

reign of Cyrus the Persian," I am not sure that would fit very well. That just deals with Daniel. Studetn/.....AAM: Yes, it certainly contains no suggestion of a destruction of the Median empire by the Persians. Very definitely it contains no suggestion of that. So we have positive evidence that the author of the book thought of a Medo-Persian law code, a Medo-Persian culture, a Medo-Persian empire in which the Medes were in supremacy first and later the Persians were in supremacy, but it is one empire. We have evidence of that. Now I don't think 6:28 proves anything one way or the other. But it is true that if he was a man greatly esteemed in the one, it certainly contains not the slightest hint of a violent turnover, because if there was, he could still be seen in the other, but it would be not the normal thing. Question.....AAM: Well, we are now trying at the moment not to decide what actually happened, but what did the author of the book of Daniel think happened? That's what we are interested in. Studetn.....AAM: No, no, he ~~doesn't~~ doesn't do that. The 11th chapter is not parallel there. The 11th chapter is a continuation of the 10th. "Also I in the 1st year of Darius the Mede," ~~way~~ way back then I stood by him. You see, that is referring back to an event in the history. It is not a date like ch.10. If that was date, what you think would be absolutely true, but that's not a date. 10 is an erroneous chapter division at that point, but if it were a date, what you say would be absolutely true. Well, now, maybe we ought to stop for 10 minuets.

Well, we were noticing then that the basic argument from the liberal view point for having a separate Medo-Persian empire is that it is necessary in order to fit with their general understanding of the book, that A.E. is the subject of the book. Now we are not presupposing what is the subject of the book. We are saying A.E. is the subject of ch.11, the subject of ch. 8. He is in the background of the whole book. But we are saying, perhaps God has some other subject in mind too. And so we are not taking a presupposition at all, as we approach it, and that argument then is not to us an important argument, and to them it cannot be ~~axiomatic~~ axiomatic decisive argument, anyway, it can predispose them to be very anxious to prove that, but ~~that~~ they have got to find objective evidence.