

I'm going to begin our course with what I'm going to call Roman Numeral I General Introduction to the Course

A. The Importance of the Book of Daniel

1. The Book in General. The Book of Daniel is perhaps one of the best known of the OT books. I guess only Genesis is better known than the book of Daniel. It is a book which contains many examples of heroism and fidelity. It is one which is often studied in S.S. Lessons. ^{2 and} Christian ~~people~~

³ ~~As well as~~ ³ Jews have been stirred and thrilled with the stories of how Daniel and his 3 companions stood true to the Lord and how they were protected by him in very difficult times. So it is a book which people everywhere are greatly interested in for its many interesting stories and incidents. We are not in this class going to study these incidents in the Book of Daniel. We will only examine them very incidentally because that is not our purpose. We are interested in this course in the prophecies of the Book of Daniel. †As I understand it we are supposed to start on the hour and run until 5 of. I would appreciate it if you could all be in your seats on the hour. In Germany it is understood that classes start at 15 after, and nobody expects anybody to be there any earlier than that, but my understanding is that we start on the hour, so if you would please be in your seats I would appreciate it.†

This book then is one which it is very useful for the Christian minister to be informed about both for illustrations that he can use for references that people are familiar with. It is a very important book in general, but the part of the book that we are going to deal with is far less known. About 1/5 of the part we are going to look at is often referred to, and the other 4/5 is very largely neglected in the Christian world. Now the importance of what we are interested in is perhaps well brought out with what I shall call point number 2 under A.

2. The ^Son of Man. Now the term the Son of Man is a term which

occurs 93 times in the book of Ezekiel, and only twice in the book of Daniel, and one of these occurrences in the book of Daniel is exactly identical with the occurrences in the book of Ezekiel ^{that is in the bk. of Ezek.} it is regularly used as a ref. to Ezek. ^{the God} He says, Son of Man stand on your feet, I'm going to tell you something; Son of Man do this, Son of Man do that." It is quite obvious in the bk. of Ezek. that this phrase "Son of Man" is a regular Hebrew usage using the word Son of to indicate an individual of a group. "Son of Mankind" -- an individual man. We read in Gen. that Abraham ran to the flock and got a son of the herds which he killed and prepared for the angelic visitors in Gen. 18. That is certainly the usage in the 93 cases in the bk. of Ezek. of the term Son of Man. And it is the usage in one case in the bk. of Daniel where the Lord says, Son of Man I will explain this to you" now, or something like that, I forget the exact phraseology.

Thus we have these 94 cases including one in the bk. of Daniel where the phrase Son of Man is used in a way ^{exactly} exactly identical with the usage of this word Son in other contexts like Son of a flock that I just referred to. There is one case in Daniel that is quite distinctive, and the interesting thing is that this one case of the use of this phrase in the bk. of Daniel is a case which became so well known to the Jewish people that in the time of the NT when this word is not used this way in the Greek, the phrase Son of Man when used by Christ was immediately understood by the High Priest as being used in this way in which it is used one time in the bk. of Dan. as opposed to 93 cases in the bk. of Ezekiel.

Jesus said: Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven and the High Priest immediately rent his clothes and said. What need have we of further testimony after this blasphemy." Now with the whole OT before them the fact that Jesus would refer to one vs. in the bk. of Daniel in this way, and that the High Priest would immediately recognize

3 Daniel 2/4/74

it, shows us how great a position in people's minds and imagination this particular phrase in the bk. of Daniel has. Not only was it known thus to the Jews at the time of Jesus, Jesus Himself uses the phrase Son of Man referring to Himself 31 times in the book of Mat.; 14 times in the bk. of Mk.; 26 times in the bk. of Lk., and even in the bk. of John 11 times. All these many times Jesus calls Himself the Son of Man, There is a statement about this by Dean Alford in his very excellent commentary on John 5:26 where you have a ref. to the Son of God who gives life and to the Son of Man judging, he says: "We have here again *ζωοποιεῖν* and *κρίνειν* bound together as the two great departments of the Son's working; - the former, as substantiating the *ἐγώ εἰμι* just uttered; the latter, as leading on to the great announcement of the next verse. But the two departments spring from two distinct sources, united in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God. The Father hath given Him to have life in Himself, as He is the Son of God. We have none of us life in ourselves; in Him we live and move and have our being. But He, as the Father is, is the source of Life. Then again the Father hath given Him power to pass judgment, because He is the Son of Man; man is to be judged by Man, - by that Man whom God hath appointed, who is the inclusive Head of Humanity, and to whom mankind, and man's world, pertain by right of covenant-purchase. This *κρίνειν* *παιεῖν* leads the thought to the great occasion when judgment shall be executed; which accordingly is treated of in the next verse." Thus the phrases Son of God and Son of Man are tied together in this note by Dean Alford in John 5:26-27 and we see how our Lord Jesus Christ used the phrase so regularly, but it is all based back upon this one use in the bk. of Daniel, and is utterly contrary to its interpretation in the 93 cases in the bk. of Ezek. I think that is very good evidence of the great importance of the bk. of Daniel in the ideas and understanding of the Jews, in Jesus' own presentation of His great power, and of His purpose

3 Daniel 2/4/74

it, shows us how great a position in people's minds and imagination this particular phrase in the bk. of Daniel has. Not only was it known thus to the Jews at the time of Jesus, Jesus Himself uses the phrase Son of Man referring to Himself 31 times in the book of Mat.; 14 times in the bk. of Mk.; 26 times in the bk. of Lk., and even in the bk. of John 11 times. All these many times Jesus calls Himself the Son of Man, There is a statement about this by Dean Alford in his very excellent commentary on John 5:26 where you have a ref. to the Son of God who gives life and to the Son of Man judging, he says: "We have here again *ζωοποιεῖν* and *κρίνειν* bound together as the two great departments of the Son's working; - the former, as substantiating the *ἐγώ εἰμι* just uttered; the latter, as leading on to the great announcement of the next verse. But the two departments spring from two distinct sources, united in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God. The Father hath given Him to have life in Himself, as He is the Son of God. We have none of us life in ourselves; in Him we live and move and have our being. But He, as the Father is, is the source of Life. Then again the Father hath given Him power to pass judgment, because He is the Son of Man; man is to be judged by Man, - by that Man whom God hath appointed, who is the inclusive Head of Humanity, and to whom mankind, and man's world, pertain by right of covenant-purchase. This *κρίνειν* *ποιεῖν* leads the thought to the great occasion when judgment shall be executed; which accordingly is treated of in the next verse." Thus the phrases Son of God and Son of Man are tied together in this note by Dean Alford in John 5:26-27 and we see how our Lord Jesus Christ used the phrase so regularly, but it is all based back upon this one use in the bk. of Daniel, and is utterly contrary to its interpretation in the 93 cases in the bk. of Ezek. I think that is very good evidence of the great importance of the bk. of Daniel in the ideas and understanding of the Jews, in Jesus' own presentation of His great power, and of His purpose

4 Daniel 2/4/74

and the particular verse where it occurs has a rather pivotal place in the bk. of Dan. We will go into that more fully later; we are only mentioning it now as showing ~~ixt~~ the general importance of the prophecies of Daniel.

