

because

000937 C

as I pointed out this morning ~~how~~ a-millennialism is a denial rather than a view. It is a denial of the pre-millennial view, it is not a denial of the post-millennial, a belief of the position that you can't be sure, and that the pre is definitely wrong. Take all - excluding the post-millennial position, take other a-millennial views, how could this fit? Well, try it with the view of the stone cut without hands being the first coming of Christ. From the a-millennial view that doesn't fit any better than from the post-millennial view. The stone becomes a whole mountain. Well, the a-millennialist doesn't believe there is a gradual growth of the kingdom of Christ until it fills the whole earth. So it doesn't fit with that at all. It doesn't fall - it fits with the a-millennial much less than it does with the post. And as to the sudden destruction of the image, well anybody who ~~w~~ thinks the great world powers against God would be destroyed by the first coming of Christ, or has yet been destroyed, certainly is looking unrealistically at the world, like an ostrich with his head in the sand saying there is no enemy. It is mighty far from what we have today. Somebody said, if this is the millennium and Satan is bound who is carrying the business on now anyway? It certainly is pretty hard to consider this the millennium. Well, it doesn't fit an a-millennial view from that view. From the other, the end of things according to the a-millennialist, it is exactly like the post, except I don't see how you can fit chapter 2 into any a-millennial view. Well now, Young in his book does his best to show that pre-millennialism is not warranted from this, but read it carefully and try to see what he says is proven here, or (2 1/2) here, and it is pretty hard to gather how he really fits it in, because it just doesn't fit. (Student). Which verse, verse 35? Yes, then were they mingled. Yes, it would be possible. The only thing is, 34 says the stone smites the image and breaks it to pieces, but then the iron, the clay, the stone and the brass are broken together. It could be, then the stone smites the image, and is (3). And then somebody comes and builds a house and takes the image and breaks it up; and uses it for the house and that could happen a thousand years later, entirely possible to put a gap in, between two events like that. The stone falls now, then it is broken up, but the way it says here I find it hard to ~~fit~~ think about it, because what it says is that the stone, verse 34 says, smote the image, ~~mm~~ on his ~~fit~~ feet and break them

to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, silver and gold broken to pieces together. Well, it broke them to pieces now but a thousand of years later they broke them together. It looks as if the same thing is said twice. It is pretty hard to see how there is a gap between them. (Student). Yes, you might say that 34 says that the feet were broken to pieces. That's what 34 says. The feet, ~~the~~ of iron and clay. All right, the feet are broken to pieces, but then 2000 years later, the iron, the clay, the brass the silver and the gold, well the iron and the clay are already broken, but 2000 years later they are broken again and so are the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together and become like the chaff of the summer threshing floor and the wind carries them away. The impression that almost any reader would get, is that what happens in 35 is the specific result caused by the smiting of the image with the stone, and it could be that it isn't the result of something else, but since the stone breaks the feet, and that's the iron and the clay, and then it says, then the iron and clay, and all the other things are broken to pieces I don't say it is impossible to put it that way, but it hardly seems natural. It is highly questionable (Student). Well, I say it is entirely possible, to take it that way, but the question is, in the light of context does it fit it? Yes? Well, excuse me, the then means thereafter, but in I Corinthians I said the then could mean 5 minutes thereafter or a thousand years after. Now in this case, it smites that image and it falls, and then they are all mixed together. That would sound as if it means a few seconds thereafter, but it is after it smites, it is not added. It is then, after. And it could conceivably be 2000 years after, but ~~the~~ since it seems to be represented as a direct result of the smiting, for that reason it would seem unlikely, to me. (Student). Whether you take it as a literal thing, or as a spiritual thing, whatever way you take it, it would seem to represent it as a subject. (Student). Well now, supposing that - well, in 1815, there were three Americans went over to Gent, in Belgium and they met with three Englishmen, and they said there a war going on over here between the British and the Americans, and we want to make peace, the British said, that's find, we'll be glad to make peace, you just give us Kentucky, we and all those states down there. We will make them an independent Indian state, I guarantee that they will never be entered into by the people of the United States, and you pay us a reparation for the damage you've done us, in making this war with us, and they

said, you sign this and we'll make peace, but the three Americans who were meeting with them, didn't like those terms, so they said, let's talk about it a little further, and discuss the details of it, and every night Henry Clay would sit up and ~~play~~ gamble with the British late at night and Johnathan Quincy Adams would go to bed early and the next morning, Jonathan Quincy Adams would get up and study his Bible for three hours before breakfast, and then they'd meet with the British. They discussed day after day, and they heard news, the British have taken Washington, they've burned the White House. And the British said - the representative said, you'd better sign this thing, there won't be any Americans left pretty soon, if you don't sign it and make peace. And then they'd hear, the British had taken this, but some way the Americans were good enough diplomats to take every little minor American victory and make a lot out of it, and talk with these British diplomats, and they weren't the tops in British diplomats, and they thought this was a small thing, this little war over here, they were busy with Napoleon and that was more important, but eventually they got a treaty worked out, which left things just about the way they'd been before, and did nothing to the people - it took nothing away from the United States. Adams and Clay were ashamed of the treaty, ashamed to bring it home but actually there was no reason to be ashamed, because under the circumstances, they'd done a wonderful thing, but the treaty was signed, the war was over, and it really was an American victory after having the terrific defeats they'd had, still not to lose anything. The treaty was signed, the war was over, but it took 6 or 8 weeks before the word got over here, and during that time the people kept right on fighting. The war was over, it was won. But here they were fighting. And it so happened that eight weeks later, just before word got here, Andrew Jackson led the British in a big battle down in New Orleans and defeated them, the only big American victory in the war, and came after the peace treaty had already been signed, but the American people heard the big victory down in New Orleans, and the next day they heard there is peace, and they thought we must have won the war, and the peace was made, they quit fighting. The war of 1812 was over. The war was over in principle when the peace treaty was signed in Europe. The attempt of the British to take New Orleans away from the United States was defeated when the British diplomats agreed to sign the treaty that didn't

was agree to, etc, but it had no effect over here, until a long time later. Now that is not a precise analogy but I think it illustrates the point I would say very definitely that every blessing we have now or ever will have, through all eternity can be directly traced to what Jesus Christ did on calvary's cross, when he rescued us from the fire of Satan, he saved the ransom, he set the prisoner free, I would say that in principle - is there healing in the atonement? Yes. We get our resurrection bodies as a result of the atonement, the bodies that are absolutely free from any decay or death. All the blessings we get are the result of Christ having defeated Satan, through his death on calvary's cross. But the outworking of it, will come in God's own time, when Jesus Christ comes back to this earth, and with a strong right arm puts an end to the forces of iniquity, and puts them out of the scene. I would say that very definitely in principle the victory was won at that time. But it doesn't seem to me that that victory won at that time in principle can be very properly represented with the ~~stone~~ stone striking the image and the whole image destroyed, and the stone becoming a mountain, which fills the whole earth. If you want to say, in principle the thing has happened already, but in outworking it doesn't happen until the second coming. In principle the victory is won, yes, but in outworking at the second coming the image will be destroyed, I would feel that that is ~~not~~ reasonable. But if the image was destroyed in outworking at the first coming, and the stone became a mountain and filled the whole earth, in outworking at the first coming, then I would feel that we should not have had great anti-~~god~~ God world powers since that time, and there wouldn't be a government of Moscow today, that is tramping upon the word of God and constantly plotting and planning and scheming to destroy all belief except the thoroughly materialistic belief off the face of the earth. It would seem to me that it is impossible to say that this has been fulfilled as yet. Now if you were to say this thing represents the principle, in principle Christ struck the image and destroyed it. That is all done in principle, yes, done with, but in outworking it ~~is~~ represents what is going to happen when He comes. But to say it represents a gradual flow process where the stone covers the whole earth ~~it~~ and ~~it~~ the image more and more goes back and becomes nothing, which isn't that a reasonable picture for ~~a man~~ to say that the thing is all mixed together and the wind blows it away, so there is no place for it. It is not a natural way to represent that sort of a thing.

And that would be a post-millennial view, rather than a-millennial. A-millennial would ~~know~~ they would say the good and evil grow together~~x~~ until the end, just as the pre-millennial do. So that I can't see how this can very well fit in with an a-millennial or a post-millennial view. Now we don't ~~e~~ insist on making all parables walk on all 4, and we shouldn't. Any parable any illustration may be an allegory because many many points which have meaning to them, may just have one big pbng that it tries to get across. But this is not just something that has one big point, because it specifically speaks of four kingdoms, and various features about them. It is more than that, but it doesn't mean every little detail that would have a meaning. Of course, do the ten toes have a meaning? Well, I think it would be very silly to get any meaning out of the ten toes if you only had the second chapter. But when you have the seventh chapter which specifically says 10 kings will rise, in this final beast, and one in this one, it specifically says it is  $(13 \frac{1}{4})$  that is on the toes, well then, to deny that these ten toes have a meaning parallel with that of the ten horns seems to me to be very silly. Of course, we note just what Young does. I don't see what he gains by it. Because he's already got the ten horns in the other anyway, so I don't see how any thing is gained by you saying you don't know what the ten toes are. Yes? (Student). If the toes didn't have a significance, he wouldn't have specified the difference between them, the difference of the toes from the rest, but whether the number of toes has any specific thing, I would say it might or might not, but I don't think we could tell if we just had chapter 9, but if we have chapter 10, 7 is the number 10 stressed, it seems to me that that proves that they do have specific (14). Yes, the number, well I think the toes would be, anyway. Thank you for that point, a very good point.

Well now, the - this is taken in relation to those. Now in relation to pre-millennialist, what do we have here? According to the pre-millennial view, - well, just a minute, I didn't say about the a-millennial, that the big objection to the a-millennial view here it seems to me is exactly the objection to the post-millennial view. The a-millennial view, this does not fit the first coming of Christ, at all, not any more than the post. Not as much as the post, but if you apply it to the second coming of Christ, then ~~9~~ it should be obvious it doesn't fit the a-millennial view. Because at the second coming of Christ, according to the a-millennial view

there is a general resurrection, a general judgment, at the end of this age, and at the beginning of eternity, the eternal age, the eternal state, and that would not be represented by the period, the coming of the mountain, which fills the whole earth. There is no earth to fill. The earth disappears. There is a new heaven and a new earth, which today just about means an eternal state.

42.

and therefore they are apt to insist that it is the first thing, but as we see it doesn't fit the first thought for any view, and yet it doesn't pose the objection of the a-millennial view if you apply it to (1/2) as it would if you apply it to the second where it obviously fits the pre-millennial view. Well now, look on to chapter 7. I didn't figure on taking quite as long as we have, but it is important to have a clear understanding of this point. I wish I had some way of knowing how long we should take on these things. I don't want to repeat and go into it so much that it gets boresome to you. Somebody said, if you don't strike oil in twenty minutes quit boring, and I don't want to bore any of you, if you think in half the time you get just as well what I'm driving at. I want to move along and find more to cover. On the other hand, if it isn't clear, why then there certainly is much better to go a little more slowly and have it clear, so I'm trying to take the amount of time to be sure it is clear to every one, and if some of you could give me a word later, on whether you think I'm going a little to slow or a little I would appreciate it greatly.

Well now, chapter 7, - chapter 7 we have 4 beasts. Chapter 2 thought of it all as one image, with a continuity of it and the whole image is broken. There are common characteristics involved.

(1 1/2) things more of the distinctions of them, there are 4 beasts, and the 4th beast has 10 horns and among the 10 horns there comes up a little horn before which 3 of the first horns are plucked up by the roots, and in this horn there are eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things. And then what happens? Thrones are cast down. The Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool. His throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him. Thousand thousands ministered unto him,,

Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. The judgment was set, and the books were opened. What is this a description of? Is this a description of the first coming of Christ? Does it seem like a description of the first coming of Christ? I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake. I beheld till the beast was slain, and his body was destroyed, and given to the burning flame. So the beast is destroyed, and the rest of the beasts have their dominion taken away, yet their lives are prolonged for a season and a time, I beheld in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and ~~the~~ glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, shall serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. Now what does this fit with? Verse 18, says further, The saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even for ever and ever. Well now, what scheme does this fit with? Does it fit Antiochus Epiphanes? The critics say the little horn is Antiochus Epiphanes, but if it is, whoever wrote it was pretty badly mistaken, because these things didn't happen, at Antiochus Epiphanes time. Well, if it isn't Antiochus Epiphanes, the little horn, who is the little horn? Well, suppose the little horn is Antiochus Epiphanes, and then one comes on the clouds of heaven, and Christ, the first coming, suppose it is that? That's 150 years after Antiochus Epiphanes. Suppose it is that. Well, leaving out for the moment our Lord's quotation of this, let's see how this fits with the different schemes. The A-Millennial or the Post-millennial idea - the Lord comes on the clouds of heaven, indicates the birth of Christ, it is the beginning of his preaching, or including his atonement, and then what happens? The beast is slain and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. Well, it could conceivably be that it was destroyed afterwards. It doesn't here say, necessarily what happens before he comes, and yet it seems to be pretty much the same time, but it could conceivably be afterwards, but at any rate what happens. There is given to him, dominion and glory and a kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him. Has that yet happened? Did that happen at His first coming? Has it happened ever yet? His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and

his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, - verse 18, the saints of the most high shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever, - Do you take this in the fullest literal sense and say this scene began at the first coming of Christ, then it would mean that kingdom lasts on forever and ever. There's no break in it. There's no other change. Does this mean anyway that there is a kingdom established whenever it is, that lasts forever and ever, and has no shame. It is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away and the kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed. Does I Corinthians 15 have anything to say about that? What is going to happen to the kingdom of Christ? It is going to be delivered to God the father, does it pass away? Is it destroyed? In other words, you can say that it is delivered to God the Father, and yet that it is not destroyed, that it has not passed away, that it continues forever and ever. Its continuance can have a change in its (6), or else this passage flatly contradicts I Corinthians 15 no matter how you interpret it. There can be a change in the condition of it, and yet it continues forever and ever. There can be a change, he can deliver the kingdom to God the father, without ~~it~~ it being destroyed, or being attacked in any way. We have to take it that way or else (6 1/2). That's quite vital, I hope that you keep that in mind. I don't think it is questionable, but I think it is important, and I think it is usually over looked. (Question.) The 7th chapter then that we were looking at, the 7th chapter has got this picture then of the thrones cast down, the ancient of days sits there. There is a great judgment. The books are opened, and the beast is slain, his body is destroyed, and given to the burning flame, and - of course that means the destruction of the little horn too, a part of the beast. But the rest of the beasts have their dominion taken away yet their lives are prolonged a season. That's interesting. What does that mean? A strange statement. It is not a vital thing for us at the moment, but eventually I'd like you all to have an idea of what ~~it~~ you think verse 12 means. And then he beholds, and this would seem to be after the beast is slain and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame, one like the son of man comes with the clouds of heaven. And comes to the ancient of days and they bring him near before him, and then there is given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion,



d which shall not pass away and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed. Now we say, look at the post-millennial view, what happened? Does this refer to the first coming of Christ, or the second? Well suppose it refers to the first. At the first coming of Christ, it is figuratively expressed, that one like the son of man coming with the clouds of heaven. All right, suppose that describes the first coming. It seems hardly to fit, but suppose it does. Then at the first coming, there is given him dominion, glory and a kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him. IDid that happen at the first coming? Did that happen? I don't see how you can possibly say that. It is pretty hard to see how this can fit the first coming of the post-millennial view. Now from an a-millennial view, can this fit the first coming? It means exactly the same as the post- doesn't it? There are even less though, because from the post, you might say the kingdom slowly grows, but from the a-millennial it doesn't really grow at all. They couldn't even grow together. Now from a pre-millennial view or no, from either of these views, post or a-, how about this being the second coming of Christ? Well, the second coming, Jesus Christ comes and ~~he~~ the beast is slain first, and then Jesus Christ comes, and there is given him dominion, glory and a kingdom that all people nations and languages should serve him. Does that sound like what the post and the a- believe is going to happen? The last judgment, the general resurrection, the beginning of the eternal state? Is it a description of that? His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away. Is that a description of the eternal state? A kingdom that shall not be destroyed. It certainly doesn't seem like it. It seems much more like a description of something on this earth here. And if you can't relate it to what has happened in the past, it would seem that it would have to relate to what comes after his return. Now here is another ~~an~~ little interesting thing, according to the a-millennial or post-millennial view it is at his second coming immediately after the resurrection of the dead, it must be then that he gives the kingdom over to the father, that God will be all in all. That must be then. There is no other time it can be. So that I Corinthians 15 describes what happened at the second coming, that the son delivers the kingdom to God the Father, then if this is a description of the second coming, then what happens is that one e like the son of man comes in the clouds of heaven, and they bring him near to the ancient of days

and he delivers over to the ancient of days, the kingdom, but this says the exact opposite, it says the ancient of days gives him up, which shall not be destroyed, that all nations, will serve him and his dominion and kingdom forever and ever. It is the exact opposite. So it doesn't seem to fit, with a post or a-millennial view. Now of course, most of your commentaries that are either post or a-view they take things like - that it doesn't say there are ten <sup>two</sup> holes, and they dwell on things like that, to try to attack the pre-millennial view, but they don't build up an explanation of how it can fit with their view. I haven't found one that really does. I haven't found that their objection to the pre-millennial view was altogether justified or even partially, but I certainly haven't found them building up a view which we could look at and see if it fits. You take a note here and a note there and say what they think it means, but they don't fit together. They don't give you any coordinative view, and I'm trying to see if we can build a coordinative view from the post or a-millennial view and I can't see how you take it. It seems to me it would fit perfectly with a pre-millennial view, and I don't see how it can possibly fit. Mr. Harding looks skeptical. You aren't skeptical? Well then, is there some point I didn't make clear? Every thing is clear thus far then? Well now then, unless there is some question at that point, I think this is tremendously important, if there is no question at this point, then we will remind ourselves of one more subject that we've already looked at, that Jesus Christ himself says hereafter ye shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, and shows that he interprets this verse as not referring to His first coming but to His second coming. And so if it is His second, then how can there possibly be that that is when He gives up the kingdom to the Father, because according to Daniel He comes to receive a kingdom, not to give a kingdom up. And some will say, yes, but it can't be pre-millennial because it says that the kingdom which He has is one which will never be destroyed or pass away and their dominion is forever and ever, and yet as we saw, the giving of the kingdom over to the Father, that God might be all in all, is not a passing away of the kingdom, or a destroying of the kingdom. It is not inconsistent to think that it simply means forever and ever. It is a change of his (13 1/2) but it still is

Christ's kingdom, even though it is delivered over to the Father. It is God's kingdom. It is the kingdom of the entire trinity rather than being specifically the kingdom of Christ. Yes?

(Student). Well, I'm just trying to see how to fit that (14). (Student).

That is before His coming. (Student). It makes a difference. This is the first one that you (14 1/2). But the first time it has the kingdom, but in the kingdom, well, according to this, the second coming of Christ from the clouds of heaven, was to precede the kingdom, rather than to follow it. Or it would be, that he is given a kingdom, at his first coming, the (15) is not realized until later. You have a great step when this kingdom is realized, but then his dominion continues, but there is a point at which he returns to this earth. And that's not the beginning of the kingdom to them, it is the end of it.

43.

Somebody asked a little ago about whether there was a parenthesis. About the possibility of a parenthesis. And let's ask that question now about what we've been looking at. Is there any suggestion or implication or necessity of anything which might be called a parenthesis or a gap in either of what we've found in either chapter 2, or chapter 7? Well, chapter 2 describes the image. You have the head, and you have the second kingdom and you have the third kingdom. Now your fourth kingdom, and here is your fourth kingdom, and it is struck on the feet. Now it is pretty hard to see that as the first coming of Christ. Well now, if it is the second coming of Christ, does that mean that according to this view (1) you have three kingdoms, that image continues - say it starts here and covers this to here, and runs to say 550, (1 1/2). And then that kingdom runs to say and then a (1 1/2). If that is the case, you have 2006 years after Pentecoste,

(2). (Student). Well, the head represents one kingdom. After you comes another. But this kingdom lasts about 50 years. And then you have another kingdom after you, and that lasts about 300 years, and after that there's a third kingdom, and that lasts about 300 years. (Student). The head of gold and then after it is another kingdom, and then after it is another kingdom, and then after it is another kingdom, and then it represents these kingdoms by a picture.

It distinctively says that one comes after the other. So there is a certain time arrangement of

the text. Then it seems to show the bottom one as being iron and then the feet and toes being iron mingled with clay, which seems to show that it has  $*(3\frac{1}{2})$  which seems to go chronological from one to the second. It seems to show that this is a duration - so it seems to me that it is pretty hard to get away from the idea that there comes a time,  $(3\frac{1}{2})$  (Student). Well, there is  $(3\frac{1}{2})$  in the Second Coming. (Student). So we have five different ones,  $(4)$ , but as to the duration, well let us say this, one interpretation I believe, this ~~np~~ here ~~p~~ represents this one here,  $(4)$  and the next one represents 300, and then the next one would represent whatever time there is between  $(4\frac{1}{4})$  and when the stone strikes. It might be 4 times as long as all the rest put together, it might conceivably be. That would be one ~~possibile~~ <sup>suggestion</sup> interpretation. Now another suggested interpretation would be that this is simply a kingdom with nothing about it in duration. This isn't talking about duration. This isn't a kingdom with nothing about duration. This is a kingdom that has the first phase but nothing about the duration of that phase, and which has a second phase, but nothing about the duration of the second phase. And ~~x~~ consequently the length of it wouldn't enter in. That seems to be a possibility. Well then, we have then these two possibilities and according to the first of these, two, it seems a ~~big~~ bit strange to have this one last for 2000 years. But not only that, the Roman Empire, is it still in existence? The Roman Empire ran until about 450 AD, and then it split into two parts - one of them pretty well disappeared, and then there is the other  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  and now there are a lot of  $(5\frac{1}{2})$ . One of them lasts a thousand years longer than the other, and then it was destroyed. There is nothing of  $(5\frac{1}{2})$ . You might say the Western Holy Roman Empire lasted until 1815, but that would neither be holy nor Roman nor empire. It disappeared then. It would be rather hard to show a Roman empire in the west today,  $(6)$ . But we may think of these as representing simply quality with no idea of duration. We may think of them as duration, with the last one 2000 years. It would be 4 times as long as the first two. But we have a unity in this one, a unity in this, - do we have a unity, can we think of the Roman empire which was a mighty vivid real force in those days, in the time of Christ, and  $(6\frac{1}{2})$ , can we see anything at all comparable  $(6\frac{1}{2})$ .

That is, there doesn't seem to me to be much unity there. Well now, that problem is a problem with these, but it becomes a greater problem when you look at chapter 7. Because in chapter 7, we see a beast, and we think of that beast as a unity. There is nothing said about the duration of it, but it is a separate unit. There is the first beast. And then we have a second beast. There is nothing said about duration, but certainly there is a unit, distinct from the first, and then we have a third beast, as a unit, distinct from the second, and then we have a fourth beast, which surely is a unit, and can we think of one unit, at all comparable to the unit of the Babylonian Empire, the unit of the Medo-Persian, the unit of the (8 1/2) one unit, a Roman empire. Perhaps even to 1453, when the Eastern Empire was destroyed. But can you think of such a unit, as down to the first century, that is to say, if the ten horns,

(8) the ten horns representing something yet to come, and one of these is going to destroy the other three, the critics try to show how that could have some application to Antiochus Epiphanes, though they have a mighty hard time doing it. Most of the Evangelicals don't think

(8 1/2) but think of this as the Roman Empire rather than , and if it isn't Antiochus Epiphanes what is it? And if it is something still future, how does it make one unity? At all comparable to (8 3/4) if you've read C.S. Lewis' book, (8 3/4)

he has a great about who was in the last days of the Roman empire, the (9) went into France. (9). Well, he has (9)

coming out of France. And he comes out of this trance, and he sees the man who was fighting against the terrible forces of iniquity, and this (9) comes to see him, and this man tells him about what happened, (9 1/4). (Hard to hear.)

Well, he said, let's appeal to the emperor then. (9 1/2)

There's nothing. There is no reason to say. (Student). You mean to think that the Roman Empire is just not mentioned. There are three beasts that come. There is another empire that comes which is greater than these three. The others are later. That would be a real big gap wouldn't it? (Student). The question which I have in mind is this now. Suppose we agree that the smiting of the image is the second coming of Christ. Suppose we agree that the burning of the beast, is the second coming of (11). And that the ~~se~~ ten horns of which

one destroys the other three, is something which happened shortly before the second coming of Christ. I think that most interpreters other than the first hold that that represents antichrist, whether it is pre post or a-. So if we agree on that, does it not seem as if some where in this view point there is a gap as far as (11 1/2). There is a break. Suppose the thing was this way, here is the image, . Here comes the Roman Empire, certain definite conditions and situations. And then in the eyes of the observer, a gap of time is just passed over, and you see those conditions represented by different parts of the image, with the idols, and then you see something here, which is enough (12) to this, that it is in some way an area here, between the two (12) to make sure there is similar iron, with clay mixed in with it, and it is a similar but different, but that there is a fixed period of time there which is just passed over without any notice. But as far as time is concerned there is a gap. But let us take the beast, could it be that you see this great beast coming, and here is this tremendous Roman empire. And then there is a period which doesn't enter into it at all. There is a period when this beast (13), but then there comes a time when this would be thought of as an area of the beast, if not similar to the (13), but we see the ten horns and we see one destroy three others. So that there would be a gap as far as any time is seen. (Student). Oh, but I think that the beast in Revelation there is a description of an individual. A man. But the beast here seems to represent a whole kingdom, which might include that. I think that this beast, if it is the Roman Empire, as most evangelical interpreters think it is the Roman Empire, the critics think it is the Greek Empire, but it is a whole (14), and the 10 kings, yes? (Student).

44.

k Very good. There is a difference. Now just what does the difference consist of? The first one, does it mean that every thing that belongs to these empires is destroyed? Or does it mean that the characteristics , because certainly the land that belongs to them is still there. The first shows certain features of these empires. The predominant features, the features which represent , these features as far as having any dominion, they disappear so there is no place for them but this one would seem to represent the beast in some way in which their dominion is

taken away. There is no place for them as far as dominion is concerned. Yet something happens which can be spoken of as their lives which is prolonged over a season. Yes? (Student). That's a thing we want to take up later, but that there might be a gap there, but that there is a gap of some sort as far as time is concerned in each of these worthy (2 1/2). (Student). Well, that's a question. We have these. This one, this one, this one, this one. From this to this, this comes later on. Well now, does it also represent time or not? That's a question I don't know how you could dogmatically say on. Certainly if it represents time there would seem to be a gap. And certainly at any rate in the image and in the beast there seems to be a unity between that which between after the third beast and ends at the ~~2~~ second coming of Christ. A unity which is hard to fit with present conditions, so if that ~~was~~ unity might be as Delancy suggested, that the beast or the legs you might say seem to disappear and then reappear as far as time is concerned. Time not being indicated. Then as far as time is concerned there wouldn't be a gap, wouldn't there? (Student). No, I mean if there isn't one represented, there still would be a time in actuality. (Student). No, no we haven't. Well, let's say it this way, legs are present the ~~length~~ at the coming of the Roman Empire, The coming of the Roman Empire, the fourth terrible beast that destroys, is present there. The end of this age yet future. The feet are in it. The ~~as~~ end of this age, that's future. The beast is there because it has the ten horns that we haven't yet seen. So it is there at the beginning, it is there at the end. Now if it does not represent any time in either way, yet there is in the actual time that it occurs there is a period when it seems not to be present, and then another period when it is present. That would seem to be, wouldn't it, so that as far as you could gather a picture of the sequence of that, it would seem if this refers to the second coming rather than the first, necessary to consider it a gap, whether it be duration depicted and a gap in the duration depicted, or whether the no duration is pictured, but a sequence pictured, but you see this element of the sequence and then as far as time is concerned, you don't think about it, and then you do see it again. In either case there would seem to be a gap. Mr. Mezner? (Student). Yes, that's it. We do not see any unity, unified empire which has existed over this whole period, which is similar to the unified empire which is visible in these previous verses. We see such a thing at the beginning of this period. There must

be such a thing at the end, but there would seem to have been a good many centuries when any thing comparable to that great terrible beast that is destroyed, is not told. Perhaps the spirit is present in the general ungodliness of the world, but as any kind of a unified present beast, it would seem to be at the end, the ten horns, and at the beginning there the great beast that destroys, it breaks every thing to pieces with its eyes, but in between there is a period of time which is ~~is~~ passed over as far as any representation goes. We are not given something which would seem to represent the condition that is there in that period. Yes? (Student). There is no evidence. No. (Student). Well, I don't see how you can get away from it at the time. You have sequence. (Student). Yes, if it isn't continuous, there is a gap. (Student). Yes, but when we try to decide what is going to be in reality, as far as the fitting of the image to the reality there must be a gap, a period which is not represented by anything specific in the image. (Student). / Yes, well that's the question. Has it continued through all these years? According to the picture it will be present at the end of this period, but has it continued through? (Student). Well, what does it represent? The great beast destroys everything, has this tremendous power. The three previous ones are three great empires. We know what the empires were. We know what they did. We know what the Roman Empire did. That in the Roman Empire which is similar ~~is~~ to what these three previous ones did, is very easily recognized, up till about 450 A.D. but pretty hard to find. (Student). The same beast there appears and then disappears as far as our, we see all <sup>if</sup> ~~of~~ history, it appears and then disappears and then appears again. There is a gap. Mr. Hayes? (Student). Well, let's say this. There is a very apparent one, in the image. There is a fourth kingdom. There is a very apparent connection between the fourth kingdom as representing the Roman Empire, and the fourth kingdom as representing the situation just before Christ comes. There is a very apparent connection, but the reality of it, I don't know, but between ~~is~~ the two stages of that, if ~~w~~ you were going to represent world conditions it would seem that you would have to put in some other ~~things~~ stages to show the various things that happened in between, which are not mentioned here. They are passed over. There is a gap, as far as our representation of <sup>beast</sup> ~~image~~ sequence is concerned for that period, and as far as the ~~image~~ is concerned, it is represented that there is a situation there which we can easily see in the Roman Empire, and it is represented



of that which happened just before Christ comes is related to this, for the four horns are thought of as being out of this empire, and it is at that time that this beast is destroyed, and yet in between there are many centuries which are rather hard to consider as being represented by the picture of that beast, and so there would seem to be as far as the actual occurrences are concerned, a period of time when the beast disappeared and appears again, a period of time which is not represented in the picture, a gap in the representation. Yes? (Student), Well, that is a matter of interest. Which is it? It looks like the other. It is represented as one beast. It is represented as one kingdom, the first part of which is iron, the second part iron and clay. Is the relationship between the two a real one or an apparent one. Whether it is or not, it is sufficiently related or sufficiently apparent, that it is justifiable to represent them as one beast, or represent as two parts of one beast. That's as far as you can go. (Student). All right, there is a possibility. You have a gap, but the gap instead of coming in the middle of the beast comes before the beast. You have three beasts and then there are a few other beasts that aren't mentioned, and there is a fourth. There is a gap. The objection to that is, I'm not sure there is much objection to it in reality. There is a very definite objection from the viewpoint of interpretation, which interpreters have considered this view. Interpreters usually say, this is the Roman Empire, and the Roman Empire is so similar to the other beast that - yet greater than any, that it is rather difficult to say, well, this is passed over and there is a gap. You could make a gap in the middle of it. Then a gap which concludes the whole Roman Empire but I don't say that it is impossible. But there does seem to be a gap of any way that we can look at this. (Student). No, but there is a gap, in the reality. (Student). In the reality, let us say this, suppose you say here is the United States. Now we look at the United States. We see a ~~man~~ man comes along who is very dignified and he's got martial bearing, he looks like a real general. He comes along and he is very fatherly, he is good in war and good in peace and has a wonderful home and the hearts of his country men. Now we see that as a representation in the beginning of American history. And then we see a representation of a man who is very close to this first one but doesn't have any of his military qualities. Make him like (13). I don't know how much you know about (13), and then we see a representation of a man who comes in and

who, it seems to me he wrote the declaration of independence, and he built the University of Virginia, and we have a few interesting things about him. Here we see a view of the United States, and we see these three men, and then we see a third man come with a little log cabin he is carrying on his shoulder, and he has ~~a~~ the words on his forehead, the Great Emancipator, and then we see a fifth one who is again a general, and a man who can (13 1/2)  
? who is the color of iron, and is very similar to the first of the three. Now we see these four periods. These four, and these five, and we see a picture of American history. Now there is no gap in the representation there. There is one, two, three, four, five coming along. In actuality we find the first one fits very well with George Washington, and the second one fits very well with John Adams, and the third one fits very well with Thomas Jefferson, but the fourth one has no similarity whatever imaginable or conceivable or any other way to James Madison, but it fits Abraham Lincoln perfectly. Did not we say, the pictures we have seen as far as it corresponds to reality is concerned there is a gap, it passes over a number of presidents between Jefferson and Lincoln. It gives us the first three and then it jumps ahead, ~~ke~~ and then it shows one great outstanding one, and then it goes beyond it and gets another great outstanding one, and the picture does not say there is a gap, but to try to fit it into what actually happened, you find that it is simply passed over great things without representing it. And you might say, here comes a beast which could represent the empire -

45.

another beast which represents the empire of Medo-Persia, another one which could represent Greece, well another one comes which could represent Rome, then there comes which could represent different things in the Middle Ages and there are a lot of little animals rushing around representing different things, some 11 some 12, there are all these different conditions. Finally we have Hitler marching across, and we have all these different things, and then we have a great beast with ten horns which represents what is just before the coming of Christ, but if you are going to make your representation be a complete picture of Hitler, you are going to have to throw in thousands and thousands of details, and what we have here is simply a few great big features given, and these big features that are given fit with thousands of details in

us. They give us a few big features of (1). Well now, do we have a right to say these pictures between themselves cover everything. Or are we right in saying, these big features are given, but in the actual reality, there are spaces which are just not represented in this, but this just gives a big feature, and in between in this case, in between the two phases there may be a lot of periods that are just passed over, there is a gap there. It doesn't say. (Student). We may have a picture of the president of the United States, which would show you Glover Cleveland is becoming president, and then they would show you Glover Cleveland finishing a term and the Democratic party repudiating him and adopting a platform completely opposite to everything he had ever stood for. And the Republicans coming in and defeating him. And carrying on a policy very similar to what Glover Cleveland had stood for and pass over the fact that between when he became president and when he finished his presidency, there was a period of four years in which Benjamin Harrison was president of the United States. You could represent Cleveland in your series and just pass over Harrison. Cleveland having had a period before and a period after. You could do that. And it would not be impossible that something similar might be done, and it looks as if perhaps such a thing might have been done when we try to fit it into actual events. That is, you can't get away from it, that the fourth beast is represented as being present in some way at the end of the age. And you can't get away from it, that the fourth part of the image is represented as being present in some way, when the image is smitten, because it says these are four kingdoms, ~~and~~ although there we have the advantage that it does show the definite phases, so that it is not impossible to think that there might be a lot of other phases in between that aren't even mentioned, aren't represented, but these two phases the beginning and end ones, are the ones that are vital for what he is telling us about. Of course, he tells us about that, and he doesn't bother to tell us about the many phases that might be presented in between the first and the last phases. Well, it is an interesting question and it is not just an interesting question. It is one which concerns us greatly with other features, the book of Daniel. That is why I spent some time on it. It concerns us greatly, and it concerns us greatly particularly with chapter 11. Because in chapter 11, as you know we have a picture of the kings of Persia, and the king of Greece, and then the division into

four parts, and then the king of the north and the king of the south and it goes on until it comes to verse 21, and in the previous verses have given us a perfect picture of the kings that preceded Antiochus Epiphanes, and verse 21, in his estate shall stand up a vile person, in whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably ~~but~~ and obtain the kingdom by flattery represents exactly what happened when Antiochus Epiphanes came in, after the death the man just before him who was a raiser of taxes and put things in good physical condition, but wasn't much of a warrior. It exactly fits, and verse 21, there are some who will say that 21 is Antichrist, but if 21 is Antichrist, it has a mighty strange gap between 20 and 21, to have all these kings described in full detail that aren't of any interest to us, I mean in the view point of

(4 3/4) they aren't of much interest. Up to the man who just precedes, Antiochus,

there are three or four that just precede him, and then all of a sudden after you tell about him, to go on and tell about Antichrist, is a mighty (5), and so most interpreters say verse 21 is Antiochus Epiphanes. (Student). What I mean is - (Student). Well now, I wouldn't quite say that. I would say this, that Antiochus Epiphanes was a tremendous interest to the Jewish nation. Now the raiser of taxes which preceded him, and the man just before that, that fought against the Romans, and the other conquests between the king of the north and the king of the south, are not of any more interest to the Jewish nation than a hundred other things, they are of great interest in these nations, as leading up to Antiochus Epiphanes, but Antiochus Epiphanes is of a hundred times more interest to the Jewish nation than any of them, because they were kings and they reigned and people carried on their business and went ahead. Well, this ~~king~~ man is king now, this man is king now, they weren't greatly concerned. Maybe the taxes were a little higher under this man than the previous, but it did not hurt too much, but when you get Antiochus Epiphanes, he comes in and begins persecuting the Jews, and trying to force them to give up their religion, and to follow his will and he is of tremendous importance, and these men before are of great interest if they are pointing up to Antiochus Epiphanes and preparing the way for his coming, and showing just when he comes, but they are not of importance in themselves, but they are of great importance because of their relationship to Antiochus Epiphanes. And that's why I say, to tell about all of them who aren't of much interest in themselves, and then skip

Antiochus Epiphanes who is the reason for being interested in them, would be very strange in deed, and most interpreters of any view will say verse 21 is Antiochus. There are a very, very few who will say verse 21 is Antichrist. That seems to me to be utterly ridiculous, to make a gap between 20 and 21. Verse 21 is one who is led up to by these others, he is of great interest to us, they aren't of much interest. To tell about them and not to tell about Antiochus would be very silly. And what he said exactly fits him. 21 tells us about Antiochus, and we can see exactly how it fits, and 22 exactly fits him, 23 and 24, 25 can ~~be~~ trace these things. You can just about see what happens. 30 describes exactly what happens. You get up to 35, and you've got step by step by step by step specific details told you about Antiochus Epiphanes, which fit with the history of him as we know it. (Student). 22, yes, well 22 is usually thought of as meaning that Antiochus Epiphanes came in there peaceably. Somebody lent him ~~some~~ money and he went in and he flattered and he got ahold, and he wasn't the next one in line for this. And the man who was in line to be it, got rid of him. The one who was entitled to be and he comes in peaceably and he gets in there and then with the arms of a flood the competitors are all destroyed, and ~~w~~ the one who had made the covenant with Israel, the one who would be the next in line to get rid of him, he's just a young boy anyway. They get rid of him. Yes? (Student). I'm very skeptical of that. It is not a detailed history. That's right. If you are interested in political history or economic history that is not here given. There are many events passed over. Which from one of those viewpoints would seem of great importance. But practically every thing in the chapter up to verse 35, can be reasonably related to an event which actually happened. And of course we don't know the full history of the time by any means. We have a few books written of the time telling things about events. There is a little we know about it. There is a great deal we don't know about it. My guess would be that 4/5 of what is told is up to verse 35, you can quite definitely relate to something that the history books tell you, the history that is written at the time, I mean, tell you was present at that period. (Student). Yes, well, we want to look into that. We want to look into those, but I think we will find that there is not much before 36y There is very little detail, and then there is a good bit after that. There is a great deal after that. But before it, I didn't realize that about Keil. I'll have to look into that.

Yes, I think most commentaries will take it that this just fits right straight along up to e 35.

And so all your critical commentaries take that literally, every one of them. This just fits perfectly up to 35, I think that most of your evangelical commentaries take that view, up to 35.

Well, I wish we had another hour on 11 now, but look into 11, it would be good to look into Keil and see what is said, and look into some other commentaries, and see what we can do with this, the rest of 11. What does it represent? What do they say? How are we going to interpret chapter 11, and then of course I've mentioned certain verses in chapter 9, which are of great interest, and we'll meet again next week.

NEXT CLASS., .nm

Now the thing that we were speaking of the last time, the point that I want to have us get clearly in mind, is the question of the continuity in some of these visions. Now there are some visions in which continuity is clearly taught in the vision. There are other visions in which it may be that that is not what is in mind, and so when they say well, it doesn't matter as far as, there is no picture of duration here. Now in chapter 2, we were looking at the picture of this image, and there are two ways at which we could look at the image. One would be to say the - each part of the image, represents a chronological period, and consequently you might say that the first begins with the top of the head, and reaches down to the bottom. Well now, that of course is - if carried to an extreme would be fantastic, because naturally Nebuchadnezzar represented the qualities of the head, and not just the top of the head or something like that. He represented the qualities of the head, and so the idea that it is strictly a picture that time is now this <sup>part</sup> ~~far~~ and now this <sup>part</sup> ~~far~~ and now this <sup>part</sup> ~~far~~ <sup>begins</sup> part, and then the other ~~a~~ part ~~of this thing~~, and now it is here, and now it is here, and now it is here, and the point comes where the two arms separate from the shoulders, and the point comes where the fingers are involved and all that, that would be carrying the figure to an absurd extreme. And so to say that it shows duration right straight along would be nonsense. Well now, can we go to the opposite extreme and say there is no idea of duration at all? That a picture which might be represented by something that might last for 50 years would be represented by the head, and something that lasts for 2000 years might be represented by half of the body. Can we say that? Well that would seem to

be going to the other extreme, and yet of the two extremes, it certainly - well, you can't say it is step by step duration. You can't say that. It is quality rather than duration, and so we can either leave duration out altogether, or somebody may say there is ~~a~~ to some extent the idea of duration, but let's look at it now from the viewpoint, not of duration itself, but of sequence. There certainly ~~is~~ is sequence. The second comes after the first. The second destroys the first. There is nothing in between. Now it doesn't say that in the image, here is one and then there is another, as ~~one~~ might say, there could be an interregnum there, there could be a (14 1/2) between the first and the second. There could be a great place of 200 years, after one kingdom disintegrated before another starts. There could be. Actually it may take a (14 3/4), now between the second and the third, there could be

46.

and the third. There could be a break of ten years, twenty years, fifty years, a hundred years, a thousand years, as far as the picture is concerned, because it says here - it shows a picture of an empire. There is nothing in it to suggest there is a (1/2), as a matter of fact, there wasn't any break. The third kingdom, the greek attacked and destroyed the Medo-Persians, and so there was no break in between the two whatever, but there - you could not have - be sure of that I would think in advance. Now when you've had the first, second and third with no break in between, then you might say, well now, we have these three, with no break in between them, we can certainly be sure that between the third and the fourth, there will be no break. Well, the relation between the third and the fourth, is not quite as clear as between the first and the second. Because, between the first comes to an end, and the second begins. The second comes to an end, and the third begins. Now that's not true of the third and the fourth. The third one divides into four parts, and they all have the quality of the third, it divides almost as soon as you start into four parts, they all have the qualities of the third, but some to a greater and some to a lesser extent. And they continue in varying periods of time. Rome itself is never included in the area of the third, but neither was the headquarters of the second included in the area of the first, or the headquarters of the third included in the area of the second. The headquarters of the third, - of the fourth, is not included in the area of the third,

like each of the others it existed as a kingdom, while the previous ~~exam~~ empire was in its high day, but the Roman powers kept growing and growing and growing and took over the four parts of the Hellenistic empire one at a time, and you can't even say this is a time when it took this one over, and this is a time when it took this one over in every case, because some of them it gradually took away their materials, their area over a period of a hundred and fifty years. Until eventually you might say it would be just - well, at the death of Antony, and the capture of Cleopatra, would be when the kingdom of the Ptolemies comes to an end, and that is I forget the exact date, but it is somewhere between 40 and 15 B.C. It is very close to the time of Christ. When the kingdom of the Ptolemies was destroyed, and that I think you can say is the last of the four divisions of Alexander's empire to succumb to the Roman power. So the Roman power as having completely taken over the Hellenistic power would not be until just about the time of Christ. And the Roman power took over much of the territory included in other sections of it, as much as a hundred and fifty years before this. <sup>k</sup> So that the taking over of the Roman Empire, from the divisions of the Hellenistic empire, was a process spread over quite a period, but there was no stage in between any part of the project. When any part of Alexander's empire ended, it became a part of the Roman empire, and by the time of Christ, all parts of Alexander's empire, ~~he~~ that is, practically everything. There was a little territory in the east that was never conquered by the Romans, but practically everything else was taken over by the Romans, so we have no break between the first and the second, second or third, or third and fourth, empire. Well now, there are three instances proven then, it doesn't mean there can't be a break anywhere, the fact that we don't have it here. It is not enough to prove anything, enough to raise the question, it is enough to establish a presumption perhaps, but it certainly is not enough to prove anything. ~~Be~~ Now between the fourth monarchy and the fifth monarchy, what happens? Did you ever hear of the term, the Fifth Monarchy? Is it like the fifth column? It is quite different from the fifth column, isn't it? In the days of King Charles of England, there was a large group in England which was called the fifth monarchy, and the fifth monarchy then were those who said, it is now time to establish the kingdom of the saints, the fifth monarchy of Daniel. It is now time to destroy the heathen,



the wicked ungodly world powers and establish the kingdom of the Saints. And the term, Fifth Monarchy has been used that way at various times in church history by a group which said, now we must destroy all the earthly powers, and establish the fifth monarchy, spoken of in Daniel, the kingdom of the saints, which is established when the stone hits the feet of the image and destroys it. Well now, that terminology is the terminology - shows the definite recognition of four kingdoms, and not more. But because that is what Daniel teaches, 4 kingdoms. Now the fourth kingdom has two phases in it. As shown in the image. There is the phase which is iron, and the phase which is iron and clay. Now ~~when~~ one might suggest that these two phases are different phases which are characteristic of the kingdom at all times. And that at all times, it is partly iron and partly clay, ~~and~~ but when the image so specifically states this, the upper part is iron and the lower part is iron and clay, and it is ~~from the Lord,~~ on the lower part of the feet that it is struck, ~~and~~ it seems to imply that there are two phases. It seems rather definitely to give that impression. And if there are two phases to it, does the second phase come immediately after the first phase, or is there a ten year interval in between? Or a twenty year, or a hundred year? Or a thousand years interval in ~~between~~ the first and the second phases. Well, as far as that is concerned, we have ~~not found anything to~~ interval between any of the first three, between any of the four main kingdoms, and ~~the~~ between the fourth kingdom and the kingdom of the saints, the picture used is one which would be strange in deed, if its interval were involved. Because to have a stone ~~come~~ and hit the image and the stone falls over, and is utterly smashed, certainly gives a vivid impression of a sudden change from one to the other, then the stone grows and becomes a great mountain, and you could say the stone grows gradually until the earth becomes a mountain, if you want, but it pictures the growth of the stone as coming after the destruction of the image, and it is rather hard to get out of that picture and idea of a stone which is gradually ~~growing~~ growing and an image which is gradually decreasing all at the same time because the destruction of the image, is there pictured in terminology which is hard to see why anyone would use, if they didn't have a rather sudden event in mind. Now, I want to refresh your minds on these questions about the second, more particularly to go on and see what we can find elsewhere. Yes?

