7s and 62 7s, I can't help feeling it like the experience I had in New Mexico after my first year in Seminary. A big box of books I wanted to ship back and I made inquiry as to the rate and I thought by shipping it by express it would be back as soon as I would be and I had to use some of my books right away and if I had to ship it by freight it might take a month coming but cost less. It was cheaper by freight--2-- and 8 something by express and so I shipped them by freight. After about 6 or 7 weeks I received word they were in Princeton in the freight office. I had to get them. There was 4 dollars and 79 cents due on them and the \$2.49 I had paid was only on account. I couldn't figure out why it would not be an even number if it was done on account. Why they would say it that way is silly but you would say that the cost of shipping is so much. You might say it would be so much to Kansas City and then so much for distances on. Under those circumstances then I would say alright, should I pay the whole sum or just to Kansas City? I would then understand a reason for it but there was no reason to say the cost would be \$2.49 and then plus the other. It just does not make sense. He quotes it here--It shall be 49 years and 434 years--he ought to give an explanation to it. Often they don't do it at all. They often just put the two together. "Why would you put two together that way to make a total?" He said 49 up to the conceding of the rebuilding of the city and this does give you a reason and it is not like Kansas City. It is until the Messiah shall appear in public and for his ministry and this is interesting as it tries to show you why this is done. He tries to give an explanation of it and why the division is made. It is the exact answer and it says the going forth of the Messiah. "Here are a few commentators who think when they should and they take it as it is written.

#81

He says 49 up to the point of completing and rebuilding the city and 434 from that point shall appear and this city shall be restored and rebuilt and the thing is settled and done. After the 434 yrs. shall have expired then the sign shall be put up with the violent death. His relationship to his ancient covenant people shall cease and we wonder where he gets that? He will reject them and he will abandon them to their righteous doom. These are the words of comfort to Daniel in this situation and God shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and will it last 47 weeks or 34 later? Even until the end will be the destination and even during these years the covenant of God's mercy shall become effective and we ask what is his covenant

and what is His end? When does this start and when does it end? Will He make sacrifice and supercede them there? Sacrifice did not cease but it went on for 40 years after the destitute. Then down on the temple came the abomination before God and the forms of worship and that happened in the region and even until a complete or partial destruction took place. It was only then that it poured forth upon the city and that is not the impression you get at all in reading Daniel 1 but it is God's answer that there is a terrible destruction for the people as it is here presented and that is the interpretation that can really be counted up in that way. It is good to know just exactly how to count but it usually points right to the time of the happening and right to the chronology of the period and 500 BC is the most obscure matter in all of history. You have to go 2,000 yrs. earlier to get anything anywhere near like it. Ques. I'm trying to open up the problem and to see what it is about. If it says it is from Cyrus then I think we should stand on that but right at the moment I'm trying to see what are the advantages or the disadvantages of the view as it is given here. From the first view you have to take it from Cyrus at the very first point. Also preferably at an earlier point and for the second view if Cyrus gave his command at 539 BC it is pretty difficult from 538 BC up to 30 AD --you have 60 yrs. too long if you try to pick up with Cyrus and thus ^{most} all who hold the second view hold that this actually does not start with Cyrus. Some try to make it that instead of Cyrus. Some try to make it that instead of Cyrus and the ones who hold this view have it in their favor and they have it instead of the other. Cyrus's command is described as the great turning point and that is the time when the exile is over and the people can then turn back. They look forward to Cyrus. They want him to open up the way for him to come back from Babylonian exile and that is stressed as the big turning point. So after they do get back they have much opposition and they are slow in succeeding and sometimes the Persian kings say they must not do anymore and then again they say to go ahead. King Xertes sends Ezra with all sorts of power to go ahead and then in the 20th yr. he sends Nehemiah with other power and when he sends Ezra it is so important that the edict be given in full and when he sends Nehemiah the edict is not given. It would seem that the command under Cyrus is the vital command and if that is the vital command, why then should we take one of these commands of Xertes and that would be after Daniel's time. I don't say it is absolutely water tight that we must take that but I do say there is much to be said in its favor. There is a book called "The Romance of Bible Chronology" by Martin Ens and a man