Now we have mentioned two reasons for the importance of the bk. of Dan~~el~~, the book in general, and this particular phrase the Son of Man as used in the NT so very many many times and resting back on one usage which is in the book of Dan~~iel~~ as opposed to the very different sense in which it is used in 93 cases in Exekiel and even one case in Daniel.

Then No. 3 The Prophecies of the Book of Dan~~el~~ are of importance because they give us a general view of history. Now we have in NT various places a very very ^{serly} kal~~is~~scopic view of history like Mat. 24 where the Lord said that there shall be earthquakes and pestilences and wars. Nations rising against nations and so on. We have these general statements about future history that is to come during the long period before His return but they don't give you any specific idea of history. The only place I think of in the Scripture aside from these statements where we have a specific indication of po~~l~~itical, historical events over a long period in the future is in the bk. of Daniel. In fact the chapter of Daniel --chapter 11 = has a long specific account of the dealings of various kings and events in Hellenistic history that is so detailed that all liberal~~x~~ scholars say it is a later writing giving history as it was known to them; and even one or two rather conservative writers say we do not find prophecies in such detail, and so this must be a later interpolation. Now that is not our purpose in this course to investigate the critics of Daniel. I might say a word about this here. Prof. Robert Dick Wilson who was my teacher and whom I assisted for a year, used to say that the Book of Daniel was the most difficult book in the OT to support the authenticity of, because, he said, it is the hardest book, there are more problems, he said, in the book of Daniel from the viewpoint of background,

5 Daniel 2/4/74

of history, of linguistics, and of language; there are more problems he said than any other. So he devoted a great part of his activity to the study of Daniel. Now most of the problems of the bk. of Daniel on which so many scholars have simply said, Of course this book was written in the time of the Maccabees, c. 160. Some of them have said precisely 164 B. C. it was published. And they said there is no question about it. That was the attitude c. 50 yrs. ago. Now of these arguments that have attacked new evidence has shown satisfactory answers to most of them, but the one argument that still remains absolutely unanswerable to the skeptic is of course the argument from prophecy -- that the bk. of Daniel does give specific statements about future prophecy, future events which could not possibly be known to any human being in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Therefore, if you don't believe in predictive prophecy the bk. of Dan. must be a late forgery. It was ~~it was~~ as early as the 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D. that Porphyry a Greek skeptic wrote a book attacking the bk. of Daniel in which he said the bk. of Dan. was written in the time of the Macc. St. Jerome in the end of the 4th cent. A.D. wrote an answer to Porphyry claiming that the bk. actually did come from Daniel. But it is not our purpose in this course to discuss the authenticity or dependability of the book. We are interested in this course in what the bk. means and specifically what the predictions of the bk. mean.

Now these are 3 reasons for the importance of the bk. I want to mention a 4th reason of great importance for the book which is perhaps less commonly thought of and that is the study of the prophecies of the book of Daniel is very valuable for principles of interpretation. Now it is sometimes said, You can prove anything by the Bible. Of course that is true. You can prove anything by the Bible or by any other book of any length that was ever written if you are going to take isolated sentences out of context and interpret them without relation to the context, you can prove absolutely anything from it today. If you are going to interpret the

Bible as any other book that was ever written , you have to study it in its context and see the principles of its interpretation and this is particularly true when you get to prophecy, Now I don't think the principles involved in the interpretation of the prophecy of the book of Dan. have been studied ~~in~~ anywhere near as much as they ought to be. I think that we will make some substantial advances over any book that I know of dealing with the subject during this semester in bringing out principles that are quite clear when you study carefully the book; principles that are important for the understanding of it. Principles which also are important for the studying of any prophetic section of the Bible.

Now just under this matter of principles of interpretation, there is a whole area of principles of interpretation which is often discussed and on which we ~~can~~ can expect considerable light from the bk. of Dan. and that is the question of symbols. The question of symbolism, the question of figures of speech. There is sometimes somebody who says, I take the whole Bible literally, I believe literally everything it says in the Bible. Well of course anybody who says that you wonder if they have ever read the Bible because you simply cannot take the Bible or any other book of any importance that ever was written absolutely literally. Every book that was ever written anywhere has figures of speech. In fact I think you can say ^{nearly} that almost all of our abstract terms began as figures of speech. I remember reading once, somebody said the statement, I will not at this time inveigh against my opponent, ~~it will be~~ It might be a very fine, elegant, dignified statement that would be quite in place in a presidential inaugural address but when you take that word "inveigh", you see where it's start is. It is from the Latin which means sail into. You would not say, I will sail into. That is rather course to tell him I will not sail into my opponent. But that is exactly what the word inveigh means, To attack others either - their ideas or we use the word inveigh which really means sail into, and most of our abstract ideas have started with specific words of