(Student). (The capital of each empire taken, but the capital of the Roman Empire never captured by another empire, so we can say that Rome is the city still remains as an enemy, but it will be taken over when the second return of Christ.) Of course, if you think of the Papacy as the kingdom of the Saints, they just take over it, very definitely, but it is true that there has no other kingdom come to conquer or establish another great power. (Student). Well, I'd rather say that a different way, to say that if there should be a revival of an empire, would there be a headquarters at Rome, you might consider that a second phase of the fourth kingdom with a space in between. [That would be a suggestion. Now I don't think from this passage, we will draw that there will be a great power, but the statement should be (9 1/2) if this second phase is still future, that it might be in some way proper to call it a second phase of the same kingdom, even though there might be a big space with an interval in between the first and the second phases. There seems to be no place for an interval between the second phase of this fourth kingdom and the destruction of the image. That seems to be still future, the destruction of the image unless you take it that the birth of Christ destroys the image. It is pretty hard to see how that has happened? Yes? (Student). That would be a possibility. (Student). Although I don't think the (10 1/2) would necessarily be the most important feature of it, there might be similarities of culture from a viewpoint, rather than that it might be even more important than viewpoint.

Well now, let's go on to chapter 7, and let us examine this question of continuity, in chapter 7. In chapter 7 we have 4 beasts which come out of the sea, and the first is a lion and he looks until the wings are plucked and he is lifted from the earth and <sup>it is made to stand</sup> ~~he looks instead~~ on the feet of the man and the man's heart given him, and behold another beast, comes, but it doesn't say that this second beast destroys the first. It just says the second came after the first. But it does say that the first was destroyed. And then it ~~see~~ says a second comes, and it doesn't even say the second is destroyed, here. It simply says, that there was a second that came, and it describes the nature of it, which seems to be a pretty good description of the Medo-Persian empire, raising itself on one side. And after this, I beheld and lo another, a third beast, yes, the third beast, it comes right after the second, but it says nothing about

destroying the second. Of the third, it says it had on the back four wings of a fowl and it had four heads, and the number four is stressed, which fits with the Hellenistic kingdom, with Alexander's empire. I think it very very likely that the stress on the number four has a specific meaning. It fits with the division of Alexander's empire. It fits with the pictures elsewhere, of Alexander's empire being divided into four with the picture of that in chapter 8, for instance, and an animal doesn't ordinarily have four wings or four heads neither one. So the stress of four here in Daniel 7:6 which seems to fit with the idea of a definitely tying it up with Alexander's empire. And then he doesn't say anything destroys this one. He says, I beheld and in the night visions a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly. It had great iron teeth, to suggest the iron of the image ~~and~~ which doesn't necessarily prove anything. It is an interesting suggestion of similarity. It devoured and brake in pieces, but it doesn't say it devoured the third beast. It stamped the residue with the feet of it, and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it, and it had ten horns. It had ten horns. And I considered the horns, and there came up among them another little horn. Now here we have a sequence don't we. We have three beasts, and in this picture we've had nothing said of any development within one of the beasts. We simply had three beasts. The second one had three ribs in its mouth, between his teeth. It doesn't say that it acquired this, it chewed up this, there is no statement of action. It is simply a picture. There is a sequence among the beasts, but it isn't even said that one destroys the other. And it isn't even said ~~it~~ so there is nothing to connect the one to the one before, to say it necessarily comes first, comes immediately, as far as the picture is concerned, there is a sequence. You could have the first a hundred(14). You could have ~~the second~~ a thousand years, the second, as far as the picture is concerned, in advance, but what happens is you have the first and the second destroyed, and the second and the third destroyed, and the third and the fourth destroyed, but that is not pictured here. It does happen. But then the fourth is described, and it says it had ten horns, and then it says that as we looked at the horns something happened, this is the third place here, a picture of something that happened. So there is a second phase. First there is a beast with ten horns. And then in this beast, there is a little horn comes up and plucks up three of the ten horns, so that we could say that there is - there are two things that are shown in the

Daniel. 46. (14 1/2) 1955-56. 28.

beast, clearly. Well now, somebody may say, yes, but I think that this beast has a second phase when there are ten horns. There are first aren't ten horns, and then there are ~~the~~ ten horns, so the second ten horns is the second phase. Well, there is nothing so stated here. All it does is to describe the beast, and say there are ten horns. But there are those who say that ~~here~~ ten horns represent a later stage of this beast, and I don't think you can deny in the picture that it is possible, that the ten horns represent the second phase though it is not here stated. But if so, then there would be three ~~phase~~ phases of the image -

47.

in the category ~~which tell~~ of Calvin's Institutes. His Institutes are works which he wrote as a young man, and worked over and revised. And worked over and revised again, he got out several editions of it. He worked over it, he studied every detail. It represents a polished finished master piece. Calvin set out to write a great work, and finally he succeeded, and he set out to improve it and make it even finer, and he kept working at it all of his life. You might say it was a great work of Calvin's life. Now Calvin is universally regarded as one of the greatest, if not the greatest exegetes of the Reformation times. There is much exegesis in his institutes and he is very, very highly regarded. He was a great exegete, a careful student of the Word of God, and one of his strongest points was exegesis, but his books of exegesis were not all of them, prepared the way his institutes were prepared. Most of them were, very very (1 1/4). <sup>?</sup> He didn't tear pp the right commentaries, but he went to Geneva, it wasn't very long before he was preaching frequently, and he preached on every day of the week, and he would take a book and write it, and these were often taken down in short hand, by someone who was there. And some of these which were taken down in short hand, Calvin worked over and polished and improved, and published his book, dedicated them to various important people in Europe. Others of them were published just about as they came, as the person got them taken down in short hand, there was practically no revision of his commentaries, so that one or two of his commentaries represent a rather finished work in the sense that he worked over it, and revised it a bit, and tried to make it represent the best he was able to do in the time available on the subject. Now his institutes

are not the best he could do in the time available. He took time for them, he made that one of the big activities of his life, getting the institutes as good as possible. He did not ~~accomplish it. So then~~ do this on the commentaries. So there are one or two of the commentaries which are as good as he could make in the time available, but if he had taken as much time for them as the institutes, he might have been able to make them better. And many of the commentaries do not represent at all what he would be able, to do with a great deal of time over it, but they represent simpler the sermons which may have been rather hastily constructed. And the result is that there is even in any portion of them, there is a great deal of very excellent exegesis. But his interest in them was not primarily exegetical. It wasn't to take the problem what does this mean and study it and fit in a conclusion of what it means. He desired to give what the passage means, but his activity was not that of investigating to get the material to determine with the most precision possible what this means, but to present something that would bring the gospel to the hearts and lives of the people to whom he was speaking, and consequently his commentaries differ from most commentaries you find anywhere. In that they are filled with heart warming suggestions and ~~the~~ with applications, and constant stress on the gospel. They are a real helpful devotional presentation, but in some cases, he took the passage, and thought, what was the application here, what is this that he truly believed was in the passage, but his stress is perhaps not what he might have stressed if he was trying scientifically to work up the meaning of this as in relation to another passage, and so we do not find an exact consistency in any commentary on points which were not the points that he dwelt on, he never worked a great deal in eschatology. He did not go into that to a great extent. He went into it a little more than I had realized, and heard some one just the other day - I was speaking at a seminary and just before it some one told of having been reading of Calvin's latter days, and reading how very, very hard he was working in his latter days, when he was in bad health, just before his death, thinking that the return of the Lord might come, and he wanted to be ready, for it, so to accomplish as much as is possible, before he came. Now I had not heard that about him before, and it was said by a man at an institute which ordinarily does not put a great deal of stress on the second coming.

And the man wasn't looking for it. He had come across it, and I was interested in the comment. I'd like to look it up and see where he got that idea, but it is not at all inconsistent with my general impression of Calvin, but - neither is it inconsistent with the fact that he was not - he did not take the subject of eschatology and say now, just what does the Bible teach about the Lord's return. Let's get all the passages together and make a big study of it, and try to find out all we can about it. He did not do that, and he ~~was active~~ worked actively, ~~as~~ we tell by certain people in his days, who set to work to establish the fifth monarchy now. You remember how at Munster they seized it, certain Anabaptists seized the city of Munster, and said we are going to establish the kingdom of the saints here, and they established it, and they ~~g~~ began to rule with a strong hand, in the city, and pretty soon they came under the control of one leader, and this leader decided that as David had concubines he should have them too, and he took quite a ~~n~~ large number of concubines and entered into various customs that way which the people didn't like at all, but which aroused the feeling on the part of the people who were against the city, and eventually the city was conquered and he himself was tortured and killed, and held up to derision, and all through Europe it aroused the strong detestation of the idea that Christians were by force to establish a kingdom of the saints, upon this earth, and Calvin shared in the general dislike of that idea, which he felt was not a scriptural idea and which I do not feel is a scriptural idea, ~~that Christ~~ I feel that Christ will establish the kingdom. He in person, not that we are to set out ~~in~~ by force to establish a kingdom of righteousness on this earth, but <sup>in eschatology</sup> that colored some of his attitudes ~~as to the future~~. It did not lead to him twisting passages away from what he felt they would be, but it did perhaps keep him from going into a really terrible extensive study of this subject per se drawing passages together from different parts of scripture. Now he has a rather extensive commentary on Daniel, there are two volumes in it, a great deal of it is of practical material, driving home the thoughts that he finds there, wonderful thoughts for the life of all Christians, but he goes rather extensively into his interpretation of chapter 7, and I have not come across any commentary who has adopted Calvin's view of chapter 7. I have not found one. Now, the present critical view, the idea that Antiochus Epiphanes would be pictured here is not what he holds, very definitely. Now he was not unfamiliar with Antiochus

Epiphanes. Calvin in his commentaries devotes a great amount of space.

Dr. Young is a very great admirer I'm sure, and he - Dr. Young as you know in chapter 2 is very insistent that there is nothing said about any 10 toes in chapter 2, and the coming of the image is the first coming of Christ. There is nothing about the second coming here. It is interesting that Dr. Young does not follow Calvin in Daniel, or pay great attention to Calvin on Daniel 7. I've not come across any commentary that follows the view that Calvin takes in chapter 7. But it is the view which would seem to me rather logical to fit with the view that Young takes of chapter 2. Calvin says that the ten horns he takes as not being a later development but as being characteristic of the beast from the start, and he says the Roman power does not have one ruler, but it was ruled by a lot of people, for the ten horns indicates the fact that they had the various consuls, the various leaders, the divided rulers of the time - of the kingdom. The ten horns represent various leaders, various rulers, in this Roman republic really, but of course, he continues that on into the coming of the empire, and the emperors did maintain for many years the form of the republic. He says that is what the ten horns represent, not specific ten, but a divided rule, and then he says when the little horn came up, he says (10) that was the Caesars. That represents the caesars he says. The little horns which came up and spoke great things and had eyes like a man, and plucked up three of the horns, that indicates the way that the Caesars took away some of the power of the republic officials. Because actually he took away all of the power eventually, ~~he~~ as a matter of face even the (10 1/2) had all the power in his hands. But Calvin makes much of that, that this is the succession of the Caesars, which is represented by the little horn, he definitely does not think it is the antichrist, but to be the caesar, the Roman emperor, and then when the books are opened, that represents the beginning of the preaching of the Gospel, and then what I saw in the night vision, and behold, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days and they brought him near before him and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations and languages should serve him, and his dominion is an everlasting kingdom, which shall not pass away, and the king of that which shall not be destroyed. He says that is the coming of Christ on the clouds of heaven, to the

ascension  
presence of God, to sit at his right hand and receive the kingdom. It describes his ~~effaction~~

This is a picture of the ascension of Christ, and according to that then, the kingdom of Christ begins with His ascension into heaven. I think you will find a great deal in Calvin discussed in another passage in the Bible, which doesn't fit with this interpretation here. It is not gathering together eschatology and trying to gather an eschatology, but it is giving the interpretation of Daniel 7, and that's the way to interpret Daniel 7. That the kingdom described here begins at the ascension of Christ, and that the coming with clouds, one like the son of man, is Jesus ascending into heaven. He says it definitely is the ascension. Now that's the way that Calvin takes this, but I have (12 1/4) commentary which takes this

that way. Of course, the critics take it that it is Antiochus Epiphanes, he is the little horn, but what was expected, the destruction of him by a great Messianic (12 1/2) didn't happen, and most interpreters take this as a reference to (12 1/2).

(Student). When there would be many rulers. (Student). I've never come across one that did. (Student). I don't think there are pictures of one thing being a type of another. I think they are one or the other. That's my judgment on it. I think that it says it is going to happen, the thing that happens. It doesn't mean that it happens twice in two different ways, unless it is says it is going to happen at all. Now that's my opinion. It may picture a spirit, it may be a picture of a series, but not because a man is going to come, and teach a course in the prophetic books, in this seminary which will greatly influence the minds of the students.

Well, you say, a man has done this. Yes, he says, but that's because an other man does it.

Well, if it means two I think they would mention it. Or if there is one, how the seminary is going to be characterized by it, a series. But for one to be a picture of one thing, and a type for the other, I just don't

(14). (Student). No, you see I - I don't know of any prediction which is a type of another. There reality may be. You (14 1/4) a

camera, and what for? To give a type of reality that comes later. You point out that somebody has done so and so and that is a type of something that could happen later in the picture. But to (14 1/2) something that is going to happen, you are predicting future things.

Now to say this is the thing you are predicting. That is a type of another thing which is later on.



I don't know of anything like that in scripture. Now I don't ~~me~~ mean that would be impossible, but I think that would be so different from anything we have clearly given, to know the possibilities one would have to have two or three clear instances of it. And I don't have - that would be my idea on it. (15)

48.

Calvin's here - to my mind, is a much more logical interpretation, of chapter 7, then a view which Young gives us of chapter two, much more. It seems to me that chapter 2, ~~se~~ physically shows a sudden destruction of the kingdom, ~~of~~ of the image, but in chapter 7, it describes 4 beasts come, and then it says the books were opened, and a fiery stream came, etc, and I beheld until the beasts were destroyed, the picture in chapter 7 could fit much better with that sort of thing, than the picture in chapter 2 could, But I don't find that any commentaries agreeing with Calvin in this view at all, and Young very definitely doesn't agree with Calvin in it.

Young says, about verse 24, he says from this very kingdom represented by the beast, ten kings shall arise. Now you notice how very different that is from Calvin. Calvin's view is a characteristic of the kingdom in multiple control. Well, that multiple control would certainly be of the Roman Empire, ~~in~~ in its early state rather than in its later, and it disappeared as late.

But he says from this very kingdom, ten kings shall arise. As pointed out before, the number 10 may be merely indicative of completeness and need not be taken as absolutely literal. These kingdoms however have this in common, that they exist during the second phase of the beast's history, he remarks on verse 8. He says, the second phase, explicitly makes the ten kings a second phase of the beast's history. Back in verse 8, he said about it, he said following the historical Roman empire, is a period represented by the ten horns. In this period the strength of the beast is expressed in full display. These kingdoms in one sense or another, arise historically from the ancient Roman empire. It does not mean that each one of the Roman empires must be able to trace its origin immediately to Rome, and he goes on and discusses that. He says the number 10 does not merely - is not necessarily precise, but that there is a group of kings that come out of it. Then he says, toward the close of the second period, there appears another kingdom symbolized by the little horn. This kingdom or government uproots some

of the others. I'm not sure that the number three is to be pressed, but this kingdom fades in the background as far as existence is concerned, and all importance is given to his head, which arrogates unto himself the (2 1/2) which belongs to God alone, for the third period it shall hold sway. See, he makes three things, very different from Calvin. It is, I believe, that one of whom Paul spoke, and then he quotes II Thessalonians 2:3-4. He says this one is the Antichrist. Thus, in one remarkable picture the entire course of history is given from the appearance of the historic Roman empire, until the end of human government. You see, Young very strongly and explicitly takes the position that the little horn is the antichrist, and that there are three stages in the beast, with no stage between. The empire first and then the ten horns come out of it, and then the antichrist comes out of one of the ten horns and destroys them. He takes that position very, very strongly as you notice here. Now he says, according to Gabelein, the ten horns correspond to the ten toes of the image of chapter two. Here however we must again remark, that no where specifically is the image said to have ten toes. The Roman Empire, argued Gabelein is to be revived, and divided into ten kingdoms. This however is to go contrary to the symbolism. The ten horns appear on the beast, which is alive. The beast does not die and come to life again in its ten horns. Rather these horns grow out of the live beast, he says. Well, the Bible doesn't say anything about them growing at all. It just says it has ten. He says, they grow out of the live beast. I incline to think that he is right, that they represent a second phase. But I certainly don't think that he can derive it as forcefully from the statements as he does. They grow out of the live beast. It doesn't say they grow at all. It just says the beast has ten horns, and Calvin takes it as a picture of the beast right from the beginning. They must therefore represent a second phase of history and not a revived form of the beast existence. Gaebeline and other expositors of the same school are not at this point ~~to the~~ true to the symbolism. A little lower he says, a third period of the beast's history is represented by the other horns, who will differ from the former ten horns, in aggressiveness and presumption. So you see, according to Young, you have in chapter 2, 4 kingdoms of which the second kingdom comes to an end, with the coming of Christ. There is nothing said about toes, where else would you strike a beast, if it was pottery except on the feet anyway?

It is a destruction of the whole beast with the ~~h~~ first coming of Christ, and that's all it shows. But according to him in chapter 7 you have a continuing picture right straight through up to the very end of human government, and the fourth beast represents the conditions which will ~~exist~~ exist, for a period of at least 2000 years, represents these divisions, and according to him it has three phases. And the first phase is the beast, the Roman Empire, and then he says, ten horns grow out of the live beast, and there can be no break in between here. And that must be what happened immediately after the Roman Empire, the same kingdom, and then the third phase he says is still future, because it is the specific antichrist. An individual, he says, who is to come out of the ten horns, so he insists that we have a continuous picture here, and there can be no break in it. It is one continuous picture. That is Young's view here, which is very very different from the view of Calvin. (Student). No, I'm just giving Young's view, and Young's view is that there are not any ten horns indicated in the first (6 1/2). (Student).

I would think so. I would think that - I mean, he insists the number given, isn't the number in chapter 2. I don't think we need to argue about that. I do think that this is clear, that it shows a sudden destruction of the whole image. It seems to me that is definite. A gradual coming down of this, and a coming up of the stone, is no where suggested in ~~chapter 2~~ <sup>chapter 2</sup> ~~in that mmmmmmm~~ and why he should so tenaciously insist that chapter 2 must refer to the first coming of Christ, and can refer to nothing else, and then makes chapter 7 show the whole history of human government right up to the second ~~g~~ coming, I can't understand. That is, I think he tenaciously holds something, and then gives the whole thing up, by taking chapter 7. Once you accept the chapter 7 shows the whole course of human government, and shows the antichrist, and show the return of Christ, once you accept that, then you have got a stress in Daniel on the second coming, and if you have that why not have it in chapter 2 also. What is gained by trying to get rid of it in chapter 2 if you admit it in chapter 7. I don't see the point of his terrific strong insistence that it isn't in chapter 2. Now Calvin takes a view that would fit with this view, chapter, but he doesn't take that. But on chapter 7, he says we have the whole course of human government. We have three phases, the ten horns grow out of the live beast. They must represent the condition of kings with the destruction of the Roman Empire, and the antichrist

will come out of that, but we have a picture of the whole of ~~g~~ human government. Well, in that case, where in chapter 7, does it say anything whatever about the first coming of Christ. In that case, there is absolutely nothing in chapter 7 about the first coming of Christ. In that case, the picture in chapter 7, is a picture of the second coming of Christ and nothing else at all. And if so, then there is a kingdom of the saints that is established at the end of the age, and then the establishment of it at the end of the second ~~e~~ kingdom, at the end of this age, you have a kingdom established then and you do not have in chapter 7 a picture of Christ's being given dominion before his second coming. So I think that is a very striking picture. Well now, you know, Young admits no jump or gap. It is continuous. It is a continuous picture of the whole of human government. Are there any gaps in Daniel? There are some who would say, there may be a break between the first and second phase. There are some who would say there is a break between the first and second phase in chapter 7. How about chapter 11? Is there any break there in chapter 11? Well, Saint Jerome says chapter - up to 20, you strike the Seleucid kingdom, and you tell about Antiochus' father and his uncle and cousin, and right there you jump forward and tell about Antichrist. And you skip over a period of a hundreds of years, Jerome would have to say. We just say thousands of years, because Antichrist hasn't come. Jerome would just say there is a big gap there. Now Young does not say that. Young says it is antichrist in verse 21. But he doesn't say we have a continuous history in chapter 11 ~~d~~ from 21 unto the end of it, and we have the end of the age, the second coming of Christ at the end of it. Is there a gap in chapter 11? You see, this question we (10) we want to see how it fits with 11. And that is why we are so interested in 11. I thought we'd ~~be~~ get into it this hour and I had these books down in case any of you wanted to look at them. But I didn't get to them.

49.

n We have been looking at Daniel 2 and 7 with a view to see whether we are justified in saying that they are gaps in the representation or whether they necessarily give a complete picture as far as they go. Now of course, that doesn't mean there are any one of them necessarily covers all the history of the universe. Chapter 8 covers a certain definite area, but within that area does it give a complete picture? Well now, doesn't chapter 8s say there are yet three kings of

Persia. Isn't that chapter 8? Or is it 11? You have three kings of Persia, and of course it is my discussion as to what it means by these kings. And does this mean he is picking out the high points of three kings. Or does he ~~id~~ say there will only be three, and then that's the end of the Persian empire. Well, it can't be that, because his prediction would be utterly false statement unless it was written after wards, it certainly wouldn't have been said. So that he picks a few high spots. Now we have places in the scripture where there are gaps. Or where there is a change of thought. Genesis 3, is one which I discussed - I guess it is some years since I discussed it with a class. Genesis 3. And we had a big discussion I remember our first year here, and rather than risk getting into that again, if you didn't have the same view point on it, or hadn't gone into it, I'd better not mention it, and only say that there seems to be a shift. There ~~seems~~ certainly is in Isaiah 7. He talks about the child, who is to be born, of a virgin, and then he says that butter and honey shall he eat, and who is the he? Is it the child of whom he's just been talking about? Is it some other child, or is it this child who he has been talking about, if we use him as a measuring stick, and assume that he was to be born in the near future, without saying that he is, and the fact being that he won't be for a long time. ~~d=~~ At least there is a shift of subject. Now there are cases where there is a shift of subject, in the Scripture. There is just no question of that. But I don't think we need to take any evidence from some other place as a proof as this (3) ~~point~~ point. I think we want to see whether in the book of Daniel we have clear unmistakable shifts of subjects, or at least shifts of subjects which are admitted by most interpreters. Does he look at the future sometimes and see a great mountain range and behind it see another range and go right off without telling about the intervening space in between? And give a picture which to our eye, looks as if it continues, and it might even to his eye look as if it continues, as if there is a natural gap in between. Now of course, that's all together different from getting two things completely mixed up. Supposing that somebody has said, about 1650 in the United States there's going to be a great president. This man will be known as the Great Emancipator. He will be born on a plantation in Virginia, and he will lead the troops as they fight against the French when Braddock is defeated. He will ~~but~~ cut rails and he will, and everything he learns he will learn as he sits by the fire and studies a few books himself. He will

be a surveyor, a wealthy planter, and make big visits to Europe, and I mean to take a few things from Washington's life and a few things from Lincoln's, a few ~~w~~ from Washington, a few from Lincoln, put them together, go back and forth from one to the other. And say there is going to be a great president of the United States and simply name characteristics of one and the other, and ~~p~~ mixed them all together, would make utter nonsense. Well, why not say you are describing Washington as a type of Lincoln. We are going to describe Washington now but this is a type of Lincoln. Eventually we will end up with Lincoln. Well, we say here, we are going to tell you about a man. He is going to be a great president of the United States. He is going to be a Great Emancipator. He is going to free us from the tyranny of taxation without representation. He's going to free us from the Red Coats. He is going to put an end to the British tyranny. And he issued the Emancipation Proclamation as a result of which the slaves will be freed all over the country. Well, you say the first part is Washington as a type of Lincoln, and then after a little you leave Washington and you go on to the antitype entirely. Well, I'm afraid we'd think it is pretty much nonsense. But suppose I would say the United States is the land which is going to be characterised by the fact of sometime having its presidency be occupied by a man of very great ability and very great character. I see a man who goes upon a plantation in Virginia, who is a surveyor, who fights in Braddock's army who is first in war, and first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen, and go on and talk about Washington, and then after we've talked about Washington for awhile, we go on and talk about Lincoln awhile. And you perhaps have to see just where the vision steps beyond this mountain peak and sees the mountain peak just behind. You go from one to the other. And you have a step but you don't have a jumping back and forth ~~like~~ back and forth. You are not saying one is a type or a representation of the other. Now just what is our method? I think we want to do this in scripture. We don't want to fasten on to it any preconceived method. We want to see what is there. But we want to seek to find a method of interpretation which gives us a definite reasonable return. That is to say, it may be a method which is different from what we have in other literature. It may be something - there may be new

principles we've never struck upon before. You take a man goes into electricity and the words negative and positive occur all the time. Negative and positive. What do they mean? Well, negative means that it has got a charge of electrons in it, that want to go out. It has more and positive means that it has less, and wants to receive them. Well, that's utter nonsense, isn't it. To use negative when you mean what anywhere else except in electricity, we call positive, and use positive when we mean what anywhere else except in electricity we call negative is utter nonsense. But the first people who worked in electricity had things completely turned around and used the word in the opposite sense. That is they misunderstood and they thought it was the exact opposite of what it is. Now it is known what we used to call negative is positive, what we used to call positive is negative, but rather than introduce confusion and make all the books out of date, and useless, and have nobody able to tell whether a book is any good unless it was after this date or before this date, and all the ~~electricity~~ <sup>electricians</sup> complete, we make substitute, because they'd have to change this terminology which we just simply say in electricity, when we say negative we mean positive, when we say positive we mean negative. And the two terms have become technical terms which are used in electricity, to mean the exact opposite of what they mean when they are used anywhere else, except in electricity. And it causes no confusion because everybody that knows anything about electricity knows that is what it means, and everybody that doesn't know anything about electricity also know that there is something in electricity they call negative and they call positive, and what it means he doesn't know, but if he starts being told what they say negative ~~and~~ <sup>means</sup> positive, and ~~positive~~ when they say positive they mean positive, he'd get all confused, and would know even less than he knows already. You have then a principle which you might say is an illogical principle in electricity. Not in the fact, but in the terminology. That it is a principle which is introduced and carried throughout in a consistent fashion, so that whenever you pick up an electrical book, and you read the word negative, you don't have to ask, does he mean negative. You know that he means positive, and that's all. And if you read positive, you don't have to ask, is he talking about what the real situation is? Or is he talking about the technical terminology, you know that if it is electricity positive means negative and negative means positive. That's all. It is a definite, consistent

terminology principle used consistently carried out and there is no confusion at all. Well now, that is - what I am saying is in our Biblical interpretation, we are using human words, and human lessons and human interpretation. And the spirit of I God doesn't give us a superhuman language. It does not give us a set of technical terms that will be applied always in just this sense with the same specifically thing put down in a mathematical form which will be absolutely perfect - we need 50 years training to interpret it, to learn all this technical terminology, but it uses human language understandable to the people when it was written, and it uses this to convey the plain ideas, and there are certain principles in matters we have to study to understand it, but ~~X~~ these must be something that is either applicable throughout or it is applicable in certain definite logical categories and relationships so that we can - that if you put enough study on it and get a logical method of approach to it, just as in electricity you use the terms negative and the ~~w~~ terms positive, so that we want to see what the facts are and what the method is. Now in chapter 2 as we've noticed, if you say the smiting of the image is the first coming of Christ, then you have a continuous picture up to that time, from the - not from the beginning of history, not from the beginning of ~~h~~ great empires, because the Assyrian was just as great as the Babylonian, and it doesn't ~~make~~ mention them, but from the time when he wrote, the time of Nebuchadnezzar's empire, up to the time of Christ, you have a continuous picture giving you a few main outstanding features, one of which it leads is characteristic of every period of that time. If you interpret that way. Did you say that the - it is not the first coming of Christ, but the second coming of Christ, and you have to, if the picture is at all literal of the sudden destruction of the image, instead of a gradual evolutionary drop, and a gradual rising. We haven't seen a gradual dropping, at all. We certainly do not have any great decrease, in ~~which~~ wicked human government today over what we had 2000 years ago. We certainly don't. We certainly do not have any kingdom of the saints ruling over large sections of the world today that is gradually growing. We have nothing of the kind. The picture doesn't fit unless it is something still future and if it is, is a picture of the Roman Empire something that is continuous throughout, or are the two phases of it in the picture separated by a space in between which is not described. And of the four animals, historic, it doesn't say one of them destroys the other, it doesn't say they come right after the



other. But historically they did come one right after the other, until you get to the fourth one. Now the fourth has a second phase in it. The little horn. Or you can interpret it as Young does as three phases. There's the animal. Then there are the ten horns. Then there is the little one. Three phases. So it could be two or three phases. But whichever way you take it, if you take it as Young does, he says we have a continuous picture right to the end of the age. Well, if you have that, then your ~~w~~ Roman Empire is maybe three centuries after Christ's first coming, which is no where referred to in this whole vision, if you take it - and the Little Horn is still future, and you've got a period of 1500 years to 1800 years at least in between, which ~~is~~ he calls the second phase of the ten horns. And maybe that is a characterization. The great beast with the ten horns described from 300 A.D. up until today. But if it did, it is mighty different from the picture he thinks of as the stone, which is gradually growing, during all this period, and this image being destroyed, because it was the first coming, very different. It could be hard to my notion to think of the second phase here as one phase during all this period. Now maybe it is. I'm not saying it is possible, but I'm just saying that it would seem at least the size of it, that you have a (13 1/2) of the Roman Empire, and then you have something that may be called the same empire, because it has some relationship, some similarity, some development of similar ideas, but which comes later, with a gap between, which is between the two mountains which the prophet's eye doesn't see as he looks. Well now, we've just asked a question on this, but now let's go on to chapter 11, and let's look at it and see what the facts are on chapter 11. You will find that most of the books, will have much giving of the theories and the ideas and their interpretation and that's all right, but at the moment, ~~we-still~~ before we are interested in theory or interpretation, let's look at facts. The fact is that Daniel 11, ~~is~~ begins a survey of history, Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all. And he shall stir up against the realm of Grecia. Well, that's what you have. You have three kings, after Daniel. And then you had a fourth king, who led a mighty army, to attack Greece. That's clear. And was defeated. He stirred up a great effort but he was too far ~~w~~ away. It took too much -

It was difficult to handle properly and the mighty empire of Persia was not conquered by the Greeks. Nothing of the kind. They had a head line in the British paper, Korean peasants defeat mighty U.S.A. The managing editor or headline writer, I don't know what it was in the London paper that put that headline in would be (1 1/2) by the newspaper (1 1/2) because it was not a true picture. It was ridiculous that a group of North Koreans drove back an army that the United States was able to get over there, but supposing that it had proven that the United States was unable to send a large enough army clear across the ocean with sufficient supplies and every thing to defeat the North Koreans and that they had been driven out from Pusan and driven off. It wouldn't be a terrifically lot different from what finally happened when they pretended they weren't able to conquer North Korea, and simply gave up. But suppose then that they were simply driven out from Pusan there, why nobody would say North Korea conquered the United States, it would be ridiculous. To conquer North Korea might involve such a tremendous expenditure and series of supplies and men at this distance, as to be an extremely difficult undertaking. And when the British Empire fought against thirteen little colonies here on the ~~was~~ east coast, it is perfectly silly to say that those little colonies defeated, or conquered or overthrew the British empire. Of course, it could be, those colonies that sent their troops over to Britain. They wouldn't have even been able to land, to say nothing of taking one city. Their power was a tiny fraction of the power of Britain, but transportation wasn't what it is today. Difficulties were far greater than they are today of fighting at a long distance, and Britain found it very difficult to send a large enough force all that long distance across the ocean in sailing boats, to defeat the people here and to conquer them, and then of course in addition at the end they had France and Spain both fighting them and that was an utterly impossible undertaking. Now those nations wouldn't have helped them any if they had easily conquered them. Americans put up a real fight, and did a good job, but it wasn't. The little 13 little colonies conquering the British Empire at all, it was with the difficulties, the distance, the transportation, and handling (3 1/2), the British Empire failing in the objective of defeating these little colonies. Well, that was the situation here with this fourth king. He gathered together people of many nations. He had perhaps five times as many troops as the Greeks could gather from their

little peninsula, but he had to take them a tremendous long distance, the organization and all that, it was a tremendous undertaking. They were not decently organized. Most of them didn't have any loyalty to him anyway. And the Greeks were fighting with desperation for their homeland and they managed to defeat this expedition, and it just wasn't worth it for the Persian empire to go to what was involved, in trying to make a conquest at that distance. And the attempt failed and the (4 1/2) after that, a period of at least a century before there was any more fighting to speak of between Greece and Persia. So we have in chapter 11, verse 1 as you know doesn't belong to the chapter at all. But verse 2 gives us a continuous picture of the first four kings of Persia. I mean the next four after his time. This would be practically the beginning, of the reign of Cyrus. But then in verse 3, which we read a mighty king will stand up, and it doesn't tell us where he is from, but everybody agrees, this is the king of Greece. He is not actually a Greacian king. He comes from Macedonia, to the north of Greece, but his father conquered Greece, and he has the power of the Greek city states, united with the organizations of the Macedonians, and with their wonderful new weapon, the phalanx, which no force at the time was able to stand against, with its new secret weapon, with which they could carry on lightning war, Philip succeeded in conquering all of Greece, and of taking the Greek troops and putting them in his phalanx, and thus organizing a force which his son Alexander was able to use, to go and attack Persia, but you have in verse 2, you have 4 kings of Persia, described and then in verse 3 you have a mighty king who stands up and this is Alexander of Greece, and there is a period of at least a century in between, with quite a number of Persian kings who aren't even mentioned. You mention some Persian kings and then one who attacks Greece, and then you say a great Greek kingdom is established and rules according to his rule. He doesn't mention here the fact that he conquers the whole Persian empire, but in between there is a gap. There is a period of several Persian kings who are not looked at. There is a chronological movement after three kings, there comes another one, but somebody could have said, in the early days of the United States history, they could have said, there will be a president of the United States who represents all the country, the whole country. He gets unanimous votes for election. George

Washington, and then you can say he will be succeeded by a man from New England, who will be very unpopular in most sections outside of New England, John Adams, and John Adams son will also be president. And you could pass over in between Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe who entered in. You could logically jump from John Adams to John Adams son. And nobody would think there is anything incorrect there. And here he has given step by step three kings and then another king who attacks Greece, and then he tells how Greece comes back and conquers Persia, and he doesn't tell how long there is between the two, and it is about a century, and there may be five or six Persian kings that aren't mentioned. And there simply is a gap passed over. You are not trying to tell all the facts. You are just trying to give a summary, a survey, and it is a reasonable step. But then we have Alexander the Great described, and then we find that his kingdom is broken, and divided into four but not to his posterity. The four is given to others. So you have the four divisions of Alexander's kingdom, and then we forget all about two of those divisions, because they don't interest us in our particular objectives. We deal with only two of them, the king of the South, and the king of the North, and the other two we pay no attention to. And the king of the South, and the king of the North, we go on to verse 20 and we give a history of a particular Ptolemy and a particular ~~Seleu~~ Seleucid and the next one and the next one and the next one and the next one, until we get down to Antiochus III, whom we have so much about and then verse 20 we have the raiser of taxes, who raises up and then in a few days he will be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle, and why have all this detail? Of all these different kings which were mighty important to people when they lived, but they are of no importance to us, today, practically except for an interesting study of past history, and of no special importance for the Jews. There's only one reason for all this, that is to spot light what is followed. It is to put a finger at the man who is the particular subject of the prediction and he comes in verse 21. But Saint Jerome, that great scholar, that great student of languages, Saint Jerome said, in verse 20, you are talking about the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kings and in verse 21, you jump forward to the Antichrist, at the end of the age. That was what Jerome thought. Jerome thought there was a gap. You see these kings, one by one, but you aren'

one, but you aren't much interested in them. And then when you get right next to the one that is tremendously important in the history of the Jews, you just skip pass him, and you go on 2500 years, to the Antichrist. Well that is a gap, which hardly seems to (9 1/2). And he was doing that and taking the opposite extreme of the view of Porphyry, who said all of this is a picture of the history, and the book is about Antiochus Epiphanes and it has nothing to do with any antichrist, the author of the book never even heard of Christ. It is Antiochus Epiphanes he is talking about, and he is writing in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The modern critical view on Daniel originated with Porphyry in the fourth century A.D. And Porphyry says this book was written there telling about historical events there very truly, but pretending their prediction, and whenever he gives something correct, it is because he knows it, but then he gets off into phantasy, as he imagines what will happen later, and it never ~~happen~~ happens, and that is Porphyry's view and that is the view of the critics today. Well, in opposition to that, Jerome jumps to the opposite extreme. He says between 20 and 21 there is a gap, Jerome would say of at least 400 years, because ~~it~~ <sup>he</sup> was at least 400 years after Christ, 500 years. At least 500 years there is a gap. He didn't know there would be another 1500 years after him, and Antichrist hasn't yet come as far as we know. So that we would say there are nearly 2000 years, and it may be 3000 years, for all we know. But Jerome just passes over just a jump. Well, Jerome thought there could be such a gap there, but that there is such a gap here seems very unreasonable because there doesn't ~~seem~~ seem to be any sense in an arrow pointing at an important man and then it skips the man it is pointing at. Why have the arrow there? Why not tell the people about the people just before antichrist instead of about the people just before Antiochus Epiphanes. So of Jerome's view of a gap between verses 20 and 21, does not seem a very satisfactory one. Not because there seems to be anything wrong in the idea that there might be a gap in the picture, because we have many gaps and we noticed one between verses 2 and 3. You will have gaps in anything unless you are going to tell every little detail. You say, that suppose somebody were to say, that in 1935 - in 1936, he was going to attend a conference in Rio and then in 1957 he was going to attend one in the Philippines. Does that mean he will

attend no conference between those . Eat no meals, make no trips, have no contact  
 with anybody between the summer of 55 and the summer of 56, or is he picking out ~~partic-~~  
 certain particular things to stress and telling about them without telling you what happened  
 to them. We have gaps in our speaking all the time. We'd have to start in and tell every  
 little detail of everything that happened. We'd ~~be~~ spend so much time talking we'd never get  
 anywhere. You have to have gaps. I asked a man once in a class, it was a class in syriac.  
 I said, bring us in a report on four main semitic languages tomorrow and tell us (12 1/4)  
 I said look in the encyclo pedia. Get the facts about the four main semitic languages and  
 tell us the place of Syriac, Aramaic, in the group. I'd thought he would come in and speak  
 for about twenty minutes. Well, he looked up and found the four great Semitic languages,  
~~and~~ one of them of which you have the largest literature is arabic, so he looked up arabic. He  
 saw something about the nature of arabic, something about the type of writing, something  
 about the type of grammar, something about the literature, where it is used, etc. He came in  
 and he talked for 50 minutes and hadn't gotten 1/3 throggh what he would like to say about  
 arabic and never mentioned the other three. Well, he wasn't leaving any gaps . He was going  
 to give everything. But he could have talked the rest of his life about arabic if he had spent  
 enough time studying it, and we'd never ~~g~~ have gotten to syriac. You have to in whatever you  
 do decide what you are going to deal with and you leave gaps as far as other things are  
 concerned, which you may or may not clearly represent. Well now in this case then, it is not  
 that there is any objection to having a gap, but that there is a series of arrows pointing to  
 a man, and the next one in line, historically is a very important man, and not only that, but  
 what is said in verse 21 fits ~~is~~ this man perfectly. In 36 the raiser of taxes will stand up  
 the vile person to whom they will not give the ~~ne~~ honor of the kingdom but he shall come in  
 peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. And I think you've all read commentaries  
 about how Antiochus Epiphanes got someone to lend him some money, and to put him in there,  
 and make it possible for him to get a chance to try to persuade people to ignore the infant  
 son of his predecessor, and put him in place and find a ~~way~~ way to get rid of the (14 1/2)  
 so that he would not be bothered with him later on. And so he got in by flattery, and by clever

means and while he was of royal family he was very definitely not yet in ~~the~~ line. Well now, is this a picture of antichrist? Is antichrist going to be a vile person whom they will not give the honor of the kingdom but he shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flattery? Well, how do we know antichrist is going to do this? There isn't evidence anywhere that this is antichrist. I mean we could have if somebody would exactly fit this. But we have no reason to say there is going to be. And this exactly fits Antiochus Epiphanes, so why attribute it to antichrist?

51.

So I think we are quite justified in saying verse 21 refers to Antiochus Epiphanes, and as far as we have yet drawn, there is absolutely no reason to relate it to anybody else. Now you could find places where there is reason to relate. I'm not saying that you may not find such a thing. X We had a man here, he was a fine Baptist speaker. He went around to Bible conferences all around the country, a very splendid man, and he gave us three wonderful messages in chapel in three different years. I heard he was in Wilmington, we had the seminary in Wilmington then. I went to see him. And I said will you come and speak to our students? He said, yes, and he came and he gave us a fine message. We had most splendid fellowship with him. Three times. And then he ~~g~~ came a fourth time. I heard he was in town. I went to see him. He was very gracious. He came and he spoke to us again. And he spoke to us and after he was speaking, he began to talk about the idea that you can be saved today and lost tomorrow, saved the next day and lost the next day, and he began to ridicule it and make fun of it. Nobody would have said, he is ruling presbyterianism. He is saying presbyterianism is illogical, that it is not true etc. Nobody would say such a thing as that, at that moment. You would say, he is now talking about Methodist views. That is what he is talking about. Oh, he said, they were ridiculous. They were absurd. They were illogical. He just threw everything actually that you could think of, on them, and most of our students seemed to agree with him, and I didn't see a look on anybody's face to show the least bit of disagreement with him, but after he'd gone on for about five minutes on that, he said, and infant baptism is exactly the same. Well now, what he said, took all the words he said before, and gave them

a double interpretation. So in the light of that you could go back and say everything there had a double interpretation, but you have proof that it did have, because he said. And I could describe what one of you here is going to do, and then I could say, a second person is going to have similar career. (~~2-1/2~~). And then you are justified in attributing it to that, and if this gives us a description of Antiochus Epiphanes, and then it says, now there is going to be an antichrist, who will secure his power in the same way as Antiochus Epiphanes does, then you are justified in taking this verse and applying it to antichrist, too, but up to the present point we have no such statement. So up to the present point we are justified in saying, this verse is a description of Antiochus Epiphanes, it perfectly fits him. You take the previous five verses, and nobody in the world thinks of applying them to antichrist. Or of applying them to antichrist's predecessor. It is agreed by everybody ~~of~~ that I know of, that they are a ~~specific~~ specific prediction of the individual in that time, which will precede Antiochus Epiphanes, and nothing else. And they lead us up to verse 21, and we have absolutely no warrant as yet, to attribute verse 21 to someone else. Now if you can find a warrant later on, that is worthy of consideration, but as far as we have gone, we have a definite fact, 21 is an explicit excellent description of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that is who it is talking about, and as far as evidence up to this point goes, there is absolutely no reason to take it as talking about anybody else. And then verse 22 tells of the great effectiveness, with the arms of the flood they are ~~over~~ overflowed before him and shall be broken. Here is this young fellow, not next in line, for the throne, though he is of royal family, brought up in Rome, little contact with people there, he thought of his chances amounting to so little in Syria, that he went to Athens, and he became an Athenian citizen, and got himself elected head magistrate of that, but now he heard of the big chance, so he left Athens and got somebody to lend him some money, and got himself secretly deposited there, and he thought he could go around making a good impression, and gets going, does away with the infant who was in line for the throne. He succeeded. And he succeeded beyond all expectation. And with the arms of a flood they will be overflowed from before him, and broken. And also the prince of the covenant. And now the prince of the covenant may mean here, the one who according to the agreement was next in line, the son of the



predecessor. It may refer to some one who according to the covenant - according to the promise was the one due to receive it. He also was overthrown. He was gotten out of the way, and never bothered Antiochus anymore, because he wasn't in this world. And then after this, ~~a=~~ he worked deceitfully. He become strong with a small people, and we go on here, and we do not need to go into detail of this, on through verse 29, the various commentaries you will find, I have not found a single commentary anywhere, which raises the least question about the fitness of every word between 22 and 29, to Antiochus Epiphanes. Has anybody found such a thing? I have not found a single question raised in any book, as to the fitness of this to Antiochus Epiphanes. Have you? (Student). A quotation by Keil such as on - oh, I see, he continues here with a long section after he starts discussing 36. He says, regarding the king whose course to its end, is described in verses 36 to 45. The views of interpreters differ. And then he has two pages there. As he starts 36, but as he ends 35, (student). At the very beginning. That's 21, he says, in this section which we have verse 21, first a description of the prince when striving after supremacy used all the means that cunning power can contrive, and his enmity against the holy covenant knows no ~~has~~ bounds. This description is divided into two parts, one verses 21 to 35, and two verses 36 to chapter 12:3, which designates the true state of his precedings. In the first part ~~d~~ is described his gradual rising to power, verses 21 to 24 to his warring with the south for supremacy, verses 25 to 27. Three, his rising ~~p~~ up against the covenant people, ~~is~~ even to the desecration of the sanctuary to take away the daily sacrifice and setting up the abomination of desolation, verse 28 to 32. For the effect of this and the consequence for the people of God, verses 33 to 35. This prince is the enemy of the Holy God, which is prophesied of him in chapter 8, under the figure of the little horn, and it is typically represented in the rising up of the Syrian king, ~~and~~ Antiochus Epiphanes, against the covenant people and the worship of God. Now of course you could typically represent this, but he doesn't say anything about chapter 7, ~~and~~ he speaks of 8 which is Antiochus Epiphanes, and he speaks specifically of Antiochus Epiphanes here, and he goes on here showing how well these different things fit with Antiochus Epiphanes, and I

C-50

have not found anywhere any statement that between verses 21 and 29 there is anything that doesn't fit with Antiochus Epiphanes perfectly. (Student). Keil has certain general statements of interpretation and general viewpoint which are worth investigating, but as to this question, what is there between 21 and 29. There is anything which does not aptly describe Antiochus Epiphanes, I have not come across any statement that there is anything in it, in which there is any question, that it can be a precise description of Antiochus Epiphanes. Now if you had an account of George Washington in the middle of the account, you read a statement that he was a member of the Illinois Legislature, you say that doesn't fit George Washington. That can't fit him. This must be a conflate picture. But if you read that George Washington was a great warrior. Well, eh fought in the Revolutionary War and the war against Braddock, and Abraham fought in the Black Hawk war. He was a lieutenant wasn't he in the Black Hawk war? Anyway they were both in war, and you read that Washington was a president, well, Lincoln was a president too. And you read that Washington was a statesman, well Lincoln was a statesman. Washington was a liberator. Lincoln was an emancipator. And before Washington died, somebody wrote in the newspapers, when Washington retired he said, now, O Lord, you may take away my soul, because I've seen the deliverance of my nation. This terrible (9 1/2) is no longer present, and in Lincoln's life there were those who called him a great (9 1/2). They had more reason to in Lincoln's life, than in Washington's because Washington was present in a peaceful time. Lincoln was president in a time when there had to be a great move of civil liberty, as there is in the middle of any war. And there are similarities between the two, but if you picture that he is a Virginian, and says he fights in the Braddock war, and tells about things all of which fit Washington, there is no reason to say that any of them have anything to do with Lincoln. And particularly if Lincoln hadn't yet lived, and we don't know what kind of man he is going to be, except for a few facts. Well now here, here is 21 to 29 with every word in it can be fitted into what we know about Antiochus Epiphanes. And what is before points directly to Antiochus Epiphanes. And most commentators agree that this is a picture of Antiochus Epiphanes. And my impression is that Keil is saying definitely that this is a picture of

Antiochus Epiphanes, but then tries to make it in some way, also a picture of the Antichrist.