up in Long Island picked it up at an auction sale for 2 €. He told me that he would not give it away for \$50 and he had the first of the two volumes. The one has discussion and the other has the tables and I don't think we have the first in our library here. I came across the second and I got it but I don't think I came across the first one. Enstie has done much good study and he presents a lot of very interesting material and he may be a bit dogmatic in places but he lists the material that we have to show difference between the dates of 500 and 300 BC and Enstie points out that according to Jewish tradition this period only lasted about 40 yrs. In the Talmud we have people living in this period who are still living at the end of it and there is only about 40 yrs. in there. I saw that fact mentioned in other places before I saw it mentioned here. Enstie goes on to show what is known about the chronology of the kings and he says that very little is known about that period and he says that our chronology there has largely been made up by a series of guesses and by guessing a certain generation about how long would each one be and they were guesses made shortly before the time of Christ by Greeks and they were guesses made by the material they had available and the material was insufficient and therefore Enstie says the dates back there are actually 60 years long and to get the true picture you read in Daniel of the 70 weeks coming up to the time of Christ and you say the dates there are 60 yrs. off and you put them together and you get the 70 weeks exactly pointing to Christ and the Scriptures say here "From Cyrus's decree until the beginning of the public ministry and that will be 70 weeks or years". I would be ready to say that must be it and then I would be ready to say our chronology would be wrong. The chronology is still on very hazy foundation but this statement is not absolutely clear that that is what it means and thus I don't feel justified in saying that must be the correct meaning. I do think we can say there is a possibility that new material may be discovered and if so the new material might prove that from Cyrus's decree until the public ministry of Christ was either 490 years or 483 years and if we found such material it would be extremely interesting and valuable in understanding the interpretations of it but since this is not crystal clear I don't feel we can say it. We should say that the evidence historically shows that the Bible is right but it is not evident enough to say that. So we have two obscure things. You cannot prove obscure things by the other. I think we can say the chronology in that period rests upon a far shakier foundation than that of most periods of time. Ques. Yes, there are things in it that are very clear. One is that God says Daniel--Daniel says, "how soon

do we get back and rebuild our city?" In 70 years it will be in a destroyed condition and this is the 70th yr. and he says, "Lord, we are sinners and forgive us and take us back." God says that he wants to comfort Daniel and show him his mercy and they will be fulfilled but He wants to give Daniel some understanding of that. What does He want to give him to understand? He wants him to understand that it is not now the end of everything but there is a long period yet ahead and a week yet ahead and the 70 years does not mean now but there is more ahead. He also wants him to understand that God's plan is going to be worked out and His purposes will eventually be accomplished and He says, "Understand this, that 70 weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city and finish the transgression to make an end of sin and reconciliation for iniquity. Seal up the vision of the prophecy, etc." There are the many wonderful things promised and they are far greater than the rebuilding of Jerusalem and it is good to have the end of the Babylonian captivity but even as Isaiah has stressed, God is going to deliver them from Babylon but there are other greater things ahead and God is going to perfect His work and deal with a question far more important than the question concerning captivity and this is to deal with the anti-christ and he gives in v. 24 the things which God says will definitely be accomplished and so we know that not all is over yet. We know that there may be a period of discouragement and difficulty and in v. 25 we are told the wall is to be built in troublesome times and thus God is going to accomplish His works. We are given something to look forward to and to know that not only is there wickedness but God is accomplishing His plan and purpose. We are told that there were to be troublesome times in v. 25--God is going to accomplish His will and God is going to accomplish His purpose in the end, in the relation of bringing in of everlasting righteousness. Those things are very definite. The big question is what happens at the end of the 70th week--it doesn't say after 69 but after 62--that suggests that there is something of importance that happens after 62 and something important may have happened there but we don't know about it.