literal sense which have been used as figures of speech and then have come to mean the things for which they are figures. Of course there are many figures like that in Scripture which have become literal words and are no longer figures in Scripture. But as in the case of any other book of any size or importance, there are in it figures of speech. Some people will say, I've often heard it said: O Revelation is a symbolic book. You can't believe anything in the book because it is just a book of symbols. Anybody can take the symbols to mean anything they want to. Well I think that is an utterly false way to deal with any part of Scripture. Scripture contains symbols. The book of Daniel contains as many symbols anywhere as any book in proportion to its size. But symbols stand for something. Figurative language stands for something. Figurative language may be difficult to interpret but figurative language is not necessarily obscure. You say, He was a lion in the fight. You don't mean that he went out and scratched the enemy with his fingernails or he chewed him up with his ~~teeth~~ teeth. It is perfectly obvious that he fought with courage, with tenacity, with perseverance. It is a figure of speech the meaning of which is clearer than anything you could express in literal language. Figures of speech don't need to be obscure, but they may be. They have to be studied carefully to see what may be obscure in them, and what is clear. Then of course a figure of speech especially if it is a symbol, if it is something of any size, there has to be a certain amount to make evident, ^{to make clear} /the picture/ of which may not necessarily have anything to do with the symbol and that is a problem which comes in very definitely in the study of the parables. In the parables we may have one simple idea presented in the course of the story. Or we may have ~~one~~ more elements in the story that have a meaning. So the question of correct interp. of symbols is a very important question in connection with any parable or with any presentation, particularly of prophecy that includes symbols of any kind. Now in this regard we are in a very fortunate position in the bk. of Dan. because in the bk. of Dan. you have a grt. deal given in symbols, but quite

quite generally you have an interpretation of symbols. Thus in Dan. 2 you have a picture given of an image and a little description of the head and a little description of the shoulders, and of the hips and of the feet, and toes, and then later on you have the statement: You, O king, are the head of gold. After you will come another kingdom which is like the shoulders and another kingdom after it like the hips and then another one corresponding to the feet. So here is a picture, a symbol which nobody would have any clear idea what it meant if it stood alone. But you have the interpretation of it given right in the same chapter. Now there is much in the symbol that isn't interpreted, and people sometimes let their imagination run and get all kinds of things out of a symbol which are highly questionable. But at least we have a basis for a study ~~for~~ of principles of interpretation of symbols in the fact that in ch. 2 we have a symbol given and then in the later part of the ch. we have the interpretation.

Now you get to ch. 7 and you get an entirely different symbol. You have 4 animals come up out of the sea. There is a little description of the animals. What could that stand for? It could stand for most anything. But you have an interpretation given. And they say, These animals are 4 kingdoms, and they tell a little about these different kingdoms. So you have a symbol given and then you have an interpretation given. And that gives you a basis for the interpretation of this symbol. You compare ch. 2 and 7 together and you find that they deal to a large extent with the same events under different symbols, so each of them helps you to understand the other, ~~and in turn it helps you to understand~~ and in turn it helps you to understand the principles of interpretation of Scriptural symbols. Then better than that in ch. 8 you have a picture of two animals, a purely physical picture of events that occurred as one animal comes fast in one direction and then another comes fast in another direction and hits it, knocks it over, destroys it, and out of the second comes *** the second one has a great horn which

9 Daniel 2/4/74

divides into four horns, and then out of them comes a little horn. Well the interpretation is given. You are specifically told that the first is the king of Medo-Persia, the second is the kgdm. of Greece, and that its great leader being destroyed there will come four in place of it. You have interpretation given more fully of the symbolism in ch. 8 than you have **previous two.** in the preceeding ch. Then when you get to ch.11 you find some of the same events given again but ~~them~~ this time in straight out language, not in symbols at all. So you take your straight off language in ch. 11, 12 you compare it with the symbolism of the previous ones, and inevitably principles are going to emerge that can be useful in interpreting any symbolism in the OT or in the NT.

So we see the prophecies of Daniel are important for what they contain, tremendously important for what they contain, since they contain much that is contained nowhere else in Scripture. But they are also very important for learning of principles from them. I have found most commentaries on the bk. very unsatisfactory because they will take up a verse and discuss the words in the vs. and often deal very superficially with it, and they will not try to get the principles that run ~~ixm~~ through and get the interrelation ^{see} of the portions and so on. And that is what we are going to try to do largely in this class and that leads us to B.

Capital A was The Importance of the Book of Daniel.

Capital B. is the Need of Objective Scientific Study. I have recently written an **article** on the question, Is Christian Knowledge Scientific? And I looked at it from two viewpoints. First, Is Christian Knowledge Scientific Theoretically? There is nothing more scientific in the world than Christian Knowledge. If you want to learn something about the moon you will have to take what you can see of the moon and what is brought back to you by people who have been there. Well, if you want to learn about the life after death you can't see it. You can't talk with anyone today who have ever been there.

But most of us have not talked with any astronaut, and most of us have not used any telescope strong enough to see much on the moon. Most of us if we want to study about the moon are dependent on what is written by others who have made observations or who have been there. When it comes to where we come from, where we are going to, what is the meaning of life, what is the nature of God, we don't have direct access to the data, we have to have a presentation of data by one who knows. So we have the Bible. We have the presentation of the One who knows about these things. We have His presentation of what He wants us to know about it, but it is presented in human language; it is presented in this long book, the Bible. The Bible is a great collection of data about these important matters. It is the most scientific way possible to learn about these is to get information from one who knows and to study that information.

But then secondly, Is Christian Knowledge Scientific? Unfortunately a great part of what ~~happens~~ passes for scientific knowledge == for Christian knowledge is not scientific, because people grab a vs. here and a vs. there and ignore the rest of the Scripture. They ignore whole portions of Scripture. They do not bring all the data that they can find together in order to get what is there in order to examine it carefully and to see exactly what it means. The tendency is too broad in the Christian world to take a question and say, Does the Scripture teach A or does it teach B? And somebody says all the reasons to say it teaches A; and somebody says here are all the reasons to say it teaches B, You weigh it and you say, A is a little ~~stronger~~ stronger than B, we'll stand on A. But actually you could go to the Scripture with three questions about any matter. Does it teach A? Does it teach B? or does it not give us an answer to this question? And you could see whether what is found is sufficient to establish either one of these. It may be that here is an area in which we are not given the data sufficient to make a definite statement. ~~I feel that~~ ^{often} Theologians make this mistake. They go to a place in Scripture and say, Does it teach A or