And I don't see how a picture of Antiochus Epiphanes, can also be a picture of Antichrist, anymore than I can see how - that is a detailed picture, anymore than I can see how a picture of George

Washington can also be a picture of Abraham Lincoln. It is true that you can find many features

in life which are similar to the other. You can do that. You could give a description of

Napoleon's life, just pointing out those ~~pro~~ features which are similar to Hitler, and you could

find many features. But if you started to give any kind of a detailed description of Napoleon,

development, you would find many things which were very different from anything about him.

And you've got a lot of details in these verses, and no reason that I know to think that any one

of them does not fit Antiochus. No book, I've come across, makes any argument, that this

doesn't fit Antiochus. So what reason do you have to say that it is talking about anyone else?

I think we have to agree that we are talking about Antiochus. Well now, if somebody wants to

make an argument which we are also talking about somebody else, that's a different thing. For

the present, I think we can agree, there is nothing to raise any question about the fact that

every statement here is talking about Antiochus, whether someone can later make an argument,

it talks about what someone else is doing, and I see no

(12) but any rate,

from 21 to 29, I see nothing here whatever, for which there is any question, but that it fits

Antiochus, and of course you could take anything here, and you could make it fit somebody else

if you shifted it a little bit. You could probably fit everything here to me if you twisted it around

some, verse 26, They that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him. I've had people sit

at my table and be most gracious to me, and then go out and criticize me. But everybody else

does, so it doesn't prove anything. But I mean you can take these phrases in that way, and you

can use them in such a way to make them fit somebody else. But you fit them altogether in this

particular way, and you have a specific picture of Antiochus. Now verse 25, I don't know if you

could, He shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army.

You can't say that about me. I never stirred up a great army. And the king of the south shall be

stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army. How do we know that the antichrist has

any thing to do with the king of the north and the king of the south. Maybe he will. But it might

be king of the east, and king of the west. We just don't know. We have no reason to think that this is a picture of anybody but ~~Christ~~ Antiochus. Well, I think that through verse 29, there is no question about how well it fits Antiochus. And then you take up verse 30. The ships of Chittim shall come against him. Is this a prediction of Antichrist. The ships of Chittim are going to come against him. Is there any ground anywhere in the scripture to think that that is a description of antichrist? But it could fit Antiochus perfectly. Antiochus was in Egypt there. And the ships of Rome, Chittim is ~~used~~ used for the whole area of the west, all the coast lands, ~~a~~ there in the Mediterranean, that is used about Palestine. The ships of Chittim shall come against him. You remember how the ships came. I described it in class. How they came from Rome, and talked to Antiochus, and there he was grieved and returned and gave up his attempts, to conquer this land of Egypt. But then when he came back, he had indignation against the holy covenant, and he had intelligence with those who forsake the holy covenant. And that's what happened after he came back, from the Romans having made it impossible for him to do what he wanted to in Egypt. He then returned and took it out on the others. Some body said that's a good reason for a man to be married. When he works in an office ~~for~~ or somewhere under -

52.

A man can do nothing. He is always bearing down on him and criticizing him and treating him mean all day. There is nothing that he can do but say yes sir, yes sir, yes sir and be very mild. Well, he could come home at night and and be an (1) in the family and take it all out on his wife, and I hope none of you will ever do that, but I'm afraid a lot of people do it. I had a land lady once who had some trouble in the stock market, and lost a lot of money and then a couple of her (1) left her, she had difficulty with them so she took it out on the rest of the family. She acted real mean to the rest of us. But she had been the nicest land lady you ever saw, and I had been with her three years. Everything was right, then all of a sudden she got mean. She got very very mean. She just had this irritation and she wanted to take it out on some body. You will find that out if you ever have much to do with government officials. You will find out that especially a petty government official who has a little (1 1/2

is very apt to take it out on the people he has to deal with and he'll make (1 1/2) around. He will give into little petty annoyances. Why should he take it out on them? He is just trying to get over his irritation at the man above him, in most cases. Well, in this case here, we notice this is in n Antiochus (2), and ~~He~~ had sense enough not to fight the Romans. He knew that his father had fought them in a long war, and had been utterly defeated, and he had been brought up in Rome and he knew their power, and he didn't think it was any of the Roman business whether he conquered Egypt or not, but the Romans figured that if they let any other power get strong enough to be a real menace to them, they'd have a big war on later on, and it was better to prevent it by a little war first, so the Romans believed in preventive war, and prevented a great many big wars by doing it. And here they didn't have to have any war against him. They simply gave him a threat, but he knew the threat could be backed up with real force. But then he went back up to his own land, and the Romans didn't care what he did there, and he took it out on the <sup>Jews</sup> ~~people~~, and they were small potatoes in comparison with the great force of Egypt, but from the Jewish view point because the Jews could sit by and read in their papers what he was doing to the Egyptians and it didn't bother them a lot, but when he was up there trying to wreck them, that was mighty disagreeable to them. And he was up there doing it, and he set to work to hellenize his whole area, and make them a unified area of Greek culture between and didn't have much difficulty in doing it in most of his area. They could see the great supremacy of Greek culture to what they had and they were only too glad to accept it, but there were many of the Jews who were devoted to the teaching of the Bible and would not do it, and so he got into difficulty there with a very small group of people. He killed a good many Jews. He tortured others and many others gave in. Many of the leaders gave in. And of course that from God's view point was vital because He was preparing a way for the coming of Christ, and He was teaching this little nation to be a witness and testimony and a foundation through which the Lord could come into the world. And nowadays one nation can forsake the Lord and there are others that follow it. And there is no guarantee that any nation shall remain/ true to the Lord. There have been ~~great~~ nations that have been great Christian nations in the past, in which there is very little Christianity today. There was no guarantee then, but God was determined to keep

this witness alive in this one nation, and He did it. No matter what was involved to do it, and so when Antiochus started in trying to destroy Judæism, and He gave great wonderful privileges to people who would forsake their Judæism, eat ~~w~~ swine flesh, exercise naked and wear hats and do the other things, that were contrary to their traditions, he found many of them falling in line ~~≠~~ very quickly. But a little group (4 1/2). And so we find that this verse 30 exactly fits history as we know it. And we have to reason to think that there are any ships of Chittim involved with Antichrist in any way. He will return and have indignation against the holy covenant. So shall he do, he returns and has intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant. He doesn't just come and attack all the Jews. He comes and he makes friends with the Jews that will forget the holy covenant. He has intelligence with them. He treats them well. He removes the high priest and puts in a man as high priest who will do what he wants him to, and he gives favors~~y~~ to the Jews if they will only give up their religion and become as Greeks. And so he is doing this but arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary. It doesn't mention the fact that there are uprisings among the Jews, which lead him to send a force in, to establish control, but they pollute the sanctuary and they take away the daily sacrifice, and they place a statue of a heathen god right in the temple, and they sacrifice swine flesh on the altar there, and they put up, they call it, an abomination that makes desolate. A statue of a heathen god put right there in the temple. And such as do wickedly against the covenant he corrupts by flatteries. But the people that know their God shall be strong, and do exploits. And they shall understand - they that understand among the people shall instruct many, and they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, ~~an~~ by captivity, and by spoil, many days. And all of this happened. It was a long time, years, before the Maccabees were able to get a sufficient force to have freedom. (Student). It fits very well with it. (Student). The reference in Matthew 24 to the abomination that makes desolate, the abomination of desolations spoken of by Daniel in the prophets is something that could raise a question right here. So let's say that verse 21 to 29 undoubtedly refer to Antiochus Epiphanes. Let's say that 30 exactly fits Antiochus Epiphanes. Let's say that 31 we could say exactly fits him except for a question that may be raised as to the interpretation

which Matthew there gives of this verse 31. So we will say, up to 30 every thing perfectly fits Antiochus. In 31 it can perfectly fit Antiochus, but does it also fit this. Now what does Matthew mean? You will see the abomination of desolations spoken of by Daniel the prophet. Does that mean, that which Daniel has predicted you will see. Now it could be. But is it also possible that Daniel described a terrible desolations of the temple, the putting up of a heathen statue in the temple, and he called in the abomination of desolations, and Jesus Christ not wishing to refer to the Roman arms, the Roman empire or the Roman power in specific terms which would make him liable to be quoted and used against him. He did not want to suffer as a traitor, as one that is considered as an enemy of the Romans. That was not His purpose. And not wishing to make any such (8 1/2) as that, it could be thus used, but wishing to give an idea what sort of thing is going to happen, he compares it to something which has been described in Daniel, and which the Jews know historically how it was fulfilled. That is to say, is he there saying, you will see something there which is the same sort of thing as happened then. And you won't get the detail of it, so that the people who are outside, don't immediately they can quote, but the people who know the Bible, immediately know what sort of thing he is speaking of, or is he making a specific statement of what Daniel predicted in that which is going to happen. Now there are two possibilities. And for our present purpose, I don't want to decide between the two, but for our present purpose, I want to say ~~that~~ this, that up to verse - through verse 30, I see no reason in the world to apply it to anybody but Antiochus Epiphanes. It at least fits perfectly with Antiochus Epiphanes. Now 31 fits perfectly with Antiochus Epiphanes too, but if some body wants to say, 30 ends the discussion of Antiochus Epiphanes and 31 starts talking about another person with a gap in between. Well, that might be presented as a matter for consideration. ~~f~~ But let's go on now and see how the facts, however, our time has gone hasn't it.

(Next part of class).

Now up to this point, we have had - up to this point we've had no question that I can raise as to anything possibly fitting with Antiochus Epiphanes through verse 34, we had no question raised as to whether it could fit with Antiochus. The only question here that is a serious question

is whether in 31, the fact of a phrase used there is used in Daniel, as used in Matthew, might mean that Matthew is saying that verse 31 is a picture of the future rather than of the past, and if verse 31 is a picture of the future rather than of the past, maybe the ships of Chittim here isn't talking about his experience but is talking about something future, in verse 30. Maybe the same thing back to verse 21. Like Jerome says, there is a big gap between 20 and 21. Or maybe all the kings of the north and the kings of the south before are a description of the relationships of the kings of Germany and of Italy that are going to take place in the year 2300 and 2400 A.D. just before the coming of the antichrist, and actually to jump forward is right after Alexander the Great back in verses 4 and 5. It seems rather unlikely to me because to me all this fits with the Seleucids and the Ptolemies so thoroughly and I don't see any point of having all these men who were not interested in specified details, unless it is a point of Antiochus and we've got ten verses here that point to Antiochus, so exactly that my inclination would be to say that through verse 30 at least it is Antiochus Epiphanes that is described. Mr. Smitley? (Student). What I'm saying is, if the New Testament proves, which I'm far from admitting that, that 31 is the prediction of something future, then I would think, if 31 is a picture of something future, it may be that through 30 is a picture of Antiochus Epiphanes, and then there is a gap and we jump forward. But if 31 is the future, maybe the gap doesn't come between 30 and 31. Maybe it comes between 29 and 30, or somewhat earlier. I'm merely asking the question, where? I'm not meaning to (12 1/2). I'm just meaning to say that if it is possible that there is a gap between 30 and 31 it is possible that there might be a gap in another place. But I'm saying that it impresses me as unlikely whether there is a gap before 21. It impresses me as very unlikely that there is a gap anywhere before 31. Now if Matthew says Daniel predicted something which is yet future, then I would say there must be either a gap between 30 and 31, or a gap that comes earlier than 30. So at least 30 ties to 31. That's what I mean to say. And if convinced that Matthew does ~~not~~ say Daniel predicted something. This is yet future in verse 31. Then I would say the gap has to be before it. But certainly I'm not convinced that that is the correct interpretation of Matthew. I think that he doesn't say then



will be fulfilled that which Matthew predicted. He doesn't say that. He says, when you see the abomination of desolations in the temple spoken of by Daniel the prophet, it could be the sort of thing Daniel described that happened there. That sort of thing is going to happen again. That is, this one particular detail. It could be. Now I'm not saying that is the correct interpretation of Matthew. We are not a class in Matthew right there now. I've known a lot of people who are absolutely sure what everything in Matthew 24 means. Personally I think Daniel is easier to interpret than Matthew 24. I think there are some very, very difficult things in Matthew 24. And - very, very difficult. And I think there are a lot of interpretations of it which jumps to a lot of conclusions. I think there are some things that are very certain of it, in Matthew 24. There are some things that are extremely certain, repeated over and over in Matthew 24. In such an hour that ye think not, the son of man cometh. Be ye ready for ye know not when the son of man cometh. That is stressed over and over and over. That you are to be ready because there is no way you can tell. There is no moment when you can say, he can't come now. And there is nothing which will happen which will make you say, now He will come, because God says this is something which is to come to you without specific knowledge of when it is. That is very clear in 24 and 25. There are other things that are clear in it, and I think there are things in it that are unclear. What does abomination of desolations mean? I don't know.

53.

I don't want to get into it now because it is a different subject, and it would take a long time on it, but I have somethings given a stress with the possibility of a close comparison between that and Luke. And as you compare them, the two chapters are so (1/2) and you get one section of it, and you have other sections, very very close. You have one section where Luke says when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies. And Matthew says, when you see the Abomination of the Desolations, ~~standing where the~~ it doesn't say standing in the temple. Here it says standing where he ought not to. And some have suggested the possibility when Jerusalem was surrounded by armies, that Matthew, when he speaks of the Abomination of Desolations standing where he ought not, he refers to the Roman armies in Palestine, which were heathen armies, where heathen insignia and all that shouldn't be. As an exact parallel

to Luke. Now I'm not ready to say that isn't, but I must say that it is an interpretation worthy of much more consideration than I've given you in our survey. It is not what we are dealing with here. Except insofar as it may throw light on this, and of course, if something in Daniel is definite, it throws light on this, but what I'm anxious to do in Matthew and Daniel, is to say \* if you take this interpretation, of Matthew, it means this. If you take this interpretation it means this. It is one or the other. Let's guess it, what we can be sure of in Daniel, rather than try to insist on a certain unclear statement in Matthew. Yes? (Student). There are other places, - a good point. Matthew might refer to another place in Daniel rather than to this one. There might be an abomination of desolations connected with Antiochus. There might be another one at another time, which is in the future, just as we have a little horn which is Antiochus and a little horn which is antichrist. They are two distinct little horns, one in chapter 7 and one in chapter 8. <sup>4</sup> There could conceivably be two abominations of desolations. And so it seems to me that the point that Mr. Abernathy has reminded us of, is insufficient to show that we do not have to say in the light of Matthew that this particular verse necessarily is not referring to Antiochus Epiphanes. Mr. Taylor? (Student). A very good point, a point that if the other interpretations of abomination of desolations are in Daniel clearly related to this, or to refer to the same thing, then of course it doesn't make any difference which it was. If the little horn of Daniel 7 and of Daniel 8, are clearly related to each other, then what you say about the one refers to the other. If they are clearly unrelated then what you say about one does not prove anything about the other, and in this case we cannot solve this, answer this until we've dealt with Daniel 9. Now what I'm trying to do now, is to examine the question, are there gaps? Is there such a thing as a gap in our interpretation? And I feel that it is better to get light on that from 11 before taking up 9, rather than take up 9 first. But - I think 9 is a much harder passage. I would rather here not get an interpretation with stress upon a definite attitude toward Matthew, but try to see what the various interpretations are here, depending upon different attitudes of Daniel, and move forward in that way. I think methodological that is a better way. So I think we should say that through verse 30, from 21 to 30, it fits Antiochus Epiphanes, perfectly. There is no reason in the world to say, you are not talking about

Antiochus Epiphanes. It fits him perfectly. And if it is a picture with all this detail of Antiochus Epiphanes, to say that some other individual will have all this detail true of him, even if a lot of similarities exist between the two, is something for which we should want definite warrant, and so I would incline to think that verses 21 to 30 would be definitely Antiochus Epiphanes, with 30 so explicit about the ships of Chittim, but then when you come to 31, I would say if we had nothing, no book of Matthew, I would say, because after all, you have to see what fits into a verse at the time. You would say that 31 would seem to follow 30, with no evidence of a break in between. Now that doesn't prove there isn't any. But we have no reason in the passage to prove a break. Then I would say, we look at Matthew, and as you look at Matthew, it is possible that Matthew is speaking of the thing that is described here, rather than of the event that is described here. When you find that that terrible thing that happens, as Daniel describes it, at the time of Antiochus, happens again, then it is time to do something. That could be; it. And it is possible in which case this would still be simply antiochus and it is possible that Matthew is speaking of some other reference about an abomination that maketh desolation rather than to this one in Daniel, in which case Matthew proves nothing of this unless we find that the other passages using the term definitely are so parallel to this, that what is said of them must refer to this. And then there is the possibility that Matthew is particularly referring to this and saying, this is a prediction of what is going to happen in the future, and in that case we must say there is a gap between, so I mean, that is the situation on this. I don't think at the moment it is important that we try to decide between them, to decide between them involves a study of Matthew, a study of Daniel 9, a study of other problems, it is better to have the possibilities before us and hold them forth, and then go forward and investigate these other things, and come back to this, with the other material in mind, and when we take up the other material, don't prove the other material by this, but look at the various possibilities about this and see how they relate to that. There is such a thing as arguing in a circle, which is very easy for us to fall into. But we can avoid arguing in a circle - to avoid arguing in a circle doesn't mean you solve this, with no relation to that. You solve that with no relation to this, but it means when you are studying this, you are careful not to let a view of that which isn't definitely and

completely proven influence you here, but you see what will be the effects of different views there. And ~~you~~ when you are dealing with that, don't let a view of this which isn't clearly proven influence you, but see how different views here would affect it, and make sure you are not deciding one in relation to the other which isn't (?) decide the relation to one, but that you find the point at which one of them is decided by something outside which then has an effect on the other. Mr. Taylor? (Student). Yes, - there was the one invasion which was very successful, but it was not intended to be a complete conquest, and then he came back and he made a second invasion, in which time he was prepared to carry it through the whole way, and the Romans probably wouldn't have bothered him if he had stopped with the first one, and they said, well, they said, we've got to watch this situation but we won't bother it. If we had our choice we wouldn't let it happen, but it probably won't do any harm if it stops there. But then when he went back a second time, and it looked as if he was going to take over Egypt, they said, we will have a force develop there, which means misery for us in the future, and it is much better to deal with a little fire, rather than to wait until it gets to be a big fire. It is like the allies back in 1936 when Hittler marched into the Rheinland. It could very easily ~~open~~ send a few thousand soldiers in there with a preventive war, and that maybe 200 casualties and we'd never have World War II. And some people think it would be immoral to have preventive war. Personally I think it would have been a great act of mercy to millions of Germans as well as to millions of others. (Student). In verse 28, - 29. It shall not be as the former, or as the latter. (Student). It shall not be in the second as it was in the first. Now that makes much better sense. Not as the former shall be the latter. Now of course, in Hebrew you say, as the former as the latter. As is in both places in the common Hebrew idiom. In English we have to leave the as in one. Like this like this. We say this is like this. We don't use one like they use two. But that is much better, because otherwise this would imply something further forward which is not mentioned. And that may have been the implication, derived by the King James translators, taken in view of the rest of the ~~entire~~ chapter. But it is not a necessary interpretation. I don't know if we could say right now, the American standard is better. I think we could say, this way, we could say, the American standard is a possible

translation, and does not presuppose something about the rest of the chapter. I think we could say that. I think that that is better, that in view of the possibility of the American Standard translation, we can take it that the verse with that is fully explicable without going on to find some later one spoke of. But if we find ~~some~~ <sup>clear</sup> evidence of a later one, then the other translation is also worthy of consideration. That is the vital point, the principle thing in translation is to realize that you don't say this means this, but you say this may mean this, or this, which fits the situation better, because there are very few sentences that are absolutely unambiguous, in any language. Almost any sentence is capable of various constructions, and we have to get the construction to the various sentences to fit together and give us an integrated meaning of the whole. Yes? (Student). Yes, it means this, that is, when he first went into Syria, he didn't know (11 1/2). That's not going into Egypt. (Student). I don't think there was any fighting. There was no actual war in that. They may have seized a few people and killed them. (Student). I'm not just sure that verse (12 1/2) means the schemes in connection with Antiochus power. We have definite evidence that there was plenty of it involved. But the full details of it we don't have. And I think there are two or three interpretations how he worked to balance the power and gave the people flattery and promises and got them to agree. Then James VI of Scotland was his second cousin, Elizabeth was down in England. He addresses her, who should succeed you, she said, who but my cousin of Scotland. Which rather surprised people because she had had James' mother killed. Beheaded, though she pretended she was not responsible for it. But James VI before that, people had been wondering about who would be the ~~the~~ king when Queen Elizabeth died, and various groups went up to see James and talked with him. And when the Puritans came up to talk with him, he was raised as a presbyterians, he was head of the church of Scotland, and these puritans of England were presbyterians, and they went up to talk with him, they came back and they said there is a real presbyterian. He knows the theology. He knows the doctrine. He can read the scripture in the original. He is very very (14). Actually he wasn't at all, but he talked to them in such a way to make them think he was. He got into England and got the power, and said, no bishop no king, he said, monarchy agrees ~~with~~ as well with - he said monarchianism and presbyterianism

agree as well as God and the devil. That is what he thought of, but it wasn't what he said. In Scotland, all the different groups in England came to him and asked him what he would do if he was king and I don't know whether he told a lie, or not, but he certainly gave them the impression that ~~would come of it~~ <sup>most</sup> they could count on him. And ~~no~~ politicians do the same. And of course it is true that a person can't always tell what he will do in a position clearly, and they an impression they truly intend to do what is right, ~~he~~ but they look into the situation. Of course would do whatever would make himself powerful, but he just .

But it is always true that when somebody comes into something, that people ask questions and very often etc. Of course, if a person has a guaranteed (15) why he doesn't need it. But this one didn't. And there doubtless were many covenants made, many plans, many problems, and I don't think that there is any difficulty in saying that this to a person at the time would be quite clear.

54.

(Student). I haven't read the details of this for some years. And I'm not sure how much is known about this yet. We have certain histories that go into this and we have quite a few facts in history, but we don't have a great amount of material to at the time of (1/2) Antiochus Epiphanes. Of course we have I and II Maccabees. Now I Maccabees tells nothing of his coming in. It tells of the (1) against him, and how he went on for years, and gives precise details of the battles etc, until finally the Jews gain the field. II Maccabees tells about the persecution. The Greek Historian Polybius has a great deal of material. Now there is a book called the House of Seleucus by (1) which tries to summarize the whole thing and give a picture as well as note it in the light of history, but there always are those details we don't know. Even if you take something as recent as the war in the United States a hundred years ago. I read a most vivid account of the battle of Chicamagua, and it described - the details of it were vivid and thrilling. I got so interested I rode right past Elkins Park up to Glenside. And then I picked up another history of the civil war and read the account of it, and flatly ~~son~~ contradicted most of the things in this book. He gave a very different account. There are many things that are absolutely clear, but there are many details even in recent history of which there can be different viewpoints,

given, with ideas and in the general situation there, that all these details can be fit with, if we knew all the facts. I don't know of anything up to this point which some body could say, well, that just doesn't fit at all. KBut just how to fit all of them, I haven't taken a week off to get the precise original history and go into them precisely to say just exactly that this fits or this fits. I haven't felt it was necessary, because I haven't felt that there is any serious question about it. Maybe it would be well to do that, but I haven't felt it necessary up to this point. We don't have any serious questions raised by anybody, that it either fits with what is definitely noted about him, or that it fits the probability in view of the amount we know of it. It fits with what probably what the case would be, but we are in a different situation when we go on a little further. Let's move on a little further for now then, and - we have this verse 33, which certainly 32 and 33 can certainly fit the time of the Maccabees ~~excent~~ excellently. We have no reason to say that there is anything here that doesn't fit. And we have 34 which there is no reason to say that it can't fit the Maccabees perfectly, and we have 35 of which it fits the Maccabees perfectly, but when we come to 36, we again say, and the king, and what do we find he will do according to his will. Well, that fits Antiochus Epiphanes doesn't it. He will do according to his will. Does it? If he succeeds he does it. But if the Maccabees succeed in over throwing him, at least over throwing his power there, then he can't do according to his will. Well, to do according to his will, maybe doesn't mean that he succeeds in every thing he tries. It means he determines to do whatsoever he wants to do. Well, you can say that fits all dictators, and all rulers, so he will do according to his will here, that may still fit Antiochus, but maybe it is talking about somebody else. It could be used of most ~~any~~ anybody. And he shall exalt himself. That can be most anybody. Do we have many specific statements before this which fit Antiochus and would be difficult to fit with anybody, but he shall exalt himself. He shall magnify himself above every god. Now what does that mean? He shall magnify himself above every god. Antiochus Epiphanes tried to do away with the worship of the god of Israel, but Antiochus Epiphanes claimed that he was the descendent of Jupiter, the great god of the Greeks, and he built the great temple to Jupiter in Athens, and he built temples to Jupiter in other places, and of course, he said he was god. All these kings claimed to be god, themselves, but

we say, Antiochus ~~attempts~~ Epiphanes. Antiochus is his name, but Epiphanes means a man of this god. The outshining god. That's his claim. To be a god, yes, but does he magnify himself against Jupiter, whom the Greeks said was the great god of all creation. The head of all the gods. There is no evidence as far as I know anywhere that Antiochus ever did any such thing as that, and the fact that he built so many temples to Jupiter would seem to point quite in the opposite direction. How are you going to say that this is Antiochus? As a matter of fact, it is rather hard to think of anybody in ancient times, as magnifying himself above every god. The Roman kings claimed to be gods. The emperors, they deified themselves. Caligula, when he was mad, in the last days of his life, he would go into the temple and he'd talk with the statues of the gods. He didn't magnify himself over them. In modern days that makes more sense. Nowadays there are plenty of people who say, I don't believe there is any god. If there is I don't care anything about him. I'm the captain of my faith. I am the master of my soul. That's a modern attitude. That's not an ancient attitude. It is easy to say to imagine a dictator who is a thorough going atheist, but I know of nothing like it in ancient times. I certainly know of nothing in connection with Antiochus, which would seem to fit this, magnify himself above every God. And he shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods. Well, that's all right, if you take the God of gods as the true God. Antiochus certainly criticized him and denied him. He was just a petty god, of Israel that didn't amount to anything, and he was going to destroy him. But ~~he~~ magnify himself above every god doesn't seem to fit this. And shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers. What does that mean? When do we have any evidence that Antiochus didn't regard the God of his fathers. Some of the critics try to make an argument that Antiochus' first coin had a picture of Apollo on it, and later ones had a picture of Zeus, Jupiter, the head of the Pantheon. Therefore he is disregarding Apollo, who may have been the god of his fathers, and now he is disregarding Apollo, and worshipping Zeus. Well, in the <sup>Greek</sup> pantheon Zeus was a greater god, ~~he~~ and Apollo was a great god, but a lesser one, and Antiochus thought he was great, he might have exalted Zeus, Jupiter, rather than Apollo. And he put pp



temples to Zeus around the neighborhood, but that doesn't mean that he was disregarding the god of his fathers. We have no evidence that I know of that Apollo was the god of ~~this~~ fathers, anymore than Zeus. Maybe he stressed Apollo as he came in earlier, having just come from Athens, where Apollo the god of wisdom would be the one that they would perhaps be apt to stress, but what does this mean about Antiochus. Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers. If this were a picture of an antichrist who was an apostate Jew, it would fit perfectly. If this should be a picture of one, and that was a characteristic of him. He was a Jew who had abandoned Judaeism, that would be a perfect description, but I know of no way in which this fits anything that is known about Antiochus. (Student). I'm not sure whether he had his head on one side and Jupiter on the other, or how it was. I'm not familiar with his coins, but I have never come across a statement that he quit putting god figures on and put his figure on. I've come across the statement, he quit putting Apollo on and put Jupiter on. Well, (student). On the coins you mean? Picture on the coins? It wouldn't be hard to get picture on the coins. There would be various sources where they could be found, but I haven't looked into that. I haven't found any such statements. I have found the statement, well, he quit putting Apollo on the coins, and put Jupiter on, but I haven't seen any statement, ~~at~~ he quit putting Apollo on, and putting Jupiter on. (Student). Of course, the critics say this is all Antiochus, naturally, and so they have to say that this is something about Antiochus. But in the history of Antiochus, it is a pretty slim picture we find evidence of anything. Now look at the next phrase. Nor the desire of women. What does that mean? He will not regard the desire of women. Some people try to say this is the Papacy here pictured. This pictures the advancement of celibacy by the Papacy. They don't regard the desire of women. And some people have tried to say that there was a goddess in Syria, Astarte, that she could be called the desire of women, because the women particularly worshipped Astarte, and Antiochus didn't worship Astarte and so he disregarded the desire of Women. But that's pure conjecture. That's a pure guess and a rather weak guess too. What this means in relation to Antiochus, it does not fit any known facts about him, that he does not regard the desire of women. And then the next phrase, nor regard any god. Well,

that's easy to think of, of some atheistic superman of the modern world. But it certainly doesn't seem to fit Antiochus, that put up monuments for his gods and temples too, to regard not any god. It doesn't fit him at all. For he shall magnify himself above all. Well, he magnified himself above men, but ~~he~~ did he magnify himself above the gods, I know of no evidence of it. But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces. There is no God known that this could be. ~~for~~ Some have tried to take the words and try to use it as a proper name, and say this is a god. Well, if this is a specific god, it is a god that we don't know anything about, and it doesn't seem to fit with - that he won't regard any god but it says he will honour the god of forces. Does it mean a god, or does it mean to be a thorough materialist? Is he like Stalin who said, - was it Roosevelt or somebody who said, oh, in the peace conference we ought to have the Pope represented, certainly, and Stalin said, oh, the Pope. How many divisions does he have? In other words, they meant, the Pope represents the spiritual force of the modern world. Stalin says, how many divisions does he have? Materialistic. And of course Marxism is thorough going materialism. Well, in his estate shall he honour the god of forces. It fits with a modern materialist of some sort. It doesn't fit with Antiochus, in any way that I know of. And a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Antiochus honored Zeus, Jupiter, the head of the Greek pantheon, with stones and pleasant things, and temples, etc, but his fathers honoured him, too. This isn't a god whom his fathers didn't know. This represents an apostate Jew very excellently. I don't see how it fits Antiochus at all. Now, unless there is a very important question, the clock is moving fast, and there are a few things that I would like to get over for the continuity, so maybe I'll have to ask you to reserve questions, unless they are extremely vital. Because there is another thing here that is very, very important. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain. And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him. Now up to this, the king of the south has been the Ptolemy king, and the

king of the north has been the Seleucid. Well now, Antiochus Epiphanes is the Seleucid. How is the king of the ~~South~~ north going to come against Antiochus. It doesn't make sense. Does it? It doesn't make sense, the king of the south and the king of the north come against Antiochus when he is the king of the north. The king of the north comes against him. That is, the king of the south and the king of the north, the United States could have the king of the south come up from Mexico, and the king of the north come down from Canada, and (13). You could have that of course. But in the United States at the time of the Civil War, you couldn't have either half attacked by the south and the north, because one has both ~~so~~the south, and one has both the north, and here Antiochus is the king of the north, so what does this mean? The king of the north will come against him. It doesn't make sense. And we seem to have a description here of another campaign against Egypt. And your commentaries - your conservatives that try to make this out as all Antiochus Epiphanes say that the end here is a summary of what precedes, but it doesn't sound a bit like Antiochus. And the liberals say, this is account of a third campaign which Antiochus makes against Egypt, which the unknown writer thought he would make, but he never made. And so it was a guess about what Antiochus would do, which was never fulfilled. There is no evidence anywhere about the campaign, a successive campaign. The liberal writers the account here in these last chapters fit (14 1/2) of what he is going to do, but Antiochus never did it. And therefore they said, \* it just shows that this man who could make an assumed prediction just about Daniel, ~~200~~ 200 years before, was pretty good at making up these predictions of what he knew had already happened. But when he gets up to his own time and goes on to make predictions of the future, (14 1/2) and these predictions just never happen. So the liberals would pretty well agree that the statements here of these three, about Antiochus, didn't happen and was a false guess. Now the liberals don't say, that these things about Antiochus, he disregards every god, and doesn't regard the desire of women, -

didn't happen. They must fit in some way, but they have a pretty tough job trying to show how they fit, because there is nothing in the history that we have to show any (1/2). So here we have a passage, well, let's look on a little further. And at that time shall Michael stand up. Now as you know, this chapter division is entirely accidental. There is no chapter division here. There is none in - (1/2). Michael stands up and verse 2, many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, ~~amen~~ Does that mean at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jews are going to win the victory and the resurrection will come. Is that what it means? Well, the liberals will say that's what the unknown writer thought, only he was mistaken. A conservative applies all of this to Antiochus Epiphanes, has got to say yes, but then after telling about Antiochus Epiphanes, he jumps way, way forward, 3000 years to the resurrection, so there is a big gap here before the resurrection. You have to say that this is not a history of Antiochus or else that there is a gap between it and the resurrection. There has to be a gap. Now if the gap just before the resurrection, at the end here, or is it some place else. We have had a series of ten verses, which deal with events that never happened as far as Antiochus is concerned and historical students pretty well agree then, and has a series of accounts of his character, of which do not fit our history of him. We have absolutely no evidence that they are true of him. Following a series of ten or fifteen verses in which everything fits him perfectly. Well, what is the natural way to interpret it. Are we going to say as Keil does, here's a picture of Antiochus Epiphanes that fits him perfectly. Here is a picture that doesn't fit him. So we must say that this is Antiochus Epiphanes, as typical of the antichrist and then that here we are looking at the antichrist so the modernist says it is about Antiochus. It seems to me that is like giving you a conflate picture of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, jumping back and forth from one to the other. (2/17/2) Particularly when everything up here fits Antiochus, and there are a great many things here that don't fit Antiochus, isn't it reasonable to say, some where here there is a gap, and whether you want to put it before verse 31, or whether you want to put it before verse 36 is not half so important as the general question, is there a gap here? Now Young, takes the position, he says - the historic Christian position which he differentiates from

the dispensationalist interpretation, you notice. The dispensationalists positions are two: one is this is antichrist, ~~not him~~ who is a Jew, the other is, this is antichrist who is a gentile. The standard Christian position is that this is antichrist. And he rejects both the dispensationalist positions. And he accepts the standard Christian position that it is antichrist who is described, and then he starts in and goes through the verses, and tells that this fits Antiochus, this Antiochus, this Antiochus, this Antiochus, every thing fits Antiochus perfectly, and then he says here it doesn't fit Antiochus, doesn't fit Antiochus, doesn't fit Antiochus, doesn't fit Antiochus at all. It is Antichrist. But he doesn't say, this is antiochus here, and this is Antichrist here. He doesn't give you very clear what he is speaking of here. But actually, these verses fit antiochus, and these fit antichrist. If it weren't for the verse in Matthew, we would not have the slightest difficulty, in saying here is the dividing point between 35 and 36, and the king will do according to his will. Now we are talking about antichrist. we look forward and we see the (4). We talk about Antiochus. It leads up to it. We show the (4) directing to it. We feel the difference. In explicit full detail. And then it has been dealt with, not fully, not giving the (4) or anything about it, but having given (4) Daniel prepared for that occasion, and though when God's will is in everything. Then we move forward to the next mountain and we see something beyond it there. We don't tell about the gap in between. We don't describe the 2000 years in between, so we go ahead and we tell about the antichrist, who is similar to antichrist. Logically one comes after the other. There are many similarities. You want to talk about the great presidents of the United States. You talk about George Washington. You tell about Abraham Lincoln, and then you will tell about somebody else. And how you do that, is naturally. And you tell here about the one, and then you tell about another. And to me, 35 through 36, is the logical (4 1/2). Now if somebody feels that it is (5). Some prefer to put it not between 35 and 36, but 30 and 31, and 31 and 32, well, (5) the details of that, to see how that fits, study it and see, try to see where it fits best here. That would go right under interpretation of Matthew. And if you study Matthew, that would go right under interpretation here, but regardless of your interpretation of Matthew, it seems to me that to lay

down the general principle, that we have Antiochus described very explicitly until is it 30 or 31 or 35, we don't need to say exactly where now, but that there is a point at which we stop talking about Antiochus, and start talking about Antichrist. And my present inclination is to think that between 35 and 36 - but it is not 1000th as important as stating the precise point, as it is to say that there is such a place, and that there is a gap there, and that after dealing with these events, we jump forward to them. Now it seems to me that if we establish that there is a gap in this chapter, then methodologically we've done a tremendous thing. We've established a possibility (6) and we've noticed that there is a strong possibility of it in chapter 2, than there is in chapter 7, there is at least - some people think that that would be the most logical way of interpreting it, that there is a gap. But in chapter 11, we clearly have a gap between verses 2 and 3. ~~(6 1/2)~~ And you must have a gap

Antiochus Epiphantes, between him and the resurrection, and to me that there is a gap clearly, is what makes the whole passage, fit together with reasonable sense. Now the idea that this is typical, it is a typical picture, it is a typical picture of one who is typical of the other, I mean if that is the case, why don't we find a few things up here that don't fit Antiochus Epiphanes as well, and less of them down here that don't fit him. Why don't we find the things that don't fit with Antiochus scattered through here. So we say that the two are one view, and here is what is about Washington, and here is what is about Lincoln, here about Washington, and here about Lincoln, here about Washington, here about Lincoln, and all we have to do is (7) half way between them, and to say, everything that describes Washington sort out, and the rest of it, we say, must be fulfilled in time to come. Well, we don't have (7). And this is a typical picture of Antichrist, is a I don't very much. It seems to me as words without any specific definite meaning is used, convey a real truth. But (7 1/2) important events, (7 1/2) and then you have a gap as you look forward beyond this mountain here, to this one over here. And then you see the rest. To me that is a reasonable approach to the problem. And this is very important before taking up chapter 9. Because if there is no such thing as a gap, it would be silly to assume that there is any such thing in chapter 9. If there is

such a thing, it doesn't prove there is one in chapter 9, but there is at least the possibility that there is. It is worthy of consideration. So I think perhaps what we think is (8)  
 to say in further detail certainly problem in 11 and 12, or to go on and work on (8 1/2)  
 How many would prefer to go on further in 11? 2 or 4. 3 would like to go further into 11. Well, I don't know whether the rest aren't saying anything. How many would like to go right now to 9? Would you raise your hand? We have about half the class, says 9. About a fifth of the class says 11, and about 1 1/2 that say that they don't care. Well, it doesn't mean that we can't come back to 11 anyway. We can come back later, but maybe for the present, hold them aside, don't forget them. Keep them in interest, but let's look at 9.

What is vital in 29 is verses 25, to 27 and every word there has to be studied in the Hebrew before you are in a position to say much about it. It is what Montgomery calls the dismal swamp of Biblical interpretation. It is one of the most difficult passages in the whole Bible, and we are not going to try to find the answer to it next time, but we are going to go into it, in the Hebrew, ~~ham~~ and so please everybody read this in the Hebrew, and have a pretty good idea of it, and if possible look in three commentaries. If possible try to get a good study of some commentaries that believe that Antiochus is already (10 3/4). And if possible make a good study of some commentaries like Young, or Leupold, that hold that the theme of Daniel is the first coming of Christ, and the second coming is about non-existent ~~as~~ as far as Daniel is concerned, And also, if possible, try to do some work in some commentary, that holds that the second coming of Christ is the vital thing. See if you can get three commentaries from the three points of view and work into it. It would be very helpful to see how they contradict or what they say, and get the various possibilities and interpretations. But first, work very thoroughly in mastering the Hebrew. Next class.

56. (0)

- which are rather vital as foundational for a good ~~th~~ bit of what we have yet to do this semester. We have our test the second hour of next week, in = our mid-semester test in the course, which covers everything taken or assigned up to the present time, and then we have ~~a~~ a week from today we only meet for one hour. Two weeks from today, we have our meeting for discussion together,

and there is a slight possibility that I might find it impossible to get here for the first hour or even for both hours. Now the chance is rather slight, and I should know some time in advance, but I did hear of a possibility of a meeting being called that day that I would have to go to if it was, I hope it won't be, that day. But if it should be, why then it would be after Christmas when our next section where we would meet together. I'm sorry about that because there is yet a good bit to cover, and some of it is rather important. †

Now we were going to move on now to the 70 weeks. There are a few of you who have some questions which you would like to go into further on other sections. I trust that everybody feels that they could profit by a year or two of study on some of the other sections, but there may be some phase that is quite crucial to you, that you would like to take up at another time, and we will if we get time. But at least an introduction to this matter, of the seventy weeks. It is in some ways the best known thing in the whole book of Daniel. Of course the incidents in Daniel are known in Sunday School to thousands of people who have never heard of the seventy weeks, but among people who are ~~are~~ really interested in the Bible, aside from the time when in Sunday School classes, you discussed certain of the incidents of Daniel, my guess is that among them, in the discussion of the Bible in general, or the teaching of the various parts of the Bible, there are more references to the seventy weeks, than the rest of the book, I don't know if I'd say the rest of the book together, but perhaps even in the rest put together, I often hear people say for instance, this. Well, does he believe in the rapture at the beginning of the week or in the middle of the week. What week? The whole idea that there is a week rests on interpretation of these 70 weeks. Well now, it seems to me that some times, people make foundational to all kinds of study something that rests just on this one thing here. And it seems to me that that is going too far. We have in the New Testament, 12 or 13 statements, which all say the same thing, and one or two of them say it so unambiguously, that I see absolutely no way of getting around it. It relates to the time of the rapture, of the church. The beginning of the return of the Lord Jesus Christ. Well now, to my mind, it would be reasonable to take these ~~thirteen~~ 12 or 13 passages, and see what is absolutely clear in them, and stand on that, and then fit in the seventy weeks into that if it ~~see~~ fits into it, then to take a certain interpretation of one



of the seventy weeks, and increase that as if that were something fixed and established and a basis for any other. That is to say, I do think that there is a little more assumption of certain (4 1/2) among the large class of Bible interpreters, in regard to the seventy weeks than is warranted. On the other hand, a statement that - of Montgomery's in the International Critical Commentary, on Daniel that the seventy weeks is the dismal swamp of Bible Prophecy, and that there are hundreds of different views about it, none of them at all sure, and every possible view that you could possibly think of, was forged before the 4th century A.D. and all every body has done since is to choose among these, and there is no ground to pick among most of them. That I think is unnecessary, but if you are going to get into it, you will find that there are certain things in it, of which we can be absolutely clear and there are certain things of which we can be mighty sure, but there are certain things in it, which will probably remain a mystery to us, on which we could put six month's study on. At least with the amount that we can put on it. And I don't see anything gained by sliding over those things and giving the impression that they are clearly understood. I think it would be much better to recognize that there are certain things you don't understand. After all, Daniel was told very explicitly in the 12th chapter of the book. He was to seal up the prophecy. It was for days to come. When the time comes the wise will understand. Therefore we can expect in Daniel that there will be certain things which will not be understood until the time comes, and some of those things it may be right good to be informed about, and then it (6) will be easier to understand them. It is good to have them in mind. But not to assume a knowledge beyond what you have, and thus to fail to see the importance of such a thing, and some thing may develop so that they will become of vital importance. Edward Robinson, the pastor of the pilgrims said as they were leaving Holland, in his final message to them, he said, I believe that there is no new truth - that there is new truth yet embraced, from God's will. I think that he expressed a real truth there, that God's word has buried in it a tremendous and amount of vital truth, significance for the world's ~~existence~~, significant for our own lives, significant for (6 1/2), and I don't think that ordinarily it comes upon us by God's mysterious way of directing us to open to a certain page and read a certain verse. He may choose

to do such a thing, but ordinarily it is His will that we study the books to see the problems, to such an extent, that we can have things together and then when we strike a new thing in the Bible similar to we hadn't noticed before, or perhaps something in our life's experience, opens our eyes, to it, and gives us an understanding of something, which (7) the Lord's will which is vital thing in our lives, in our work. So I think it is very vital in our study that we see what the problems are as well as that we see what is definite. And to these seventy weeks there are both types of things. Now the passage should not of course be studied apart from the context. And the context is the entire 9th chapter. We have been dealing with a good many passages, without paying a great deal of attention to context, but we've been assuming the context, and I've assigned you to know the book as a whole. The easier things we haven't dealt with greatly in class, but I'm taking for granted that you will get them, and see them in their relationship, to those crucial points which we are discussing. But in this case, the 9th chapter, the whole chapter is gathered ~~we~~ around this matter. It is pointing up to it, in a way you might say the chapter is like the ~~passage~~ package, a man just came in and said there is a package from Gimbels, and said that my wife said for me not to open it. Well, I don't know what may be in it, but there is string around it. There is wrapping around it, the package. You have to take that off, to open it up, and see what is inside. Now that's a poor illustration, but yet there is an element of truth to it, - this ~~the~~ package, this chapter - the rest of the chapter ; is the wrapping, but in this chapter the wrapping is of more important than it is in an ordinary package that you get, because ordinarily you get a package, and what is inside is perfectly clear - the wrapping is simply a means of protecting it while you are getting it. Well, perhaps this is a means of protecting it. It is a means of bringing it to you. It is a means of making it clearer to you. It shows you where it came from, what it is, and so we've got to have an idea of what is the background of these seventy weeks, even though the seventy weeks are the things for which the chapters are written. Now the chapter, first we date it. The first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, the seed of the Medes, which is made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. We know where we are. The first year after Babylon was conquered by the forces of Cyrus.