22 **I think that we can say that it doesn't necessarily mean that after that time the Messiah will be cut off, but to say that it can not mean that seems a little over-dogmatic. The A.V. say "not for Himself". Keil insists that it cannot mean that. He insists that it must mean that he won't have anything--that nothing is His afterwards--it is ayin that is used. I am not so convinced by that particular argument but it impresses me that it would be just as clear to say there will be nothing left to him--he has nothing. It doesn't the usual way of saying it but not an impossible way to say it. I don't see how Keil, though

I don't see how he is entirely justified but the big thing to me against the second view is that some phrases that perhaps refer to the death of Christ are twisted in with other phrases that have nothing to do with it. This phrase of confirming the covenant for a week is very very different--what does it mean. If this happens during the 70th week, where does it end? What was at the end of the 70th week. Lupiold takes the third view in making this look forward to the second coming of Christ. The first view makes Daniel refer only to the Macc. period. The second view has reference to the Macc. period but has as the main thing the first coming of Christ towards which it ultimately looks forward, but the third view says that it primarily looks forward to the 2nd coming of Christ--to Antiochus and to Anti-christ, and whether it looks forward to the first coming of Christ or not, would not make much difference--at least it isn't stressed very much and is not the main thing.

To sum up this matter of the 70 weeks--the first view would say that they referred only to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and these are 70 years. The Messiah might refer to Zerrubbaa' or Cyrus--it is easier to fit that part in with the first view than with the second, but they don't explain what it means here when it mentions about anointing the most holy and there doesn't seem to be anything to fit this. The picture here given seems to present a conclusion to God's Word, but there certainly was no conclusion that could be said happened at time of the Macc. So this view is held by those who think the book is simply a fraud, to encourage people to fight for their lives at that time. The second view is one which tries to disregard anything that had to do with anything beyond the first coming of Christ, and which makes Daniel out to simply be interested in that and that is the end. That view is not satisfactory when we look at the 7th ch. and you can't interpret the 7th ch. in line with it and it is rather hard to interpret the 2nd ch. in line with it. As far as this section here in the 9th ch. at first sight this seems to fit all right--to Messiah 7 weeks, and 69 nine weeks until his earthly ministry and then he would be cut off but not for himself--at least it is not clear that it means that. And where it speaks of causing the sacrifices and oblations to cease--it is rather difficult to rightly interpret that verse. Certainly in v. 27 a great despot is described who is a great enemy and causes the oblations to be stopped and it seems to be something like what Antiochus did, and if it isn't Antiochus it is like him--it is picturing a time similar to the time of Antiochus and there is no time

at the time of Christ that was similar to this, and so if you believe that Daniel is a true prophecy and it seems to be a similar thing that is still in the future, and then we have a problem about fitting in the last week and if you have it looking to the anti-christ then that is the 3rd view--ch. 7. 11 and 12 all fit in best with the third view, and this has nothing to do with dispensationalism one way or the other. If dispensationalism means to have people saved some other way than by the death of Christ, this has nothing in the world to do with that. As far as premill. is concerned, it says that this kingdom will not be destroyed, therefore it is an everlasting kingdom and therefore it can't be this kingdom which lasts 1000 years--of course premill. don't believe that it will be destroyed but given to the Father--there is nothing in this that denies premill. and on the other hand there is nothing that proves premill. though there is one thing that suggests it--that at the return of Christ after He has the kingdom it is given over to God that He may be all in all. I think that statement fits with it and not with any other view--I don't see anything in the book of Daniel which is against or for the premill. view--I do think that the book of Daniel has its stress for the end of the age--of course that is the view which Premill. and dispensationalists but just because they agree in this, doesn't mean that both are connected. This 27th verse would seem pretty definitely to refer to the end of the age--if the 70th week is at the end of the age, the question arises as what to do with the other 69 weeks and that view I think we can take the same as Keil and Lepieold holds. But when it comes to what the 69 weeks are, we must realize that there are difficulties and we can't be dogmatic as to what time they refer. Alva McClain of Grace Theo. Seminary has written a little booklet which is largely taken from Sir Robert Anderson's book, The Coming Prince--he was a big manager at Scotland Yard in England and he has written extensively on Biblical themes. He figured the 69 weeks so that they come right to the day--in order to do that he has to have it begin with the 20th year of Artaxerxes and it is highly questionable as to its beginning at this time, and then he has to be sure that the triumphal entry is a certain date but those years are a dark period and we aren't certain as to how long a time it is--I would say that the Bible when it speaks of years is speaking of 365 days--360 days would make around 981 years but they are secondary to the main--we don't know the chronology of that period well enough to say whether it is true or not, as to when Christ was cut off, whether