11 Daniel 2/4/74

does it teach B? Well look at the evidence and weight it carefully and let us say 60% of what I can do with this vs. inclines toward A, 40 % toward B. I say therefore it teaches A. Then I go to another vs. and I say, Look at this one. Well as I look at it 60% of it is toward B and 40% toward A, but we have already proven from the other verse that A is right and not B. So of course even though this vs. looks like B, it must be A. So we put it together ^{with} it. We do that with three or four other verses and pretty soon we've got a list of six or eight different passages all of which we say prove A, when it is all resting ~~pa~~ back on that slight preponderance in the first vs. we looked at. Now we have got all these passages proving A. Then we find that place in Scripture that seems to sharply contradict this and we immediately proceed to explain it away until it means absolutely nothing, or to twist the words into something that they obviously did not mean. I feel that theologians of every group, every type have occasionally made this particular mistake. I feel that a scientific approach to Christian knowledge requires that we go to the Script. and try to see what can we really learn from it, and what are the questions on which we must say we do not ~~kw~~ yet know. Now this maybe is not so important for the one engaged in active Christian service as the minister or the missionary, or some other phase of direct Christian service. He can take a few great truths and he can present them and the Lord may bless him and use him greatly, and he may not know much more about what the Scripture teaches. He may simply take over what has been given him by others. But the time will come when new questions will arise. New problems will come up. New ideas will be presented and he needs to be ready then to go to the Scripture and say, Yes you are right, or to say, No you are wrong. Or to say that is a matter on which I find no clear evidence in Scripture and therefore it is not necessary I take a position but I will definitely say it is not a thing that should be stressed in a Christian church because it is not clearly taught in Scripture. So I feel that there is tremendous need of objective study of Scripture. I feel that

13 Daniel 2/4/74

any particular field, and my great interest is that we go objectively and find out what there is that is absolutely clear, and where we don't know we say we don't know. That we don't read things into something that are not clearly derived from it. So we are going to study the bk. of Dan. largely by itself in this course. We are not going to take prophecies in the bk. of Dan. and try to relate these prophecies to what we find elsewhere in the Scripture, and where we have something obscure here and something that is obscure elsewhere we are not going to fit them together and get something that is absolutely clear and explain what is going to happen in the world in the next 50 yrs. on the basis of this. We are going in fact to deal with the bk. of Dan. with hardly any reference to other parts of the Scripture. Only when the reference is so absolutely clear that it is pretty difficult to see how any intelligent and honest person could question it. As for instance the fact that when Jesus called himself the Son of Man, it is evident that He did not use it in any of the senses used by Ezekiel, nor in the sense used once in the bk. of Dan. but in the sense used the other times. That is very obvious, but I might not even refer to that if it were not for the fact that Jesus said, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven, and the high priest rent his clothes and said, This is blasphemy, what need ye of further evidence. There could be no possible question that he was referring there to this one specific vs. in the bk. of Dan. There is no other possible way to take it, and when it is so perfectly obvious we may make reference to it. But our purpose in this course is to take Daniel and not except in very rare occasions, to bring evidence from elsewhere in Scripture to prove some -- what something means. But to take the passages in Dan. by themselves and to see what we can derive from them and to put our emphasis on what is clear and where there is a possible view to note it and note the evidence in favor of it. And where we can say that we don't know too clearly and definitely make that statement. If someone else wants to say he can prove that it is clear from

something else in Scripture, that's a different subject. That is not a part of the purpose of this course. Now we will refer to material outside of the bk. of Dan. principally to matters of history. Because as we mentioned Daniel gives us more material about the history of the world in general than any other part of the OT. A considerable portion of this deals with events that have already occurred. In that case we will take time to see what those events have been, and just how do they fit with statements given in Daniel. So much then for B. The Need of Objective Scientific Study.

Now we will call Capital C. The Purposes of the Course. Now there are certain specific purposes. You might say I have already mentioned them but I am going now to briefly summarize the purposes we have looked at.

Our first purpose is a survey of the prophecies of Daniel. We are going in the first place to try to have a definite clear idea of what are the predictions in the bk. of Daniel. I would think, I feel that every Christian ought to have this knowledge. Anybody can get this simply by reading the bk. of Dan. through two or three times. It's not a major purpose of course but it is a thing that certainly should be accomplished by this course.

Secondly, we are going to examine the relevant historical facts. At this point we will draw upon material which any of you who have a M.A. in history probably know already, although you may not, because we will look at several different periods of history. A great part of what we looked at in this area, anybody who has taken considerable ancient history may already know, although part of it deals with periods on which a good deal is known but which are often skipped over in studies of Ancient History. So it may not be known to you, but is very vital for the book of Daniel. So we will want to get a clear idea of the relevant historical facts, and just how much evidence do we have regarding them, because it is a strange thing about history that there are some periods concerning which we have very very full knowledge, and there are others periods concerning which we have very little knowledge. And of course there are those who will make big guesses

15 Daniel 2/14/74

where there is very little knowledge. But some of these periods people just skip over. The average person say who has majored in history in college might have a fairly good idea of the events of ^{the history of} ancient Greece and Rome, but they might not know much about those great tremendous events that took place earlier in Mesopotamia, in Egypt, in Asia Minor, and in Palestine. If they do know a fair ~~amount~~ amount about the events of the history of Greece, say up to 300 B.C., the chances are that from 300 on they know practically nothing about the history of Greece. They may know a fair amount about Rome from then on up to c. 400 A.D. But from 400 to 800 A.D. most of them will know practically nothing. Actually our evidence is slight, but there is a long period -- 400 yrs. There is very little known about it. Very little more known about the 300 yrs. from 800 to 1100. There is long period of history which most people know very little about. Then of course from then on, our difficulty becomes just the opposite. We have such a tremendous amount of material, that people are apt to take just a very small part of it and study it extensively and know nothing about the other.

I was talking to a man who teaches history at two different colleges and I told him of the very interesting bk. I read last summer about the history of Europe between 400 and 800 A.D. To my disappointment he was not the least interested. He said, "All my study is from 1800 on." There is a tremendous amount of material from 1800 on, but I question whether any^{really} ~~edly-will-anybody~~ will really understand this last two centuries if they don't know something about those periods back then which were in some ways so very similar to our present situation. So we won't have much time on that in this course, but it does have a bearing on Daniel, so we will spend a little time trying to get in the main facts clearly in mind. So that's our second purpose then: To examine the relevant historical facts.

Then ~~our~~ our third is to see what is clear, and where we have some-^{they said} thing on which - - - Well, I ~~don~~ won't be like/Prof. Warfield once said, Now on this vs. there are 187 different views that have been presented.