In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years whereof

the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. Immediately a question rises, anybody who wants to understand the chapter and gets this far, must do what? (Student). I say that anybody who wants to understand the chapter and starts in and gets this far, to where he read the second verse, must now do what? (Student). We could go further than that. We must say that he must understand that, but how did he go about trying to understand it? (Student). I understood by books. What books? Jeremiah. So he must look to Jeremiah. So if you are going to understand the seventy weeks, you must know something about the seventy years, and so it is vital to know what is the reference in Jeremiah, which is referred to. Is there one reference or is there more than one reference? And exactly what does Jeremiah say in those references? Now that would be a vital first step here in the study. Now the second step then, and that's a thing that you can do yourselves easily enough, the second step is, to ask this question, when are these seventy years? They are the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. Does anybody here know when these seventy years spoken of ~~had~~ finished? (Student). You would say that it finished when Cyrus conquered Babylon, it finished. (Student). No, but I mean, as we look at it, when - (Student). Yes, well now, you suggest 538. Mr. Weber, what were you going to say? (Student). To the end of the captivity? (Student). Yes, the first decree - that is, you would say it was when the king said, you may go back, not when the people actually went back. Not when they actually got there. Nor not when they actually got the city rebuilt. But it was when the man gave the decree. (Student). Yes, well, I would think the desolations of Jerusalem, would extend until it became no longer desolate. Why would the desolation end when there was a decree given? What would a decree have to do with it? Of course, you wouldn't get it cured without a decree, but after all is it secured until a thing is done? (Student). We could argue that. (Student). They were up when they took Babylon? (Student.) The punishment of Babylon and the punishing the king of Babylon and the nation certainly took place when Cyrus conquered. There is no doubt of that. But after Cyrus conquered it, it became - Darius made his palace there, it was a headquarters - the great headquarters under them, it

continued to be a great city. 200 years later, Seleucas, the general of Alexander seized Babylon and that became the date 312 B.C. ~~annum~~ from which years were figured for 1500 years later. You get ~~the~~ a Biblical manuscript of 1500 A.D., it will say dated so many years after Seleucas of Babylon. Babylon was the great capital of that area, in 312 B.C. It continued to be an important city. Now how long I don't know. Whether Babylon was an important city in the time of Christ or not, I really don't know, but at least it was a very important city in 312. And that is ~~212~~ 200 years after - . So I don't think you could say that it was made desolations at all, until well after that. But I don't think that needs to be a bother us much, because he says, after the seventy - he says, when the seventy are accomplished I will punish the king, and the nation, - that of course, all happened then. Now - to punish the land and make it perpetual desolation, you might say it begins punishment in the time of foreign domination, but actually ~~the time of desolation~~ when it became desolate may have been many centuries. But this is a good point that Mr. Taylor points out, that this passage here in Jeremiah 25:12 says nothing about the desolation of Jerusalem, does it? What Daniel says is that the word of the Lord said to Jeremiah - that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

D. 57.

Well, it might make you wonder, was Daniel in 9:2 referring to some other passage? Was he doing that? Or was he - is this his interpretation rather than his quotation? Daniel says, I understood by books the number of years - well, Babylon is already punished, the first year of Darius, the king of Babylon, has been punished, and a foreign ruler has taken over. So you might say Jeremiah's prophecy is already fulfilled. Now if Jeremiah's prophecy according to Daniel, it was 70 years that he would accomplish in the desolations of Jerusalem. Well, now if in 538, you see Cyrus conquered, 538 or 539, what was 70 years before that? 608. And was Jerusalem desolate in 608? When was Jerusalem destroyed? (Student). 586. So that if you take 587 from 538 is how many years? (Student) O. 49 years. In other words, it is seven sevens. It is not seven/ tens not seventy years, but seven/ sevens. That Jerusalem was desolate up to that time. Can it be that Jeremiah spoke of the time when Babylon was to be conquered, and at Daniel gathered from that, in 70 years Jerusalem will be desolate. Now of course, in the

vision you see, Jeremiah speaking, about the land having been established, and making up for the years in which they hadn't carried out the established rest of the land. (Student). Yes, perhaps that is more germane than Jeremiah 25:12 here is, because that says after 70 years are accomplished in Babylon I will cause you to return to this place. Well now, 70 years in Babylon then, would - 70 years in Babylon then would be - that still he visits them and causes them to return, that might refer to a decree, might it? It gives them permission to return, or it might return to actual starting, or it might refer to their getting there. Suppose we take 5:38 for that, - would that mean that they had been in Babylon ever since 608? Well, that chapter begins with the words, now these are the words of the letter that Jeremiah the prophet sent from Jerusalem to the elders, and the priests, the prophets, whom Nebuchadnezzar has carried away captive after Jeconiah, the king and the queen and the eunuch and the princess put in Jerusalem the carpenter and the smith, were departed from Jerusalem. When did they start from Jerusalem? In what year? (Student). Jeconiah departed from Jerusalem? 597. In 597 they departed. 59 years. Not 70 years. Yes? (Student). Yes, in other words Nebuchadnezzar took a few people before, and it may be that chapter 29 here of Jeremiah, you want to put after Jeconiah the king, and all his places were departed from Jerusalem, as time when Jeremiah sent the letter, rather than the time to which he is referring necessarily. 70 years in Babylon might refer then not to these people here, but to other people who have gone before. It would seem most likely that Daniel himself had gone before. So that that is a reasonable suggestion there. At any rate, these speaks of the time when the people are in Babylon, and over here in Daniel 9:2 it says 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem. That brings us back to that about the sabbatical years. Every 7th year the land was supposed to lie south, Jeremiah said, we haven't done it. God is going to cause the land to lie fallow to make up for the desolations. That would bring us to that, perhaps rather than to these two. I don't have any reference right at hand. But that is an aspect to be taken into account too. This is then our first problem in the chapter. What do these seventy years refer to? If you mean the time when Jerusalem was destroyed, up until the time when the decree was given, that the people could come back, that is 49 years, rather than 70, that is 7 7's, rather than 7 10's. If you ~~can~~ mean the time when some of the people, not the

great multitude, but some were in Babylon, you get a 70 year period. But that fits with what is said back in Jeremiah here fairly, 70 years, but not so well with what is said in Daniel. Daniel speaks of the desolations in Jerusalem. It is rather hard to think of Jerusalem as desolate from a period 20 years before it was conquered. It is hard to think of it as desolate that early. You might think that 11 years before it was conquered, because they took quite a lot of people and Jeconiah. But even then, the city was still quite a city under Zedekiah, until it was ravaged and destroyed after that. Well, that's your first problem when then and with what we've mentioned here and what you gather, and what you can look up, you could write me half an hour discussion on this problem of the seventy years, if I took a notion to ask you next week, I'm sure. Mr. Abernathy. I think we could go on, unless you have some vital question to ask me. (Student.) I didn't stress that. (Student.) It is rather complicated. That is a passage I would explain in the light of these things, rather than this in the light of this, unless you have pretty clear evidence. I don't know of any way to get something definite from that to this. Now further study than I've done, we might get something that would help you, but my guess is that we need help from here rather than (8). Well now, let us go on and see what our next problem is. This seventy years business is something which is not as crystal clear. Jerusalem was not desolated. Seventy years later it was opened up. That did not happen. Jerusalem was desolated 49 years, before the decree was given that they could go back, the Jews could go back, 49 is seven sevens. And we have seven sevens later in the chapter, which you all are aware of, of course. But the seventy years here given, in Jeremiah it is not so bad if you take it from the first exile, how long they were in Babylon, but if you take it here, the desolations of Jerusalem, it is a little bit uncertain. Now he knew that there was a problem. And so he set his face to the Lord to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting, sack cloth and ashes, and prayed to God and confessed, and what did he confess? His misery that the nation had come into evil days? His feeling that they belonged to God and it was up to God to take them back. They were God's people. He must take them back. I think it is most interesting to read this chapter and read Isaiah 64, 63, the last half and 64, and see the difference here. There we have - we are your people,

These others aren't your people. You've got to do all this for us. Here we have - we have sinned and we repented. It is quite different. But now in this case, you note the stress on sin, verse 5, the confession. We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have rebelled, have not hearkened unto the prophets who spoke in God's name. Those righteousness belongs to you, but to us confusion of faces. Very different from the other place. To the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall all Israel near and far, Lord to us is confusion of faces, - to the Lord is ~~mercy~~ mercy and forgiveness. We have not obeyed the Lord. To walk in His law. Yes, all Israel has transgressed thy law, ~~but~~ even by departing. Therefore the curse is poured upon us. He recognizes the righteousness of what <sup>4</sup>God has done. Under this whole heaven has not been done such evil as has been done upon Jerusalem. Is that true? Certainly not true of anything that happened in Jerusalem before 587, because before that while many people had been taken into captivity that had happened to hundreds of other people, ~~and~~ in that time the city was pretty definitely destroyed, but the same thing has happened to Nineveh, the city many times as big as Jerusalem. But that was 587, 49 years before this that the great destruction of Jerusalem had come. He says, ~~and~~ what's been done to Jerusalem and it is only right for ~~us~~ our sins. He repeats that over and over. Righteousness, sin, iniquity. That is the big burden. This is not a passage which is dealing simply with political events. It is not dealing simply with the question of whether a good deal is built up, or guessing. It is not dealing simply with whether God is going to treat his people, give His people great material blessings now. It is dealing with the sin of the people, and the need that something be done about this sin, ~~and~~ there is constant repetition of confession of the sin and the iniquity of the people in this verse. Recognition that it is on account of that the curse is come. Now therefore he says in verse 17, hear the prayer of thy servant, - cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate. - O my God, incline thine ear, and hear. Open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, Lord, hear. Forgive. Defear not, for thine own sake, O my God. Defer not what? Forgiveness. Forgive our sins, for thy city and thy people are called by thy name. So this is a tremendous prayer of Daniel. It is worth much more study than we are giving to it now, but it is important that we have it in the background to what follows. But there in verse 21 he was speaking and praying and confessing his sin and the sin of the people of Israel - the man Gabriel, - being caused to fly swiftly, touched me

about the time of the evening oblation. ~~We read about~~ Do we read about Gabriel anywhere in the New Testament? (Student). Yes, he announced the coming of the wonderful things that God was going to do there in connection with the ~~at~~ first advent of Christ. Now the proof of a suggestion of a possible tie up between this and the first coming of Christ, and that is interesting because we had no tie up - no clear tie up thus far. The attempt has been made to prove that this tie up is between Daniel 2 and the coming of Christ, with the stone smiting the feet of the image, but it is not a very successful attempt. We have had in nothing we've looked at yet, any very clear reference to the first coming of Christ, but here it is interesting, that the same angel that comes to them, comes to him. Now that doesn't prove a tie up, but it is interesting in view of that failure to have nothing to tie up with that, and he said, Daniel, I am come to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of your supplications the commandment came forth. Here is one of the commandments here, when Daniel began his supplications. That's when the commandment came. The critics say that is when the seventy weeks begin. That that is when the word went forth. When the commandment came to him. And I am come to show thee, for thou art greatly beloved. Therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. Daniel says there is seventy years is going to be accomplished. So he confesses the sin of his and the sin of the people. God says the seventy years are over. You can go on back. He says seventy weeks are determined upon my people. Well now, that surely is related in some way to the seventy years. Does it mean the seventy years aren't over yet. There are still seventy weeks left. Is that what it means? Or does it mean the seventy years are over, and this was necessary, but there is necessary a further seventy weeks. Or does it mean the seventy years are over, and their sin is expiated, and now you are going to have seventy weeks of bliss and joy. <sup>^</sup>Actually there are three possibilities, that's the next problem. Which of the three it is. I don't say we are in a position now to know as yet, but some people will say, well of course, it is not so and so. Well, what are the possibilities. Here are the three. That's a point we could study on and reach a conclusion on. Now he goes on and says, Seventy weeks are determined - and you can't reach a conclusion with a question like this raised, until you know what the seventy weeks are for. Seventy,



weeks are determined in which to rebuild Jerusalem, to set up a

58.

a thing on which we can be dogmatic. That the purpose of the seventy weeks ties up with his prayer of confession. On that we can be dogmatic. This is not simply a promise of political victory. It is not simply a promise of material prosperity. It is related to the confession of sin and iniquity. What is going to be done in these seventy weeks? This what is needed to rebuild Jerusalem, the great capital. Is this what is needed to clear up the desolations? Is this what is needed to get the people home again? Is this what is needed for great joy and rejoicing? No, this is what is needed, to perform these matters, which are related to the prayer of Daniel. That is, that is what this verse means. This verse says, seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity. There are three negatives, aren't there? To finish transgression. To make an end of sin, to make reconciliation for iniquity. Three positives. To bring in everlasting righteousness. To seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy. Well now, if we having this question, the purpose of the seventy weeks, immediately we think of the three main approaches to Daniel. First, the Maccabean approach. The purpose of Daniel, as all the critics say is to look toward the Maccabean period. We will all agree, one of the purposes of Daniel, is to look to the Maccabean period. Therefore we have nothing against the possibility that in the course of Daniel, is looking at that specifically. Well, you don't want to relate anything to that, that is related to something else. And we certainly don't want to restrict anything to that, that is dealing with somebody else, but we don't want to fail to relate to that, those matters which are very definitely dealing with it. Well now, is this Maccabean dating? This is the Maccabean time. It is the freeing of themselves from Antiochus Epiphanes. Finish the transgression. Make an end of sins, and make reconciliation for iniquity. What is there in the Maccabean that has anything to do with iniquity? Did the victory under the Maccabees, against Antiochus Epiphanes, bring in everlasting righteousness? If you asked anybody a hundred years later and they will say, oh, it is wonderful what those Maccabees did, freeing us from Antiochus, the Syrian oppression,

allowing the temple services to be reestablished again, allowing ~~it to go on knowing that~~ ~~it will~~ us to go on and not interfere with the progress of our religion. It is wonderful. But they will say, the descendents of these Maccabeans, which we call the Hasmoneans, are about as rashly a group of kings, as we've ever had, are more so, and these rulers, in Jerusalem are a pretty low lot. Talking about everlasting righteousness, why there are very few people who consider them as righteous in any manner, shape or form whatever. So that they certainly did not bring in everlasting righteousness. They certainly did not do that. They brought a wonderful freeing and relief from this oppression, but they brought in no everlasting righteousness. To seal up the vision and the prophecy. I don't think this would be seal up, in the sense of Daniel 12, to hide the vision and the prophecy so that it would be later understood. I think it means to set a seal of approval on it, of the fulfillment of that which is predicted. Well, if that's the case, it could fit in the Maccabean time, that is there clearly predicted in Daniel 8, and 11, and now definitely fulfilled. It could refer to that, or anything else, that had been specifically fulfilled. Yes, or what else? To anoint the most holy. Anoint the most holy. Literally, a holy of holies. To anoint a holy of holies. Well, the Maccabees cleaned out the temple, and put away all the miserable abominations that the Syrians had put in. They built a new altar, and I suppose they anointed it, so perhaps you could say that this particular phrase, could be fulfilled in that. Well, we say, could this fit with the first advent. We found that some fit pretty well, and some not at all, with Maccabees days. Can it fit the first advent of Christ? Well, there are seventy weeks. To finish transgressions. Jesus said, it is finished. Jesus bore the penalty of our sins, to make an end for sins. Our sins are buried in the deepest seas. Our sins are hidden behind his back. Our sins are nailed to his cross. They are made an end of, in one sense. In principle they are done with. He has borne them on the cross. We are forgiven for our iniquities through Him. But he has not given us complete sanctification yet, he has not like to himself yet. He has not done away with the affects of sin, and suffering, and misery in this world as yet. He has in principle then completed sin and done away with iniquity. In principle, yes, but he has not in working out of it, done so, because that will not be until the second advent. (Student.)

No, what I am saying is that these three phases, as they stand in the King James version here, could apply to the first advent, but I'm saying that they do not apply with absolute certainty, to the first advent alone. I say it is a very good application, and yet there is a possibility ~~(6)~~. by no means the requirement, that they may look on and further. Now it is very interesting that Professor Young in his book, when he deals with these statements here, to the purpose of it, takes up one of them in which he objects to the King James translation. And that one is the one where it says that they - where it says that - the very first one where it says to finish or complete transgression. Now he says the interpretation to finish or complete does not mean, justifiable, He says that it is better to think of it as to restrain. The thought is well expressed by one writer, the sin ~~which~~ <sup>laid</sup> is hitherto ~~(7)~~ naked and open to the eyes of the righteous God will now be shut and sealed up and hidden by the God of mercy, so that it may be regarded as no longer existing. A Biblical form of describing forgiveness of sins, analagous to the phrase hiding His face from sin, putting away sin. Now I don't think much of that interpretation. ~~That~~ That is, the word there, is a word which as it stands doesn't mean to finish, but to restrain. But does restrain mean to forgive. It seems to me that the writer he is quoting from is pretty well making the word mean something quite different. You come to a king and you say, ~~and~~ I have sinned against you. I have been in rebellion against you. I want to surrendered and to confess my wrong and to ask you forgiveness. He says, I will restrain your transgression. Does that mean he forgives it? (7 3/4). To restrain sin, would seem to mean forcibly hold it down, put an end to it, rather than to forgive it. Now this quotation here given, to make restrain the sin which is hitherto laid naked and open before the eyes of the righteous God will now be shut in and sealed up and hidden by the God of mercy. It will be regarded as no longer existing. That as a way of restraining the word restrain, I must say impresses me as a very (8 1/4) way of doing it. And I'm not at all surprised that he would prefer to quote somebody else rather ~~than~~ than to say that in his own initiative. It certainly seems like, if you can make restrain mean forgive, you can take up just about anything to mean anything it impresses me. Well now, to complete might mean forgive, or it might mean to put an end to it. To restrain to me seems to mean simply to hinder, not to put an end to. Let's find the exact Hebrew word. Who has it in mind? I imagine that you've all read it, and the final (student).



took it the way tradition takes it. Well, this is not an extremely important question in connection with the chapter, because it is simply one of six statements along together here, but we can say this, that ~~hmm~~ these first three statements seem to fit with the first coming of Christ quite perfectly. Yet they might fit with the second coming equally perfectly. They don't necessarily fit with the first. ~~¥~~ They could go in either one, but they don't go with the Maccabean period, and then the second three are the positive - to bring in everlasting righteousness, Was everlasting righteousness brought in in the Maccabean times? Hardly. Was it brought in in the first coming of Christ? Well, in principle yes. But in actual outworking, certainly not (13). To seal up the vision and prophecy, there were many fulfillments, fulfilled predictions in the first coming, and there will be many in the second. So that doesn't prove anything. And to anoint the most holy, anoint a holy of holies, that is a rather difficult phrase. That is quite difficult phrase, anoint a holy of holies. I would say that that could refer somehow, Christ's coming is described as to anoint ~~be~~ the most holy, and yet it seems a rather strange way to take it. To call him the holy of holies. Many have taken it that way. It seems more naturally to fit a sanctuary or building, but not necessarily. It may mean Christ. It may mean something else. It is a hard phrase. Mr. Delancy. (Student).

59.

So that the six purposes are not just (1/2) but they don't fit the Maccabean period. They don't seem to fit that interpretation, and it does seem as if they would fit the first and second coming, either one, but it does seem that they point with absolute certainty to one. Well, this is the first verse of our four verses, and this is one as you see with quite a few problems of meaning, but I don't think they are extremely vital, the problems in this verse. Blessed is that one who anoints the most holy, or a holy of holies. Further study of it might make us a littler/ surer, but I incline to think that we can say that this doesn't fit the Maccabean times, but it could fit the first coming or the second coming, or his (1) relationship.

We have looked at this 24th verse, and we have noticed that there are some problems in the interpretation of the words in it. They are not especially serious. There may be cases

where there would be a fair amount of difference in the conclusion you would come to, of the meaning of a certain phrase, but the meaning of the verse as a whole, is not difficult. And the various possibilities wouldn't make a great difference, so that while there are some things that are worthy of further study there, I do think that the ~~verse~~ verse as a whole, is tremendously important, but that the study of its (2) is not as important as ~~many~~ many other things.

But there is a further question about this verse. It begins, seventy weeks are determined upon thy people. Literally, it is seventy sevens. And the question is a very important one. What are these sevens? What do we mean by a seven, as used here? Now that is a question which we may not be able to answer, just with dealing with verse 24, because we go on talking about these sevens or weeks, in verse 25, and in verse 26, and in verse 27. And therefore, for a final conclusion regarding this, we should perhaps wait until we have evidence from the other chapters. But for a - if we can make a definite decision here in verse 24, of what the sevens or weeks mean, why then we have that as a basis for the other verses. I shouldn't say, we should dogmatically on whatever we find in verse 24 say, this is it. Until we've looked at the others. The others might require modification, but I would say that - if we could get something pretty established here, we'd be in a find basis to go ahead. On the other hand, if we don't find evidence in this verse to prove it, we note the question and leave it to be considered in relation with the other verses. Now what do we mean by a seven, seventy sevens, of - does it mean weeks as you have it here, as weeks being a period of time which is approximately one fourth of the time it takes the moon to revolve around the earth. A period of time which involves seven times of turning the earth on its axis. Is that what a seven means. Our ~~word-Engl~~ English word weeks is not what proves it. It is a Hebrew word here which is translated weeks. Dr. MacLain in his little book on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, brings out a very striking point that in the next chapter in verse 2, Daniel says, I Daniel was mourning three full weeks, and that what is here called full weeks, is literally weeks of days. Three sevens of days. Now I'm not sure that full weeks is the correct, is a very literal ~~transgre~~ translation. Verse 3, sevens of days. Three weeks of days. The fact that he points out that there he says weeks of days, suggests that weeks doesn't necessarily mean a week of days. It may mean a seven of anything. It may be a seven of months.

It may mean a seven of years. It may be a seven of most anything. And consequently, that ~~is~~ it is a question to be decided in the light of context. What is he talking about? Seven of weeks. Seven of days. Seven of months. Seven of years. Seven of what? Now there are others who say, this seven is a week. It means a week of days, but on a prophetic principle, they will say of a day standing for a year, this will represent ~~it~~ this says days but represents years. Now MacLain very strongly denies that view point. He says that we must not say it is a principle that a day stands for a year in prophecy, because that is not to be accepted. That we do not accept this as days standing for a year, but that these are weeks of years. Sevens of years rather than sevens of days. Now it is a rather involved question. What kind of sevens are they here? It is a question which there might be some kind of evidence, that would make it very clear. If we had that kind of evidence. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, to make an end to sins. To do these things. Now if we knew that in the Maccabean times there was a period of seventy weeks of days, 490 days, if there was such a period, at that time of 490 days in which these things were done, then we might say that is proof that it means days. But there is no evidence of any period of 490 days in the Maccabean times, in which these particular things were done. Well, they weren't done in Maccabean times anyway. Well, suppose it refers to the first coming of Christ. Were these things done in 490 days in the time of His first coming? We have no proof they were, and if that is what it referred to, why would it say determined upon thy people, and upon thy city. That wouldn't seem to fit with that. Well now, how about the second coming of Christ? At this point we cannot reject the possibility that this says, that at the second coming of Christ, there will be a period of 490 days in which these things will be accomplished, 490 days are ~~levied~~ levied upon his cities, and upon his people. That is a possibility of interpretation at this particular point. A possibility that I think breaks down as we go on, because we read, know therefore and understand from the going forth of the commandment, to ~~restore and~~ restore and rebuild Jerusalem, until, shall be these things. Well now, that command meant being something given that comes just before the end of the present age, well, it could be. It could be, but as you read these verses, it doesn't seem likely that it is a description of it. Seventy periods of

seventy days, at the end of the age. It doesn't mean that. And so, I don't know of anybody who holds that view. Now the other possibility that it is not literal weeks of days, or the

(8 1/2) but that it is sevens of years, you say how about the Maccabean period.

Well, 490 years, till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, you say. Well say they gained their freedom in 186 - 168? Yes, 168, B.C. 490 years before - that was ~~when~~? It was 558.

538 is the time when the Jews were delivered. How's that? (Student). 658 doesn't come until the end of the exile, as a long time from the beginning of the exile. It doesn't come to any ~~of~~

Well, there have been critics - there have been holders to the Maccabean period, who have tried to prove that this is 490 years up to Antiochus Epiphanes. And it is pretty hard to prove.

The only way to prove it is to say the unknown writer who wrote at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was all mixed up in his chronology, and thought it was then 490 years since the decree, the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem. Well, it is pretty hard for a Bible believer to take any view like that. So that we believe that God predicted

Antiochus Epiphanes. We believe that chapter 8 and chapter 11, tells us much about Antiochus Epiphanes. That is a divine prediction, but we can't see how this is a prediction of Antiochus Epiphanes, because from any viewpoint, that I know of it is much too long a period. ~~(10 1/2)~~ ~~to reach to Antiochus.~~ And so I think we have to say that if you take it as days we know nothing

in the Maccabean times to fulfill it. It wasn't fulfilled anyway in the Maccabean times. It certainly is not a true prediction with a relation to Maccabean times. And as years it doesn't run up to ~~h~~ that period. It is ~~to~~ much too long a period. Well now, let's try it as years for the

first advent of Christ. 490, is the first advent of Christ. Well, what happened 490 years before the first advent of Christ. ~~e~~ We usually date the return at 538, and we usually date the Ezra's reading of the law at 444. Where does 490 end? Or is it not a reference to the birth of Christ, but a reference to his death? Say around 30 A.D. That would make it 460 B.C. Well, can you find something about that time that would relate to it. If you can find something that may be a reasonable starting point, then maybe it is pointing up to the first coming of Christ.

Well, how about the view that it relates to the second coming of Christ. If we said, I know of no one who holds that it is seventy weeks of days at the time of the second coming of Christ.



I don't see anything possibility in that view but I know of no one who holds the view. Now how about saying there are 490 years until Christ comes back. Well, He didn't come back in 490 years. That doesn't seem to fit the Second Coming. He didn't come back, but we have noticed, in chapter 2, there is probably a gap. In chapter 7, I think there is certainly a gap. In chapter 11, there is absolutely no question that there is a gap, somewhere in the chapter, because it goes right straight along up to the resurrection. So there is a gap in chapter 11 unquestionable. Is there a gap here? Do we have 70 weeks determined upon thy people, and upon thy city, part of which comes just before the second coming of Christ, and part of which comes earlier. Thus something which might possibly have both the first and the second coming in view. Well, we will say that if you take it as literal years, the only way that it can relate to the second coming is to have a gap given. Now there is a third view which is held, which is presented by Young, very very strongly, and presented by Leupold very very strongly. They say these sevens are indefinite figures. They are general periods. They are not a specific length of time. Well, to my mind, it is quite simple to say, there will be three periods in the history of the Christian ~~year~~ church. There is the ancient church, the medieval church and the modern church. How long were they? The ancient church was about 400 to 600 years, the medieval church was about a thousand, and the modern church so far is about 300 and no body knows how long it will last. They are periods. We have three periods. There are seven periods in the life of man. Seven is the age of man. How long is an age? They vary. They vary greatly. They are not uniform. And so he might have said there will be ten periods, call them sevens if you want to. Seventy sevens, let's say, seventy being an indefinite period. There are ten sevens of (14 1/2) upon your nation. In the first one this has happened. In the second will be like this, and the third will be like this, etc.

60.

To do as Young and Leupold do, and say they are indefinite periods, makes it seem very, very strange to me to be a number like seven. There are ~~at~~ 70 indefinite periods, of which seven goes up to something, 7 indefinite periods. Then there are 62 indefinite period. Then there is

one indefinite period after that. I just can't conceive of somebody writing indefinite periods. 2, yes. 3, yes. 10, yes. Even 20. There is a difference between the periods. There is something distinctive about each period, and the periods varying length. We have six days of creation. I wouldn't at all be surprised personally if one of those days was a million years long, and another one was a third of a million, and another one might be ten million, or a billion of years. But they are days which differ from one another, in some way, each of them is a period. Which have some differences, not an absolute difference, but a definite difference, period before and after, the length of them they differed greatly. There is no reason to say that they are of uniform length, or even of approximate length. But when you say there are seven, there must be some reason for having that many, and then you would think, there must be some difference between them. I might say to you, between here and West Chester tonight I will pass seventy farms. Some potato farm with half an acre in, and then a big farm with a thousand acres in. But each of them would be a farm. But if I say it is seventy miles, it would be pretty hard to think that in some case, I'm using English miles, 5280 feet, in some cases I am using sea miles, ~~nata~~ nautical miles, 2000 yards. A mile and a fifth of our mile, and then perhaps by using  $.(2 \frac{1}{2})$  is ten miles long. Well, you could have different kinds of miles, in different nations, but you say that it is from here to West Chester it is 63 miles, and in some cases you would think it -is sea miles, some it is nautical miles. It doesn't (3).

It seems as if when you use so many it in someways represents duration, so that it seems to me that that does not disprove the idea that  $(3 \frac{1}{4})$  but it certainly looks against it.

This phrase, seventy weeks are determined. Now of course, you can divide them up and say, seventy weeks, sixty two and one weeks. You can say, one is a little bitty period, and 7 a medium ~~human~~ size period, and sixty two ~~a~~ the big period. It could be something like that. But it doesn't seem a very satisfactory way of interpreting when a number is precisely given. Of course, 70 might be quite a round number, but when you divide it up into 7, 62, and 1, it doesn't seem to me a very satisfactory approach. You can't do anything chronologically, maybe you will say, well, they are indefinite periods, but I would incline a little more than that to feel like saying, well, @

I can't do anything with it myself, but there are probably other factors, I don't understand. And when I know the factors I'll see how to work it, rather than to say they are (4) days. Leupold is very dogmatic that the scripture nowhere has such a thing in it as a seven of years - a week of years. That it does not exist in scripture. Now that seems very strange to speak of it dogmatically, because in the Old Testament we have specifically the idea, there are six years to plow your fields, and then there is one year in which it lies fallow. That is seven years. That seems to show a definite unit, which would be of seven of years in the Old Testament. When I first ~~said~~<sup>read</sup> what Leupold said, ~~there was~~ there, I immediately said, well, I can't understand that. His saying that a week never stands for seven years anywhere in the Bible. I think that he and young both say that quite positively. I said, I can't understand that because Jacob after he served 7 years for Leah, and 7 for Rachel, didn't he say, fulfill her week also. I'll give her to you. You see there are 7 years there for Rachel. So I looked up, Leupold had two commentaries. One on Daniel and one on Genesis, and they both have a lot of excellent material, and I looked up on ~~B~~ Genesis, and I found that he said here is Daniel - here is Jacob and he married Leah, and he didn't want Leah, when he found out he married her. He wanted Rachel. And Jacob said, fulfill her week, carry out the full week of festivity of marriage ~~for~~ to Leah, and then ~~you can serve seven years~~ we will give you Rachel and then you can serve seven years for Rachel, and so the seven refer to the week, rather than the time you serve for Rachel. Well, I find that most commentaries agree with that view. That is quite definitely held in most commentaries, I believe it is explicitly held in the Revised Standard Version, by their translation, if I recall correctly, I ~~he~~ attended some lectures on Genesis with Dr. E. H. Speiser at the University of Pennsylvania a couple of years ago. He very explicitly took that view - fulfill her week of festivities. And yet despite this great number - this great amount of scholarly agreement, I just don't know of anywhere it says the festivities are one week for a wedding, and that you are to put in a week for it, if that is what is involved, and that this is necessarily that, and especially when it goes on and says, that he served seven years for her, I'm not a hundred per cent convinced that they are right on it. And yet when there

is such a tremendous consensus of scholarly opinion, and that that refers to seven days, of feasting for Leah, rather than to a seven years of work, I feel that you cannot take it as a parallel to prove ~~that~~ this one. You can't do that. You would have to have further evidence so I feel the possibility that that is what it says. Mr. Paashaus? (Student). He definitely served seven years for his daughter, no question to that. But in the statement where he says fulfill her week, he is using the word week for seven, to describe the seven years or is he merely ~~p~~ referring to the week of festivities. Well, it seems to me that maybe ~~you~~ he is referring to the year, but when there is such a strong scholarly agreement to the other, but particularly when I don't think that most of those people have a dogmatic ~~moti~~ motive of trying to do away with the idea of the seventy years to fit this. I don't think that that is in the minds of a lot of them, that when you get people agreeing on something very often you can find a reason for taking that view. A strong desire to believe something, but certainly there are a lot who hold that which there is no such (8). So I just wouldn't feel safe in using that as proof that this can't be seventy years. I think that the of using sevens to mean the days with the word days explicitly in the next . is not a proof but is a stronger argument than the evidence for their saying. (8 1/2)

(Student). The American Standard takes it that way. And they may be right. Most scholars (8 1/2). I have the feeling that perhaps they are wrong. Well, that is our question here then, how ~~then~~ long then are these sevens of weeks, and some of the arguments that it can't be years, some of the arguments are rather (9). But of course, the proof that they are years, you've got to prove how they fit logically. Now I must say, there are many books which say, these are years of three hundred and sixty days, and that impresses me as extremely weak, that statement. I have found several books, which say they are years of three hundred and sixty days, which is the Babylonian or Chaldean year. I found that in several books, but I've found no proof on it that where the Babylonian or Chaldean year was 360 days. I found no such thing anywhere. (Student). Yes, that is another type of proof. That is a much better type of proof. In the case of the - they are Babylonian years. I have no proof that there ever was such a thing as a Babylonian year. Dr. MacLain doesn't agree with that at all - a

Babylonian year. But there are other writers who do, and a good many of them. And that from that aspect, to say it is a Babylonian years, and therefore it is 360 days, this was given in Babylon, but I look up (10) and there he gathers together ~~the~~ the material of the from the Cuneiform tablets, from the various aspects ~~and~~ cultural life of the ancient Babylonians. And he says that in the early days a month was the time a moon went around the world, and that is about 29 1/2 days. The ~~mo~~ earth turns around, so the moon seems to go around 24 hours. Actually it goes around once in 29 1/2 days, so the result is that it rises a little earlier, rises a little later, and sets a little later. So that the new moon sets in the evening at sun set, and sets a little later and a little later and a little later, until it gets to full moon when it is rising just at sunset. So that the moon is going around the earth and it goes in 29 1/2 days, and in the early days of Babylonia, they have a watcher on the mountain to look and see when the new moon appears, and if the new moon appears during the night, if he saw the new moon he would light a fire and the people down in the valley would see it, and they would say tomorrow is the first of the new month, we'd better start paying rent tomorrow. But if he didn't see the new moon, and he didn't light a fire, they've got one more day to stay in their houses because the month's rent is already paid, Well, after a time they got a system worked out, it would vary between a 29 day month and a 30 day month, 29 and a 30, and so a lunar year which is a year that has 12 months in it, it is 354 days, of actual months. 12 times when the moon went around the earth. That's 364 days. Now an actual year is 365 1/2 days, an actual year. 365 1/4 days, a little less than a quarter. And so the Babylonians didn't know how long a solar year was, but they did know that when they went along the lunar year, pretty soon it was out of date, so they put in an extra ~~day~~ month in order to straighten it out, and after a period of time, they worked out a system, by which they put in extra months ~~ever~~ so often as a regular system according to the calendar, and you can tell years (12 1/2) and so that your year looms a little ~~way~~ this way or that way, 12 lunar months, 354 days, but every now and then there is a year that has 383 days, and enough to keep it even, so that your year stays just about even for the Babylonians and that is done by the Jews to this day. The Jews to this

day ~~have~~ in their Jewish year have a lunar calendar ~~who~~ with an extra month inserted every so often according to a definite system so that you can know what the dates are going to be a hundred and thirty years from now, if you are going to figure it out. It ~~is~~ is just what it means if the year is this way or not. Over a period of time it keeps absolutely straight. Well that is the lunar year.

Now the Mohammedans have a lunar year and they don't fit in any extra months so that the result is that in the Mohammedans, they have the month of Ramadan, the month of fasting in which there is no pious Mohammedan who eats a single bite of anything on any day in the whole month of Ramedan, and that's wonderful to go for 30 days without eating a bite, Of course, they make up for ~~it~~ it by feasting all night, but they don't eat a bite, they don't even drink a drop of water during those thirty days in the month of Ramedan, but the month of Ramedan sometimes comes in the winter, sometimes in the summer, because your months ~~is~~ is changing all the time, because the year is 354 days and so often it just stays off, they don't put in any extra month.

61.

so called

Then from any Babylonian years ~~at all~~, we have no year of 360 days. Now the evidence given for a year of 360 days, that evidence is nothing so called Babylonian that I know of, but the evidence I find for it is that a period of a certain number of years is designated as a certain number of days. And since our months have varied from time to time and from period to period, our method of dating has varied, and we often use round numbers anyway, in figuring which impresses me personally that 360 years - to say 360 days for a year is a round number is a reason to say, a year is 360 days, it is a good approximation, and your month have varied from time to time. There has been no comparative established system until very recently, as you ~~many~~ may know, Julius Caesar put ~~it~~ 30 days in every body else's month, and 31 in his month, and Augustus who followed him, and thought he should have just as long a month as Julius Caesar, so he took the month of (I believe it is called) Sextember, the sixth month, he named it after himself, and named it August, it only had 30 days, so he added one and took

one away from February, and that evened it up, and so ever since we have had to have poor little February with only 29, so that we can give the emperor Augustus just as long a month as the emperor Julius Caesar. So we've had our system for a long time now, but before that there were many different systems, and the Jews when they went into exile, adopted the Babylonian system, and gave up their old, Jewish system, and we have Jewish month names, occasionally in the Bible. We have a whole Jewish system, but we have in the latter part of the Bible, mostly the Babylonian system. And it is interesting to go down here to the Dropsie College, and see on the cornerstone of the Dropsie College down here on Broad street, the statement that this building, this cornerstone was laid in July 17, 1925 (or something like that) it is just an arch, and then there is another arch which gives it in the Jewish date, and they say it was laid in the year 3792 of the world or something like that. They have a figuring which is different from us. And they say in such and such a date, in the month Hamilton and Hamard was the old Babylonian god, Ezekiel speaks of the women weeping for Tamuz, as a terrible abomination, and the Jews today in their religious service, call their months after old Babylonian deity, because they adopted the Babylonian calendar in Babylon, in other words, what I mean is, this system of months etc has been in vogue until the time of Augustus, and of course we even made a change in our calendar, because the Gregorian calendar which we have now is only 400 years, so it has been a good ~~time~~ deal of (3 1/2). And so personally to me strictly speaking a day is a period in which it gets dark and it gets light. If you want to start it at sunset, it gets dark, and it gets light. And it comes up to the next dark period. There is a day. If you want to start it in the middle of a time between when it gets dark and when it gets light, as we do now, it is a day, a month is a period that the moon goes around the earth, now we have an artificial system, but that is what the word month actually means, and ours is nearer 29 1/2 days - that's pretty ~~near~~ much what we have, ~~and~~ except we've added an extra one for some of the Roman emperors who wanted it. Then a year - well, I would say that many primitive people speak of so many winters. Most anywhere you live, there is a period, in which the earth goes around the sun. It gets cold and it gets warm, and it is hard to know just how long that period is, because the

years vary, but if you would figure, them over a length of time, you would get it, because they will average exactly  $365 \frac{1}{4}$ . And that's what a year is. Well now, why would God ~~make-year~~ figure years, each of which came five days short of one time, so that He would say 490 years, and actually mean 486 years, or 484 or something like that. That to me sounds quite illogical. That He would figure - to say years, but He doesn't say years, He says sevens, but if the seven means seven of years, it seems entirely reasonable that it may do so, but if He says years that seems to me to mean one time that the earth goes around the sun. One time that we have four seasons. Spring summer, ~~spring~~ autumn and winter. Not a time five days shorter, and thus amounting in 490, to four or five less. It impresses me as something which the Lord certainly could do if He chose to, but I would need a good deal more proof than I've ever seen yet, to feel any certainty that that is what He means when He says 70 weeks, that He means seventy periods of seven, not real years, but of seven periods ~~in~~ of 360 days. A lunar year, well that is a period of 12 times when the moon goes around the earth. It is not a real year, but there is something natural about it, but a 360 day year is just a round number. And my feeling is that when you say 360 years, you mean the period that is actually  $365 \frac{1}{4}$ . I could say it is 10 miles to the city, I might mean  $8 \frac{1}{2}$ , or I might mean 11. I certainly don't have to mean 10 miles right exactly, or at least to say it is a hundred miles to Harrisburg. It is just a round number. But that to me is a great difficulty, this idea of a year, that is not a year. I find that (6 1/2) very hard. but I just don't know where to look. But now I think that is a very minor point. The big point is what we are interested in now.

And the big point here is to raise the problem, what kind of weeks are these? And I mentioned the three main views, and then of course, as a possibility under the view that means years, the possibility that it doesn't mean a real year, but something that is sort of like a year. And I can't help feeling that even if you are speaking of one, or two, you don't mean real years, you mean something like it. If you speak of 490, that you would mean 490 periods of ~~some~~ summer and winter, rather than 486 (7 1/2). (Student). No, 70 is 7 10's. 70 is not the plural of 7. You see, a 7 or a group of 7's, but 70 is 7 10's, isn't it? (Student). It is a very complex



thing. (Student). Not just a number 7, but like 7w, ~~and~~ (Hard to hear.) But now if you did, that would be a fourth possibility. Well now, this is our question. I'm not now at present trying to give you answers, but trying to present problems, to you for special study. The big problem and the most interesting one is still ahead. We go on to the next verse.

And here is an interesting phrase. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, when is that? Well, when does the command go forth? Montgomery says, of course, it is when the Divine command goes forth, in other words, when Jeremiah says these words. That is when the Divine command goes forth. Somebody else says no, but when Jerusalem was conquered, ~~and~~ because that is when Jeremiah said that it was going to be rebuilt, the divine word went forth. And the critics who are actually materialistic are here the ones who are insisting that it is the Word of God that matters. And the people who accept the Word of God are insisting that it is the word of a king that matters, the going forth of the decree, the word, and the fact of the matter is that we cannot be dogmatic, on it, as to precisely what fits. But I would certainly think that the more natural way to take it would be the Word of a king, rather than the word of God in this case. When God says, from the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, but by that He doesn't mean, from the time when I have said that Jerusalem is going to be restored and rebuilt. It doesn't mean that He (10 1/2) it that way, and that is what He meant. But of course they do that in order to try to get 490 years before the Maccabean period, - when Jerusalem was destroyed or even earlier than that, is when the Divine word went forth to rebuild there. ~~and~~ Well now, when did the king make an edict? There are a number of different times when kings made edicts related to Jerusalem or something about it. And so there is a problem which might well be examined objectively first. When were edicts given for ~~getting the~~ bidding the Jews to go back to Jerusalem, or giving them any privilege in connection with what they did there. There are many statements. Look at these cases, and see exactly what the edicts were, and see to how great an extent they fit with this. And then having done that go 490 years after that, and see if it fits into something definite, and there are many books which you will read which state specifically that there is only one edict which fits these requirements, and which say that that one comes to a period of about 490 years, after the time ~~of~~ or before the t

D

of the death of Christ. Now that is a problem to look into, and we won't take time now to look into that, but I would rather you do it inductively rather than to see what somebody says. Look at these and see what they are, and see how they fit, but that is a problem. It is not a difficult problem, but one on which we may get an answer fairly easily, but now for the next problem, I want you to read me, you all have I hope, prepared these verses in the Hebrew, I want somebody now to read the 25th verse, because there is a point where the King James version has a very, very queer translation. And so I don't want the King James translation now. I want the Hebrew. As it stands, and will somebody read  $\delta$

62.

NEXT CLASS.

(Dr. MacRae talks about previous test.) This section of the 9th chapter here is certainly not, I would think, the most important thing in the book of Daniel, ~~but~~ by any means. There are many things in Daniel that are so much more clearly indicated, that they surely would be more important than. If this was more important, surely the Lord would have made it clear. This is a passage which abounds in difficulties. And yet I think there are certain things in it which we can be absolutely clear about. Now of course, I think it is good to distinguish between the attitude that we take together as a class, and the attitude that you might take in preaching on this. I think it is very important that we recognize that there are two activities in the Lord's service. There is the activity of studying the Word and learning what God's word says. And that is an ~~att~~ attitude on which we should be just as objective, and careful as we possibly can be, and in any view you take you should stop and look at any objections you find, and see what you can that is against it, and try to be absolutely 1000% convinced you don't read something into it. And you will find many things that the evidence looks 70% this way and 30% this way. Well, maybe it is 70%. And this other is 55 and 45, you may take it that way. And try to get a definite idea, just what is the status of opinion of your opinion after you study a passage, because in this way, you go forward and you get light from other passages, you will keep from being led astray, by a dogmatic jumping to conclusions. I think that is very important, and that's what I try to do in this class. But I do think that we should not think that is the right attitude to take in

presenting God's truth. I think that there are cases when you (2 1/2). There are cases where we take a group of people and teach them how to get into the Bible and dig out what there is (2 1/2). But I think the major part of our activity is not that. It is that of preaching what is clear in the Word. And you can find plenty in the Word that is clear, and speak positively on it. Without spending time stressing things on which you can't be clear. I would say that we have found very definite conclusions on matters in the book of Daniel sufficient for a whole series of very helpful sermons already, and I would say that you should be able from this 70 weeks, to reach certain conclusions which should be extremely helpful, and extremely vital, in presenting to the people, even if there are many matters in connection with it on which you have to say, I don't know. Or you say, maybe it is this way, maybe it is that way. But, whether it is this way or this way, it is one of the two. It is very definitely on this line, or on this line, and the two agree in this, and therefore you have a positive conclusion, even though in the aspect of that conclusion in which you are not so positive. I think that the Lord wants us to speak not with an uncertain tone. He wants us to speak clearly and definitely and strongly, but he wants us to combine our clear definite speech to that which we from our careful objective study of the Word are convinced is really taught in the Word. And so if you have the two operations separate in your mind, I think you can do each of them better, then if you try to do them both in exactly the same way. You have them separate. You don't say, anything in your public utterance you are not convinced is right, but you don't have to give all the ifs ands and buts. And you don't have to spend a lot of time in going over it ~~the~~ things that are uncertain and if you are talking to people who are strongly convinced of a certain view on some comparatively minor point, and you think that your interpretation on this minor point is incorrect from the Scripture, - there may be times when it is your duty, to go into that minor point very thoroughly, but ordinarily your duty is to take the things that are clear in the Scripture, and present them, the big things, and not to get into needless arguments over minor points, of which people may be strongly convinced are not harmful in themselves.<sup>m</sup> Now of course, if it is something that is harmful, that is different.