It happened or not, and it might have happened at that time--we just don't know. God might figure the way that man figured, but I see no warrant for say that God figured 360 days when man figured 365--it is something that is not impossible but I would say rather unlikely. I have never seen any convincing evidence that would prove that these are 360 days. You might speak of a month as being 30 days but to my mind there are two possibilities--this goes up to the first coming of Christ and then there is a gap and then the 70th week comes in the end--it seems to me that is a very probable view which seems to be consonant with Scripture elsewhere--there are gaps elsewhere. There is a gap in Isaiah 11, though that doesn't prove there is a gap here. If the 69 weeks goes to the first coming of Christ, then to have a break seems an entirely reasonable interpretation. My personal inclination is that it begins with Cyrus or before--if that is the exact number of years, then probably our chronology about the years--we have made a wrong guess. The thing that I feel we can be sure on, is that the last week is still future--of that we can be sure. I think that we are to know and understand certain things, and one of those things that we are to know is that the age is not coming to an end in Daniel's period, but there is a long period ahead, and that God is going to fulfill His work in bringing in everlasting righteousness--I think that we can and know and understand that. The 70th week seems to come just before the coming in righteousness--that is the 3rd view definitely. As to how the rest of this fits in--the exact arrangement of it is hard to figure out. How there is 69 weeks before Messiah is cut off. There is a very simple idea that at once suggests itself--that is when the commandment goes out to rebuild--not from a human being but from God--that this is a command which God gives when Jerusalem is destroyed in 586 B.C.--that the desolation is to end 49 years. There is something that is not extremely likely, but it is interesting that 49 years exactly Cyrus issued the decree--therefore you have 7 weeks of years. If you have 62 weeks from Cyrus--it would be until Cyrus who is called the Messiah--we would say that the chronology was quite wrong--that would get in the 7 weeks very nicely--if that isn't the 7 weeks I don't know what the 7 weeks are; then with that view in mind, v. 26 would be speaking of a different Messiah from that spoken of in v. 25--it does say after the 62 weeks--it does suggest a space between the 62 and the 70th. You have the city built in troublous times--after 62 weeks Messiah is cut off but not for himself and then the Prince, or antichrist

in v. 26 would describe after the end of the 62 weeks--that is the way McClain explains it. That would mean that v. 26 was in this phase--it would be the destruction of Jerusalem in the space between the 69th week and the 70th week which comes much later. Then we don't have a hint given as to when the 70th week will be, which is natural because we are told that we don't know when Christ is return, so I wouldn't expect any evidence in the Scripture what time it is going to be. It is a gap of indeterminate length. The difficulty with this interpretation is that of chronology--I don't see how you can start with Artaxerxes 20th year--I don't see what you do with the 7 weeks in that case. Many interpreters put the 7 and 62 right together--those are difficulties. I would incline to think that the first Messiah is Cyrus that came 49 years later and then the true Messiah is cut off 62 weeks later--one thing I think that we can be sure about is that the last week is definitely much later. Keil denies that these weeks are 7 year-periods. He takes the view that they simply are general periods and Young follows him in that though rejecting him in other views. We have Laban telling Jacob to fulfill his week--he means 7 years. The term week may mean year. That doesn't say that a day stands for a year, but that a week stands for a week of years--that is a possibility. On the other hand I don't think that we can be dogmatic about it--I don't see anything to the idea of it simply being a symbol--I would think that $3\frac{1}{2}$ meant 3 and a half times what time is meant. If a week is not a seven-year period, I would incline to think that it is a definite period. I would think that they would all be a certain length, equal in length. According to Lepiould--you have seven weeks from Cyrus to the time of Christ--actually you have about $5\frac{1}{2}$ centuries--so then a week would be about 80 years. Then he says you have 62 weeks from then to the time of the antichrist--if you do--then that would mean 50 centuries or another 3000 years before the coming of antichrist--I don't think this is impossible, because we have no proof in Scripture that Christ is not coming back before 3000 years--certainly I think that he would be amazed if anybody would say there were 2000 years before the return of Christ--withintx a couple of centuries surely Paul thought He was coming back though He didn't return in a couple of hundred. There are many indications that his coming is getting near, but we have no proof that it is getting near. I incline to think that He will come withint the next 250 years, but I don't think that we can be dogmatic about it.