16 Daniel 2/4/74

They are all wrong. I going now to give you the correct view." I am not going to try to do that. Our emphasis is to try to see what is definite and clear in the book so that a person should know. Unfortunatly some commentators thought they will state these facts clearly when they deal with that part of the book, when they get to other parts they act as if they did not even exist. They pay no attention to it. They are dealing with a vs. and they tell what it means, but when they get to another vs. they forget all about it seems from the way they deal with it. Well, we want to see what is clear in the book and get that and ^{know} now that and I think that is much more ~~important~~ important than getting the obscure things. But we are interested also in where there are possible views to note what these are. To note the possible views regarding important things in the predictions of Dan., and where the evidence is not sufficient to decide between them to know a little bit about the evidence pointing in each direction. Then someone may come along with some clear proof somewhere else in Script. or something in history that shows which of them is right. But until they do let's not be dogmatic about them. Then we are interested very much in what I have mentioned already but I want to mention here again, we are greatly interested in noting the principles. Here's where I feel that all the commentaries I have seen are very deficient. They do not notice certain principles that are absolutely clear in certain parts of Daniel and then in other parts where someone applies these principles they will simply say that ridiculous, that's impossible. Well maybe it would be if you don't have evidence for it but let's see what the evidence is. Let's note the principles. I feel in some ways that's almost more important than noting the specific predictions themselves.

Now our time is going rapidly, and I'd like to have a list of those who are present. I'm not going to take time to call the roll. Write names down so that everyone who is signed up for the course is present.

Now we will go on to Roman Numeral II. This will be

II A General Survey of the Book of Daniel. Now ~~in~~ the Book of Dan. naturally divides into two main divisions. The first 6 chapters is primarily history, and the next 6 chapters is primarily prophecy. Now that does not mean that the first 6 chs. are all history because the best known by far of the prophetic chapters in the bk. is the second ch. which is contained in this first part. But it is embeded in an historical situation very definitely, and the other five chapters are important events, and the account of ~~a~~ these events -- Occasionally there are small predictions included in them, but the only big prediction, the only extensive prediction in the first 6 chapters is that which is contained in ch. 2.

Now the last 6 chapters is all either prophecy or the situation in which a prophecy is given, a situation not told for itself but in order to introduce the prophecy. So we can very properly say that the second half of the bk. is all prophecy. This second half of the bk. is in the gen. Chn. ~~would~~ very little known. I would say that the general Christian world knows ch. 2 far better than any portion of these last 6 chapters and some portions of them are hardly known at all, but ~~te~~ they are all --- one or two little portions of them, are widely known among certain groups of Christians. But the whole thing is important for a proper understanding of any of it.

So these are the two main divisions of the bk. of Dan. Now there is a very strange thing about the bk. of Dan. Ch. 2 begins by saying that King Neb. had a dream, and his mind was troubled and he called in his wise men and he said to his wise men, Tell me what this dream was and what its interpretation is. It is very evident that Neb. was on to these wise men. They=== He had had dreams before and he had asked them What does this dream mean? Last night I dreamed that this attacked this and there was a tremendous wind and so on, what did this dream mean? And they said, Oh that means that a certain kingdom facing you over this way is going to have a big rising up

18 Daniel 2/4/74

and ~~when~~ ^{and} you attack this kingdom you will utterly destroy it, and then he found out that actually nothing of the kind happened and he decided it was very easy for these men if he'd tell them a dream to make up any kind of interp. so he said, I'm going to prove whether they really know anything or not. They must not only tell me the interpretation, but they must tell me the dream too. So he said, You tell me the dream, and the interpretation of it. Next vs. 4 says, The wise men answered him == the English says, "in Syriac" and then they proceeded to say this is absolutely impossible to do. But the word where they say "this is impossible" if we had more advanced students in this class than we have, I would ask somebody to read from the Hebrew those first 5 vs. of the ~~2^d~~ the second chapter of Daniel. I have always found it rather amusing to do that, because the person reads the first four so readily, he reads right along, and then he gets to this "And they answered him in Aramaic -- in Heb. rather Syriac, and then the words look like words they are familiar with but they don't quite fit because Aramaic is a lang. similar to Heb. but ~~A~~ about like French and Spanish let's say, enough different that you find yourself at sea very ~~soon~~ soon. But the strange thing is that it doesn't merely tell you what the wise men answered in Aramaic but gave you what Neb. said in Heb. == it doesn't merely give you what they answered in Aramaic; it goes right on in all the rest of the chapter in Aramaic, and so are chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Then at the end of 7 which is Aramaic, we turn to Heb. in chapters 8 - 12 are Heb. So you have the book of Dan. divided linguistically into ch. 1:1-2:5 and 8-12 Hebrew, and a section in between Aramaic. This does not correspond with the major division of the book which is 6 chapters of history and 6 chapters of prophecy. It's an overlapping division, The Aramaic ~~division~~ of Daniel was extensively studied 50 yrs. ago and scholars tried to prove that this Aramaic is the Aramaic of 400 yrs. later not the Aramaic of the time of Neb. Dr. R.D. Wilson did a great deal of study and wrote many articles to show that the Aramaic == the evidence is that the

19 Daniel 2/4/74

Aramaic from that time from which we don't have much Aramaic is more like the bk. of Daniel than the Aramaic of the later period, but it is a strange book in this way because of the division into Hebrew and Aramaic not corresponding to the main division of the contents of the book. There are various theories made as to why this is and I think they are highly questionable. I merely call your attention to that fact at this point.

Now the first part of the bk. of Daniel has these 6 chapters and each of them ^{is} ~~has~~ a distinct unit. The Archbishop did a very good job in making his division of the first half of the bk. of Daniel because each of them starts with a situation, completes it; and each of them starts with a different situation than the one before. They don't run straight along. Each chapter is a distinct account of an event, each of these 6 chapters of the first part of Daniel. It is an excellent ch. division. I would like you before our next meeting next week to glance over the bk. of Daniel, get a general idea of its contents. I would like you specifically to look at the last 6 chapters. Now I don't ~~want~~ ask you now to read the last 6 chapters, but glance over them. Ask yourself: If you were to divide these 6 chapters into divisions, logical divisions like it's very easy to divide the first six. Each situation finishes and a new situation starts. Whether the new situation starts the next day or starts 10 yrs. later is not made clear. Sometimes it may be many yrs. later. There is clear division. Now in the second: Divide these last 6 chapters into either 4,5,6,7, divisions. I mean don't divide them into a lot of divisions and don't just make two certainly. But make somewhere between 4 and 7 what seem to you to be the most logical divisions of this into sections== ch.7-12. I would like you to do that for next time. Just write that little bit out. It won't take you very long, and get a general idea of the bk. and next time we will have a general survey of the bk. of Dan. & then start at ch. 2.