But I've known seminary graduates that go out and take a church, in which the people were very thoroughly convinced at some point which I don't think the scripture teaches, but which was a very minor thing. Or a very harmless thing. Just go after those people and feel it was their duty to convince those people that they were wrong on just minor points, and the result is they have had divisions, splits, and didn't get anything like that started, emotions get aroused, get to where they don't believe - they will believe what one person says, and they won't believe what another person says, and will get all of that. I've known people who have been thrown out of churches, and have had churches divided in two, in a way that I know is very very harmful. We don't all agree. The Lord didn't make us that way that we would all agree. But He does want us to agree on that which is vital. And to stand on what is vital. Well now on this we agree on this, it is definite that this 9th chapter is all of it leading up to this prophecy of the seventy weeks. And therefore the seventy weeks is not just a little minor thing, an incidental thing. Now there may be things earlier in the chapter, that are quite incidental. They don't effect the main purport of the chapter. But the chapter is leading up specifically to this point. This is what God has revealed. And He has led up to it with a very large e- introduction here, and that stresses its importance. It is a thing that is here before us, and so a person has no right to say, well, Daniel is a symbolic book and we just can't understand what this means, and it doesn't matter. We have no right to do that. We have the duty of ~~grasping~~ grappling with this, not to reach a conclusion on every detail. But to see how much there is in it that is definite, and vital and important in order that we can clearly understand it. And as we looked at it two weeks ago, we noticed certain definite problems in it. We noticed that it begins with verse 24, and seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and the question is, how are they determined? Why are they determined? What is the purpose of it? Upon thy people and thy holy city seventy weeks are determined. \* Now there are some people who jump to pretty radical conclusions just on these words here. Jump to some very strong conclusions and I think any such things are worthy of investigation, but let's not jump to conclusions, without examining it to be sure what they are. But what is the ~~purpose~~ purpose of these seventy weeks? These seventy weeks is

related to sin isn't it? It is related to sin. It is related to iniquity. It is related to everlasting righteousness. Now this - to anoint the most holy is a very strange phrase. If you can become quite certain what it means, find. But I don't think that it should be the crux of the passage, but the verse as a whole has a stress upon the matter of sin. That certainly could connect up very definitely with Christ's first coming. There are phrases in it which it would seem as if it might connect with the second coming, but certainly the first ~~coming~~ impression of it, connects more with the first coming, then with the second, of this verse, wouldn't you feel? I won't say a hundred per cent more, but the preponderance would impress me as being in that direction, of this verse. And it is the only verse we notice in Daniel so far, on which I could say that. Because there is so remarkably little in it that would seem to point to the first coming. (Student). Verse 24, yes. Well, you can find phrases in it which certainly could be. Would suggest the second coming. But I incline to think that you find more (9 1/2). I incline to think that. Now I don't think that it is obvious. I think it might be a thing worth spending a good deal of our time on, (Student). Yes, to ~~make~~ reconciliation, doesn't that suggest to you the atonement. To make reconciliation for iniquity, seems to me very specifically to suggest the atonement and point to calvary. I don't see, how to make reconciliation, could point to the second coming at all. Yes? (Student). Yes, to make reconciliation - accomplished between whom? (Student). That it means to reconcile Israel for its iniquity, and that that would be performed when all of Israel is saved. Therefore that would point to the second coming rather than to the first coming. That's very interesting. Yes? (Student). What's the Hebrew word? (Student). Now does כִּפּוּר mean reconciliation? Is not כִּפּוּר the regular word for the atonement? It is a common word for the atonement? (Student). No, I didn't bring my - I brought my Englishman's and several of those books, time after time, and I thought of it today, but it being a little late, I didn't stop for them. And I haven't used them. Now here is a case where I don't like to speak dogmatically on that. I've made considerable study of כִּפּוּר from the viewpoint of determining its root. But not with this question in mind, how does it relate to reconciliation. But off hand, I

be translated reconcile

wouldn't think that  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  would occur in the piel at all. Off hand I would have thought  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$

is a regular word for atonement for sins, and the thing I studied  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  mostly on is as to the root of it, because it is commonly said that  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  comes from the word to cover. And it means cover

sins, and I don't believe it does, but I may be wrong on that because most scholars incline that

it does, I've found one or two that don't. On a passage in Isaiah, I feel that it is used to wash

away. Rather than to cover over, so that most of your authorities will say it means to cover over.

But it is the common word for the atonement. It is used in Leviticus perhaps dozens of times,

in making atonement for sin. Off hand, I wouldn't think that  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  has anything to do with (13)

but would deal with the sanctifier. And I haven't studied it from that viewpoint, but it may be

that there is evidence to get that as a possibility, but at least it is not the required meaning of

$\text{כִּפֹּר}$  at all, in the piel, because it is the common word for making an atonement for sins.

Yes? (Student). Oh, you are talking about the other phrase. Not the one of reconciliation.

Yes. Well, now, just a minute. We were speaking for a second of reconciliation for iniquity.

Now the other one, to make an end of sin, just in an off hand way, I feel slightly that that

should deal with either one. That you make an end of sins in principle, when Christ atones for

them, you make an end of sin, in the full outworking of deliverance (14) at His second

coming, but even then you might say you make an end of sin still more, at the end of the

millennium, because there is still (14). And so I would think that the phrase, not

specifically toward the first coming which I incline to think it is  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  in the piel.

63.

Let's not spend a great deal of time on this particular verse now. I want to raise the problem with you, to stress it that the off hand impression, well, this is definite. It deals with sin.

That is definite. It is not just a matter of a destroying of wicked world powers. It is not a

matter of establishing prosperity. It is not a matter of doing away with oppression. All these

things are things that are often touched upon in the book of Daniel, but this verse, has a

very specific relationship to sin, and that is why I suggested that the relationship to the first

coming seems to stand right out as you look at it, the relation to sin, because the first coming

was the great thing dealing with sin. Now of course it is true that the atonement destroys the

sin in principle and the outworking of the atonement comes with the second coming. That is true. But It certainly can not ignore the atonement. And to look to this last phrase, of course, to anoint the most holy is a very (1 1/4) problem. I'm not ready to say what certainty on it, but to fill up the vision and prophecy I think very definitely - I think definitely that that means to bring evidence of the truth. That could fit any particular period which was predicted and fulfilled. I think this 24th verse needs further consideration, but I do think that the atonement is suggested by it, very definitely. Not necessarily exclusively, but suggested very definitely.

It is not just a matter of a couple of (2). Yes? (Student). No, I wouldn't think so. Because that would be making a thing the object of itself. Seventy weeks are determined on thy people. What for? Why, to bring to pass the things that I am now going to destroy, the seventy weeks affect the second coming, you see. I mean, I don't think that to fill up the prophecy would carry that meaning. I would think that it would mean, to bring a sealing to visions and prophecies of some considerable extent, rather than just a (2 1/2). That would be my impression.

Well now, the next verse gets into the problem, into the specific statement about what is going to happen to these things, and it begins from the going forth of the commandment. And there we have a problem right away, what is the time? And Lange here tells of what different scholars have said, and gives you about 20 different times, that different scholars suggest are the time when the going forth is meant, and of course the question is, is it a divine command? Is it a human command? Is it God's command? Is it a man's command? But it is a commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem. That is of course a very vital thought. Well now, we have to look at all these different ones, and see what conclusions we reach. Some are very dogmatic about it. Practically all are. There are many different things, but I think there are some who tend to reject it quite easily.

But then, that ~~g~~ from the going forth of the command unto Messiah the prince, shall be, here I feel as if we can certainly feel that the authorized versions' punctuation is wrong. It should be seventy weeks and two weeks. That seems to me, I can't get away from it, that that seems to me too artificial and unnatural. Know that from now until Christmas, it is going to be 32 days. It is going to be 11 days, and 18 days until such and such a time, and then it is going to be 3 days.

Well,

Well, why would I say 11 and 18? Why wouldn't I say 29? It just doesn't seem sensible to me to say 7 and 62, when you mean 69. Now of course 7 and 62 is 69 from the beginning of the first to the end of the second is 69. But if you meant 69 and say 7 and 62, is so, without any parallel anywhere, that it just doesn't seem - but in addition, even if somebody were to say, means 69, it is 7 and 62, then to say at the end of the 62 will be such and such, I think that he certainly would then say, at the end of the 69, unless there is an important time when the 62 begins. It seems to me that the 62 is units, and the 70 is a unit, and I don't see how you can get away from that. I don't see any possibility on that, and of course, as the Hebrew stands, you have a statement, of what is going to happen in 7 weeks, or if you want 7 and 62, but then you have a statement with no sign, and then you have a third statement with a time, and you put 2 statements of time with the first thing, and no statement of time with the second thing, when it would be just as dramatical to make the division between the two periods of time, - I can't get away from the feeling that this seven weeks period is a definite period. That it is not just a way of saying 69. (Student). Yes, you mean that there are those who say that 7 and 62 run concurrently. They both start at the same time, after 7 weeks this happens. This goes on to 62. And then there are those who say, between the 7 and the 62, there is a gap, so it makes the total more, so I think that one should not assume a gap with out evidence, but I think one can admit the possibility of a gap, and then see if there is any evidence that there may be one. I don't think that one has the right without evidence to assume there isn't any gap. I would say that definitely. If he had said, it will be 7 weeks, and 62 weeks this will happen, and at the end of the 69 weeks, so and so will happen, then it seems to suggest that the total is 69, but it doesn't seem that way. It says at the end of the 62, and so it doesn't seem to me that it decides the question, but it does seem as to whether it continues or whether there is a gap. It does seem to me that when you say 70 and you have 70 and 62 on one, it seems to suggest that they run ~~concurrently~~ successively, whether gaps are given, the total is 70, ~~an~~ rather than that the 70 and 62 run concurrently. The 70 seems a rather strange thing to say if the total of it is only 62, or 63 instead of 70. But that the seventy is a unit, it seems to me that that is very hard to get away from, and of course it is true that Daniel has J= Jeremiah has talked about 70 years, very definitely. He talks about



70 years, very definitely, and now Daniel talks about 70 weeks, and he speaks of a 7 week period, a ~~70~~ 62 week period, and it is very interesting that between the destruction of Jerusalem, and the time when Cyrus let the people go back, was 49 years. That is a fact. That fits with the 7 week period. That doesn't prove that that is a 7 weeks period here, but it certainly I don't think should be brushed aside. I think that when you have a similarity ~~as~~ as striking a thing that it is worthy of consideration. (Student). Cyrus released the people from Babylon and let them go back, 49 years after Jerusalem was destroyed. After the final taking of it, the destruction of Jerusalem. That's a 49 years period, and it being a 49 year period, and this speaking of 7 7's, it must be seriously considered whether that could be properly interpreted as being a seven week period. Now if it isn't, it doesn't prove that it is, but - and it might even be that there is a 7 weeks period which we can't prove what it is. It might even be, which would be obvious to the Jews at the time. But simply to say there are two periods, when it says there are 7 weeks, and 62 weeks, and 1 week, it seems to me is not dealing fairly with that. (Student). You mean, on the question of whether the beginning period is the point stressed, whether this begins when (10) but that is not what I've been talking about. You are referring to another man altogether. Well, let's not go into that other matter now, because we have about 20 decrees mentioned, by different writers, and I think we could - I don't want to pick one out to look at it now. I didn't suggest that Cyrus' decree was the time when the 70 weeks begin. I didn't suggest that at all, but I did say that the period before Cyrus is a 7 7 period. That's all I said. (Student). The 70 years, yes. You mean Jeremiah's period, yes. (Student). All right, - when did the captivity end? (Student). Would the captivity end with the people going back, when they were still captive, when they were subject to foreign domination? (Student). But I mean, if you are going to use the word captivity here, I would say that captivity is when they are subject to a foreign nation. And from that view point if you speak of the captivity, I don't see any evidence, of saying the captivity ended before the captivity period, before about 160 B.C. If you are going to speak of the exile, the exile ended whenever an individual came back, the exile for him. And as to the exile for the whole nation, many of them never did come back. And if you are going to say, when the majority got back, you see, well it is pretty hard to determine when it is. There is no time when all the Jews went back.

Now the exile ended when they had a right to go back if they wanted to. You might say that. Or you might say the exile ended, when the great bulk of them went back, but I don't know if the great bulk ever did go back. It is pretty hard to speak dogmatically about that. But the length of the time that Jerusalem was desolate before there was any rebuilding there, is just about 42 years. That is (12). The time Jerusalem was desolate. Well now of course this is Messiah the prince, and who is Messiah the prince? Well, the word Messiah the prince is the critics interpret it as until an anointed prince, and they mostly take that as referring to the high priest, who was the high priest whom Antiochus killed. Now I don't think we have any right to say this Messiah the prince here must mean Christ. There certainly is the possibility of it, of interpreting Christ. There are those who say Messiah the prince, means Cyrus, and it is a fact that in Isaiah, Cyrus is called the anointed one. And it would not be impossible that this was a reference to the year up to the anointed one, who gave the people permission to go back. That would be a possibility. Of course, those who feel that they can get a period of exactly 69 7's between the time when the edict was given, and the time of Christ, the Messiah the prince might refer to Christ. But I don't think it has to. Well, that is one thing that I feel that we have to take into account some way, that we have to give three periods of it. I don't feel that we can just have 2. We can come to conclusion that we don't know what the three periods are, we can figure 2, and don't know the 3. We can come to that conclusion. But I don't think we should come to that conclusion with out trying first to interpret it in another way. Now if you take the phrase, the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times. When is that to be? Is that immediately after the command was given? Does that refer to the whole time? It seems to be a more natural thing to take it in relation to the 62 weeks, the way it stands here.

64.

Then we find that after the sixty two weeks, Messiah will be cut off. The anointed one will be cut off, and will have nothing. Nothing to him. And the prince, the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. That's a very very strange phrase isn't it. The people of the prince that shall come. Is that Messiah the prince he's just been

talking about? The prince that shall come. Or is it some other prince? Well, it doesn't say this prince is going to destroy the city and the sanctuary. It says his people are going to, and that certainly seems to me to suggest that this prince is going to come later on than when these people do this. It certainly seems to suggest that. kThe people of the prince that shall come. It is a very interesting phrase. And then the end thereof with a flood and until the end of the war desolations are determined, there is an upheaval which comes. It doesn't say just when. And then verse 27, he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week. In the midst of the week he will cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Many writers say this is the atonement. He causes sacrifice and oblation to cease. A very dogmatic statement. Personally I am very skeptical of this. That in a strange way it speaks of Christ's sacrifice. That it makes sacrifice and oblation to cease. I don't know how it makes it to cease. I don't see that. And when we have got about Antiochus Epiphanes cutting off the sacrifices for a certain length of time, it seems to me it is the natural interpretation of this phrase that it either refers to Antiochus Epiphanes or to someone else, who is in some way ~~to~~ similar to him, who stops sacrifice rather than that it is Christ stopping it. Now there are other phrases used of Christ and Messiah shall be cut off which seems to fit him very well, that seems to fit perfectly. Though not so obviously as you have to say immediately that is what it must mean, but it does seem to fit perfectly, but I don't see how this fits. And I think that is - this is the point of the great instance of those interpretations which say that this is a prediction that looks forward to the first coming of Christ, and that is the end of what it looks to. And there are many writers who say that. This is looking to the first coming of Christ, the seventy weeks end there with Christ coming. Well, He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. They have to take that as referring to Christ, and then we say that in the middle of the week, He causes sacrifice and oblation to cease. That's His atonement. Well, His atonement, how did it cause sacrifice and oblation to cease? I don't see that. If somebody believes the people were saved because of sacrifice before, well His atonement would cause that they no longer could be saved by a sacrifice, but I don't think that anybody ever was saved by any other sacrifice, than the sacrifice of Christ. I think that we had sacrifices before the

the 1

the looking forward to Christ's sacrifice. Surely after His coming when they had ~~k~~ the sacrifices it was first believed that this was showing what God would do and hadn't heard of the fact that Christ had died already. It would be, might be a means of salvation, as it would have been before. That is, the blood of bulls and goats would never take away sins. It is Christ's death that takes them away. And God caused that 40 years after the death of Christ, sacrifice and oblation would cease, and they have ceased ever since, and the ceasing was the result of the death, of the atonement having been completed on calvary and ~~w~~ now we have our Lord's supper which looks ~~back~~ to what He did, just as they looked forward to it, but His death is the vital thing also. So I can't see how that is a description of Christ here, as it seems to me that it must be Antiochus Epiphanes, or another like him. And of course we ~~do~~ have one like him already in chapter 7, compared with chapter 8, which is Antiochus Epiphanes. And those who say this is Christ, they say, well, His death is the middle of the week. Well, where is the end of the week? ~~k~~ Where is the end of the week? Or where is the beginning of the week? How would this - how is His death the middle of the week? (Student). I don't think we have any evidence. (Student). It is pretty likely a guess, isn't it? (Student). Well, if the cutting off of oblation in the middle of the week, is the death of Christ on the cross, the end of the week would have to be either that, or the destruction of Jerusalem, definitely, it would have to be one or the other. But they don't seem to make very good sense. Of course, if it is future, then we don't have to say exactly what it is. You can say it is something yet to come. But, this seventieth week is very, very difficult to interpret as relating to Christ. ~~A~~ Now if you take the 69 weeks as coming to Christ, or the 62 weeks follows the 7, say, after 62 weeks, Messiah shall be cut off, but not for~~x~~ himself, that certainly is a perfect picture of what Christ did. He is cut off. A perfect picture of the atonement, and of the death of Christ, and then after the end of that week, the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and the end thereof as a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. It certainly would seem to be a perfect~~x~~ picture of what happened forty years after Christ's death in the destruction of Jerusalem. Not within the period of 69 weeks, but after the period of 69 weeks. And then He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. Who is the

He? Now of course if this he is the Messiah, the anointed one, our Saviour, if it is, why then, to confirm the covenant with many I don't know what it is. It is pretty hard to guess. It is hard to get anything I know of in relation to Christ's first coming, in relation to that, but we've just read about the people of the prince that shall come, and who is this prince that shall come? Is he a good one? If so, why will they destroy the city and the sanctuary? And if he is an evil one who is to come, and these are his people who do this, but he is yet to come and he is to confirm the covenant for one week, but in the midst of the week to cause sacrifice and oblation to cease. Well, that would seem to fit very well with our descriptions in 7 and 8, because in 8 we have Antiochus doing something after it, in 7 we have another little horn who is described, a little horn who is very similar to Antiochus in many ways, and could it be that there is this similarity between Antiochus and this future antichrist, that he is to do something similar to what Antiochus did, and that it will be in the middle of a 70th week, with a gap in between the 69th and the 70th, and he coming in the 70th, but the people that destroyed Jerusalem after the 69th week, being the people of that from which he comes, and of course we do have the little horn definitely stated to come ~~is~~ out of the fourth beast, the fourth beast is Rome. That would tie up with this, and it seems to me that that is just a statement, just as any other (9 1/2), is that. Yes? (Student). I think that - I think most interpreters tie up the end of 26 with the middle of 26, pretty closely, I think most do. And it would seem a little strange to me to have the end of 26 be described as something that happened after the middle of the week, which is described in 27, it would be quite a confused picture I would suggest. There is a close parallel between the end of 26 and the end of 27. But it seems to me that unless you take the view that 27 is recapitulating 26, as those do who say this is Christ, and makes a firm covenant with His people. Then it would seem that they must be two different things here. Well, we have these 70 weeks which are going to come, and ~~th~~ of course the big question is, what is the length of these weeks? And there are those who (11) against the idea of - that a day stands for a year. And I'm not sure that we have much scriptural evidence for a day standing for a year, but we certainly don't have to interpret this as a day standing for a year, because there is no mention of days in it anyway. It is seventy sevens

and they could be sevens of days, sevens of years, or something else. And so it is not an unnatural suggestion to take it as years. It is certainly an altogether possible interpretation, but I can't get away from the feeling that if there are sevens of years, they are solar years.

I don't get any sense out of the word year~~s~~ otherwise. Now people, apart from modern astronomical calculation, find it difficult to know exactly how long a year is, but I don't think there have ever been people who have ever found it very difficult to learn how long 20 years is.

And for anybody ~~K~~ that could read and write, or keep records, with (12), to think - to keep a careful record, and come to the conclusion that 19 years was to be called 20 years, it just doesn't sound reasonable. You might think that one year was 250 ~~years~~ <sup>days</sup>, or you might think it was 460 days. The year varies tremendously, but that you should think that 2 years was 3, you wouldn't get 3 winters in 2 years. That is, the word year if it means anything, means a succession of seasons, so it is a succession. That is, the word ~~is~~ year if it means anything, means a succession of season, so it is a succession. ~~is~~ I mean, in astronomy we know that it is the earth going around the sun, but as the word is used in the Old Testament, it doesn't seem that, the people didn't know that. It means a cycle of seasons. That is a year. And that is what the word year means, and to say that a year is a specific number of days, it seems to me that

(13), that would seem to me very unnatural. A year is approximately 360 days.

There is no question about it. It is a very good approximation. And if I come to you (13 1/2) and I come to you in ~~k~~360 days, that is a year from now, 380 days would be a year from now, but 360 is a close approximation. But if I come to you a year from now, it doesn't mean this particular second, or this particular minute, or this particular hour, and it doesn't have to mean this particular day, unless you specify a year from now. I come a year from now, can mean in the same month, next year. But when you say 10 years from now, you may not mean within a couple of months, but you certainly don't mean 10 specific periods of lengths which is different than the ordinary length of year, but you can't mean that unless you have mighty strong evidence that you are going to take the word year in that sense. And the fact of there being expressions in the scripture that speak of a half a year, as a 180 ~~year~~ days. It is a natural round figure for half a year, which doesn't prove that there is such a thing as a prophetic year, which is a specific number of

days, different from the number of days in a natural year. I can't follow that, at all. (Student).  
65.

(Student). Yes, it could be anything. The most natural way to take it is as 70 days, the next most natural is a sevens of years. It could be a seven of months. Now it perhaps could be a round figure of sevens. It could be. It is a rather general statement, but I think we should try the natural way to see if it could fit, before we assume that.

NEXT CLASS.

Now we are dealing with this matter of these seventy weeks, and many people as they look at them find ~~some~~ such diversity and such difficulty that they say oh well, as Dr. Montgomery says in the I.C.C. commentary, it is the dismal swamp of Biblical study. He says, you simply can not understand it, and when I was in - I was teaching in another seminary. A very orthodox seminary, and one of the professors there said to me one day, some body wrote in and wants to know something about a date in connection with this, and the particular question asked, there wasn't any very definite - any way to fit in, and I told him, that they  $(2 \frac{3}{4})$ ; get you anywhere, well, the way he answered me, he gave me the impression, that's what you would expect. Just a joy to tell this person all this figuring of dates was 70 weeks was just a lot of junk, now that's not what he said, but that's the impression I got from his attitude. Well, I hadn't studied the matter then, and I will say that a lot of the effort do prove to be very futile. But I do think that that does not mean that we can just brush the thing aside. I think we must say God has a very definite meaning here. It is a meaning that is vital for us, or He would not put it in as the subject of the whole vision, which this whole vision leads up to ~~it~~ and stresses, and so we do not want to read into it any thing that we don't find there, but we do want to see what there is definite, because God gave this for a very definite purpose. Now as you look at this seventy weeks here, the first approach perhaps is to say, we have noticed that everything in the book of Daniel, I mean all the important conclusions you might say, are interpreted by someone in one of three ways. They are referring to the Maccabean times. They are referring to the first coming of Christ, or they are referring to the second coming of Christ. Those are the three (4). There are other points that are important. Well now, those who apply this

to the Maccabean period, we could take a month looking at all the suggestions, but we can say this there is no suggestion that is much good. We could say that very definitely. In order to have it apply 490 years to come to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, they have to start the whole thing way back before the very beginning of the exile, and that doesn't sound reasonable, and then when they do that, and Lange gives a lot of various views that have been suggested by men who attempt to explain it from their viewpoints, such as saying the 62 weeks come first and then the 70 weeks. Some have tried to say they are weeks of days, and they just refer to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes but it doesn't fit with the ~~the~~ language. It is pretty hard to see how this can be a prediction of the Maccabean times. Now it is an obscure enough passage that you cannot give it the difficulty there as a prime argument against the Maccabean approach to the book. You can't do that, but you can say that ~~the~~ the attempt to fit it into Maccabean times, is difficult enough and that there is no real satisfactory fitting it in, I mean, there is no fitting in that is sufficiently satisfactory to be a strong argument in favor of the Maccabean, exclusive Maccabean interpretation of the book, I think that we could say very definitely. And = now if our big problem was (6) the book, as the critics say, than we would have to look at it a little more from that viewpoint, but I don't think we need to for our purpose in the class which is interpretation. We have seen that there is much in the book which does refer to the Maccabean period. It does refer to Antiochus Epiphanes. And it is very foolish to brush these things aside. They are a part of the great value of the book, in showing God's hand in predicting those things so far ahead. But this particular thing does not fit under that category. So then, the interpretation that some take that practically every thing in the book of Daniel is the prediction of the first coming of Christ, that approach to the book of Daniel is not a very satisfactory approach as we've already seen. It is pretty hard to say that the second chapter is dealing with the first coming of Christ. It is practically impossible = there are some who can find the first coming of Christ ~~in~~ in every verse of the Bible, and it is true that the Bible is more pointing to Christ's crucifixion and there is nothing important than that, and it is in many places where it is not obvious. But that doesn't mean we are just to find it in every place. There are such passages dealing with other subjects, and in Daniel we - there is very little outside this ninth chapter that would seem to be pointing in any specific way to the first coming of Christ.



But now in this 9th chapter, that does not prove that the 9th chapter is not, because it is such an outstanding theme in the whole Bible, that it would be rather strange if there wasn't anything pointing to the first coming of Christ in the book. It would be natural to expect to find something, and if you don't take this chapter as dealing with the Maccabean period with Antiochus Epiphanes, if you don't take it that way, I believe all interpreters feel that it has a great deal of reference to the first coming of Christ. I think that all interpreters feel that way. All who do not take the critical view. So then the question is, does it refer exclusively to the first coming of Christ, or does it have a reference in it to something else? Now we looked at the first verse of it a little bit yesterday, we spent quite a while on it, and maybe we should before the ~~the~~ term is over, but in a casual glance at the verse, it at least would be strange if it didn't have some pretty definite reference to the first coming of Christ. It seems to me that on the face of its reference to the first coming is more definite than to the second, in that verse. Now whether there are certain parts of the verse, that ~~must~~ must include the second coming is a matter for careful study. My impression is that there should be such a thing to fulfill that verse which seems to mean more than just the first coming~~x~~ so that it would seem to have considerable emphasis on the first coming. Well now, the interpretation then that this refers exclusively to the first coming of Christ, is one in accordance with which every thing in this prediction must be specifically dealing with His coming, or that which will immediately follow. Well, we've noticed that verse 26 can very reasonably be applied to the first coming of Christ and what follows. But now, the real question then is, what about 27? There are those who will tell you, 27 goes back and recapitulates what happened in 26. 26 ~~is~~ would say after 62 weeks, or after these 62 weeks, Messiah will be cut off and have nothing, and people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof will be with a flood and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. I have not come across any interpreter who does not take the critical view, who does not say that this is a prediction of Messiah's, of the crucifixion of Christ, and of the destruction of the city by the Romans. Well now, if this is the case, then if 27 is speaking about the one who is going to be cut off, He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. Is this describing something that He does

right after His resurrection? I don't know of any interpreters who take it that way. But you will find a number who say that this is going back to tell about the one who can be cut off, what he does before he is cut off. He confirms the covenant with many for one week. They say that before he is cut off, and then in the midst of the week, he causes the sacrifice and oblation, refers to his being cut off, which they say ended sacrifices, I don't see how it ends sacrifices, to fulfill, it fulfilled their sacrifices. I don't see how it ended them. It did end 40 years later. If you say they ended as far as having any meaning then is concerned, well, I cannot find anywhere in the scripture the idea that a sacrifice saved people until <sup>K</sup>Christ died, and after that it did nothing. It seems to me it never saved. The blood of bulls and goats can not take away sin. It always pointed to Christ's death. And there is no reason why it has to point forward. It could point forward or backward. His death fulfilled it. \* Now we knew the reality, we did not need to have the shadow of it. We do need to have memorial of it, and anyone who knew that He had died for our sins, would be foolish to go and ~~form~~ perform a sacrifice to look forward to the Messiah for people who didn't know it, the sacrifice would have every bit of meaning for them, in that next 40 years as it would have had in the previous 40 years, so it seems to me a very strange way to say that He died on the cross, for our sins, and to say in the middle of the week, he causes sacrifice and oblation to cease. And then to continue right on, after that, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the ~~consum~~ consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. To say that that is a description of the same thing described in the end of 26 as the down fall of Jerusalem, would just seem to - well, it is not a very orderly systematic presentation, and it is very obscure. That doesn't prove it is necessarily wrong but its weakness. \* Now that's the second approach to it, and the third approach - the approach that says that this passage here has a reference to the return of Christ, is worthy of consideration because the second one draws a very definite snag in the obscurity of this 27th verse. A very definite snag. It is very worth looking at, in any (13 1/2) but when we have this very definite snag (13 1/2) it would seem that the verse would be particularly worthy of investigation. Now if the third is true, then the he who will confirm the covenant with many people for one week, I don't know what that means if it is Jesus. How did he confirm the covenant with many for one

week? ~~in~~ I don't know what it means, if it referred to him. ~~Thought~~ that is the way that many take it, but if you take it as being the - if you don't take it of him, the Messiah, then you've read of the prince that shall come, and it would seem rather reasonable to say this is the man you've just mentioned. The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and he, the prince that shall come shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. And that is certainly a reasonable approach to the thing.

66.

Then this is the prince that shall come and is something after what previous was, he confirms the covenant not for the next week, doesn't even say for the seventh week, but it says for one week, and so the possibility that it is the prince that shall come, who does this, and then in the midst of the week in which he has made a covenant he breaks the covenant evidently by causing sacrifice and oblation to cease, and quite naturally interpret it in relation to what Antiochus Epiphanes did, as something similar, not that but something similar. That is one phrase here that can fit very well with Antiochus Epiphanes, - it can be something similar, and in such a case, the last half of that week would be a time of great difficulties & similar to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Well now if you take that interpretation immediately you strike the difficulty that this 70th week that comes right after the 69th week is pretty hard to find a historical situation at that time that would relate to it, etc, but we have the same difficulty with chapter 7, we have the little horn, it rises up and then the kingdom of God is established and that seems very definitely to refer to something much later on. We notice that either in chapter 7, the fourth beast is terrifically long time, or that the period referred to by the fourth beast has a gap in it, that it has a start and it has an end, which are related, but that in between you might insert something in time that was passed over. And we notice that it seems almost to be required some sort of a gap between in c. 7 and in c. 27, and in 11 a gap is very definitely required because we have Antiochus Epiphanes described, and then we go on and ~~in~~ we hear what he is going to do, and God is going to destroy him and bring the resurrection from the dead. And the resurrection from the dead & comes when Antiochus was destroyed. As we noticed the last view verses didn't fit with Antiochus, at all, and most

Christian interpreters take this from referring to Antichrist, and consider it as a gap, that there is a jump, and that is the interpretation that is taken by most, even by those who hold to - who try to make everything relate to the first coming of Christ, and ignore the second largely, they feel there is a gap in chapter 11. They may not say it by that term, they may oppose the idea of a gap, but up to a certain point - they say this fits Antiochus Epiphanes, it is him described, it tells what he did, it is a wonderful prediction, 400 years ahead of what Antiochus did, then they say this can't possibly fit Antiochus, this can't fit with Antiochus, this is Antichrist. Well, if so there is a gap, between (4 1/4), and the gap is not, you say a thing about Antiochus, then you say a thing about Antichrist, a thing about Antiochus, then a thing about Antichrist, and shut them up together so that you are looking at the two as one figure. We talk about one of them and then we talk about the other. And in chapter 11 I don't see any way to make sense out of chapter 11 without assuming there is a gap there. I think most interpreters do, whether they express it in that terminology or not, and so if we have very likely a gap in two, and in seven, either that or a very long stretch passed over with just a very few (5), and certainly as history shows there are times in between that don't seem to fit. (5k) and if we definitely have a gap in 11 it is not unreasonable at all to say there might be a gap here, that the 70 weeks determined upon the people point first to a period of 7 weeks, and then to a period that may be 62 weeks, and a period of 62 weeks ends with a crucifixion of Christ, and then that it says that - it speaks there of what happens after his crucifixion after the end of the ~~70~~ 62 weeks about the coming of the people of the prince that shall come to destroy the city. And then that it speaks of this prince that shall come, jumping forward from what the people of that prince that shall come, shall do, to the prince that shall come himself, and passing over the period in between. Thus leaving a gap between 26 and 27, and having the 70th week that is determined upon the people be a week that does not follow immediately the first ~~from~~ 69, but that there is a period in between that is passed over. Well now, that interpretation given simply without any background, in what else we find in other passages of the book, and of other books too, might seem to be a rather strange contradicting force (6 1/2), but in view of the fact that we

practically have to find a gap in 2 and 7, and we absolutely do I would say in chapter 11, it would seem to be right in line with the general approach to the book, to say that a period of the 70th week does not immediately follow the 62 weeks, but there is a break in between. But that does not decide whether between the 7 and the 62 weeks, there is a break in between. It does not describe that. But it does say that there is a break of - a period before the 70th week. Now that impresses me as the thing that has least difficulties of interpretation there. In fact the other views, impress me as having such great difficulties as to be entirely unsatisfactory. This view impresses me as being in line with the view of the method of approach of the book as a whole, and fitting in with this figure that has been stressed in chapter 7 and 11. This antichrist who is to come. To find him here referred to again but here he is called the prince that is to come. And fits it right in with other things. The book of Daniel has various things looked at and overlapping things are stressed. Very few things stand isolated, the reference to Christ's death here would be to stand isolated. Not tied up with anything else with the book of Daniel. But it is such a very important thing regarding the economy that it is strange ~~e s~~ indeed, if it didn't have some reference to it. Now to my mind this is the best interpretation of this 70th week, that it is a gap from the 69th, and any interpretation that makes the 70th week come right after the 69th appears to me to run into very great difficulty. But it does seem to me that while I think it is the correct interpretation and one which I think the study of the book as a whole practically requires it, I do not think that it is so obvious, that it is right to make it the foundation for our study of future prophets. It seems to me that it would rather be something fitting into our understanding of future prophecy, rather than the foundation ~~starting from~~ point for our study. Personally I do not at all like the terminology which is rather wide spread today of believing in a rapture at the beginning of the week, or the middle of the week, or the end of the week. It doesn't seem to me the word week ought to be used, in that way, because I don't think that it is crystal clear, this matter of the week. Just how long is that week is going to be and just where does the rapture come in with it anyway, it doesn't seem to me there is any reference to that in this (9 1/2). Now how long is the week? It would seem quite natural to assume that the 7 is a 7 of years, but I don't

think we can be dogmatic and the assumption that there must be 7 ~~week~~ years between the rapture and the return of Christ with His saints or that there must be 3 1/2 seems to me that either one of them is jumping pretty far beyond the evidence. To my mind if you look at the New Testament references, to the return of the Lord for His saints, you find at least a dozen times in the New Testament, where it is strongly (10) that it comes in such an hour that you think not, and that it is something which you are always to be ready for, and which so far as we can be able to ~~the~~ disciples were given any reason to know by that it might have happened right in their day, and therefore I am very strongly convinced of this, at least of the New Testament references, that there is no recognizable ~~X~~prophetic event which will come before the return of Christ ~~before~~ His saints. That is, that no one has any right to say, Christ cannot come today because something hasn't happened yet, or because conditions are not in a certain way. It seems to me that Luke 12, absolutely proves that, and many others have to fit in with that. Now that is not to say that there may not be predictions that will happen before the return of Christ. But if they are predicted, it will happen before His coming, they are of such a nature that we will not be able to say with certainty that they have or have not. Now of course one thing that some people point to is the matter of Peter, it was told how Peter would die. Well now they say Peter - it is foolish than to say that the disciples could be ready at any moment in case Christ would come, because they know that it couldn't come until Peter died. Well, maybe that would be a good way of knowing it today, though I'm not even so sure that - suppose you were to say, the Lord can't come until Eisenhower dies. Well, there is no use of our looking - in such an hour as you think not, he will come. He will come in such an hour as you think not. The Lord says let your loins be girded. Be ready, for in such a ~~an~~ day as you think not, the Lord comes. He says to his disciples be ye ready, watch and be vigilant. He comes when you don't expect him. But you say, well the scriptures say that Eisenhower is going to die first, so there is no need of our expecting him, that he will come today because Eisenhower isn't dead yet. Well how do you know he isn't dead? There is the possibility that any man today, any man at all, that he might, no matter how (12 1/2) that he might die 6 hours before you've heard about it. And in those days ~~for~~ when they didn't have telegraph

telephone or airplanes, Peter might have been crucified and the people - the other people might not have known it for three months afterwards, and so as far as your saying, we don't need to be watching for the return of the Lord because Peter said it. He is going to be crucified first. A person might say that who might be with Peter, but no body in another town could ever say it. Even the people in the town (13 1/2). \* it was to Peter that the Lord said let your loins be girded about and be ready for you know not when the Lord comes, to Peter, and Peter says, Lord speakest ~~he~~ thou this to us or to (13 1/2). He didn't hesitate did he? (13 1/2) and he asked whether it is just for the disciples or to all the people. And so it seems to me that today that - is there going to be tribulation before the Lord returns? Certainly, there has been tribulation all through Christian history. Christian And if you think you are going to live a life without tribulation, or if you have no tribulation in life, you are probably not one of the Lord's people, because He wants tribulation and He wants to try us, tribulation and to test us and develop our character and you can have a lot of tribulation without any actual persecution, but there can come, there could come, it is not inconceivable that the communists could conquer this nation and could subject us to -

¶ 67.

persecution - the most terrible thing that the world has ever seen before the millennium.

km (hard to hear) - persecution under Nero and under Diocletian and the persecution under Domitian, was terrible, and there is no reason - no body can say the Lord is not going to come for his saints at the end of the tribulation because he says in such an hour as ye think not, but we say, oh well, it has got to be a pleasant time, and everything is going lovely, so we know the Lord is going to come. Well, that is denying His statement, in such an hour as ye think not He is going to come. There has been tribulation, there will be tribulation, there will be no tribulation before He comes which can be said this is the Tribulation spoken of in the scripture, and now it is time to start looking. In such an hour as ye think not, now is the time of what He said, such an hour as ye think not because now the tribulation. There can be nothing like that. Any tribulation (1 1/2) the Tribulation must be

(1 1/2). And to my mind there is much evidence that after the Lord takes His saints

up in the air that after that there will be a great outpouring of His ~~wanting~~ wrath upon this earth. To my mind there is very great evidence for that. But to say in the beginning of the week, and in the middle of ~~the~~ week, seems to me that is the sort of thing that a person might think of (2). He might say, if I believe the 7th week of Daniel is in the distant future, well, I think we can go beyond (2 1/2) I mean the distant future from the time (2 1/2). And to say - that I think we can say very definitely, but to say when in that 70th week the rapture occurs, it seems to me that there is so much evidence about the rapture in relation to the fact that we don't know when it is and so little to connect it up with a particular time in the 70th week, and I think I have to say that there is no reason to be dogmatic as to the length of this week. Now Sir Robert Anderson in his book, tries to show by figuring that a prophetic year was 360 years instead of 365 thereby cutting this period down more, and starting at a certain point, for your figuring of the 69th week, he tries to show that the 69th week ended right exactly on the same day, the time of the first (3 1/2), and therefore the people should have been able to figure up ~~at~~ exactly when Christ would come. Well, it would be interesting if the Lord gave us such specific evidence, as to the time of (3 1/2), but it doesn't seem to me that this idea of a 360 day year has any basis. It seems unnatural. It seems so unnatural, we would have pretty positive evidence of it, that when God says a year He doesn't mean one revolution of the earth around the sun, but he means an arbitrary (4). And also it does seem to me that the 7 weeks and the 62 must be separate periods. It seems to me that (4 1/4). Now there might be a gap between that. I don't think it is impossible at all, that there might have been a 7 week period, and there might have been a gap. He doesn't say up to 69 weeks, he says 62 weeks. There might have been a gap, and then the period of the 62 weeks, and then a gap, and the period of the 70th week. I do not feel that we have a specific figuring that can point to the day of the first coming of Christ. I don't think that that is (4 1/2). Mr. Webber, are you familiar with Dr. Cooper's specific theories on this point? Well, can you tell me this, when does he say that the 70 weeks begin? (Student). It is my impression,



that Dr. Cooper followed Romance of Bible chronology. And gets the 49

- the 69 weeks exactly up to the time of Christ, by saying that our secular ~~chronology~~ chronology is 16 years off, and it is my impression that Cooper follows him in that. Well, if he does that then he would have an entirely different place for the start of the 70 weeks, than Sir Robert Anderson does. (Student). The first of these. The - Just in an obvious approach to the thing here, it would seem the first decree of Cyrus would seem to be the natural impression, because that is when it is given to them. Daniel says the 70 weeks is over, now is the time for the Lord to establish universal righteousness, and the Lord says, there is 70 weeks. We've had 70 years. Now there is 70 weeks left, and it would be natural ~~to~~ to take it starting right from then. Now it doesn't say it is necessarily (6 1/4) but that would be a rather natural obvious way to take it as starting. Now and I believe I Cooper start it that way, but they say there is about 60 years in the chronology of the Persian period which is incorrect, and made an argument that our chronology of the Persian period has been made by guess, we have a big period in there, with very little evidence. Well now, whether he is correct in that, I'm not ready to say, but this is true that scholars today do not consider the P dates of the Persian period as (7). They assume that the date 586 is definite. Now he would make it about 526. But they assume the 586 as the definite date - that there is no question on. Now that doesn't prove but that they might be wrong. We might find that there is evidence of a mistake in that person's chronology. We might say (7 1/2) very little evidence of the period, but I don't think we should build a great deal on such an assumption without such evidence, but the thing that impresses me as interesting here is that Cooper at least, if you take his view, does not feel as Anderson does that the evidence is absolutely clear that it must refer to the decree of Artaxerxes, Anderson feels that there is no question that that is the decree to which this refers. Now there have been many different decrees suggested for it, and it is a subject to be worthy of study, but I just don't feel that we can be absolutely dogmatic upon it, or there wouldn't be as much diversity of opinion on it, as there is. So that to my mind, in this 9th chapter, to my mind the theory that there is a gap, between the 69th week and the 70th week to

to my mind is makes far better sense out of it than any other than I know of, and fits in with the analogy of the book of Daniel. And that this then is giving us information about the Antichrist whom we have already given in chapters 7 and we get again in 11, and that we learn from this the further point of similarity from Antiochus Epiphanes, that he is making the covenant and then of his break, sometimes within the week, and that - and there being upheavals and difficulties up to the end of the week, and the same ~~then~~ thing that we find in verse 27, about the glory of the Lord, at the end of the glory doesn't refer to the time of the (9), and if - it seems to me ~~that~~ to be a little further (9) a little further evidence given but to be dogmatic as to the length of the week, or to take the week as a foundation so far, that as going beyond (9 1/2). (Student). Yes, I would think that it would be an interesting study whether they can fit together with but I would not say it is not a 7 year period, not by any means. But that our evidence is absolutely definite it isn't 7 <sup>yes.?</sup> weeks that is what I would say, yes? (Student). Yes, and so more convinced you become that the 7 weeks and the 62 weeks, are definite periods of 7 years, the more evidence we have for believing ~~that~~ that it is probably a (10 1/2). I don't mean to say that I feel that it is wrong that it is probably is a 7 ~~w~~ year period, but what I mean to say that it is established definitely enough to make a foundation. I would rather bring in the 70th week as something to throw further light as what we get out, rather than to feel it is a foundation upon which to build. (Student). It just says after 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off. It would not be impossible though (11 1/2) but this would seem to me rather likely that this is what is going to happen. (Student). I don't know if I would definitely say it, but I would say that - I would incline rather definitely that (11 1/2) I; wouldn't say that it is impossible but the 62, if you can find, a period which fits with the 62 pretty well, and with the description of what happened, and then to say then after the 62, but after all, the 70 weeks is here the basic thing (12) and I wouldn't expect you to have too many things outside of (12) of that of a 7 week period, of how he discusses what happens in that 7 weeks period. Then he discusses a 62 week period, well now whether that 7 week period is 49 weeks here,

Daniel 67. (12 1/2) 1955-56.