It would seem to me that Leibold's view has a possibility--that you have 7 weeks up to Christ's first coming and 62 weeks up to the antichrist and then one week for the time of the antichrist, but if that is the case, it would be at least 3000 years before the Christ's second coming. I don't think you can have some weeks lasting 80 years and then some others 30--it doesn't seem very probable or very symmetrical. This view impresses me as exegetically possible but fitting in with the idea that it is still a long time before the return of Christ which it may be, but of which I think there are enough indications to the contrary, that it is not the probable thing--I think that the other is more like with the gap inbetween and the last one comes at the end. This statement that the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing--Keil says that the influence of Christ is cut off. You can see how the influence of Christ has been cut off in country after country in the last 2000 years. You had a vital church in various parts of Africa that have been overrun by Mohammadans; a thriving church in Italy and then the papal inquisition cut it off-- there have been many thriving churches that have been completely cut off and to say there will be such a change at the beginning of the 70th week that you can say that the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing.

85 -- I incline to believe that this refers to the first coming of Christ--and that it doesn't mean that he won't have anything, but that there is nothing they have against Him for cutting him off. I incline to think that this is a description of the atonement but the one that causes oblations and sacrifices to cease is the antichrist in the middle of the 70th week and this may come somewhere in the near future. That verse fits with the general teaching of the N.T.**that God is not telling us something in advance to satisfy our curiosity, but He wants us to be ready and faithful, because no one knows when He is coming to take away the Christians with Himself. I cannot get away myself from the fact, that when the 70th week occurs, the church will not be here but with its Lord. We must realize that we are in Satan's world still and our purpose is not to get involved in this world now but to win to Christ as many as we can, and may we be willing to be such a witness as He wants to make of us. Of course when the Church is gone the Bible will still be here and there no doubt will be some who will realize that they were trusting in something else other than Christ and they will have this book to encourage them in their stand for Christ.

We must remember that prophecy is not given to satisfy curiosity but when the time would come that was predicted then the people living at that time could see how well that which was foretold worked out. You look at that passage in Isa. that speaks of a light coming out of Galilee and you wouldn't know what that meant--but when Christ preaches in Galilee then it becomes absolutely clear as to what it means. It isn't given so that we can say on a certain date Christ is coming but we are to be witnesses in this world which is controlled by Satan and we must not get discouraged when Satan gets hold of our work and turns it into desolation. The purpose of Scripture rather than to satisfy our curiosity is to build up in us certain attitude which the Lord wants us to have--the attitude of patient endurance for the long period which may come--if the Lord should yet tarry 3000 years let us be patient--on the other hand if He comes right now that He will find us ready. It is not for us to say when He will come but let us be faithful right now--let us be faithful and ready and as time goes on he will enable us to see a little more here and a little more there and it thus encourages us along our way. Consequently I think that it is very important that we hold the 3rd view in the book of Daniel rather than the first or second which seems to fit with most of the portions of the book of Daniel. Our job is to be faithful rather than to build a great empire --we should do our best and build it so it will last. I think that we should compare ch. 2 and ch. 7 and we can trust God even though the world is under the control of Satan at this time. He has told us in the N.T. that He is coming at a time when we think not--we can't be sure that He is going to come right now and it is not His will that we know when it is near--He wants us to be the more energetic for the carrying out of His work and it becomes increasingly probable that His coming may be near, but the thing about when He is coming is not so important --I don't say there is gap in this 9th ch. but it impresses me as the most probable interpretation. In ch. 11 there is a definite gap and then in the latter part of 11 going on to the resurrection there is a definite gap--there is either a gap after Antiochus Epiphanes or before the resurrection. If there is a gap there, no one can say there can't be a gap here in ch. 9. The is matter of the Abomination of Desolation --some have suggested that this is land of Palestine and that this is referred to in Luke and this is not an impossible interpretation. This abomination may refer to the very image that he puts up--Antiochus put up the image of Jupiter