Question by student: Did you mean that you saw an acting factor between the first 6 chapters, say like a connecting factor between ch. one and ch. ?

Answer: O the same people are involved in them. But if I were to tell you about an experience that I had during my second yr. in college and then I were to say, One day I did so and so, and then describe an experience of my first yr. in seminary, there might be many connections; there might be some of the same people but you would not know whether it was the next yr. or 3 or 4 yrs. later. There is quite evidently a sharp division right there between each ch. of the first six. Some of the last sixes will tell you when it happened, so you have a very definite evidence that it happened at different times but in some cases there isn't.

And I would like you to bring that in signed just the division that you would make logically into not less than 4 or more than 7 chapters, and we will meet here again next Monday.

2/18/74

III
DANIEL COURSE

copy 2
3rd lecture

Nebuchadnezzar reigned from 605 to 562 B.C. Incidentally let me say this about these dates. The year has begun at different times in different areas in the world. For instance the Vatican even up until about 1600 started the year with Dec. 25 which in a way seems a much more logical place for a Christian to start it than on Jan. 1. From a secular viewpoint Dec. 21 would be a still more logical place to start it because that is the time when the sun stops moving in one direction and starts moving in another. So it is a real turnabout in the condition of the world, and of course our year is a cycle in our relation to the sun. Some have, the Romans started the year on March. 1 up to the time of Julius Caesar, and that's why we call our ninth month Sept. which means 7th month, and we call our 10th yr. Oct. which is Latin for 8th month, and our 11th month Nov. which is Latin for 9th mo. and we call our 12th month Dec. which is Latin for 10th mo. because they were named that way then. You see the result is then some people will say that Evil Merodach began to reign in 562, some will say 563. We cannot be sure in most cases within one year because different people start the year at different times. So when you find a disagreement of one year in those dates you understand why it is, and unless we have some evidence of the exact time when it started, when something was done, if it just says "in the year" it overlaps one of our years.

But now we see that Nebuchadnezzar reigned from 605 to 562, so his 2nd year was either 603 or 602, depending on just how long it was in the year. So about sometime before 603 is the 2nd yr. of Nebuchadnezzar when Nebuchadnezzar had the dream which Daniel explained.

Now in Ch. 7, which is in many ways parallel to ch. 2, it begins "in the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream." Fifty years ago many scholars said there never was a king named Belshadzar. We now have absolute evidence -- it's only a little evidence but quite sufficient to prove

absolutely and no scholar disagrees with it that Belshazzar was King of Bab. even though he is not listed in the ancient lists we have found of kings of Babylon. Belshazzar was the son of Nabonidus, the 4th king after Nebuchadnezzar, and Nabonidus associated Belshazzar with him on the throne. We don't know when he did. We know that Belshazzar was king at the end of his reign in 539 because ch. 5 ends with the his death when the Medes and Persians conquered Babylon. So we can say definitely that Belshazzar was king up to 539, and he did not become king until 555 when his father became king, but we don't know when his father made him king with him. So it's at least 555, the first year of Belshazzar, and it may be as late as say 543 for all we know. which ^{was} is the first year of Belshazzar.

Now then how many of you could tell me how much time passed between ch.2 and ch. 7. Yes? (Student - 55years plus? No, it's 45 years plus). It would be around 45, right. Just one digit wrong but very close, an awful lot closer than the next year has we spoke of before. Let's say, it was many years. Now ^{till} when I looked up these dates this morning I would have said at least 20 yrs. But you see it's at least 45 years in between. So we have, in the book of Daniel, a quite wide range of time covered. We have all that interval between the dream in ch. 2 and Daniel's dream in ch. 7.

Now we are going to refer briefly to

D. The Principle of Progressive Revelation

I believe that it is important for our understanding of the Bible and particularly of the OT to recognize this principle. God did not write a complete presentation of all the facts of importance about eternal things and give it Adam or to Noah or to Abraham or someone and say, Here it is, study. There was a world in which people turned away from God, and God came to those people to lead them into the knowledge of His truth and it takes time for most people to become accustomed to a new idea. So the principle of progressive revelation applies in the Bible as it does in the education of any of ~~it~~ us.

We get a few ideas and then we get them improved and we get something added to them. We don't learn all physics, everything that is known about physics, and then we go on and learn everything that is known about chemistry. We learn a little bit about each, and then we learn a little more, and then we maybe specialize in one of them. Progressive revelation means that God revealed gradually, little by little. It does not mean that He reveals something and then later shows it was wrong and something else is right. That is the liberal idea of progressive revelation. They believe that in this primitive time it was all right to have primitive ideas. Well there is an element of truth in that. You cannot get a child to understand fully advanced ideas. But you don't need to give them false ideas. You don't need to say anything that is false. And God has revealed things to us gradually. He gives a hint and then he gives another hint, and perhaps He explains a little about something, and then he gives a fuller explanation of certain aspects, and then later a fuller discussion of other aspects but overlapping. And thus we find through the Bible our knowledge being increased.