123.

the only period of 49 weeks that I know of, is (12 1/2) is the period between the destruction of Jerusalem, and the coming of (12 1/2) I don't say = at the present moment it impresses me that here we have a period of ~~with~~ which ends with the coming of one who is described in Isaiah as the anointed prince. And as one and who is one who gives - (13). Now that impresses me as very interesting. The great difficulty of this is, that it is from the going out of the commandment and (13) gave a commandment and other kings gave commandments, but of course, some say it is the Lord who makes the commandment to built Jerusalem (13 1/2). I don't remember , so that is a difficulty . But then to say if such is given, here is a definite picture of this length, which ends ~~w~~ at this specific time. Then the 62 weeks might come immediately after this. It might come later. Now if the 62 weeks, there comes a time when they rebuilt etc, there is a description of what happens in this 62 weeks period. And then it says after the 62 weeks will Messiah be cut off. Well, you say that is over here. And then to take in the 70 weeks, over here, that impresses as -

68. (0)

(hard to hear) with the cross and then after that (1/2) at the end of 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off, that doesn't seem to me to support the 70th week (1/2). It seems to be and it could be following the people of the prince that shall come (1/2) that could happen at the end of the age (1/2), but to say that you have 62 weeks and then that there is a gap, and over here (1) then there is the 70th week, it doesn't impress me as nearly as . I don't think it is possible, but it impresses me that after the 62 weeks (1) (Student). The only way that I can see that that can mean the Lord Jesus Christ, is to put the 7 and the 62 together, and say that (1 1/2) 7 and 62, I don't say that is impossible, but it does not impress me as a very natural way to take it. Though it certainly seems to me he takes the 69, or you might say 60 and 9, but to say 7 and 62, it seems to me so very unnatural, that it just doesn't seem reasonable. (Student). No, we certainly have two princes. The prince that shall come. Yes, we have two princes. One of them has two anointed ones. It doesn't seem to me as natural. Yes? (Student).

It ~~se~~ seems to me very probable, but as to whether there is a gap between the 7 and the 62 weeks, or not, I'm not sure we have evidence to prove one way or the other, but I do feel at the moment that we do not have conclusive proof that each of these 70 weeks is a 7 year period. That I would say. They are periods, but as to whether there is a specific length revealed to us to that extent, the difficulty of fitting it in, to the history as we know it, makes me feel that it is at least possible that those are ~~wrong~~ <sup>?right</sup> who say that at least some of the weeks are indefinite periods of indefinite lengths rather than definite (3 1/2). At least and perhaps.

It is not to my mind impossible that the 7 weeks might be the period before Cyrus, and the 62 might be a more general expression for the period when Cyrus (3 1/2). Yes? (Student).

No, I would think that in such a case the 7 weeks would be a period of medium size duration. The 62 would be a long period and the 1 would be a short period, making up 70 (4 1/4). It is just a question of whether it was the Lord's intention to give us specifically chronological information that we could use, and the difficulty that we have in using it, makes me wonder whether that (4 1/2). (Student). No, I ~~w~~ would consider 70 a round number, and from the 70 one, would be ~~a~~ the figure for a small, and ~~a~~ 7 for an intermediate and 62 would be the large number. I don't say necessarily correct, but I think it is possible. I think it is possible we will find it is exactly 490 years, but if we find so it seems to me there will be data ~~a~~ involved that we don't have available yet. And the difficulty of finding the terminus of the 7 weeks, to me, is rather strong against our being sure that we can tell exactly the length of period.

END OF CLASS.

/ I think we would be wise to spend more time right now on chapter 9, we were very wise in not doing anything with 9, until we had spent a fair amount of time on all the other portions of the book, but I do think that we need more time now on 9, there are some very interesting problems and questions in connection with it. The chapter 9, as with the other chapters, we immediately begin with a fine margin, 3 points of references. Is it a chapter which is dealing - I say a chapter, the whole chapter leads up to a focus in these 4 verses. Are these 4 verses dealing mostly with the time of Antiochus Epiphanes? The critics would say that is the focus

of the book. Well now, for just a minute, let us leave for just a minute the question of fitting it in, and let us look at the bigger aspect of it. What is the purpose of the book of Daniel? According to the critics it is ~~e~~ to encourage the people of God in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Well, we must agree. We cannot set that aside. It would be silly. We agree, but we say that is a purpose. We don't say it is the purpose. To try to prove that is not a purpose of the book would be ridiculous. Chapter 8 you have to twist and force to get any thing out of chapter 8 other than a~~n~~ deliberate attempt to encourage the people in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is leading right directly up to it. That is the purpose of the chapter

(8). Chapter 11, that is a purpose of chapter 11. Chapter 11 goes right straight along through a lot of kings who may have been important politically, but are of no importance for us, from the viewpoint of God's dealing with mankind, unless their interest is to point their finger to Antiochus Epiphanes, and they go step by step by step by step upon the kings preceding Antiochus Epiphanes, and then you get up to the one right immediately before him, and some people say, now it ~~a~~ jumps to Antichrist. Of course that is utter nonsense. Why on earth should you have anything about all those kings in there, if it is not for the direct vital purpose of pointing to Antiochus Epiphanes? It is a purpose of chapter 11. It is a great purpose of chapter 11. A very vital purpose of chapter 11 to encourage the Jews for the difficult times of Antiochus Epiphanes, but we saw in chapter 11 that it could not be ~~a~~ the whole purpose of it. If that is the whole purpose of chapter 11 then the writer of the book was a prophet. ~~It~~ Definitely. Because he goes on and tells things about Antiochus Epiphanes that were true. ~~It~~ It says that he did things that he never did, and it says that he was immediately followed by the resurrection which did not happen at that time. There must be Antiochus Epiphanes in chapter 11, but there must be a gap in chapter 11. These people who say that there is no evidence for a gap, they have to take chapter 11 as a fraud. They have to either do that or recognize it. There is absolutely no other way to take it. Now that doesn't mean to say of course that you have to have Antichrist in chapter 11 as well as Antiochus Epiphanes. Somebody could say, all it says about this man is about Antiochus Epiphanes and then there is a gap between his destruction and the resurrection. A gap comes there. One could say that.

That could be it, if it were not for the fact that the first half of what he said, so definitely and precisely fits Antiochus Epiphanes and the last half so definitely doesn't fit him at all. So Young says in his commentary, this is dealing with Antiochus Epiphanes, but it ~~is~~ is dealing also with Antichrist. Antichrist foreshadows, is typified by ~~Antioch~~ Antiochus Epiphanes, and then to the first half of it with everything he shows how wonderfully it fits Antiochus Epiphanes, and then with the last half he shows how it can't possibly fit Antiochus Epiphanes, but it is only dealing with that. And instead of saying then that it is Antiochus Epiphanes as a figure of, or prefigure of or type of Antichrist, it seems to me much more sensible to take the first half which definitely fits Antiochus Epiphanes and say it is Antiochus, and then say there is a gap, and then say that after the gap, then it goes on to speak about Antichrist. With a gap in between. Well then, if we have the gap in between there, we have the gap in 11, which has as its first purpose the encouragement of the people for the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, but which has an additional purpose, and what then is that additional purpose? Well ~~that~~ additional purpose must be to encourage the people in the time of Antichrist. And to let them know when the Antichrist comes, and it actually does not mean the destruction of God's plan, ~~the~~ destruction of God's will, that he also was to perish even as Antiochus Epiphanes was to perish. And that God is going to bring the resurrection and set up His kingdom, so we have two purposes here in chapter 11. We have two foci. The first focus Antiochus Epiphanes, and there are other ones, which our third focus of, the end of this age, the time of the setting up of a period upon the earth, by God. Well now, the purpose which you've noticed in chapter 1 is to encourage people in the time of difficulty, and Antiochus Epiphanes is one of those times. Chapter 2, the purpose of is to encourage people in the times of difficulty and to show that God has a plan, but there is nothing in chapter 2 which in any ~~specific~~ specific way would relate to Antiochus Epiphanes. It shows the very end of it all, in a way that cannot be set aside specifically. Now there are those who try to make chapter 2 have its focus in the first coming of Christ. It would take an awful lot of figurative interpretation to interpret that stone cut without hands, which comes and hits the image on the feet, bursts it all to pieces, and then it becomes a whole mountain and fills the whole earth. The first coming of Christ.

There is very little similarity (hard to hear) and the first coming of Christ.

It would seem that if you have to fit chapter 2 between the second focus and the first coming of Christ and the third focus, the return of Christ, that chapter 2 fits the return of Christ.

And is not much different from the 1st (13) coming of Christ. It is true that in principle

God destroyed the kingdom of Antichrist, the kingdom of this world, with Jesus' death on the cross, upon Calvary, that He won the victory through His death. That without that victory

the outworking of the second coming could never occur. But that is extremely vital and you

might even say that is in the background of chapter 2, but it does not seem to me to (13 1/2)

to be in the foreground of chapter 2. So that in chapter 2 if we have this second focus involved

it is only to be found there because we know from other passages that it is the background of

the third focus, but the third focus consists of that (14) rather than the first.

Then of course chapter 3 deals with the men in times of great persecution and God has chosen

to deliver them and that would be to encourage the people for the coming of Antiochus

Epiphanes but it also could be for any time of oppression, tribulation, difficulty and perhaps

in particular for the time of Antichrist. It would not any special relationship to the second

(14 1/2) of Christ. And then chapter 4 is where Nebuchadnezzar is shown that God

is the God that should be the ruler of all the world and again to encourage the people for the

time of Antiochus Epiphanes, or for any time of persecution and so would also be helpful for

the time of Antichrist, but would not have any very direct relationship to the first coming of

Christ. And then for chapter 5 we have again the same as chapter 4. It is God showing His

control over the nations. It encourages them in time of persecution, it is very vital for the

time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and very vital for the time of Antichrist, no particular direct

relevance ~~from~~ to the first coming of Christ.

69. (No 69) 70.

Chapter 6 as God's ability to stop the mouths of lions again just the same as to encourage

people in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, tremendously helpful also in the time of

Antichrist. No particular direct relevance to the period of (1) Christ. So in all

these things, chapter 11 and 12, chapters 1 to 6 we found ~~not~~ nothing directly related to the

Daniel. ~~from~~ 70. (1) 1955-56. 128.

first coming of Christ. And we have Antiochus Epiphanes exclusively in chapter 8, definitely in chapter 11. And in the ~~book~~ background certainly in the stories of (1 1/2) but not specifically here. Then we have chapter 7 and in chapter 7 we have an - any reasonable interpretation of chapter 7 you have Antiochus Epiphanes definitely. And to make the little horn of chapter 7 the same as the little horn 8, involves (2). In chapter 7 the focus is the Second Coming of Christ, with Antichrist. Who is it if it is not Antichrist. It is not Antiochus Epiphanes. It has no relevance to the first coming of Christ. It must be Antichrist. So chapter 7 is dealing very definitely with the end of this age at the time of Antichrist, the time when Christ returns. The time when He sets up His kingdom on this earth, when Christ is (2 1/2) Well again, nothing in the first coming of Christ, - then we have looked at every chapter of the whole book, except 10 which is introductory to 11. 12 by a (2 1/2) we looked at every chapter of the book (2 1/2). You read the introduction to Young's book, you get the idea that Antiochus Epiphanes has some importance in Daniel, but the main thing in Daniel, is the first coming of Christ. Now the main thing in the Bible as a whole - the atonement of Christ is the most important thing in the Bible. Without it there could be nothing for us. Without it the second coming (3). Without it we could have none (3). But as far as the book of Daniel is concerned we have found no (3 1/4) anywhere.

Now then, take up the 9th chapter of Daniel, and we have our 3 foci. The one the critics make be everything, which we recognize to be the vital purpose in the greater part of the book of Daniel at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Secondly the first coming of Christ which many evangelical expositors make the big thing in chapter 9. And third the return of Christ, which has a very very vital thing, which many (4) and to my mind is rather (4) and (hard to hear.) The first is much more important than the second coming. Without it

(4). But that doesn't mean, because it is much more important than the second, that the second is not also important. (4 1/4). Now in this chapter 9 then we try to relate it to the first focus. And speaking now not of the times and the precise details in trying to fit them in, but speaking of the big thing of the purpose of it, how does that fit with the book? Here is Daniel, and Daniel is told - Daniel says the 70 ~~we~~ years is over. The



captivity should come to an end. The Lord brings to pass His wonderful promises, and God answers and says, 70 weeks are determined upon the people. What for? The 70 weeks before you get another big crisis? The 70 weeks lead up to the time of Antiochus, when there is another big crisis? There is not much comfort in Daniel (5 1/4).

Yes, you are going to be delivered from exile. That is coming now, but 70 weeks from now, there is going to be terrific oppression, another time when God will deliver His people out of that. Well, ~~if~~ you don't find much about deliverance at first sight. It begins with a definite reference to sin and transgression. It will take 70 weeks to get over this matter of sin and transgression. They end up with the pouring out of great troubles. They poured out upon the desert. Well, it might be just a warning to Daniel, that the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (6) is coming. If so the 70 weeks relate to the time from Daniel to Antiochus Epiphanes, and there are those who try to interpret it that way. It is pretty hard to (6 1/4) and only a very few people and then they interpret some of these things as being specific predictions of Antiochus Epiphanes and they don't ~~partic~~ particularly (6 1/2). For instance - 27, shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. What does that mean? Young is very good on that, where he discusses how it fits this and how it fits this and how it fits this and Antiochus Epiphanes confirmed the covenant with many == Antiochus Epiphanes encouraged those who wanted to turn away from God to follow pagan customs, to do so. That's not (6 3/4) Antiochus Epiphanes becomes the king over Syria which controls Palestine, he doesn't become so by confirming the covenant. What does it mean? It is very hard to find any real relevance to it. And then there are others who try to take the 70 weeks as literal weeks of days and apply it in some way to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that it pretty hard to fit in. And if you take it simply as Antiochus Epiphanes here. God is going to deliver, God is going to give a time of downfall and discouragement. Well, that's not (7 1/2). That's difficulty. It doesn't give much warrant for that. And so it is not satisfactory to say Daniel 9 is simply having as its great focus its ~~purpose~~ purpose Antiochus Epiphanes. It is pretty hard to fit that in. Now I don't like to rule Antiochus Epiphanes out. We've noticed in chapter 2 he disregarded him, and in c. 7 he disregarded him, but in chapter 11 he so definitely stressed, and in chapter 8, he ~~is~~ so

definitely stressed while he may be passed over here, it seems a bit strange that there is no reference. It would be rather more satisfactory if people find it that way rather than too detailed, to say he is coming right after 8, which so definitely refers to him, and right before 11, which so definitely refers to him, but that he is the main focus of it, ~~is~~ hardly seems a satisfactory answer. Then there is the second approach, the approach which many evangelical interpreters take, this has as its focus the first coming of Christ, of course, Young finds that in practical every chapter in the book, and it is true that in the Bible all roads, as they said, all roads lead to Rome, in the Bible everything carried out properly leads to Christ, and particularly to His atonement, and there is relationship between His atonement and every thing, but perhaps less relationship to the book of Daniel, than in many other books. The book of Daniel looks more not at the atonement itself but at that which is produced as a result of the atonement, the return of Christ, and (9 1/4) no specific reference to the atonement or to the first coming of Christ anywhere in the book, (9 1/4). Now in this chapter here then those who say this relates to the first coming of Christ, that is the focus of it, they will say that everything in verse 24 is fulfilled in the first coming. To bring in ever=~~is~~ lasting righteousness perhaps in the first coming. To make an end to this, to finish the transgression, perhaps. The evidence seems a little more reasonable that they include not simply the atonement (9 3/4) in principle, to have victory over these things, but also the actual outworking of it, the fulfillment of it in the return of <sup>Christ</sup> and to the putting an in the world. end to the power of evil. But then the heart of, about the relation of the chapter to the first coming of Christ, is certainly that 27th verse. It is not so hard to take 26 as relating to the first coming of Christ after the ~~2~~ 62 weeks Messiah will be cut off, but not for himself. That isn't so hard to decide that that must describe the death of Christ. And then you continue with what comes immediately thereafter, and very soon thereafter, the ~~people~~ of the prince that shall come, destroys the city and the sanctuary. And the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And that could fit very well with the first coming of Christ. But what about 27? He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.

Well how is that? Confirming the covenant with many for one week? How does that relate to the first coming of Christ? How do you apply that to the first coming? Young is very good in his proof that that doesn't fit Antiochus. I don't remember just how he proves that it does fit Christ. Let's see what he says. The subject is indefinite. That's the first view. The second is that the subject is the prince of verse 26, the third is the subject is one week, that is, one week will confirm the covenant for many which doesn't make much sense. And then the fourth, the subject is Messiah and he that is Messiah will cause to prevail. This Young says is the view that seems to be the most sensible, that the prince as subject does not appear to be the most natural reading. Well, why isn't it? How in the context would you explain the subject? It does not at all appear to be at all as natural reasoning, for the word ~~off~~ occupies only a subordinate position even in verse 26 where it isn't even the subject of the sentence. Well, that doesn't prove anything, right here. The city and the sanctuary are to be destroyed not by a prince but by the people of the prince. The people are in a more balanced position as the prince. Well, that is a matter of grammar which I don't think is very vital. It continues furthermore this entire passage is messianic in nature and Messiah is the leading character. The general theme of the passage introduced in verse 24 is surely Messianic, the (13) depicted therein were brought about by the Messiah and is climaxed in the anointing of a holy of holies. Furthermore in verse 25 the appearance of a Messiah is the great (13) leads up to him who (13 1/2) how does that prove that the he in verse 27 is ~~the antiochus~~ Messiah

The exposition is shown how utterly impossible it is to refer this to Antiochus. Verse 26, two principal themes are introduced - one the death of the Messiah, and ~~two~~, the subject under discussion, the city and the sanctuary, by a people of a prince who shall come. In this verse therefore the principal characters are the Messiah, and the people, not the prince. Well, that doesn't seem to me to prove much in this. Now let's go on. He shall cause to prevail a covenant. The writer does not mean to say that he will cut a covenant, the ordinary idiom to express such a thought is to cut a covenant, this idiom is not used here.

how this does not fit Antiochus. That there is no way that any bargains Antiochus made would do this. He has quite a reference to this, and then he says number two, the view of (1/2) the antichrist will make a pseudo-religious covenant with the mass of lovers grown cold.

Number three, the view the prince is not ~~the~~ related to the little horn of Daniel 7. And where it says - he deals with that at length and so it can't be that, he says, I don't see a four. I see a five here. I don't see the four at all. <sup>4</sup>But anyway here is - he says the view therefore that a future Roman prince will make a covenant with the Jews must be abandoned. In what sense however may it be said the Messiah causes the covenant to prevail (1). The answer to this question would seem is to be found in the fact that the Messiah during his earthly ministry, and by means of His active and passive obedience to the law of God, did fulfill the terms of the covenant which were in olden times made with Abraham and his seed. Romans 15:8, <sup>speaks of</sup> this covenant, as the covenant of promises made unto the Father. That's very good, but how does that, He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week? How does that fit with this? This covenant which was made with the Father is generally called the covenant of grace. Thus the Westminster Confession rightly says, man by his fall having made ~~him~~ himself incapable of life, by that covenant, that is, the covenant of works, the Lord was pleased to make a second commonly called the covenant of grace, whereby He freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him that they may be saved, promising to give unto them and unto all those who are ordained unto life, His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe. That is very fine. But how is that what is meant by He shall ~~ever~~ confirm the covenant with many for one week? Are we only saved for one week? How does it fit? Just say it for the 70th week? What is the connection here? He continues with his quotation, "this covenant differently administered in the time of the law and in the time of the gospel. Under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the pascal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all four ~~of~~ signifying Christ to come, which was for that time sufficient and efficacious through the operation of the Spirit to instruct, build up the elect in faith and the promise of a Messiah, Messiah by whom they had full remission of sin and eternal salvation

and is called the Old Testament. Thus our Lord fulfilled the terms of this covenant of grace that upon the basis of His finished work life and salvation might be freely offered to sinners. This explanation and this alone fits the Hebrew text. Does it? He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. His point is, that the Hebrew doesn't say He makes the covenant, but He confirms His covenant. He causes it to prevail. But how does the one ( 3 1/2). (Student). Yes, but I mean we can take that up later. (Student). Later. That might be it. Yes. Let's go on a little bit. He says - it could. We'll not dealing yet with the question of how long that would be. But why say for one week? He confirms it for one week? Does Christ make the covenant of grace for this age or are we not saved from eternity?

(4). He confirms ~~the~~ it ~~from~~ with many for one week. How does it fit? How can you fit the one week in? If you just say that He shall confirm the covenant with many - if there was nothing about any seven weeks in the chapter, if it said that Christ is going ~~to~~ to confirm God's covenant or make God's covenant prevail with many - I'd say that's exactly what He does when we accept Christ. He makes the covenant of grace prevail in our hearts and in our minds. He doesn't do it for one week. Yes? (Student). That's not what He says. He says shall confirm. No, you see, that's Young's big point here. (Student). That's Young's big point here. This is not making a covenant but of course there is no evidence of ~~any~~ Antiochus making a covenant anyway, so if it is make a covenant, it wouldn't fit Antiochus. But it is to make a covenant prevail, confirm it, which is already made. Well now, to confirm a covenant - make it prevail. The covenant already being made for one week, would not seem to mean that He makes it begin with some people and with other people during the beginning of the course of the week, but it continues along. If he confirms it for a week, it would seem that that's ~~the~~ the length of time it is, for which it is confirmed, or else perhaps the length of time within which He does the confirming of it. That might be it. He confirms it for one week. He might spend one week, a person might conceivably in a - you might all buy stock in a  
You and  
certain company. A thousand other people might buy stock in a certain company, and you turn in your money to this company, and I might be president of the company, and I might get busy

for one week signing my ~~my~~ name on stock certificates, which confirms to you the covenant with you whereby you have made this money, have an ownership from the company and have the right to share in ~~the~~ its earnings. I could spend one week confirming~~g~~ for many of you this covenant. I could do that. I would think that confirming it for one week would either mean that there is one week during the course of which the confirming is done, even though the covenant runs on, or that the confirming is done in order to last (6 3/4).

It is one of the two. But I don't think that (7), and all he has been saying so far, would be quite relevant if we weren't in a passage dealing with any ~~was~~ 70 weeks at all. If it was just in a passage dealing with the work of Messiah. He will confirm the covenant with many. But he will confirm the covenant with many for one week. What does that mean? Well let's look on a little further here on what he says. He says, this explanation, and this alone fits the Hebrew text. The language here employed is obviously based upon the ordinary Hebrew idiom, which is used to describe the making of a covenant, - well now, this is a little bit extreme in language here. Obviously based upon the ordinary Hebrew idiom, to cut a covenant with - is the ordinary Hebrew, idiom, for making a covenant. Yes. But this doesn't have that phrase. This has the phrase to cause a covenant to prevail, and he says that phrase is only used once in the whole Bible. So according to what he says, this particular phrase is never used except for one other case, and then it is in relation to a covenant, so that - you see when he says the language here employed is obviously based upon the ordinary Hebrew idiom, it would be better I ~~w~~ should think to express the meaning it has in mind. He said the language here employed is different from the ordinary Hebrew idiom, for making a covenant. And so it can't mean the making of it but it must mean something else. That's what he means, but he says it is obviously based upon the ordinary Hebrew idiom, thus to cut a covenant with, is to make a covenant - to cause a covenant to prevail forth, is to make a covenant efficacious. And that seems quite reasonable - to cause a covenant to prevail, or to make it efficacious, or it might be - yes to make it efficacious, or to make it more efficacious, or to continue its efficacy. I don't think just

to make it efficacious. But it is not the ordinary word to cause a covenant to stop. And yet the fact that it isn't the ordinary Hebrew word doesn't prove that some other word might be used for the (9). It doesn't seem to me that it is obviously based upon it, but that we have no other word. At any rate his ~~a~~ big argument here is that this is not the starting of a covenant but the continuing of one, but he says making it efficacious, - he says, this covenant is caused to prevail for the many, that ~~the~~ concept introduced between he and the many, the concept which seems to ~~refer~~ reflect upon the great Messianic passage Isaiah 52 to 53, although the entire nation will not receive salvation and many will receive it. Here is the particular reference appears to be the Israelitish believers. That's very good. The many. Jesus causes the covenant to prevail for the many. It's fine if there were no weeks involved, if there were no 70 weeks involved. But what on earth does it have to do with the 70 weeks? He says, although the entire nation will not receive salvation, the many will receive it. Here the particular reference appears to be to the Israelitish believers, "for the period up to the stoning of Stephen or perhaps in mercy until the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, at which time the new covenant which will be in fact only the unfolding of the old covenant, and makes no distinction between Jew and Gentile, went fully into effect through the destruction of the temple, and through its natural existence. What does that have to do with the 70 weeks? The word one week is introduced. He pays no attention to this. You'd almost think you would have to drop it out. Because all his ~~damn~~ discussion here is very excellent, if you have a statement somewhere, Christ confirms the covenant with many. Excellent. But what is the one week going to be? Yes? (Student). \* Yes, but that is reading a lot into the passage. (Student). That is reading an awful lot into the passage. To me, we've overlooked the one week altogether. Maybe he does express (student). How long did you say the one week was? (Student). \* That's reading an awful lot into this verse. I don't see any reference on that in this verse. (Student). That is, what is the language according to the view which makes the exclusive focus of this chapter be to the first coming of Christ. What is the week? Yes? (Student). And so you would say then according to that view that between the baptism of Christ, and the

baptism of Cornelius was the time when Jesus was confirming the covenant with many for one week. And actually it would seem to me that His activities during that week ~~were~~ would differ tremendously from the time before it, the crucifixion (13), and in addition to that it would seem to me that as far as the offering of salvation to the Jews was concerned the baptism of Cornelius didn't stop with him in any sense of the word. Peter ~~came~~ came down to Jerusalem and talked to him about it, and they said - well, then, God is also giving salvation to the Gentiles. That's wonderful. But nobody suggested that he wasn't giving it to the Jews. And after the baptism of Cornelius my guess would be that for many many years after that the overwhelming bulk of those who became Christians were Jews rather than Gentiles. And it certainly would be many many years after Cornelius before there would be any ~~number~~ ~~sizeable~~ sizeable number of Gentiles. Yes. (Student). Yes, but how does verse 27 mean, he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. How does that mean, he will give the covenant to Jews as Jews for one week. And that's reading an awful lot into the chapter. I don't see any reference in it to Jews as Jews receiving something then that Jews could get afterward, but not just any Jew. I mean that's an awful lot to read into the verse. It is an awful lot to get a week out of, yes? (Student).

72.

- the Jewish receivers receive it just during that week? No more after Cornelius? At Cornelius time there is an extension to others, but as far as Jews not getting it as Jews, if you are going to make a division there, I would think you'd have to come (1/2) the Jews in (1/2) rather than . At least 20 years later. And even after that, Paul went and circumcized Gentiles. Even after that, he took a vow. That is to say, (1) and was not a Jew, ~~the~~ the Jews are not to be circumcized anymore. It was the Gentiles (1) circumcized. James' words in the council were, that he will build up the tabernacle of Jacob, and to it shall come those who are His people, and the nations who are called by His name. The Jews and the gentiles both coming to him, but all of them coming in not as Jews, but both coming in, and Paul would say that all who ever were saved including himself were saved through Christ's faith, not through any rites, but there was



no difference that I know of, in the way a Jew could do anything, before Cornelius or after him. Or even before the (2). That all of that is reading an awful lot in, that there isn't even anything to suggest it. Yes? (Student). Yes, but why would that bring an end to the week in which it is extended to the Jews? (Student). Yes, but is that a reason. I mean, there is nothing in this verse about it. (Student). \* Now it would seem to me that there are three things that we find stated there. <sup>1)</sup> He will make a covenant prevail for one week. The one week might be the time within which He will do that which is efficacious in making the covenant prevail. And that would be a reasonable interpretation wouldn't it. He will make a covenant to prevail for one week. He will make a house strong for one week. That is he goes in there and he works hard for one ~~wee~~ full week, establishing all the foundations and everything (3 1/2) that house is upon, so they'll last for many many years, he spends one week making it strong. Making the covenant prevail for one week with many. The week is making it prevail, but it prevails a long time after that. <sup>2)</sup> Another possibility is that if you make this prevail for a week, he establishes the covenant or make it strong - a covenant previously (4), so that it continues for one week, and one week is the time for his continuance. <sup>3)</sup> And a third is - in view of for the many, he makes it prevail for the many, that he makes it prevail for this one, he makes it prevail for this one, he makes it prevail for this one, after this one, after this one, after this one, after this one, and he is making it prevail for various ones. But the time in the course of which he makes it prevail for any of these (4 1/2) is a <sup>week</sup> one. Now there we have three different possibilities. The third is what we just now. But after speaking of this one now, that he makes it prevail for many of the Jews during this week, during the time of Cornelius, he began making it prevail for some Gentiles, but he still continues making it prevail for a lot of Jews for a lot longer. And to say 70 weeks are determined upon your people, well suppose you were to say, there is a period of 2 weeks in which students of Faith Seminary may get tickets at a special rate to the Philadelphia Symphony during 2 weeks. You say that's fine, let's go down and get the tickets, but then somebody comes along and he says, look here, I went down there a week after the end of the two weeks, and they gave me a ticket. You say, I wish I had known that. I would have gone. I just . Now it is too late and I didn't go

but you went down and got one. Well, I say but they said it was only ~~two~~ during two weeks that they said we could get them. So I asked them, why is it that you have it later. Well, they say, we said there were two weeks in which ~~we~~ students of Faith Seminary could get it, and that was true, but after the end of those two weeks, they are open not only to students of Faith Seminary but also the students of Eastern Baptist. Well, you would never say they are open to students of Faith Seminary for two weeks, if you meant they were open to students of Faith Seminary for four weeks, but for Eastern Baptist also the last (5 3/4). If you said for two weeks here, (5 3/4), and somebody else and there was no stopping during the time of (6). There was no stopping to the Jews at the time of the Jerusalem council. And when Paul went to Rome, at the very end of Acts, the first thing he did, was to go to the Jews and present the gospel. And many of them clave unto him and believe but there were others who didn't and he said now, I'm going to turn to the Gentiles. But he (6 1/2) did not say there were no Jews then because there were a sizable number, and my guess is that in the early church the change from the time when the majority of those who came in were Jews to the time when the majority who came in were Gentiles was a change that took place gradually over a long long period, and that there is no one point you can point to and say here is where the Jews ended and the Gentiles began. The Gentiles became more and eventually the time came when hardly any Jews were (7) but there have been some Jews who have been saved all through the ages, and there are some today. I would think that if you are going to say that he causes the covenant to prevail in the sense that he makes it efficacious, and that (7) which took a long time, then you must show how this (7) indicates the time when He makes the covenant prevail. When he does that. Well now, maybe that's (7). includes the resurrection today. The resurrection, the crucifixion, the resurrection, the week. 7 ~~was~~ day period. Maybe he did. Maybe he does that, maybe he makes the covenant prevail for this week and that's the seventieth week. Or if you can find a period of 7 (7 1/2) or an indeterminate period which is a period during which he establishes the covenant. He makes it to prevail though its efficacy continues long after, or if you can show a specific period which you can call a week which is the period

within which - the period for which . Now that it could be. You cannot do that with some other kind of problem. It might be that its efficacy lasts a week. But that could be possible. Now if it is the third sense that there is a period of a week during which Jews are received into the kingdom of Christ, then that week should not be given his baptism I would think of perhaps be at Pentacoste. I would incline to think it was at Pentacoste, but at least it would not stop then until the very end of the (8 1/2). It would go on as long as any Jews were being received into the kingdom. But those would be the three possibilities of making this refer to Christ as making a covenant prevail for one week. Because you've got the phrase one week in there and it has to in some way mean something you can call the 70th week. It doesn't seem to me that he deals with. He goes on - when do the events of the 70th week occur, and then he takes up the matter of a parenthesis or a gap and tries to show there is no such a thing as a parenthesis or a gap, but he is not dealing with the question just how does this come in ~~w~~ in relation to the Christ making the covenant prevail. How does that relate to a 70th week? Now of course he goes on with the next and in the midst of the 7th. And that is closely related to what I've just said. Yes? (Student).

Well, as we've noticed chapter 9, verse 26 says after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off. <sup>triumphal entry</sup>  
Well, I don't see how you are going to say that means the (10 1/2) after 62 weeks, or that means the baptism of Christ is after 62 weeks. How does anything, if this refers to the life of Christ, how does it refer to anything except His crucifixion. It could fit that perfectly. But how does it fit anything else? How does it fit baptism? How does it fit the triumphal entry. Well, if it be the crucifixion, after 62 weeks, Messiah shall be cut off - if that is the crucifixion, then verse 27 begins and he shall confirm the covenant with many - Young says the he must be Messiah because Messiah is the subject of the sentence before - shall Messiah be cut off but not for himself or have nothing, and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and the end thereof shall be with a flood unto the end of the war desolations are determined. I would incline to think that the he could be Messiah or could be the prince, because both of them are nouns used before. The prince is nearer this, Messiah is in a more important place in the

sentence, the subject. Either one would be possible here. If he is going to prove it has to be Messiah, it can never be prince, he would have to show by examination of many many statements that wherever you have a he following it always refers to the subject of the previous sentence and never to a word which is used in a prepositional clause. I would say that you would have a hard time proving . I would say that you cannot tell whether it is the prince or the Messiah simply by the form. You have to determine that by context. But now if the 62 weeks ends with the crucifixion when does the 70th week begin? It would seem to me that there are two possibilities. One is the possibility that it begins with the ~~crucifixion~~ ~~ereft~~ crucifixion. The 69th week ends then, surely the 70th week begins then. The other would be the possibility that there is a gap after this, and it begins much later. Well now of course Young devotes several pages to prove that there can not be a gap. But if there is not a gap, then it would seem to me that it must be at the crucifixion. I don't see how you can say it is at the triumphal entry, or how you can say that it is at the baptism. If there is no gap and the 69, after 69 weeks Messiah is cut off, then if there is no gap, the 70th week must begin, when he is cut off. That is, after the crucifixion. Yes? (Student). Then if it starts here - if this is where the 70th week stops as it must be, it fits the 70th week here. Then he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week would surely relate to that week which begins at the ~~ereft~~ crucifixion, and if it relates to the week that begins at the crucifixion, it seems that we have three senses it could be properly used. That he spends one week confirming the ~~ere~~ covenant, in which case you might say the week of the crucifixion and the resurrection - that is the week that makes the covenant strong and effective. It makes the covenant last forever. In that case it would be a week of 7 days at the most. <sup>u</sup>Certainly. It would be less, but certainly not more. He shall confirm it - he shall spend one week confirming the covenant with many. Then the actual relationship to the individual might be made ~~very~~ at various times. That the confirming of the covenant - the establishing of its strength was done by His crucifixion, and it would be the doing that which relates to the week.

Then as we've noticed there is the second sense that it might mean, he confirms the covenant for a week. The covenant is to last for a week. Well, if this is Christ's death which is the confirming of the covenant then what you mean by the 70th week must be all eternity. It certainly wouldn't be any brief limited period for which His covenant is confirmed. And so I'd hardly think that you have 69 weeks, and the 70th week would mean all eternity. Hardly. And then the third sense it might be would be he will confirm the covenant with many for one week. There will be one week after His crucifixion, during which it will be possible for individuals to be received into this covenant. If that is so I don't see how you can end it with the ~~eve~~ conversion of Cornelius, or with the (1) apostolic council. I don't even see how you could end it for the present day, but certainly not as either of those is. Yes, Mr. Delancy. (Student). The suggestion that Mr. Delancy made I might say impresses me as a better one, than any I've ever heard made for this section of the book, that is, the idea ~~e~~ that he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, means there is a period after the crucifixion in which many Jews will become believers in Christ, and this period is then a period of maybe 80 to 100 years, and in the midst of this period, Jerusalem is destroyed. That would be the meaning of this verse according to that. I've never heard that expressed before. I must say it is a better interpretation than any I have heard, by those who think that the confirming of the covenant with many is the (2) Messiah. Yes? (Student). The interpretation Mr. Delancy has suggested I haven't come across anywhere. It is a very interesting one, and I think it is ~~is~~ stronger for this view of the relation to the first coming, than any I have heard, but now let's look ahead and see how Young interprets this. Young interprets, he shall confirm the covenant with many for a week as the salvation which Christ has made (2 1/2) for many people. But then he continues, and in the midst of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation ~~e~~ to cease, and he says that the subject to this verb is the same as that of the preceding and it is not Antiochus who ~~defended~~ <sup>?</sup> the temple rites, he says, this refers, the subject is the Messiah who by His death causes ~~death~~ sacrifice and oblation to cease. Now if he causes sacrifice and oblation to cease refers to the death of Christ,

but I don't know how he caused them to cease by ~~intention~~ that, so I think that is very poor, but that is what is taken by the great bulk of those who hold these (3 1/4).

He says that after Christ's death, the sacrifice continues for a time, until the destruction of the city by Titus. However, ~~the~~ actual cessation was in reality but the outward manifestation of that which had already been put into effect by our Lord's death. He says that after the death of Christ, the sacrifices of the Jews could not longer be regarded as legitimate, and ~~if~~ of course if that is so, Paul was certainly very very wrong when he took a vow, and when he went into the temple etc, and in the Scofield Bible there is a heading, that occurs in the footnote, that here the author of Galatians (4) takes a Jewish vow. Paul made a ~~ve~~ terrible mistake at this point. Personally I feel that when the apostles (4 1/4) we can expect the Lord (4 1/2). Yes? (Student). Yes, a mistake but not a terrible mistake. But if the Jewish sacrifices were an abominations, any reality - I don't think that overscrupulous is doing something wrong. I think it is a mistake to be overscrupulous, yes. That is to say, if you are going - there are certain things which if you are overscrupulous about, you are just wasting too much time on it. It is better to save that time and energy to do other things. You take someone who says it is human pride, human vanity to wear buttons on your coat. Well, I don't think they are sinning, ~~indeed~~ cutting buttons off their clothes. I don't think they are doing anything wrong. I think they are being overscrupulous. I think they are making a mistake. I don't think that is required. But as between the persons who cut off all the buttons from their clothes, for fear of worldly vanity, and the person who makes worldly adornment an object, an end in life, I prefer the former. I would think the former is the better. I think there is a middle ground. But I do not think that the going to extreme on a point like this is wrong. I don't quite like the word overscrupulous. My personal opinion would be that as Paul said, the blood of bulls and goats can never save. It never could. In the time of Abraham, it couldn't in the time of David, it couldn't when Jesus was a boy. The blood of bulls and goats couldn't save. But the blood of bulls and goats ~~is~~ points forward to the Messiah who (6 1/2).  
through service  
And it is Christ's will that we point back ~~to~~ the communion instead of through the sacrifice.  
But sacrifices ~~is~~ could point back perfectly all right, and a Jewish believer, a pious Jew, who

didn't know anything about Christ, or who had not become convinced that this one of whom he heard a little, but hadn't heard much, was the Messiah, I don't see why he would come into the temple three weeks before the crucifixion, and that was wonderful, at least, for the great true legitimate sacrifices, and he would come in there a year later and it would be an abomination. It doesn't seem to me reasonable that if it ever represented the death of Christ, it would represent just as much 40 years after. Of course God brought it to an end. It was His will that afterward it would represent the same thing by a different thing. But that they then ceased to be a legitimate thing representing Christ, then became an abomination,

(7 1/2). I don't see any statement for that in this, and to say that Christ made them cease by His death. He didn't make them cease by His death. It ~~was~~ ceased 40 years later. And I don't think he ~~derives~~ derives them as significant about His death. I think it was just the exact opposite. He fulfilled it. He didn't destroy them. He fulfilled them. And if you want to say He fulfilled the sacrifices, that is all right, but to say he makes them to cease, it seems to me that that, Young and a good many others gives as a description of the death of Christ, and it doesn't seem to me to make sense, but more than that it seems to me it gets the chronology all terribly mixed up, because it is in the midst of the week that he causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and if that is a description of Christ's death, the 70th week which begins with the crucifixion then how does he do this in the middle of the week? Now of course Mr. Delancy says this doesn't refer to the crucifixion at all, but it refers to the destruction of Jerusalem 40 years later, to get around that difficulty. Yes/ (Student).

That there are 2 different periods of 62 weeks. (Student). That's one way of getting around the difficulty. Somebody says it is the end of the year. Somebody says at the end of the year we are going to have a picnic, and somebody says at the end of the year there is going to be a funeral we find the picnic and the funeral a month apart and so we say there are two different limits, (Student). But if you say there is a period of 70 weeks, and at the end of 69 weeks something happens, and something happens in the middle of the weeks, then you have the 69 ending at two different places, (Student.) Yes, but can't you prove that conclusively that they are the same? The passage says, 70 weeks are determined on your

people. Well now, I don't think he is going to talk about two different 70 weeks periods, now. 70 weeks will be one 70 weeks period. Now in this 70 weeks there is first a period of 7 weeks. And then there is a period of 62 weeks. And then there is a period of one week.

Well, now, in that context ~~there are~~ of that period of 62 weeks (11), it wouldn't be a thing in which you could say, in one period - well, I won't say that this would be impossible

Here is a 70 week period. Here is 7 weeks. Then there is a 62 weeks period which comes to here. Then we may say after the 62 weeks this will happen so we start it up to there, and so there is 7 before that. (Student). If you can do that you can do anything. Why bother with

70 weeks. Why not say, there is going to be a day when ~~w~~ this will happen, there is going to be a day when that will happen. What do the 70 weeks have to do with it. If your 62

is going to end at different times, we will say, we will divide this man's life into 3 ~~epochs~~ <sup>periods</sup>.

The first is his first ten years, the next is his next 40 years, and the next would be the last

10. And the 40 years run up to the time when he is president of the United States. And we'll

say at the end of the 40 years, he will run for the presidency. And ~~that~~ <sup>it doesn't</sup> makes the 40

years end with when he is nominated. It has two distinct periods. (Hard to hear.)

(Student). Yes, I would think there is a gap there. (Student). Well, I think that would be

very confusing to choose the same terms, I think at least you could say another (13)

to put something in to differentiate it. If I were to say, when the man came in to a room,

I noticed that his eyes were brown, after I talked with him awhile I noticed how blue his eyes were. You say, what's the matter? Did his eyes change. I say, oh no, I'm talking

about a different person now. Well now, I would think if you were going to talk about a different person you would say it. You say that there is a 70 weeks period divided into a

7 a 62 and a 1. You talk about the 62. Well, it would seem to me that it is reasonably

required that as long as you keep talking about a 62, it is the same 62 unless you indicate

in some words that it is another 62. (Student). When is that? That's in the 62 weeks isn't

it? Yes.



NOTHING ON THIS RECORD.

Daniel. 75. (0)

(Student). Yes. (Hard to hear. (Student). But in that being built again, it is in the 62 weeks. (Student). Yes, well that is to say, you could put a gap in the middle. That's perfectly all right. Here is a 7 weeks period. Then there is a 62 weeks. Then after the 62 weeks, there is a period of  $(1 \frac{1}{2})$ . There is a gap. Then there is the one week. That is perfectly all right. And then to say after the 62 weeks, you mean by that this instead of this. That would be terrifically  $(1 \frac{1}{2})$ . It would seem to me that the 62 weeks, used twice ~~quite~~ in the same two verses, must refer to the same period. I don't see how it could refer to both. If it would be both, it would be better to say, you've got a period of 7 plus 62 plus 62 plus 1, and that would be a hundred thirty something, instead of 70. (Student). But that's a different 62 than the previous. So it makes a hundred and twenty four. (Student). But he does add them together. He says 70 weeks. Daniel adds them together. Daniel says there is 70 weeks. (Student). That's right, but if it includes 2 distinct 62's, why does he say 70? Why doesn't he say 132? (Student). Well, how can you get two different 62 weeks periods out of 70? (Student). 459. And then he says 410. That's 49 years later. That's 7 weeks. Then he says the next period of 62 weeks runs until Christ's baptism. That is 62 weeks period. But then he says the  $(4 \frac{1}{2})$  was completed at 405. So he starts another period of 62 weeks there. (Student). Now what possible warrant would you have for making one 62 period go to there, and another one to there? Where is there anything in this verse to suggest that? (Student). I mean it is possible that a man could have an idea like that. But the question is would he ever express such an idea the way these two verses are expressed? I can not imagine. I can't see why anybody would say there are 70 weeks, these 70 weeks include 7 up to here, and 62 up to here, then after the 62 are 62 and by these 62 we don't mean those 62 but they start 5 years later, and then ~~\*~~ in the middle not a week that comes after these 62, but that which comes there, comes  $(6)$ . It fits the things in, but it fits them in in a way that is ~~not~~ doing a terrific lot of imagination, without any warrant. It is a very

interesting attempt to (6 1/4). (Student). I don't think it is absolutely impossible. After 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off. The 62 weeks come to an end, and there is a little break, and then he is cut off. That happens in the 70th week. The only thing is there I would certainly think that 27 he will confirm the covenant with many for one week, would require that to begin with, at the place where he previously spoke, the 62 has ended. (Student). Yes, but what does he say confirm the covenant means? (Student). And then he stops. (Student). Of course, the purpose of that is to make the midst of the week cause sacrifice and oblations to cease means Calvary and get that in the middle of the week. That's the purpose of it, but I don't see how that could mean Calvary anyway? And to say that that is in the middle of the week requires that after he says 62 weeks, shall Messiah be cut off, after 62 weeks have passed and still another half week has passed, and that is not impossible, but that it hardly seems the natural way - three distinct periods. Because it is not quite natural. Now these are the difficulties which we have seen with fitting this into the making the first coming of Christ be the focusing. They are the difficulties of it. Now to my mind, the first coming of Christ seems to me is in 26. This is the exclusive focus. They are the difficult ones. And to my mind all of these attempts to make - causing sacrifice and oblation to cease in the middle of the week refers to the death of Christ, that's pretty difficult to see. Now the suggestion that Mr. Delancy has made, - has thought of that would make the 70th week run for about 80 years, and have that refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, impresses me as definitely better than these, but I see a real difficulty with it, in the relation to the latter part of 26. That is, your chronology kind of goes forward and steps back in a way that is a little confusing. That is, after the three score and two ~~years~~ weeks, Messiah is cut off, but not for himself. That is the end of the 62nd. The beginning of the next, of the 70th. In the 70th the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and the end thereof will be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. That is a description of the latter part of the 70th week. Then we go back and mention the beginning of the 70th week, he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week through His atonement, and all through this period, during this, and then in

the midst of the week He shall cause this to cease and the rest of the verse being a parallel with ~~26~~<sup>27</sup> the latter part of 26. I don't think it is quite as difficult as Young has it, where he has this go on to the destruction of Jerusalem and then go back in 27 again, and go over it again more sufficiently. Yes? (Student). I would think that quite likely, but now let's glance, we haven't a lot of time left, let's glance at the possibilities of the third focus. According to this view we do not find the first focus in these particular chapters, or at least I don't know of any definite place we would find. But according to this view, verse 26 definitely refers to the second focus. That is, Antiochus Epiphanes we wouldn't see there. But verse 26 would refer to the crucifixion, and then that would be the end of the 269th week, Messiah is cut off, and then the rest of 26 would describe His end which do not occur in the 70 weeks at all, but would occur after the end of the 269th week, and therefore it would be quite logical to connect it right at this place. But then in 27, you would say he will confirm the covenant with many for one week, and you would not be going back to the end of the 69th weeks, but looking forward to the beginning of the 70th week, which comes at a time then with a gap between the two, and the end of the 69th week. And the events in the latter part of verse 26 is a different part than the first (13) in the first part is a gap, and in that case the ~~p~~ he is the prince that shall come. Of course, Young says that's impossible because you wouldn't call the Roman army an army of a prince that wasn't yet born, anymore he says than you could call the army beat the British in 1778, the army of Eisenhower, but of course it doesn't say the army, it says the people. It seems to me the people could be used in a wider sense. But he says that that couldn't be but that this, according to this interpretation, the he would be the prince that is to come. A coming prince who would be the antichrist. And whether he is a Roman, or whether he is a Jew in (14) something like that don't have to be vital at this point. It could be considered and decided from other evidence. As far as this evidence is concerned we would say this one is the one described as the little horn in chapter 7, and described as the antichrist in chapter 11. The he will confirm a covenant with many for one week. That would mean he will make a covenant which will run for a week. This was supposed to go on for a period which would be

Daniel. ~~76~~ 75. (14 1/4) 1955-56.

148.

for

D 148

designated as a week, and then in the midst of the period ~~in~~ which he had made a covenant, that connects up the week with the previous in 27, it makes it definite week for it, that in the midst of this week, he will break his covenant, causing sacrifices and oblations to cease, and then that you would have a time of upheaval and turmoil, thus not giving us here the end of a period, but telling more about his )14 3/4) and in the end we would have to gather from other places the (14 3/4) from chapter 7. And according to this view it moves straight along in sequence and has in 27, it describes events which are still future, while 26 describes the time of Christ. Now those would seem to be the three views which might be taken on this chapter and of course the next question that occurs is -

D. 76.

the question of what is meant by the seven, how long are they? And as to how long they are, most natural interpretation is, they are seven days. But it is pretty hard to fit that in with any interpretation of this section, that God says to Daniel, there is a period of 490 days just ahead, it could have been, but if so we would expect some explanation for it some where in the scripture. Or that he is looking forward to a certain period of 490 days, it would be hard to find it fit into these events of this specific period of 490 days. Some have tried to in connection with the Maccabees, but - in connection with either of the other two, that was not an interpretation. Now if these are not days, what are they? Well it would seem to me that there would be two possibilities again. One would be that they are years, 7 of years, which would be just as possible - and another would be that they are an indeterminate period. Now how are we going to prove which it is. It doesn't say here. How do we know? Is it a definite period? Or is it (1 1/2). Well, I know of no possibility of deciding. It doesn't tell us, except by seeing what it fits with. And if I knew of a case where these were 7 7's of years, 49 years which exactly fit, with the description and was followed by a period of 62 7's of years, which exactly fit, that would seem to me to be pretty good proof that they are 7's of years, and the 70th also could be a 7 of years. But I confess that as far as I'm concerned, the end of the 7 weeks and the beginning of the 62, is unknown. The thing that impresses me as

more likely than any other is that it is Cyrus, the messiah spoken of at the end of the 7 weeks, because he is definitely called the messiah in the book of Isaiah. The anointed one. The anointed one whom God sent to deliver the people from exile. And it so happens that we have a period of 49 years between the destruction of Jerusalem, and Cyrus' releasing the

(2 1/2). And so that could fit very well with the 49 weeks, but the difficulty with that is that the beginning of it, the going forth of the decree to restore Jerusalem, to say that is the destruction of Jerusalem seems rather far fetched. Now you may find something in the scripture which predicts ~~in~~ the decree of restoration which was given at just that time, like for instance when Jeremiah when Jerusalem was besieged, bought land in Anathoth which was in the hands of the enemies, that was a prediction that it could be restored. You might find something like that that you would take as the going forth of God's definite word that the city would be restored. You might. But it isn't the most natural interpretation about anything. But it is the only place that I know where the 49 did fit. Well then you put that 49 years is, that is, 49 years to a Messiah, that is the 49th year of the Messiah, well then, you put that 49 years in there, and I don't know where you get 62 from then on, from 538 B.C. 62 7's just doesn't fit. It doesn't take you anywhere. So I don't know of any precise interpretation which I find satisfactory. Now the attempt has been made to show that you take the 7 and the 62 together and have 69, that you can bring it from the time of the decision under Artaxerxes, the 20th year of Artaxerxes, right up to the triumphal entry. Well now, that probably runs too long. It runs into (4) and of course they try to get around that by saying they are not regular years, but prophetic years. Prophetic years have only 360 days, but I don't know of any evidence that is given, that an artificial period which is not a year, not the time that we have (4 1/2). I mean it is altogether natural to speak of a year as 360 days. It is a round number. It is very natural to do that. But to speak of the term of a year, to use 360 days to mean ~~2~~ 365 ~~is~~ is quite natural. But to say a year and mean 360 days, when there is absolutely nothing in nature of that length, and I know of no nation that has ever had a calendar which (5), it is not a lunar year, it is not a solar year,

it is not a year that has ever been used anywhere I've ever heard of. I don't see any warrant for using it. The only way I can think of anybody to get a warrant, is to say when we have terms of round numbers, they must mean precise numbers, and that must mean for the purposes of prophecy, God speaks of the earth as if it is only 360 days, instead of 365 1/4). And that doesn't sound logical. And - but I don't think that is so tremendously ~~is~~ vital because we are not sure enough of the chronology of the Persian period anyway, the absolute surety to be precise, so that - I would say that it is not impossible that our dates for Artaxerxes are actually wrong, that it might be that you have 483 years, to Christ's crucifixion to the time of Artaxerxes. But to get the day right up to the triumphal entry, that seems to me quite without any warrant, but what's the difficulty there to me, if you do that, if in 483 years, you have nothing for the end of the (6). And this doesn't say a 69 week period. It says a 7 weeks and a 62 weeks. And I can't imagine he would say 7 and 62 and not only that, you might say 7 and 62 to mean 69, I don't think you would. You would say 60 and 9, you wouldn't say 7 and 62. That is utterly unnatural. But even suppose you did that unnatural thing, then in the next verse, to not say after the 69 weeks, but after the 62 weeks, that seems to me to imply very very definitely that there is a ~~p=~~ vital point at the ~~end~~ end of the (6 1/2). And I don't . And so my personal feeling is that I incline to think that we will probably find when we have all the evidence, and (6 3/4) get the facts we will probably find that these were 7's of years, and that they fit here very well. But that with the evidences at present known to me, I don't see how we can prove that they are 7's of years, and I don't see any objection to their being a period to some extent indefinite, but in such a case, I certainly don't think the 7 weeks is longer than the 62 weeks, I think there is more or less a relationship and to say that the final 7 weeks - the final one week period is precisely a 7 weeks <sup>period</sup> period, it seems to me is the same then, an assumption of which we can not be sure. I would say - here is a millennium. For a thousand years they shall reign with Christ. My guess is that that is a precise thousand years. But it is only a guess. If it be 400 years, if it be 2000 years, it could still be used with this round number of a thousand years. It can express an indefinite period but it is

a long indefinite period, but not a small one. But a ~~sm~~ long period. I do not feel that we can be dogmatic as precisely a thousand years, but I think that it is rather likely and I would say that (8) and personally I don't like the idea of building up your ideas of eschatology with a question, is the rapture at the beginning of a 7 year period, is it at the middle of the 7 year period, is it at the end of a 7 year period. I like rather to take it, in scripture, when does the rapture ~~it~~ comes. What do we know about it? And it seems to me that it is very clear in scripture that there is no predicted event which can be recognized, which we can say must precede the rapture. It seems to me it is absolutely (8 1/2) that no man cannot say the rapture cannot come today. That no man can say that, and well, I would say the ~~repet~~ rapture must come in the beginning of the week, if people can tell when the week begins, but if the rapture comes in the middle of the week, I would say that nobody knows the week has begun, they may look back, and say yes, we've been in this week for awhile, but they can't tell it has begun, because the N.T. is so clear that the rapture comes at a time when nobody can say that it can come (9). ~~A~~ Of the day or hour of that, the apostles were told to (9) they could not. But to be sure - I ~~don~~ know these are not 70 weeks of days, but as to whether they are years or (9 1/4) my own opinion is (9 1/2). (Student). I think that would be a hundred years too early. I really think it would be 100 years too early. (Student). I incline to think now that that would be 100 years too early. ~~€~~ That's my impression. (Student). Well now, the decree of Artaxerxes, what dates do they give for that? 445. (Student). Yes, that's definite. I would say that if you find a satisfactory explanation, of the 7 weeks and the 72, which makes them to be weeks of years, then it would be extremely ~~e~~ likely, I would almost say certain that the final one is also (11 1/2) and if the fact that you cannot find a conclusive proof of a 49 week period, of a 7 weeks period, when the (12) would fit, ~~\*~~ makes me feel that I cannot be dogmatic that the last one, is a (12) but if we could find it I wouldn't feel that that was. (Student). It could very well be. (Student). And that could be. It could be that in some way the 49 years period was first up to Cyrus, and then that the next period ~~w~~ began when they began to rebuild the

temple. (Student). Now we have not gone in to that. There is a very interesting question. Here is 1535 days in verse 12, verse 11 there is 1290 days. Now what is the difference? What do they refer to? Are they refer to the days when the daily sacrifice would be taken away in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, or do they refer to something which is yet future. What is the difference between the 1290 days, and 1535? I don't know of any evidence on that. † (Student). It seems to be related, doesn't it. We'll have to stop. We only have 2 more hours on Daniel, and ~~we~~ maybe we could take one more minute, and see if you would have - what you would think is most valuable - we've covered to some extent the whole book. Now what would be the elements of it that you would think would be most valuable to spend the next two hours on?

If one is to take something new that you haven't gone into yet, (14 1/2) I've gone into the things that I thought were most important in the prophets, and spend some time on them rather than trying to cover every thing. Another would be to take something we've already covered and go more into detail in certain aspects.

#### NEXT CLASS.

77. (0)

This is our last meeting in the class on Daniel. And I asked you last time what you thought ~~a~~ was the most valuable to do today, and the majority of the class seemed to think to review and get solidly a good many of the things that we have covered this year would be most helpful, while there were some who thought it would be especially useful to look at Daniel 11 again, to get a little clearer idea on where the transition comes, in the chapter. So let's do that first. Let's not take too much time on it, because we ought to take a fair amount of time on review I think, and we can - if we get through that ~~we~~ review than we can come back to Daniel 11 or we can come back to some other question that you might be particularly interested in, but let's now look at Daniel 11 and get the main points in mind there. As you all remember, the last really chapter of the book, because there is no real way to subdivide it, includes 10 11 and 12. There might be an argument made for starting a new chapter in the middle of 12 somewhere. Chapter - perhaps at ~~the~~ verse 5. But certainly



the first four verses of Daniel 12, and all of Daniel 11 and Daniel 10 belong together, and of all places to make a division, one of the poorest is where we now have it between 10 and 11. If you want a minor division you can have it between the 1st and the 2nd verse there. But verse 1 certainly belongs with the previous chapter. It is ridiculous to have a chapter division here. Of course it is vital that we remember, that these chapter divisions were not put in until comparatively recently. They were not in the Bible originally. They are not part of the original Bible. The text is continuous, and chapter divisions were put in, and not particularly well put in, <sup>they are very good to find places</sup> (3 1/4). But they are very bad, if you think the chapter is necessarily a unit. Because very often the divisions are in the wrong places. But now we have this chapter 11, and it begins, I shew you a mystery. There will stand up yet three kings in Persia. We know this is in the time of the kings of Persia. And chapter 10 began, in the third year of Cyrus king of Persia, all this was revealed to Daniel. So we know that the chapter begins with the time of Cyrus king of Persia. And then we have an account of God's prediction of what is going to happen in the future, running through chapter 11, and into chapter 12, and in chapter 12 we read in verses 2 and 3, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And of course we know from New Testament teaching that there is a gap, between the first and second half of verse two there. Many of those that sleep in/ the dust of the earth shall awake. First all those who were saved through Christ will awaken to everlasting life. And a thousand years later, those who are lost will awaken to everlasting contempt, and in that interval in between, you have the wonderful millennial reign of Christ. They 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. I don't mean that that shining will cease at the end of the thousand years, but it starts certainly at the beginning of it. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end. Many are going to study it through and they are going to understand it better as time goes on. But there is much in it that won't be understood right away. So verse 3, verse 2 the last part - at the end of the millennium, verse 2 the first part is the beginning of the millennium, the end of this present age.

So we know that this vision runs on to the very end of this present age. Well then, the vision starts with the time of the - Cyrus, king of Persia. Does it continuously cover everything during this long period or are there big jumps. Well the vision, the actual vision starts with chapter 11:2. There will stand up yet three kings in Persia, and the fourth shall be higher than they all. And by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece. And there is much discussion of why they still ~~say~~ there were three kings of Persia. But you can take it that the three kings after Cyrus, and that brings you up to the fourth king, the one who made the great attempt to conquer Greece. And then between verse 3 and verse 4, you have a gap. There is no question of that because there were maybe 15 kings of Persia, instead of three, instead of four, if you have one in Cyrus, and three more and then the fourth, that's five. There were another six or seven anyway. But we have the king of Persia trying to conquer ~~king~~ Greece at the end of verse 2, and then a logical step to the king of Greece, who comes back and conquers Persia. And so we have a gap between verse 2 and verse 3. Now of course the critics try to say this is - verse 3 says Alexander the Great comes right after verse 2. There are yet three kings of Persia. When actually there were a dozen or 15 kings of Persia, so that just shows the ~~author~~ author of Daniel just didn't know. And of course that is ridiculous. There is no reason in the world to determine it that way. God is predicting. He traces it forward to the king who attacks Greece, and Cyrus was succeeded by his son, and then Darius became king after him, and then you get Xerxes, and then you get Artaxerxes, the fourth. And when Artaxerxes, against all against the realm of Greece, it doesn't say he is going to conquer Greece. He is going to stir up all against him. And Artaxerxes sent forth the orders telling all these great armies from the many different sections of his empire, and come together, so many of them, they couldn't understand one another language, and this was a tremendous heterogeneous mass, but far more numerous than anything the Greeks had gathered. The reader of the book of Daniel said look what is predicted. He is going to stir up all against the realm of Greece. He is going to have all these nations under his control. What is the outcome going to be? Well the next verse says, a mighty king

shall stand up, to rule with great dominion and do according to his will. Is that the one we've just been looking at who stirs up all against the realm of Greece. No, it sounds as if somebody else. Maybe it is a greek king, and they watch for him, and they find Artaxerxes, fails to conquer Greece, so they say well, that is not - he is not the great king. This sounds as if it is a Greek anyway. Well, kGreece is divided into a lot of little city states, fighting against one another, and Athens is powerful for awhile, and (8 1/2) destroys Athens. You say, my, what does this mean? On, and on and on. It goes. A couple of centuries pass. A big gap there. And then, a great Greek king arises, Alexander of Macedon, conquers all of Greece, conquers all of Asia Minor, conquers the Persian empire, he indeed rules with great dominion and does according to his will, but he is hardly 30 years of age, when he dies. When 11: 4 he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken. And shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven. It is divided into four parts, not to his posterity, his two children don't get any of it. They do for a brief time, with hardly any (9) to four different generals, not according to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled. All of these are much inferior to Alexander's power, his kingdom is plucked up, even for others, and those that would belong to. And then the Jews as they saw these events passing on, they noticed, they read Daniel, the king of the south is strong, they saw this happen, verse after verse, as it happened they saw exactly who these kings were. The king of the south, the king of the north. How they fought, what happened, they said all these things aren't particularly important, but there ~~s~~ they are pointing to something. They are pointing on. They are showing that God was speaking to Daniel, He is pointing us on to something vital. And so they went on pointing on and they got on here, until they got up to verse 20. There shall stand in his estate, a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom, but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle. And then they find exactly that's what happened after the great Antiochus III who was so powerful, but was defeated by the Romans, - then after that great warrior there followed a man who takes the kingdom that was just about bankrupt, and very carefully raised the funds, and raises taxes, and makes great economies, and gets the thing solidly established

and then he died, not in battle, not ~~in~~ assassination, he's gone. And his child is too young to do anything about it. He doesn't succeed him, and in his estate stands up a vile person, to whom they don't give the honour of the kingdom. They don't think Antiochus IV is the next one in line, but he comes in peaceably, and ~~changes the kin~~ obtains the ~~re~~ kingdom by flattery, and gets control of things. Well now, Jerome says between 20 and 21 there is a gap. Jerome says verse 20 is speaking about what is just before Antiochus Epiphanes and then all of a sudden in 21 you jump forward to the very end of this age, to the Antichrist. That's what Jerome says. And there are some who follow him. But (11) after seeing these different kings exactly fitting, all these that don't matter as far as we are concerned. They have been important figures historically, politically, but as far as religion is concerned, so far as the relations to the Jews, so far as the God's kingdom, and God's power and God's authority and the temple of Jerusalem, as far as that is concerned, they don't ~~believe~~ even enter in. What is the point of mentioning them except to lead up to the next one, ~~is~~ Antiochus Epiphanes (11 1/2) who tries to destroy the works of God and to do away with everything that is taught in the scripture and brought in this terrific period of persecution upon the Jews. What is the point of what precedes unless that is it? (Student). Now this, you just suggested I don't remember ever coming across. We have Antiochus III at some length in the verses before. Now Lange's commentary is quite helpful because he quotes from so many authorities. Montgomery of course quotes a good many too, but Montgomery is more apt to quote the critics than to quote some of the conservatives but not so many. Lange quotes a good many. Lange is a bit old now of course. Now, which verse were you speaking of Mr. Taylor? (Student). Verse 19. Now let's see if Lange has any statement about verse 19? In verse 13 to 14 he says, "description of the warlike beast of Antiochus the Greek," and verse 19, - verse 18, he shall turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many of them. Certainly 18 is Antiochus III. And then verse 19 he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land. Lange says that these words are probably ironical. Instead of advancing against the forces of a foreign land he (13 1/2) those only in his own realm. Perhaps in ~~the~~ the direction of placing

them in good condition for defense. I don't see how you can get Antiochus IV in there. Verse 20 describes the raiser of taxes, that's Seleucid, the successor of Antiochus III. I don't know where you could get Antiochus IV in. (Student). That's very interesting. I never heard that. I'm just wondering if we had a book that presented it I'd be very interested to see what it would say. I never heard anybody before suggest that (14 1/2) was anything but the immediate predecessor of Antiochus IV. This suggestion would be that all of Antiochus IV was just jammed into that one verse.

78. (0)

I'm just wondering who holds that view. Now I've brought in quite a few commentaries here, but I didn't bring the Annotated Bible by Gaebelain. I wish I had that/ I'd be interested to see what he has to say about that. I had all that I could carry. Now let's see if Young mentions any possibility like that. Young says, verse 19, - verse 18, doubtless this word reproach has reference to the high handed haughty dealings of Antiochus III with the Romans. Verse 19, these words are evidently to indicate the (1) of Antiochus' defeat. It is then indignimeous. Verse 20 in the place of Antiochus the Great appears another king Seleucus Pilopater who will cause an exactor, one who collects money, to pass through the land for the sake of the kingdom. This one is Heliodorus the prime minister who was sent to seize the money for the temple. Then he starts 21, Antiochus. I never heard that suggestion before. I don't quite know how you can say that. It seems to me very strange to take Antiochus III who was a great warrior but had no importance as far as Judaeism is concerned, and give him 5 verses, and then to jam Antiochus the Great into one verse, and it seems to me Seleucus is altogether passed over in that view, and then you get him in in the next verse. (Student). Oh, Jerome's view. Oh, you mean that that was Jerome's view. Oh, I never thought of that. Let's see now what he says. Yes, he gives the view of Jerome here. Here, Montgomery of the I.C.C. says, 10 to 19 the exploits of Antiochus III. Then - 18 and 19, the utter defeat of Antiochus by the Romans and his miserable end. He doesn't suggest anything else. He has a section further on, on the interpretation of - notes on the interpretation of chapter 11. And - well, as far as Jerome is concerned, Young translates

Jerome. Young translates what Jerome says on verse 21 following. And here is what Jerome says, I have Jerome right here. Young's quotation, Jerome says on verse 21, hitherto the order of history is followed and between Porphyry and myself there is no controversy. That is Jerome's words. Other things which follow at the end of the book, he interprets as applying to Antiochus, who was surnamed Epiphanes the brother of Seleucus, son of Antiochus the Great. We however think that all of these things are prophesied concerning Antichrist. I don't see any suggestion there that he found Antiochus IV earlier, at all. (Student). You could separate them from what precedes. (Student). Yes, they would seem to belong right together. And it would seem to jump from Antiochus III, to jump completely over Seleucus to Antiochus IV. No, I'd be much interested to find any books that present what you've mentioned. (Student). No, but I thought that you said, isn't the common view given? (Student). Well then, let's continue here then, I'd be interested in any evidence of anybody that holds that verse 20 speaks of someone other than Seleucus, but I don't know who it would be. I don't know how it could fit in, if it isn't Seleucus. And if 20 is Seleucus it leads up to 21 which is Antiochus. And you take 21 here, and Jerome says that he thinks that between 20 and 21 it jumps forward to Antichrist. He interprets everything from 21 to 45 as describing Antichrist. And that makes a tremendous gap before 21 and it leads right up to the important man and then just skips him. And to me that seems extremely unnatural. Now of course, Jerome does explain it in a way that does not seem to me at all satisfactory. Let me read what Jerome says about that. Jerome says, <sup>4</sup>we think though all these things are prophesied concerning Antichrist which will come at the last time, and since to this there might ~~be opposed~~ seem to be opposed the fact that the prophetic word leaves such things in the middle from Seleucus to the end of the world. It may be replied that in earlier history where it was speaking about the kings of Persia it put only four kings ~~only~~ after Cyrus the Persian, and passing over many intervening events, suddenly came to Alexander the Macedonian king. This is the custom of the sacred scripture not to relate everything, but to explain these things - those things which seem to ~~be~~ be most important. That is, Jerome recognizes the presence of gaps, very definitely there. He says this is the custom of

sacred scripture. But Jerome continues and since there are many things which we must later read and expound which do fit the personal Antiochus, he should be regarded as a type of the Antichrist, and those things which have partly applied to him as being completely fulfilled in Antichrist, and this is the custom of the sacred scripture. And then he goes on to give evidence which I don't think is very good. That it is the custom of scripture to do what sounds to me like a very very strange thing to do. That is, what he says happens is, Jerome here says, that you have a presentation of these various kings, of no importance to us, except of pointing to Antiochus and they get up to Seleucus, who we wouldn't care a bit about, except he is the man just before Antiochus, and therefore was important (6 1/2) and then here according to Jerome we just jump over here to Antichrist, and all of this is entirely descriptive of Antichrist, and everything it says here fits Antichrist. It is all a picture of Antichrist. But he says, Antiochus who is here, is a type of Antichrist, and therefore Psalms says this and this and a few things scattered through there, fits Antiochus. It seems to me a very very peculiar way to interpret. That to say here is Antichrist. What do we know about Antichrist? Oh, what we can interpret from predictions in the scripture and we have no evidence that he's not yet come. Only if we put scripture passages together do we learn anything about Antichrist. Well now, to say all of these verses are telling about Antichrist, and they are all about Antichrist, but scattered through this there is this and this and this, that fits Antiochus so Antiochus is here a type of Antichrist. I mean, it seems to me a very very illogical. If you were to say now from Antiochus and you were to describe Antiochus and then you were to say there is going to be one later who will be much like Antiochus - well you might say then, Antiochus is a type of the (8) that comes later. But this is a picture of Antichrist, but Antiochus is a type of Antichrist, so when people then see something fulfilled, they ~~suggest that~~ say yes, Antiochus is a truly a type of Antichrist, and then when they see something that doesn't fit, well, it doesn't fit Antiochus, so it is not Antiochus he is talking about. It wouldn't be much help to people as proof of fulfilled prophecy, as proof that Daniel was (8 1/2), as God spoke to him, it wouldn't have much reference to Daniel. It wouldn't have much value to encourage people in the days of Antiochus (8 1/2)

When they'd read a verse they'd say well this is true. Wonderful. The next verse wouldn't be fulfilled. They'd say, oh well, then that isn't supposed to be. The whole thing refers to Antichrist. It doesn't seem at all to me at all satisfactory approach. But Jerome takes this. I mean, it doesn't seem to me to mean anything. It seems just a very vague sort of thing. It seems to me that it is far better to take a verse and say, who is this verse talking about? Is it talking about Antiochus? Is it talking about Antichrist? Is it talking about somebody else? Well, verse 20, is talking about Seleucus. I don't see anyway to doubt that. And if verse 20 is talking about Seleucus, 21 should be Antiochus, the next person. There might be a gap. It might not talk about Antiochus. It might jump forward, it would seem very strange to do that, after you've given a series of points to point forward to that particular area. Like, suppose I wanted to indicate to you the letter <sup>p</sup>g is the letter I'm giving. I say Mr. Paul, and you say Mr. Baul or Mr. Paul. Well I say m n o p. Paul. I tell a man that on the telephone, when I can't think of a word that began with it quick enough, I've done that, a, b, c, d. And you know from the run which is the next one, but suppose I wanted to say, now this starts with t, I'm talking about Thomas, not Domas, Thomas, and - how do I show it, M n o <sup>t</sup>p - Thomas. Well, you say, p is after o. Oh yes, but t is a type of p. P looks like t, there are differences, but there are similarities. It is a type of p, m n o t, well, it wouldn't make any sense. The m stands for m, the n stands for n, the o stands for o, the m the n the o don't matter a bit. They are just for indications to get to the o and it is there to point to the next thing, and the next thing is p, and here Antiochus III is of no importance to us, and his predecessors aren't. They don't affect the history of God's dealings with the world, anymore than the recent prime ministers of France. I mean it is interesting from a historical viewpoint, but there is no reason for the Bible to deal with it. They are indications. They are pointers. m n o, and then the next one is p, not t. And here you have Antiochus, and Seleucus, which points to Antiochus IV. Well, why tell all this about Seleucus and then jump clear forward to Antichrist? It would seem senseless. And then you say though it might not seem to make



sense to me, but it might be true, yes. We any of us can make mistakes, and things may appear we see through a glass darkly, we get things confused, we misunderstand, and eventually when we've learned more we see how long we were before. That has happened to all of us, and we progress in our knowledge in life, which happens to all of us who study any subject. We grow, and then we drop off it the false ideas we've had in our (11 1/2) minds before. So let us say that we might discover that actually the gap is between Seleucas and Antichrist. It seems very illogical, but let's look at what it is talking about and does it picture the letter t or the letter p. Well the letter t is unknown as yet. We know of Antichrist as one prediction. We know little about him as yet. We know he is to come. We gather the things from the scriptures. But Antiochus we have history of and the history fits verse 21 exactly. That's the way Antiochus became king. Is there any evidence elsewhere in the scripture of the Antichrist that will come in? That he will be a vile person to whom they don't give the kingdom, honor the kingdom, but he'll come in peaceably, and gain the kingdom by flattery. Maybe antichrist will be like that. We have no scriptural evidence for it. We have no reason to know that that's the picture of the way Antichrist is going to be. But we do know that it exactly fits Antiochus. And what right do we have to say it also fits Antichrist, or is it any sense a picture of Antichrist? I personally think we can safely say, that verse 20 is clearly Seleucas, verse 18, 19, and (12 1/2) were clearly Antiochus III, and verse 21 is clearly Antiochus IV. I think we can ~~then~~ say that. And I'm sure that any commentary you look at, will tell you that verse 21 exactly fits Antiochus Epiphanes. This is a description of exactly what he did. And then in verse 22 it shows how he established his power. It fits ~~w~~ exactly with what we know of Antiochus Epiphanes, so that 23, 24, and 25, and 26. 26 shows him and his cousin down in Egypt They eat at one table, but their hearts are to do mischief, and ~~see~~ speak lies at one table. An exact description of events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Now is there going to be something like that in the time of Antichrist? Maybe. But when you have a description of something in the reign, something that happened then, and your history shows it exactly fits. People at that time could say, look what happened, it shows how the book of Daniel

is correct. It shows God spoke through Daniel. It is exactly fulfilled. Well then could say, yes, but it is going also to happen to Antichrist. Well, what proof do you have? Where in the scripture does it say that this would describe in connection with Antichrist? If this is fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes, what right do you have to say it is also going to be fulfilled, in Antichrist? And it exactly fits what we know of Antiochus Epiphanes. So then, you say there is Antiochus Epiphanes. It fits him. What right do you have to say it is talking about somebody else? In addition or, instead of? And you turn on to verse 29, at the time appointed, he shall return, and come toward the south, Here we have him making a second attack against Egypt. And then however, it will not be the way he wanted it. The ships of Chittim shall come against him. He shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant. Now the ships of Chittim come against him. He is grieved, and he returns. Remember, that was one of the events in Antiochus IV's reign, which is one of the most dramatic things in all history. One which would tremendously impress everybody who heard of it at the time. One that the Romans were so proud of they constantly told about it. How the great powerful Syrian rulers who had Egypt practically conquered. This Roman noble simply came and said, the Roman senate says you get out of here, and go back, and he did it. It was the sensible thing to do, because he knew what they'd done to his father. He knew how his father had fought them for years and then utterly annihilated by them, he had been brought up in Rome. He knew the Roman power, and when the Roman senator says you have to get out of Egypt, -

79. (0)

Then when Antiochus said, well I will have to think about that. He said, you can think of it ~~as~~ just as long as you stay in this circle here. Antiochus said, oh well, if that's the way you feel, all right. And he did the ~~w~~ise thing, and confessed to superior power in a situation like that. And somebody said, he who fights and runs away, lives to fight another day. And if you are faced with superior forces, it is ~~s~~usually wiser, to stop, and gather power for another attempt, and a man in Antiochus' position trying to fight the Romans, when you are faced with the Roman power, the sensible thing is to quit trying to fight them, and turn your

energy elsewhere. Paraguay might attack the United States, and threaten to destroy it.

Or say Paraguay attacks Brazil. Say they attack Bolivia, and then say the United States sends word down there, we are going to come and destroy Paraguay desist from attacking Bolivia.

Well, the Paraguayins might say, we'll we are going to be ~~marty~~ martyrs. We're going to die. <sup>about 50 yrs ago.</sup>  
As they did in the battle. What was it, they had over a million of them killed in a war. They stood up against 3 nations, each of them several times as large as they were, until they got them nearly all killed. They might do that, but they'd be very foolish to. And Antiochus is not a man to enjoy the glory of just facing superior power, in getting annihilated. And so when the ships of Chittim came against him, he was grieved and returned, and this would exactly fit - and people would read Daniel and they would say, look here. This is exactly fulfilled.

It is just exactly what was predicted. But then we read, he will have indignation against the holy covenant, and ~~we~~ he will have intelligence with them who forsake the holy covenant.

And we find that that is what happened, Antiochus Epiphanes, and he (2 1/2) against the Romans who ordered him back in two weeks to do anything against the Romans, though mighty powerful otherwise, and took it out on the ones he could take it out on, the way most bullies do. And they say, when you find a man who is a tyrant at home, and lords it over his wife, and family, his chances are that all day at the office, he is in misery and fear before his boss. He takes it out on his family. Well, that is what Antiochus did here. He came ~~here~~ home to the area, which his grandfather had had, and Seleucus had gathered the taxes of, and he came back there and he tried to be tyrannical, and he was, and then he found that the Jews were a unit against him. They didn't oppose him politically, but they wouldn't accede to his desire to unify his empire, and made them all have similar worship and similar culture etc, and so he proceeded to try to destroy the Jewish religion, and we find that he ~~polluted~~ polluted the sanctuary, and took away the daily sacrifice, and put up an idol in the temple. He did exactly what is described in verse 31. And those that did wickedly against the covenant he corrupted by flattery, exactly ~~in~~ verse 32 is fulfilled, and then the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits. There were a few people who refused to give in, and this ~~insuff~~ insignificant priest, Mattathias, his son refused to give in and they fled into the wilderness,

and they began making little petty attacks, on Antiochus' forces, and they were successful in a few skirmishes, and that gave other people courage and they gathered to them, and soon they had a larger force, and in attacking suddenly and unexpectedly the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits. That's what they did. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many. They shall fall by the sword, and by ~~fire~~ flame and by captivity, and by spoil, my days. Now when they fall they shall be helped of with a little help, but many shall cleave to them with flatteries, and some of them understanding, shall fall, to try them, and to purge them, and to make them white, even to the time of the end, because it is yet for a time appointed. Now everything here was fulfilled, exactly. Everything. It fits Antiochus. What reason is there to say it refers to anybody else. It exactly fits Antiochus. Now we've noticed that in the end of the chapter we have the resurrection, so chapter 12:2, 3, are not Antiochus or his time have not yet come to pass. Well, take chapter, ~~ver~~ 12, verse 1, and chapter 12:1 does not seem to - well, it is rather general. You can't say a lot about 12:1. It may be something terrible that hasn't yet come. It could conceivably be a description of Antiochus, of his persecution because ~~is~~ it is rather general. But the previous verse, verse 45, is that the death of Antiochus? He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. What does that mean about Antiochus? Take verses 40 to 45, at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him, and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, - ~~Pro~~ Porphyry who wrote his book to show that Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees, and there is nothing supernatural about it. It simply describes what actually happened. He says, this describes a third campaign. Another campaign against Egypt, by Antiochus. And a few scholars who followed Porphyry, in saying this is another campaign, after the one described back in verses 29 and 30. But if it is, another campaign, what happened to the Romans. They scared him. He got out of Egypt. Didn't he go back in spite of him. It doesn't seem likely. There is nothing in history that says anything about

this. There is absolutely no historical evidence or anything. The only evidence whatever is the statement of Porphyry in his commentary on Daniel. This must be another campaign against Egypt. He made another attack upon Egypt. But this doesn't say another attack upon Egypt. Verse 40, at the time of the end the king of the South pushes at him, and the king of the North comes against him. This is Egypt attacking Syria. If that's what the south and the north mean, as they did earlier. Not Syria attacking Egypt, and there is no historical evidence of Egypt making an attack upon Syria at this time, or with Syria responding with an attack like is described here, and then after such an attack, to enter into the glorious land and many countries overthrown, and then if there was no such an attack, then that this wouldn't happen after the attack. 42, he shall stretch forth his hand, also (8) also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. It doesn't fit Antiochus. Egypt did escape him. There was no further attack on Egypt by him. He shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. Such things never happened to Antiochus. He was hoping, he had all Egypt under his control, and then these Romans came and told him to get out, and they got out. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him. Antiochus was troubled with tidings all right, but they were tidings from the west, not from the east, and they are already described in verse 30. Why go back and describe them all over again? Verses 40 to 45 does not fit Antiochus Epiphanes. Verses 21 to 35 exactly fit Antiochus Epiphanes. Well, isn't it ~~reasonable~~ reasonable to say 21 to 35 is Antiochus Epiphanes, when there is indication leading up to it, exactly pointing to that time, telling about his immediate predecessors, and then when this describes exactly what he did. Is it not reasonable to say 21 to 35 is a wonderful prophecy given hundreds of years ahead of time of exactly what would happen, in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes, so that people would see how God had made these wonderful predictions. And why on earth should that be a prediction of Antichrist. What should it have to do with Antichrist? There is nothing said to suggest it is Antichrist. There is no statement here that there is going to be another like him, who will do all these things. There's nothing of the kind there. And it certainly

seems to me as reading into it to find anything about Antichrist, between 21 and 35, or anything about Antiochus, between 40 and 45. Well now, between 40 and 45 Montgomery points out that on these verses, we have differences of opinion, and he says the ~~views~~ <sup>views</sup> regarding these different verses 40 to 45, I think she gives a certain specific number of views on it. She says for the variety of the interpretation of this passage we may aptly quote <sup>Vernon ?</sup> (10) who says, with regard to these verses, there are as we have seen, three rival hypotheses, namely - one, that they relate to historical facts that took place after those already mentioned. That is, after the year 168 B.C. Now that can be held only by assuming that these things happened, but there's no nobody knows it. ~~The only~~ historical statement of it anywhere, and it seems extremely unlikely that it could have happened in view of what the Romans had already done. 2, that they give a general sketch of the course of events from 171 B.C. to the death of Antiochus. That they are a general sketch of what is already told, and that this doesn't fit it very well anyway. 3, that they describe not real facts, but merely the expectation of the author. That's what most of the critics hold. To these, he says, should be added, four, the view that has been maintained from Jerome, that the end of Antichrist is portrayed here. He says, the present writer agrees with the great majority of recent commentators, many of them of most conservative tendencies, who would find in the passage an accurate forecast of Antiochus' death, in regarding the passage as a prophecy of the king's catastrophic end. But it cannot with these conservative theologians, ~~because~~ be taken in any way as an exact prophecy of the actual event. It says this man died, and Antiochus died, so it is a prediction of Antiochus. But the way he died is altogether different from the way this man died. So it can't be taken as an exact prophecy. It is just true that both died. That's all. An exact prophecy of the actual events of his reign. The alledged following victorious year with Egypt including the conquest of (11 1/2) and Ethiopia in the face of the power of Rome, and the silence of secular history is absolutely imaginary. All attempts to place the scene of the king's ~~action~~ actual death as actually foretold in verse 45, are based on misunderstandings. He says it does not fit Antiochus at all. But it is true he died. This says that he died. Now he says, however, this inaccuracy of the prophetic forecast, is of extreme value for the critics. Our

books must have been composed well before the time of his death. You see, the fact that it says Antiochus will die a certain way and he didn't die that way, is of great value to the critics, because it proves that Daniel was written before he died, and proved that he didn't know how he was going to die, and he made one guess, and it came out in an entirely different way. Well, that is of great value to one who is convinced that it is purely a human book, and there is nothing supernatural about it. But if you believe that it is God's book, and it is true, then you can't say it is Antiochus, when it tells the things that didn't happen to Antiochus. He says, on the other hand, the essence of the prophecy was strangely justified, by Antiochus' miserable death. The essence is strangely justified, because after all, Antiochus had a humiliating death, and it describes his humiliating death. Of course, Antiochus died in Persia, and this says he died in Palestine, but then that's just details. (Student). That it is Antichrist. Porphyry says it is Antichrist. But (13 1/2) that it is imaginary. The first view is that it is additional historical events of which we have no evidence anywhere. The second is that it is a recapitulation of what precedes.

I wanted to bring out on the outline here, we have the description you might say, of the character of Antiochus IV from verse 21 on, his character and his generality, you might say, 21 to 24. Then we read about his deeds, from 25 to 35. It tells of the deeds of him. Then 36 tells again about the man. What kind of a man he is, he does according to his will, he shall exalt himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the god of gods. 37 neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, 38, but he honors the god of forces. 39, Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god. You want Antiochus himself, how he becomes king, 21 to 24, then you have Antiochus' deeds in history, 25-35. Then you have the king's character, described 36 to 39. Then you have the king's deeds 40 to 45. Well, now you can say, we'll describe a man, and then we'll tell of his deeds, then we'll tell more about the man, then we'll tell more about the deeds. But if it is two men, it is a rather natural place to make a change, after you tell about the man, tell about his deeds, then you tell about a different man, and about that man's deeds. And when the prophet tells again about the first man, it exactly fits

D168

Antiochus Epiphanes, and when it tells his history, it exactly fits the history of Antiochus - and then he goes on and tells about a man, and it doesn't fit Antiochus in the slightest bit, and then what he tells about his deeds doesn't fit Antiochus in the slightest bit, it seems most reasonable to say, the second place in the description is in a different place than in the first, and therefore the gap is there -

80. (0)

Now in this chapter 11 here then, we have the account of the king and how he became king, and it doesn't fit with - it does fit perfectly with Antiochus, there is no (1/2) that I know of, to say that he is talking about anybody else. Then we do have account of events of his reign, which just fits with his time. Then, if you kept on telling of events of his reign, but it still goes on with things that never happened, why, it could be to fit in with what the critics say, that the man wrote pretending it was prophecy, given hundreds of years before, but it was actually written at the time. He pretends that there is a prediction of things that everybody knew had already happened. And then when he goes on after that time, making guesses about the future, his guesses are just crazy. They didn't work out. But the interesting thing is that the difference, the distinction between the events that happened, and the events that didn't happen to Antiochus Epiphanes, is not made just between 2 verses, but between the verses that describe the events that happened to him, and the verses that describe the events that didn't happen to him. There is a series of five verses, four for five, which describe a man's character. And why of all of a sudden, after telling so much about his deeds, goes back to describing his character again for five verses, and then go on with some more of his deeds. But the deeds you go on with never happen. And the deeds before all happened exactly. And then you take the description of the character that comes right here, and it isn't Antiochus' character. It doesn't fit Antiochus. It is similar to Antiochus. He's the little horn. The Antichrist is a little horn. He is described in chapter 8, a great voice that blasphemes against God. Antichrist in verse 7, a great voice that blasphemes against God. But there is much difference between



the two. And look now at verse 36, The king shall do according to his will. All right, he shall exalt himself, alright. That's true of any of these dictators. But he will magnify himself above every god. Antiochus Epiphanes built temples to Jupiter all over the ancient world. How would that magnify himself above every god? He will speak marvelous things against the god of gods. Well that's all right if it means he will turn against the Lord. That's good enough, but certainly that he magnifies himself above every god, there is absolutely no evidence of that happening. Antiochus Epiphanes, Epiphanes means a manifest god. He claimed to be a god. Well, his ancestors did too. Most of the kings claimed to be god. But he made more of the claims than the rest, but that he magnified himself above the gods, there is absolutely no evidence anywhere. And neither shall he regard the god of his father. What does that mean? Absolutely no evidence whatever about any such thing about this time. Absolutely none whatever. Some say this is a picture of Antichrist, and that he is a Jew, and that he doesn't worship the god of his fathers. That may be. Antichrist is still future. And that may be a way in which it may be (3 1/2). But I know of no way it fits Antiochus, with trying to find a way, they say Apollo was the great god of the house of Seleucus, and they say Antiochus went and built a lot of temples for Jupiter, so he is disregarding Apollo. Well, we have no evidence of that. There's (4) - all we build that on is looking at some points and seeing how often Jupiter is on. He glorified Jupiter who all the Greeks regarded as the greatest of the gods. But that he ran down Apollo, any, who had been particularly venerated by his parents, there is no evidence of it whatever. He shall not regard the god of his fathers, nor the desire of women. What does that mean? Who won't regard the desire of women. Some try to say there was a very licentious cult, the cult of Adonis, a very licentious and very local and very wicked thing, and they said that might be called the desire of women, well, to say that is the desire of women, why should the desire of women mean that? What they say, is it maybe does. And then they say maybe Antiochus, being a man of great culture, and refinement didn't like this licentiousness, and was against it. There is no evidence that he was, but maybe he was. Maybe that is what this means, he shall not regard the desire of women. This is pure

conjecture, there is absolutely nothing whatever known about Antiochus that could fit.

(Student). No, I believe his father was Antiochus III. But, he shall not regard any god, a man who builds temples to Olympus all through the Greek world, how do you say he doesn't regard any god? There is no reason in the world to say that. And magnify himself above all. There is no evidence to that. He certainly magnified himself above men, but whether he did above the gods - But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces. Well, Jerome says this forces here must be a proper name. One of the gods <sup>(6)</sup> - nobody ever heard of any gods by that name. It said he won't magnify any god, and now it says he will honor the god of forces. What does it mean? Well, it is quite a reasonable thing to say that it means that this Antiochus, - this Antichrist is going to be something like Stalin, to worship ~~at~~ power. He doesn't believe in any god, but he worships power, the god of forces. Some people say money is my god. Power is my god. That fits with that kind of a view. There is nothing in Antiochus that could fit it whatever. It doesn't fit Antiochus. A god who his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones and ~~pleasa~~ pleasant things. Well, he said, he built all these things for Jupiter, and his fathers worshipped Apollo. Well, suppose he did. That's like saying, here is a Roman Catholic who is going to build a temple for one whom his fathers knew not. Because his fathers ~~wif~~ worshipped the puts up ? Virgin Mary, and he worshipped the temple of Christ. Why people may worship the Virgin Mary, but they all theoretically consider Christ tremendously important, and if one turns attention to Christ, instead of the Virgin Mary, that's not saying a god whom his fathers knew not. It is exactly that way here. There was never anybody who worshipped Apollo, who didn't know Jupiter. The two were tightly connected in the Greek mythology. So that - thus shall he do in the most strong holds, with a strange god. No evidence of Antiochus ever having anything to do with a strange god. And then 40 - 45, doesn't fit. So we have a passage where through 35 it fits Antiochus perfectly, 36 to 46 doesn't fit him at all. We have the kings' character, and his deeds, and it fits Antiochus. Then we have a king's character which doesn't fit Antiochus, and deeds which doesn't fit Antiochus, immediately followed by the resurrection. and the reasonable thing to say is the first is not Antichrist, and the second is.