A good illustration of this is the matter of the trinity. You open up the Book of Genesis and you find that the name of God is in the plural, and of course your scholars will all tell you this is a plural of majesty. Well nobody can prove it isn't, so I don't say we can prove the trinity by the fact the Hebrew word *elohim* is plural. But I do say it is interesting that the word used for God, for the God of the Bible, for the true God is in the plural. It may give us a little hint of the fact that while God is one, there is some element of plurality in God. It may give us a hint of it. Then we find God says, Let us make man in our image, and you say right away, Let us make man. Is He talking like an editor today, or a king using a plural of himself. Ordinarily God uses a singular of Himself, but in this case He uses the plural. Maybe there is a hint here of the trinity. Now we can't say this proves the trinity not at all, but there is the beginning of a suggestion that we may later find

evidence to prove that the suggestion is a true one. We go on and we get various little hints of the trinity, though in the Big thing it is important for people to know in those days was that the heathen idea that God is in every tree, every plant, every cloud was a completely erroneous idea. That God is one sovereign being who controls the universe (is right). So the unity of God is a tremendously important fact. It is vital to stress, and the OT stresses it a great deal, but in the course of it there are little suggestions of the fact that there is also a plurality in the nature of God. When we get to Isa. 48:16 we get a sentence which must be absolute nonsense to someone who does not have some conception of the trinity, because we read starting with vs. 15: I even I have spoken; year I have called him: I have brought him, (that is Cyrus) and he shall make his way prosperous. (We have here surely God speaking. Who else would have brought the king and made the king prosperous? Then He says) Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I (now that is not the prophet talking - "from the time it was, there am I". It's the same one who spoke in the vs. before. It is God. And yet he goes right on and says) And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me. (Well there you have the Lord God has sent me and His Spirit has sent me, and I am the one who was from the very beginning). Well there is a mighty clear statement of the trinity here, in Isa. 48:15-16. Any other interpretation of the passage makes nonsense. Yet it stands quite alone. There is very little on the trinity in the OT. The trinity was not ~~reve~~ revealed in any clear way until Jesus Christ came and it was made apparent that Jesus Christ is God. And we know that He is God; we know that the H.S. is God. So we know that while God is one, and there is only one God, we know that there are three persons in the Godhead. We can't understand what that means. No one can really understand it, but we know it is a fact; the Bible teaches it. Thus we have this progressive revelation of the trinity. Now in the book of Daniel we have one of the most interesting

illustrations of progressive revelation to be found anywhere. It is interesting not only because it throws further light on the understanding of these portions of Daniel but it is interesting because it gives us principles and background to use in studying other doctrines in the Scripture.

In ch. 2 we have a vision which we are going to look at in detail today but I just want to say in general today at this point that ch. 2 shows there are going to be four great empires. Four great kingdoms as they call them. Now in ch. 7 we again have four great kingdoms, and given in such a way that we surely are justified in saying they are the same great kingdoms in ch. 2, but they are given under an entirely different symbolism. And the destruction of ^{human} the/kingdoms in ch. 2, and the establishment of the kingdom of God, is given again in ch. 7 under an entirely different picture than was given before. But you put the two together and you learn a good deal more about it. Then in ch. 8 we have a specific statement, we have first a symbol, and then we have a specific statement that we are looking at the second and third of these kingdoms. So ch. 8 throws light on the 2nd and 3rd kingdoms that are described in ch. 2. In ch. 7 we had added to the figure a little idea of something at the end of the 4th kingdom that we call the antichrist. Ch. 8 tells about something that happens in the course of the 3rd kingdom that is historically known as the events connected with Antiochus Epiphanes. We'll look into him quite a bit later on. He lived between 200 and 150 B.C. We have similarities between these two figures in ch. 8 and ch. 7, but one's in the 3rd kingdom; the other's in the 4th. Then we you get to ch. 11, you start in with the 2nd kingdom and it makes it clear that's what you're talking about. It tells you a little about that, then starts in with the 3rd kingdom and goes on to a certain point and then suddenly jumps forward to the end of the fourth kingdom. So you have 4 different pictures that fit together, and you have a progressive revelation in which you learn a little more step by step, and you have different figures illustrating and enlarging your understanding. Now in

a case like this when you come to study it, you look at something and from your impression of another to say, This must mean this, even though there is nothing in it that says it does. Then having reached your conclusion on this you go to the other and say, This meant that, therefore that means it. You see what I mean. You can argue or reason in a circle. You can easily mislead yourself with that sort of thing. So we would want to go as Daniel went through this. We want to watch progressive revelation, and as we see ~~ka~~ new knowledge added, we can look a back and see what light it throws on what was earlier. But we don't want to throw the light on the earlier thing until we have reached the later point where the light comes, but simply take it as it would have been to Daniel then and see what are the possibilities before him. So much then for D. The Principles of Progressive Revelation.

Now let us take III

III Examination of Chapter 2.

A. the Situation. I've already referred to the situation of ch. 2: In *the* ~~the~~ second year of ^{regarding} ~~Nebuchadnezzar~~ Nebuchadnezzar had a dream, and he called in his wise men and he said, Tell me my dream and what it means. He evidently was very much angered at this time. He said, If you ~~don't~~ make known to me this dream you will be cut in pieces and your houses will be made a dung hill. Now ~~of~~ Neb. was the sort of man who would just all the sudden make a fool demand on people without any background or reason for it, he never would have succeeded in establishing that great kingdom of Babylon and maintaining it in its strengt as long as he did. Evidently there is a ~~bra~~ background to this. He must have had experiences before when he had dreams or symbols or things and he called in the wise men and they ~~took~~ ^{gave them} took what he did, and they made up some high flown thing as an interpretation of it, and then it did not work out at all. And he thought that they were pretending to know a lot when really they knew very little. So now he reaches a point where he says, I have had this dream and if they really have the wisdom they claim to have they will explain to me

what it means, and they will prove they can explain what it means by telling me what it is. So he gave them this command. They said to him, This is impossible. *Nobody* could do such a thing. But he said (vs.15): The thing is gone from me. This Aramaic word here translated "gone", we have no evidence of it meaning "gone" in early Aramaic. We have a few cases in the Talmud where a similar word means for something to go out, but this is very late, and very slight evidence. We have greater evidence of a word which would mean it is firm, it is established. In the context th+ it is quite clear that that is what it means whatever of the two ways you take the word. Either, I have said it, it has gone out from me, it is established. Or, Here it is, it is established. The decree is made; this w is what you've got to do. You've got to not merely make up some idea what the dream means; you've got to tell me ~~wah~~ what the dream is and then I'll have reason to think that what you are saying it means is really worth listening to.