The second is not Antiochus, and the first is. Now we have a different kind of problem altogether. If you had two verses that fit Antiochus and three verses that didn't. One verse that did, and another verse that didn't, and half a verse that did, and half a verse that didn't. Then you might have to work up some wierd theory like one is a type of the other, part ? and approximately this one, and part the other and that sort of thing, but you have nothing of the kind here. You have a long passage which exactly fits him, and a long passage that doesn't fit him at all. And surely it is reasonable to say there is a gap - a jump from describing Antiochus, the one little horn, and then go on to describe the other little horn, who is like him. One prefigures the other, one is a type of the other. Yes, but you are describing one, and then you are describing the other. Mr. Hayes. (Student). Yes, I take the God of forces means not a god at all. That it means materialistic power. And then it continues, a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver and precious things. It has to do with a strange god. Oh, I see, you mean this is (student). You mean the god of forces wouldn't be materialism, but it would represent like as if a Christian were to turn Buddhist or something like that. Of course it could be. (Student). Yes. It could be. If you take the god of forces by itself, it sounds as if this man is materialistic. Now of course the trouble is verse 27, says he won't consider any god. He won't regard any god, but he will, this doesn't say he will worship this strange god. Does it? It says he will honour him with gold and silver. He shall acknowledge and increase with glory. It could be that it is like Stalin who didn't - what was it? I've heard of some of these men, building temples for gods, they didn't believe in the least bit. To try to advance the idea of them. I've heard the claim made about Kaiser Wilhelm that he tried to convince the Arabs that he was the Moheemadan, he was (10) Moheemadan, and he built a mosque for them somewhere, to try to convince people differently that he was their protector. And I don't know if there is any truth to that or not. But some have done that sort of a thing. Of course, it is true of the French today. I think I've mentioned in this class before, that in France, they say to get ahead in politics in France, you have to be known as an Atheist. Anticlerical at least. but ~~moreover~~ they say if you get into French diplomacy, representing France

outside of France you have to be known as the great protector of the Roman Catholic Church. Because that is what France is, outside of France. And it is a political measure pure and simple. Now that could possibly be (10 1/2) verses, described on the part of the Antichrist, a political attitude, spending a lot of money in order to win adherence, from some religion that he didn't hold to. Unless you take in some such way as that, I wouldn't find so much difficulty between it, and the beginning of 38, as I would between it and the beginning of 37, where it says he won't regard any god, but will magnify himself above all. There is on the face of it a contradiction between two succeeding verses. But it is probably an attitude in one case in not believing in it, but the other an attitude of giving to help that which is contrary to his whole background, and which he doesn't really believe in himself. Yes? (Student). Well, I don't know if that is sort of reading into it, because the reason won't regard (11 1/2). He'll magnify himself above all gods. Now unless you mean he deifies himself and that is a new unknown thought before us, it is going on and seems to speak of another one, a god whom his fathers knew not, later on. I would question, I don't say it is impossible, but it doesn't impress me. (Student). Well, it could be. After all, it is regarding what Antichrist is going to do, and we won't know until he gets here. And then if we were then at the time, we'd see things happening in a certain way, and he'll begin to say, oh, just look at this, look at this, look at this, I never thought of that interpretation but when you see it is exactly that. There will be many predictions like that given. It is pretty hard to know exactly how they will be, but when the time (13). But the vital thing is we have a passage about Antiochus, and then we have a passage (13). And that there is a gap there seems to me just about (13). Well, we'd better not take anymore time on this now, if we are going to get any review in, and I - and there are two or three here probably that we could go in to a new point, at the end of chapter 12, or some other subject like that, and it would be very valuable right at this time. I think we could all get value in going into 6 or 8 hours on new points that we haven't touched on, but my aim in this course has not been to get answers to these minute or questionable points, but to see

15123

what is clear in the prophet. To see what we can stand on in the prophecies. And see what right methods are in handling the prophets. And I think that for most of the class, it would be doubtless most useful now to have a certain amount of recapitulation and to see how it all fits together. I want to remind you again of the big thing that the book is a unity as a whole, the book of Daniel. It is not a book simply given to satisfy curiosity. It is not a book simply given to clear up details about the future, but it is a book given to prepare God's people to face persecution. That is the purpose of the book. It is to prepare them to face persecution. (Student). I would say that there is not a single chapter in the whole Bible that what we have to say about things in it we don't understand. But I would say there is not a single chapter in the Bible, that there is a great deal in it that we do understand clearly, some more than others. But it is an infinite book, and not merely a part of it is -

81. (0)

not merely a part of it is infinite, but all of it is infinite, and therefore in all of it, there are understandings, there are meanings, there are points that we do not see, which we may find eventually, but we won't find them by taking simply one chapter, and just dealing with that, but when we study one chapter will throw light on another, and that will throw light on the third and that on another one, and as we go forward, we constantly learn more about every chapter of the Bible, and as we do, learn more about anyone, it gives us suggestions to others. (Student). Let's look at the seventy weeks in the resume, let's not start with it. I think the 70 weeks is not the right place to start. I went through in the order which I think is the order, the best order to get into the book. I think first, to get an idea of what the narrative portions mean. Now that is not the purpose of our class. We ran over it very hastily. But I would say that for a congregation there would be no point in bothering with the prophecies of Daniel hardly at all, except for one or two things, until they had learned the narrative parts, and gotten some of the great lessons in the narrative portions. You could spend a year on the narrative portions of Daniel. There are lessons in them which are tremendously valuable to all of us, but it is - to prepare us to meet persecution, in great times of difficulty, but in addition to that, it prepares us for lesser things, which all of them

D174

so it is valuable to all of us, all of Daniel is. Now of course the narrative portions in Daniel are especially valuable to everybody. Very valuable and very useful and very helpful. Then I would say after that, there was - the first purpose of the book is to prepare people for Antiochus Epiphanes persecution. And one great way of preparing is to show that it is predicted, so that when it comes people don't say, oh my, who ever dreamed there would ever be anything like this. (2 1/2). You say, how can there be a god of righteousness, a god who and permits this sin. loves his people ~~who are sinners~~. Well, he predicted it. It is prophesied. It is going to come. (2 1/2) God knew that it was going to come. It is part of His plan. Now that is a big element of comfort already, isn't it? You get that very clearly. Chapter 8 predicts Antiochus Epiphanes unquestionably and so does chapter 11, and there is a very great element of comfort in finding it predicted, and finding his defeat ~~de~~ predicted. That is one great purpose of the book, and people in Antiochus Epiphanes day, find chapter 2 and chapter 7 predicting an end of all unrighteousness, and that helped him too at the time of persecution like that, even though it doesn't predict that that is going to come right then. It helps them in their faith and in their trust, ~~in~~ and their confidence to go forward and serve the Lord. But then it doesn't stop with Antiochus Epiphanes. It goes on and it helps us in all ages, in chapter 2 and in chapter 7, it gives us a summary plan of God's dealings to us, and it shows the great forces ~~as~~ of wickedness which are to come, the Babylonians, the Medo-Persians, the Hellenistics, and the Romans; one after the other. It shows the order, that came to past, just as predicted. Two different descriptions under very different figures, but they fit. It works out that way. And then we get to the Romans, the furthest off it was predicted, we find that that one is one which comes to an end at the end of the age. And so there is either a very very long period of Roman supremacy or there is a gap in the account, and then a reestablishment of something which is related to the Romans in such a way that it can properly be continued as an extension of the same thing. So we have this elongation or this gap in the fourth kingdom, in chapter 7 and in chapter 2. Then in chapter 7 we have the coming of one in the clouds of heavens, who is brought near to the ancient of days, and given a kingdom. And that must be Christ given His millennial kingdom, or it doesn't fit anywhere. And then eventually He gives the kingdom back to the Father

that God may be all in all. I think that, the relation between the millennial kingdom there in chapter 7 is a very very important thing of the book. Then we have how does this (5) come to an end? Well, there are ten horns, and there comes up a little horn, which destroys three horns. And that is an interesting picture of Antichrist, very interesting, assumed that phase at the end of the age. In chapter 7, now whether in chapter 2, there are ten toes on the image, to fit with these 10 horns, (5 1/4) the ten horns teaches what is going to be. Chapter 2 doesn't give us detail of it, whether a little implicit detail like that fits with the history or not is not particularly important, because chapter 7 gives us the facts. Chapter 2 ~~hasn't~~ if it is 10 toes, it fits. Young says we are not told how many toes. Well, we are told in the other chapter that it has ten horns. And here if the toes ~~p~~ represent anything they correspond to the horns, maybe we don't have, don't represent anything - maybe we have the thing taught once instead of twice, but we have it clearly taught. And if the toes don't fit that they don't fit anything. Well, the attempt then to make the first (6) coming of Christ, be the vital thing in chapter 2 and chapter 7, seems to me to be an utter ? failure. I don't think that Daniel relates particularly as a whole to the ~~vision~~ first coming of Christ. I don't see it in chapter 2, I don't see anything that can be properly applied to it, except the stone made without hands, some say refers to the Virgin Birth. I would say that this is Christ coming, but it seems to me that it is the second coming, rather than the first. But inasmuch as Christ's second coming is an outworking of that which is one in principal, by His first coming, and He won the right to overthrow Satan, through His death on calvary's cross, and then He defeats Satan, His outworking of that which was won through His first coming, to that extent there may be allusion to the first coming, but that the first coming is specifically meant as Young holds, by the coming of the stone which smites the image, and causes ~~the~~ it to totter and fall, and break into a thousand pieces, doesn't seem to fit at all. Well then, chapter 2, chapter 7, are perhaps the first approach to the prophecies of Daniel. Next, I think, is chapter 11, where we have the clear picture of the events up to Antiochus Epiphanes, and then we just jump forward to Antichrist, and then we have this very interesting

picture of Antichrist followed by the resurrection, and then after that a few words about the resurrection, and then a few questions at the end, which it would be quite the study to know whether they relate to Antichrist, or whether they relate to Antiochus <sup>L</sup>Epiphanes, or whether they relate to something else. That is, I would say, that the main teachings of 12 are clear, but some of those details would take a lot of study, to look at different views on it, for one to be ready and dogmatic on it. Now the seventy weeks are more or less a unified self. And so it, I think that we need to study ~~everything~~ <sup>the other things as we did</sup> first ~~in detail~~, and then we went to the seventy weeks, and we find that the seventy weeks is a matter of great importance. This is brought out by the way the whole chapter leads up to it and leads towards it. And then the chapter reaches its climax, in the presentation in verses 24 to 27. And we look at this, and shall we say as Montgomery says, this is the dreary swamp of prophecy. Nobody knows what it means. It is just uncertain. Well, I would say not, but I would say like in any science there are things that we know about them, and things we don't know. And let's not be dogmatic about the things we don't know. But ~~w~~ neither let us fail to ~~be~~ observe what is clearly taught. Well, what is taught? We are ~~taught~~ <sup>taught</sup> here that the end is not yet in the time of Daniel. Seventy weeks are determined and in the course of these seventy weeks, these certain great things are to be done, described in verse 24. Some of these things are fairly clear. Some of them aren't quite clear what they mean, but they relate to sin. They relate to iniquity. They relate to righteousness. And that seems to connect us right up with the first coming. But then they maybe relate beyond that, that they relate not merely to winning the victory in principal over these things ~~is~~ perhaps, but in actual outworking ~~some~~ e of the

(9). And so these will relate to the first and the second coming ~~of~~ it would seem.

It would seem rather difficult to stop at the first, but impossible to relate them only with the second, without at least some relationship to them. Well then we find in verse 25, ~~is~~ that from the going forth of the command to Messiah the prince, is seven weeks. And the way the King James version says 7 weeks and 3 score and 2 weeks, I confess to me is nonsense. I cannot imagine a man saying 7 and 3 score and 2 if he means 69. It doesn't seem to me to make any sense. And now there are many who think it does, so I ~~w~~ don't want to be dogmatic.



D177

I certainly don't want to be dogmatic. I merely state that it is my opinion, that the way it is expressed must indicate three periods of time rather than 2. That and the fact that he said after the 62 weeks rather than after the 69. So it seems to me that we have clearly here three periods of time. Well now, these three periods of time we are not told much about the first. We are told very little about that, to Messiah the prince, does that necessarily mean to Christ? Well, is Christ usually called Messiah the prince, means Messiah. But Cyrus is also called Messiah. And Zerubbabel is called Messiah. Messiah is any one who is annointed. And here an annointed prince (10 1/2). I don't know. I wouldn't be dogmatic on that. But it does seem to me that this 7 weeks is a third. Now how long is this period. If it is Cyrus, then I would say, it is a period of 49 years, and that's pretty good evidence that the weeks are weeks of years. But if it is not Cyrus, then I don't know that we have proof that whether these 7, are 7's of years, or whether they are just general 7's. But my feeling would be that they are definitely not 7's of days. We can say that, pretty definitely. They are not days. It is either years, but it is an indefinite period. I would say that definitely. And if it is years, I think we might say it is astronomical years. People might not have known how long a year was. They might have just thought it was 380 days. They might have thought it was 354 days. Some might have thought it was 360 days, but if you talk about 25 years anybody in almost any part of the year would tell how long 25 years was, he wouldn't think of it was 23. He might not know how long a year was. He might say well, we have winter and summer and fall and winter again. It is getting cold like last year when we began our figuring, and that was just 360 days ago. But then the next year, when they would say, well, it is getting cold again, like when we began our figuring last year and the year before, he would probably say it is 380 since last year. So he would add these together and say, well, a year is about 368 days, and it wouldn't be many years before he would think of it as 365 1/4, would be the time to figure exactly. And if he never thought to figure exactly, a year would mean to him a succession of seasons. It would mean a period including winter, and ~~the~~ to say that 483 years actually means 479 years ~~and~~ or something like that, because it didn't count, the count was 360. It could be that, but it seems to me very artificial, and I don't think we have

D178

sufficient evidence to base it on. These might be general periods, but if they are years, I would think they are (13). Now that's my feeling on that, and I wouldn't want to be dogmatic, on it, but I feel fairly well convinced. But I do think we can be dogmatic that they are not weeks of days, they are either weeks of years, or they are indefinite periods. I think we can be dogmatic on that. And then we say that the command to go forth and restore and rebuild Jerusalem, but it is not rebuilt right away. Well, that certainly is what happened.

And we find that when Jerusalem is built, that (13 1/2) troubles times, and that is exactly what happened. Read Nehemiah and Esther, and see how they built it, in troublest times. They had troublest times. And then after the 62 weeks, Messiah is cut off, but not for himself. What does that mean? The critics try to make it be the high priest or nothing. I don't think (14). I think it is a prefigure of the sacrifice of Christ. I think we are told that after 69 weeks, Christ is going to suffer, for His people's sins. I think that is here. I think it points forward to that through which the great things of chapter 24, are to be accomplished. Transgressions finished, made an end of sin, reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, fill up the vision and ~~prophecy~~ prophecy and anoint the most holy in principal (14 1/2) at the death of Christ. And much of it happened in actuality at the death of Christ. Now I think we have this then -

82. (0)

happening to the death of Christ, everything here up to the middle of verse 26, but I don't think we find verse 24, fully worked out yet at the time of Christ. I think in principle we have it done, but not in any outworking. And then we read that after Messiah is cut off, the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. And what is the people of the prince that shall come? Does this mean a prince will come with his people and destroy the sanctuary. It could. But if so, it is a rather strange way to take it. Does it mean that He will come and destroy the sanctuary, then, and these people are in some way related to a prince who will come later, and whom we are going to speak later on. I wouldn't dogmatically say that is the case, but it appears to me the most likely. But in any way, the Roman people came,

and they destroyed the city and the sanctuary, 40 years after the death of Christ. It seems to me that is what we are told, in verse 26. It seems to me that we have a great deal in that definitely predicted. Back in the time of Daniel predicted after Messiah is cut off, this city will be destroyed. It seems to me that is a tremendous (1 1/2). And then verse 27, we will confirm the covenant with many for one week. Who is the he? Who will confirm it with many for one week? Well, they say this is Christ. That he must be Christ, and he confirms it with many for one week. I don't know what it can mean if it is Christ? But the nearest now to it, is the people of the prince that shall come. Why bring in the prince that shall come at all, unless you are going to tell something about him? ~~It~~ It seems to me very reasonable to say this is the prince to come. Something is going to happen. It (2) will be his confirming of the covenant with many for one week, and we've already got sixty-nine week, and we are told 70 weeks are established upon thy people. This may be the 70th week. It seems to me that by far the most reasonable interpretation of the 70th week, is that you have a gap between the 69th week, and the 70th week. And in the midst of the week you cause sacrifice and oblation to cease. Does that mean Christ dying on the cross - on the cross he fulfilled the meaning of all the sacrifices? He didn't make sacrifice and oblation to ~~a~~ cease by His death on the cross. He made them cease having any validity to save souls, but they never had any validity to save souls. They never had any meaning whatever, but to point to his death. The blood of bulls and goats can not take away sins. They ceased 40 years after his death. They did not cease at his death. It doesn't seem to me that this is a description of what Christ did, but a description of something (3) in the middle of the week. (Student). The word dispensation is a word that has many different meanings. ?

And I think that the basis of the meaning is this that there are different periods of God's dealings with His people. There are differences which date from the past. These differences well, I think it is true that God's provision to look forward to the death of Christ, with (3 1/2) sacrifices, and God's provision to look back to the death of Christ (3 1/2), and it would be expected that that change which took place at that time, but I would not be at all sure that it took place precisely. That is to say, the Christians (4) with having their

meals together . invested the meal with having specific meaning as that, <sup>so</sup> And they were attending the sacrifices which were described in His death, ~~through~~ it could describe His death (4). It was a change that took place, that it was God's will to be made. But to state specifically that it was a result of His death, (4 1/4). (Student). Yes, but they doubtless fastened the veil up again. It was rent. (Student). Yes, but was God's purpose in renting the veil to show - what was His purpose? (Student). Well, it might, but I mean, it doesn't say so. There are other things it might mean. Yes? (Student). I don't want to take much time, but let's just very briefly glance at that. Hebrews 10: - ~~w~~ that's where we read the blood of bulls and goats can't take away sin. Verse 20, having therefore brethren, boldness to enter into the holiness by the blood of Jesus in a new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil that is His flesh having a high priest over the house of God let us draw near with a true heart and full assurance (6). The veil is His flesh. It is consecrated. (Student). I'm very skeptical about their not having direct access. You read the Old Testament prayers. (Student). I' think you could get into a big discussion there. I'm not sure (6 1/2) sufficient on it. The fact is, that there is a way made for us into the holy of holies through Christ's death. That's a wonderful feeling. But that it means that it is at a particular time, we had access and before that we didn't have access, I rather question that. It would seem to me more to be a parallel showing the importance of His death which is that which makes the way , but I think that all ~~through~~ who ever believed in His death have found the way whether it is before or after it happened. But, this verse 27, it doesn't seem to me described what Christ did, at that time. I don't know how He confirmed the covenant with many for a week. I don't think that His death is properly described, that He causes sacrifices and oblations to cease, and if it is, I don't know how it (7 1/2) in the middle of the week. I don't see the relevance of the middle of the week there. It would seem to me that it is more reasonable to say that this is a picture of something Antichrist is going to do, and that between the 69th week and 70th week, there is a gap. Well now, if there is a gap between the 69th and 70th, maybe there is a gap between the 70 and the 62. I don't know. And if somebody can just show me how exactly there is a point which can be reasonably said to be the

time of the going out of the decree. There are many times which different scholars think it means, but if somebody can point to one time which seems rather reasonable to mean this, we don't have to insist it is the only time it can fit, but one that fits fairly well, and then you can show a 49 period from there to something that can be called Messiah the prince, like Cyrus, and from that you can show a 62 weeks exactly times 7, period, which points right to the death of Christ, I will say that is pretty strong evidence that these are weeks of years. And in such a case, it is extremely probable, that the weeks, the following week is a seventy year period. That the week which is yet to be, which is postponed but is to come after it again, that is a 7 year period. Now I will say further than that, that the fact that the period of 62 weeks are, if it is a general indefinite period, it is still the period before the coming of Christ, which certainly wouldn't be as long as two weeks, to one of the seven. It wouldn't be 14 year weeks, it wouldn't be that long. It might be 10 year weeks. It might be that. That is to say, it is not a tremendous lot longer than 7's of years. I would say that. And therefore if it is an indefinite period, it is not a great deal longer, than this in any case, and consequently even if you are not convinced they are definite 7 year weeks, you still would have no reason to say that the week that is postponed, is apt to be a long definite period. I would say that there is every reason to think that it is highly possible that it is a 7 week year. If we find it is a 10 year period or a 100 year period, I'm not ready dogmatically to say that it is going to be. My own feeling is that it is, I think extremely - or I ~~cannot~~ think I can say it is practically just about certain that between the 69th week and the 70th week there is a gap, & that the 70th week is still future, that the 70th week is the last period before the actual beginning of the Millennial Reign of Christ. I feel that we can be just about dogmatic on that. But as to how long that period is, I would say there is the strong probability that it is that, but as to whether it might be 5 years or it might be 10, or maybe even a hundred, I don't think we can dogmatically say it isn't, and that it just seems to me that it has given us a very interesting glimpse of the fact that it is to be such a period at the end of the age, and shows us a few interesting things about it, but the idea of talking about it, ~~and~~ as a definite set thing - is the rapture at the beginning of the week or the

middle of the week, or the end of the week, it just seems to me that that is putting a measure of dogmatism upon it, which we are not justified in ~~particular~~ particularly including with certainty that it is a 7 year period, but it is entirely probable that it is a 7 year period. This is the one thing in that connection I think we can be absolutely dogmatic about. I think that the Gospels make it absolutely plain and unquestionable that the rapture of Christ comes at a time when no body expects it, and not only that, but that there is no time from the time of the death of Christ on when all the Christians, or even the majority of the Christians can say definitely that it cannot come, unless it be while they were a little group in Jerusalem. But ~~w~~ once they were scattered anybody could say, well, (11 3/4) the rapture. Peter has to be crucified yet. Unless you were right with Peter how could you say he hasn't been crucified yet. You wouldn't know. And there wouldn't be one/tenth of (12) that any man, who would be near enough to where Peter was, in those days of telegram or telegraph (12) to be sure that Peter hadn't been crucified the day before. And He said so definitely, you shall be like people who wait for their master to come, and don't know when He is coming, and you are watching and waiting for his coming, and in Luke 12, Peter said, do you say this to us or to all. Christ said, I say it to all including you. Not in those words but that certainly is what it means. And to me, as ~~his~~ <sup>one</sup> saying ~~the~~ well, the rapture couldn't come tonight, because the <sup>week ?</sup> (12 1/2) hasn't started. To me that is definitely wrong. Now I don't say that the week couldn't start, and the rapture come later, but I say if the week starts before the rapture, I don't think that anybody on earth will be able to say the week has come, until it comes. Then after the rapture it conceivably could look at, oh now, the week has gone on. We've been in 10 years of it already. And here comes another 10 years, after the rapture, but I don't think anybody on earth could say that. I don't think anybody on earth will have the slightest (13) to say at any time that the Lord can't come today. Or at least that many (13). That I would say you can be dogmatic on. But I feel that the 70 weeks seems to tell us an awful lot. But I feel that like everything else, there is an awful lot that it doesn't tell. What about (13 1/2) Christ? He is God. He is man. How do you explain it? How do you understand it? You can't. a little bit of a summary. understand it at all. You can't. And that is true of almost any area of <sup>learning</sup> living, of

almost any field of study, of any field of science. 2 and 2 makes 4. But what does that mean, 2 and 2 makes 4. Well 2 men and 2 men make 4 men. ~~W~~ But 2 men and 2 cats don't make 4 of anything. Or they make 4 animals, but what is that? What does an animal do? What I mean is, these things ~~of course~~ all of them have a simple measure of truth in them, where they are easily grasped, and they have a big area to them which you can go on and study for the rest of your life, before you fully understand them. some we aren't able to.

Well that 's a very rapid resume. (Student). I would say that the first (End of course.)

The 9th chapter of Daniel is somewhat different from the others and therefore we have left it until the end. There are only a few verses of prophecy in this chapter, yet they are the == so emphasized as to be clearly the outstanding feature of the chapter. A great part of the chapter (particular verses ) us taken up with Daniel's prayer of confession and intercession for his people. He says that he made this prayer because he understood by Jeremiah's statement that the Lord would "accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem."

It would seem that Daniel understood that this meant == that the 70 years were about up, and therefore prayed his prayer of intercession and confession that God would againx bless His people. In answer to the prayer the Lord sent Gabriel. Daniel says he had already "seen in the vision at the beginning" to explain to him the Lord's will in the matter. The famous prophecy of the 70 weeks is contained in vs. 25-27. Seventy years have now passed regarding the desolations of Jerusalem. Daniel has prayed extensively to intercede for his people. The answer is "seventy weeks are determined upon thy people"(vs.24). In vs. 25-27 details about what is going to happen in these seventy weeks are laid out. This wee need to study in detail. First however it would be helpful == it is important to know what is the purpose of these seventy weeks. We find this in vs. 24. There are a number of statements of purpose in vs. 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city." Thus we see that the interest of this is very specifically connected with Daniel's people (whether this is understood of his people ,according to the flesh, the Israelites, of of His people according to the spirit, the true children of God regardless of physical ancestry). "And upon thy holy city". This would seem specifically to refer to the city of Jerusalem. These weeks are determined for certain specific purposes. We need to investigate these a bit: (1) to finish the transgression. At first that would sound as if the transgression was in progress and needed to be carried further. This of course is hardly conceivable that God desires that transgression be carried further, yet there is a parallel in Genesis where God said that the



Even if the first period was taken as 69 weeks instead of 62 weeks, it would obviously not reach from Cyrus to Christ. Sixty-nine sevens of years would be 483, far short of the 538 from Cyrus to Christ. The force of the preconceived assumption is so strong that a number of impossible expedients are taken in order to make the figures precisely fit.

Thus Anstey, Mauro, and Cooper blithely assume that the Persian period should be shortened about <sup>a</sup> half century, and even though this covers the greatest period of classical excellence in Greece and \_\_\_\_\_ seek to find an exact prediction \_\_\_\_\_ not with Cyrus command, but with an alleged later edict by Artaxerxes even though there is no evidence of any such edict by Artaxerxes. The first ch. of Nehemiah tells that he gave Nehemiah permission to go back to fix up the tombs of his ancestors. We have already noticed that Jerusalem had already been rebuilt \_\_\_\_\_ years before that time, and if this edict be taken as the starting point the number of years then reaches about a decade too far == about a decade after the time of Christ. a number of interpreters try to get around this second difficulty by alleging that the years involved are neither solar years ~~or~~ nor the kind of years == or lunar years or any kind of years of which we have evidence of having been used by any people in any nation, but instead an imaginary so-called prophetic year of 360 days. One recent evangelical writer finding the figure of 69 weeks of years from the second year of Artaxerxes would reach too late a date for the crucifixion of Christ and says we must begin from the eighth year of Artaxerxes when he gave a command

87

is that if the 70 weeks begin with a human command to rebuild Jerusalem, ~~it~~ *is* must refer to the edict of Cyrus in 538 B.C. Not only is this the only edict to rebuild Jerusalem of which we have historical evidence, it is so important that it is ~~quoted~~ *directly quoted* twice in the Bible, ~~(in Ezra in the first and sixth chapters of Ezra)~~ *in full*. It is quoted *verbatim* in the first chapter of Ezra, and ~~then in the sixth chapter it is again quoted~~ *it is and says that it was* reaffirmed by Darius ~~quite a few years later~~. It is also specifically predicted by Isaiah in Isa. ~~48~~ 44:28-45:1 that Cyrus is the one whom God has ~~been~~ anointed and appointed to rebuild Jerusalem. Isaiah says, "He is the one who will build my city." If the ~~word~~ *shows* the command to rebuild Jerusalem refers to a human command it must refer to Cyrus; otherwise ~~x~~ Isaiah would be a false prophet and his book should be deleted from the Bible.

Great confusion has been caused because the passage has so often been approached with unwarranted assumptions, particularly with the assumption that the prediction would show the exact space of time when Christ's first advent would occur. Those who adopt this assumption also assume that the weeks must be counted as years = weeks of years rather than general periods of time. Sir Robert Anderson wrote a book called The Coming Prince in which he declared that these 69 weeks would point right to Palm Sunday == to the exact date of Palm Sunday. I know of hardly any scholar today *While the NT is not my* field of specialization it is my impression that very few if any NT scholars to date would accept the date for Palm Sunday that == would accept the year for Palm Sunday and the exact *date* that Sir Robert Anderson insists upon. In order to reach that date he has to assume that these are not only weeks of years, that the years are not ordinary years-- solar years nor lunar years nor ordinary years but a type of year never found on sea or land which he calls prophetic years. Occasionally the OT refers to a number of months as so many multiples

it should not be a great task to show the correct view of the interpretation of the passage. We offer the following interpretation as one that accepts all clear statements == all unambiguous portions of the prophecy, that takes the words of others exactly as they stand, and freely admits there are parts of it which may point to either events with which we are not familiar, and where our theorizing may easily become wrong == we could be wrong, but that is no reason to twist them into something that they obviously do not mean.

Taking the passage then exactly as it stands and avoiding the false punctuation that is found in most translations made in the last four centuries we find that that the teaching of the passage may be as follows:

The word is not a human command but a divine prediction. We have already noted the prediction in Jer. 32 particularly in vv. 42-44 of that ch. The first v. of the ch. shows that this prediction was given in the last year before Jerusalem was destroyed. Nearly a score of years after Daniel had been taken prisoner to Babylon. God == When it looked as if it was the very end of Jerusalem's history, Jeremiah == the Lord ordered Jeremiah to declare that in this place business would again be transacted. This is a clear prediction of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Exactly 49 years after God gave this word, Cyrus gave his edict that the city could be rebuilt. Daniel could see that the first segment of the 70 weeks had been exactly fulfilled, and this would give him renewed confidence that the whole prophecy could be depended upon. He would have no idea when the second segment would commence. Nothing is said about the time when the 62 weeks begin, only about what happens after it ends. This gives us an approximate idea within a century of the time when Christ's first advent occurred. If we look at it we see that people of ~~today have~~ <sup>the day had</sup> no grounds for knowing exactly when it would come, but we can see that Daniel had predicted it with the approximate time. This gives us renewed confidence that the entire prediction will eventually be fulfilled.

of 30. This is a general method of reckoning ~~and~~ rather than an attempt to give precise statement. But it is this use of general figures Anderson assumes there is a prophetic year which consists of exactly 360 days, thus eliminating 5 days from each year and believing that he can cut off about 6 years from the length of the 69 weeks so as to make them come exactly to latest possible date for NT \_\_\_\_\_ could consider as the date of Christ's crucifixion. Such an approach is clearly an effort to twist the historical facts to fit a theory and must be rejected. If one is to use such methods it would be simpler to follow the theory of Anstey, Mauro, <sup>ideas</sup> and Cooper who simply say that all present knowledge of ancient chronology ~~is~~ prior to Alexander the Great are incorrect, and that the Persian period should == was actually 70 years shorter than is usually thought to be the case.

If one will cut off so many years from the period from Cyrus to Christ, he can make the figures exactly fit. However, the place where this would have to be done == cut off is the very == would be the period between the Persian attempt to conquer Greece and the time of Alexander the Great, the time of supreme Greek classical history and literature. Our knowledge of Persian history might conceivably be wrong for this period. Much new material has been discovered in recent years. Our knowledge of Greek history for the period is very full, and fits ~~w~~ with present ideas of Persian history. There is no basis for simply dropping out 70 years but doing so is less harmful to Biblical interpretation than to make the word commandment to rebuild

It is quite clear in the passage that the == that Christ's first advent is specifically referred to and described in the words "he shall be cut off" though having no guilt" and that Antichrist is predicted in == that the 70th <sup>Attempts to</sup> week refers to the time of Antichrist. It tends to take the terminology of the 70th week and relate it to the first advent of Christ results in nonsense.

verses 25-26, In the prophecy of the 70 weeks the three periods may be continuous or there may be three separate periods with unmentioned intervals between them. Sound method forbids us to decide hastily between these two possibilities.

We should look for clear evidence to see which best fits the Biblical statements and the facts of history.

*Another point where it is wrong to make a snap judgment concerns v. 25, where the beginning of the first segment of the 70 "weeks" is designated in the*

NIV by the words: "From the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild

Jerusalem." Here many translations render the Hebrew dabhar as "commandment,"

or "decree." This is really a paraphrase. The Hebrew means simply "a word."

*note in NIV*

It could refer to a command, but it could just as easily refer to a promise or a revelation. Among the various possibilities for the time to which it refers, one that is at least as possible as any other is the occasion when

God gave a promise through Jeremiah, in the year when Jerusalem was destroyed, that people would again own land and carry on business in this region (Jer. ...

32; note especially vv. 1, 6-15, 28-29, 42-44). ~~Since~~ Daniel had already re-

ferred to two of Jeremiah's predictions in this ~~very~~ chapter, he would cer-

tainly also be familiar with this one, which was issued in 587 B.C. It is in-

teresting to note that the time between the promise that God gave through

Jeremiah and the conquest by Cyrus, who would allow the people to return, was

exactly 49 years.

*Another point where it is all too easy to make a snap judgment concerns the words in v. 25 that the NIV renders as "the anointed one, the ruler" and the KJV renders as "Messiah the Prince". The NIV has a marginal reading "An anointed one."*

copy -  
 in v.25 ("commandment" in the KJV) is not the Hebrew word mišwā, which the KJV renders as "commandment" 173 times, but the common word dabar, "word," which is sometimes used for an authoritative word or command, but is far more often used for a message, a declaration, or a prophetic prediction. <sup>Amend</sup> It might easily indicate a divine prediction such as the one found in Jeremiah 32:42-44 that Jerusalem would again become a place where business would be carried on. Decision as to the exact meaning of dabar in Daniel 9<sup>125\*</sup> should be left open until the more definite points have been ascertained.

A second place of possible ambiguity relates to the use of the word translated "the Anointed One" in verses 25 and 26 ("Messiah" in the KJV). Although these are the only times the word "Messiah" occurs in the KJV Old Testament the Hebrew word that it represents occurs more than 40 times. It is usually rendered "an anointed one" or "my anointed."\*\* In about half of its occurrences it points to a king. Although the word generally refers to an Israelite, there is one instance in which God applies applies

\* In Dan.9 the NIV translates dabar as "decree" in only one of its five occurrences. In v.2 and v.12 it renders it as "word" and in v.23 it renders it once as "answer" and once as "message."

\*\* It should be remembered that capital letters do not occur in Hebrew. The difference between "the Anointed One" and "an anointed one" is often, as here, merely the interpretation of the translator.



*copy*

~~in v. 25 ("commandment" in the KJV) is not the Hebrew word miswa, which~~  
~~the KJV renders as "commandment" 173 times, but the common word dabar,~~  
 "word," which is sometimes used for an authoritative word or command,  
 but is far more often used for a message, a declaration, or a prophetic  
 prediction. Among the various possibilities for the time to which it  
 refers, one that is at least as possible as any other is the occasion  
 when God gave a promise through Jeremiah, in the year when Jerusalem  
 was destroyed, that people would again own land and carry on business  
 in this region (Jer. 32. Note especially vv. 1, 6-15, 28-29, 42-44).  
 Daniel had already referred to two of Jeremiah's predictions in this  
 chapter; he would certainly also be familiar with this one, which was  
 issued in 587 B.C. It is interesting to note that the time between

② to Jeremiah's word and Cyrus' conquest was exactly 49 years. *God's*  
*913a*

Another point where it is all too easy to make a snap judgment  
 concerns the words ~~in v. 25~~ that the NIV renders as "the Anointed One,  
 the ruler" and the KJV renders as "Messiah the Prince." The NIV  
 carries a marginal reading, "Or, an anointed one."

While the English word "Messiah" occurs in the King James Old  
 Testament in only these two cases (vv. 25, 26), the Hebrew word that it  
 represents occurs 39 times in the Old Testament, and in the other 37

*check figures*



9138

*should be noted*

~~A second fact that is clear in the light of Scripture and history is~~  
 that if the 70 weeks begin with a human command to rebuild Jerusalem, they must begin at the edict of Cyrus in 538 B.C. Not only is this the only edict to rebuilt Jerusalem of which we have historical evidence; it is so important that it is directly quoted twice in the Bible. It is quoted in Ezra 1, and Ezra 6 quotes it again and says that it was <sup>re</sup>-affirmed by Darius. It is also important to note that Isaiah 44:28-45:1 declares that Cyrus is the one whom God anointed and appointed to rebuild Jerusalem. If the phrase, "the command to rebuild Jerusalem" refers to a human command it must refer to the edict of Cyrus; otherwise Isaiah would be a false prophet and his book should be deleted from the Bible.

Obviously a period of seven weeks of years (49 years) could not reach from 538 B.C. to the time of Christ. Even a period of 69 weeks of years (483 years) is still at least 50 years too short. Consequently many interpreters imagine that the phrase must point to an alleged edict in the 20th year of Artaxerxes (445 B.C.) ~~But if this is taken as a starting point, 69 weeks (483 years) obviously goes beyond any conceivable date for the life of Christ.~~

*L to A on 9132*

*\* Even if this were done, 69 weeks (483 years) would  
 see discussion in Appendix note*

to Ezra: to offer sacrifices on his behalf in the temple in Jerusalem— an edict which is utterly different from "a command to build the city" and that fruthermore implies ~~that the city~~ the fact that the city had already been in existence for many years.

Probably one of the most reasonable attempts to interpret the prophecy is that of Keil repeated by Leupold. At the beginning of E. J. Young's commentary on Daniel he says of Keil's commentary, "This is, I believe, the best commentary on Daniel." Yet when Young discusses chapter 9 and he quotes the views of many scholars and makes no reference whatever to Keil's view, which == a view which comes nearer to take the actual facts of the passage into consideration == into fair consideration than most other views published thus far.

One reason== recent evangelical writer finding that a figure of 69 weeks of years from the time of Artaxerxes & so-called edict to build Jerusalem would come too late for the crucifixion of Christ, says we must begin the period from the eighth year of Artaxerxes when he gave a command to Ezra to offer sacrifices on at the Temple in Jerusalem on his behalf. This is about as far as one can get from Daniel's statement-- the word to return and rebuild Jerusalem It implies that the temple was already there, and indeed the city had been built nearly a century earlier and been standing during all this time, even though its walls were in disrepair. Such attempts to force history and Scripture into line with preconceived ideas should be rigerously cast aside, even if we find it uncomfortable to our past assumptions to do so.

*copied*

The second part was fulfilled through Cyrus' edict allowing the Jews to return and rebuild Jerusalem. Since the first group returned from exile in 538 B.C. this second part of the prediction would run for about 67 years.

Thus we see that Jeremiah's prophecy of the 70 years was not intended to be precise. It meant that about seven decades would pass before <sup>Babylon would</sup> ~~the~~

<sup>lose its power and the</sup> exiles could return. The prophecy was not intended to satisfy curiosity about the exact time, but to assure God's people that the long exile would eventually come to an end, and to enable them afterwards to look back and receive new confidence that full trust can be placed in God's promises. *[to Ac 1:20]*

*B* When Cyrus conquered Babylon, Daniel had been <sup>in exile</sup> ~~there~~ 67 years. Though he saw the sin and wickedness of his people and knew that further punishment might reasonably be expected he hoped that the glory of Jerusalem would soon be restored, and therefore ~~he~~ made a long and heartfelt prayer (vv.4-19) confessing the sin of his nation and beseeching God to turn away His wrath from Jerusalem.

In answer God sent the angel Gabriel to give Daniel a message. Although the ~~period of~~ 70 years was <sup>ending</sup> ~~about to~~ end, Daniel <sup>would</sup> ~~was to~~ be given information about a much longer period. *[to Con p 906]*

*C* *copied* Gabriel assured Daniel that he was personally highly esteemed, but said little that could be easily taken as hope for his people and his holy city. After the promise <sup>in v.24</sup> of removal of sin and bringing in of everlasting righteousness <sup>in v.24</sup>, the picture of the course of events in the <sup>next three verses</sup> ~~predicted 70 "sevens"~~ contains very few clear words of happiness or joy. War, desolation and trouble are foretold. ~~Difficulties will continue during the remainder of the 70 weeks.~~

If Daniel had ended his book with this ninth chapter it would indeed be a book of sorrow, but he did not do so. The twelfth chapter contains a promise of resurrection and has many words of blessing for those who are true to God.

The actual prophecy consists of the following verses:

Copied

A

Some Bible students have suggested that Jeremiah's predicted 70 years really referred to the time between 587 B.C. when Jerusalem was destroyed, and 515 B.C., when the rebuilding of the temple was completed. However, neither of Jeremiah's prophecies of the seventy years mentions <sup>either</sup> the destruction of Jerusalem or ~~of~~ the rebuilding of the temple. The prediction is specifically related to the remaining years of Babylonian supremacy, Et Bon 905

In the words that describe the first period there are two points where *snap judgments* have quite generally been made. The first of these relates to the word that is rendered decree in the NIV and commandment in the KJV. This word

~~916~~ copied

That the Hebrew accentuation is correct is clearly indicated by the fact that v.26 begins with the words, "And after the 62 weeks" instead of "after the 69 weeks." While all translators recognize that this verse begins with the words "after the 62 weeks," most interpreters treat it as if its real idea were represented by the paraphrase in The Living Bible which says, "after the 69 weeks." Thus a preconceived idea has led many interpreters really to take the passage as two periods--69 weeks and one week, when actually there are three periods: seven weeks precisely stated, 62 weeks precisely stated, and a remaining week implied.

A second fact that is clear in the light of Scripture and history is that if the 70 weeks begin with a human command to rebuild Jerusalem (instead of a divine prediction that the city will be rebuilt), they must begin at the edict of Cyrus in 538 B.C. Not only is this the only edict to rebuild Jerusalem of which we have historical evidence; it is so important that it is quoted twice in the Bible. It is directly quoted in Ezra 1; Ezra 6 quotes it again and says that it was reaffirmed by Darius. It is also important to note that Isaiah 44:28-45:1 declares that Cyrus is the one whom God anointed and appointed to rebuild Jerusalem. If the phrase, "the command to rebuild Jerusalem," refers to a human command it must refer to the edict of Cyrus; otherwise Isaiah would be a false prophet and his book should be deleted from the Bible.

2 1/2 - 1000 - 1000  
[unclear] suggest [unclear] 1000

906  
7

copy 7/26  
10

were already in process. As we shall see later, it ~~is~~ <sup>would not be</sup> ~~very~~ <sup>reasonable</sup> to ~~think of~~ <sup>think of</sup> ~~consider~~ the first segment of the 70 weeks as having already been completed, and completed to such an exact degree as to give Daniel renewed confidence in looking forward to its other segments.

Gabriel assured Daniel that he was personally ~~greatly beloved~~ <sup>highly esteemed</sup>, but said little that could be easily taken as hope for his people and his holy city. After the ~~statement of purpose~~ <sup>promise of removal of sin</sup> in v.24, the ~~prediction~~ <sup>(b)</sup> contains ~~very few~~ <sup>very few</sup> clear words of happiness or joy. War, desolations, and trouble are foretold. <sup>(7)</sup> <sup>(3)</sup> and bringing in of everlasting righteousness <sup>(5)</sup> picture of the course of events in the predicted 70 "weeks". <sup>(8)</sup> Difficulties ~~will~~ <sup>will</sup> continue during the remainder of the 70 weeks.

If Daniel had ended his book with this ninth chapter it would indeed be a book of sorrow, but he did not do so. The twelfth chapter contains a promise of resurrection and has many words of blessing for those who are true to God.

<sup>actual</sup> ~~in the situation in which the prediction was given in mind~~  
The prophecy consists of the following verses!

[To 906a

The second part was fulfilled <sup>through</sup> by Cyrus' edict allowing the Jews to return and rebuild Jerusalem. Since the first group returned from exile in 538(or 536) B.C. this second part of the prediction would run for ~~67 to 69~~ <sup>about 68</sup> years.

Thus we see that Jeremiah's prophecy of the 70 years was not intended to be precise. It meant that about seven decades would pass before the exiles could return. The prophecy was not intended to satisfy curiosity about the exact time, but to assure God's people that the long exile would eventually come to an end, and to enable them afterwards to look back and receive new confidence that full trust can be placed in God's promises.

When ~~Daniel~~ <sup>Cyrus conquered Babylon, Daniel had been there 66</sup> made this prayer he had been in Babylon ~~66~~ years. Though he saw the sin and wickedness of his people and knew that further punishment might reasonably be expected he hoped that the glory of Jerusalem would soon be restored, and therefore he made ~~this prayer~~ <sup>a</sup> long and ~~eloquent~~ <sup>heartfelt (vv. 4-19)</sup> prayer confessing the sin of his nation and beseeching God to turn away His wrath from Jerusalem.

In answer God sent the angel Gabriel to give Daniel ~~his answer~~ <sup>a message.</sup> Although the period of 70 years was about to end, Daniel was ~~not~~ <sup>to be</sup> given information about ~~another~~ <sup>a</sup> and much longer period.

There is no statement that the entire prophecy was necessarily future. Gabriel did not say: "The 70 years are over; now 70 sevens are about to begin." He merely said: "Seventy 'sevens' are decreed for your people and your holy city." He did not say whether the 70 ~~weens~~ were then entirely future, or

Footnote for insertion on page 24

An additional difficulty with ~~Keil's~~ Keil's ~~view~~'s view is that Jerusalem was actually rebuilt and stood in a rebuilt condition, ~~though~~ though in troublous times, during the period from cyrus to Christ, ~~not during the period from~~ <sup>twenty</sup> rather than during the 20 centuries that have passed since Calvary. [Check Leupold]

If it be suggested that the rebuilt city here represents the church and the time between the first coming of Christ and the rise of Antichrist, <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ described here under the figure, it is to be pointed ~~out~~ out that the fact that the city is not merely being built then but being rebuilt or built again is stressed in the ~~passage~~ passage, and this would fit the rebuilt city of Jerusalem and the second temple better than it would fit the rise of the Christian church (nc) end of period



- 24 KJV Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end  
NASB Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end  
RSV Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression. to put an end  
NIV Seventy sevens are decreed for your people and your holy city to finish transgression, to put an end to  
Anchor Seventy weeks are **dedreed** for your people and your holy city, until crime is stopped, sins brought to full measure

KJV of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to  
NASB of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness,  
RSV to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness,  
NIV sin, to atone for wickedness, to bring in everlasting righteousness,  
Anchor guilt expiated, everlasting justice introduced,

KJV seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.  
NASB to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy place.  
RSV to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.  
NIV to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy.  
Anchor the prophetic vision confirmed, and the Holy of Holines anointed.

- 25 KJV Know therefore and understand, that ~~from~~ the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto  
NASB So you are to know and discern that from the issuing of a **dedree** to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until  
RSV Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming  
NIV Know and understand this: From the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the Anointed One,  
Anchor Know, then, and understand this: from the utterance of the word regarding the rebuilding of Jerusalem to the coming

KJV the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks:  
NASB Messiah the Prince there will be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks: ~~###~~  
RSV of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks  
NIV the ruler, comes, there will be seven 'sevens', and sixty-two 'sevens.'  
Anchor of an anointed leader there will be seven weeks. Then during sixty-two weeks

KJV the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.  
NASB it will be built again, with plaza and moat, even in times of distress.  
RSV ~~of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks~~ it shall be built aginwith squares & moat, but in a troubled time.  
NIV It will be rebuilt with streets and a trench, but in times of trouble.  
Anchor it will be rebuilt, with its streets and moat, but in a time of distress.