He then tells this and none of them can interpret it, but DANIEL comes and prays to God to reveal the secret to him, and God reveals the secret to Daniel, Daniel and his friends having prayed about the matter and Daniel came before Neb. and said, I have no wisdom to explain interpretations like this but he said, God has given me the inter. He has told me what it is. Then Dan. says (vs.31) Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. And he tells us now what the dream was. Then he said (vs.34) This is the dream and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. He gives an interpretation and when he finishes Neb. worships Dan. and commands them to offer a sacrifice to Daniel, but Daniel said: Don't worship me. It is God h who has done it. The king said to Daniel, Truly your God is a God of Gods and Lord of Lords. Well now this does not mean that he became a follower of the God of Israel, it does not mean that at all. But it does mean that Neb. was proud of following all the gods of the day. He would tell everyone of them how he was his servant and doing what he could for him. He believed in many gods and he was ready to

take the god of the Jews as one along with the others. But at this point he saw that the God of the Jews had done something that no other god could do and he put Daniel and his friends in high position as a result of this.

Now that is the situation here. In this course we are interested in the prophecies. How do we interpret the prophecies. So we look at

B. The Dream. Now let us read the dream. It is vs. 31-35: (reading text) "His belly and thighs of brass" - now that's a bad translation; brass was unknown at this time. It was 500 yrs. after this before brass was discovered. It should be bronze. Actually the Hebrew word is simply copper, and it is used for any alloy of copper of which we have today two common ones, brass and bronze. I think most of you think probably as I do of brass as something rather shiny and not particularly strong. Maybe that's because when I was a boy we had brass bedsteads everywhere. I don't know whether it may be in some forms much stronger thing. But that's the impression at least we had in my childhood of brass. Whereas bronze is one of the strongest of metals. I was talking once with a metallurgist for the Anaconda Copper Co. who told me that in an ordinary penny -- at least a penny of that time -- it was 60% copper and 40% zinc. He said -- not 40% but 39 and 1/2% -- because he said you add 1/2 of 1% of tin, and that is the characteristic of bronze to have tin in it, and he said, Adding 1/2 of 1% of tin made the metal 2 and 1/2 times as strong as it was before. Well bronze, you see, has tin in it, and though the tin is not particularly strong, with the copper it makes a very strong metal, and bronze was very important in ancient warfare, and in ancient life. So this does not mean something that is shiny and weak by any means, but it is a very strong and valuable metal. And he says that his belly and his thighs were of bronze. His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands. Now how would a stone be cut out without hands? If you have ever walked much in the mountains, you sometimes have heard a sound above you, and you look up

and you see that the stone has become dislodged from the side of the mountain. It can easily happen if you are near a cliff or a steep slope, a stone becomes dislodged and starts to fall. It is one of the greatest hazards in climbing in the W Swiss Alps is falling stones. A man told me that he was one time climbing in the Swiss Alps and he said, they heard a sound ahead of them and they pressed themselves up against the side of the hill just as tight as they could, and he said a stone that ~~maybe weighed 10 lbs.~~ hit right in the middle of his knapsack, right back of his head and went right through the knapsack with such force. He was not injured at all, but if he not quickly gotten out of the way you can image what would have happened to him.

Here it says, A stone was cut without hands. It was some natural force, or some occurrence other than ~~human~~ ^{human} planning or human effort that caused this stone to come. The stone was cut without hands, which smote the image on its feet that were of iron and clay and broke them to pieces. Then was the iron, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together. Now this is a rather difficult picture to get. You can imagine that if something hit it on the head, it might break up all the metals. But were it to hit it on the feet it would make it fall over. And if it fell over it might break into two or three pieces, but that it all would be broken and mixed together, is a dream. It is not something that you would ever expect to see in natural events. But of course this was simply a dream. But in the dream, Neb. must have said, That's strange isn't it. What a queer thing that was to happen, but he said, Daniel is describing exactly what I saw. I saw that it hit on the feet and yet he said, the iron and the clay ~~which~~ ^{which} were in the feet & but not only those, the bronze and silver and gold, they all got broken to pieces. Broken to pieces together and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floor. They were broken all of them up into little tiny pieces. The wind carried them away that no place was found for them, and the stone that some the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. Now you could think of 100 different possible interpretations.

You could think of 100 different possible interpretations of such a dream. It certainly in itself doesn't tell us anything. You see an image standing there. Then you see something hit it and then you see this queer thing happen to it, it all getting broken to pieces even though it was only hit on the feet. Then the wind carrying it away. Then the stone begins to grow and grow till it fills up the whole earth. It's a fantasy, something that could never occur in real life, and there's nothing to tie it to. It could mean anything. No wonder Neb. was quite amazed by it. What on earth does this very strange dream mean? That's what he wanted to know. That's why you could make any one of 100 guesses as to possible interpretation, but he wasn't going to let these people pull the wool over his eyes by giving them one of these interpretations, saying it is true. But when Dan. described this queer dream that he had, he said, Well, if he can tell me all that that I haven't told to a soul, his idea of what it means is doubtless worth looking at. So we look at

C. The Interpretation of the Images Main Parts. By that I mean the four main divisions of the image. There are four main divisions to it. In the interpretation of it, reading vs.37-44.

Vs. 37 (reading text). At this point he is making Neb. feel happy and giving him a start for it.

Vs. 38(reading text) Neb. must have thought, My isn't that wonderful. I can tell the birds and you go and get grain and bring it to me. I can tell the birds what they are to do. The fowls of the heavens, wherever people live they are subject to me. Well of course, Neb. knew he wasn't if he'd stop to think. You remember Canute the Danish king who ruled over England, his followers said to him, Oh you could rule anything. You could tell the waves to be quiet and they will be quiet. They said, You are the great king. He said, Let's go down to the seashore, and he put his chair (throne) down there on the seashore where the tide was out, and he said, Let's see whether you're talking truth. He said, Tide stop there; don't

come in any further, stay there. And the tide came and came and came until it covered the bottom of the chair and he got up and got his feet feet wet and he went back and he said, Now don't talk such nonsense. Well, Neb. had some tough struggles in his life, and he didn't mind getting a little bit of flattery now and then. This of course was rather an extreme flattery that Daniel gave him, that the beast of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand and hath made thee ruler over them all. And wherever the children of men dwell -- well of course, Neb. was a pretty powerful ruler over the people in Mesopotamia and to the lands to the west of it as far as the Mediterranean Sea but to the East of it the empire of the Medes was pretty strong, and also the Medes held a good deal of territory to the North of it, and Neb. had become king by overcoming the Assyrian empire. He had the Medes together with the Medes doing a very great part of the fighting. They had their own territory which the Assyrians had never had and a considerable part of the old Assyrian Empire so this statement that Dan gives at the beginning was a wise statement for a man to make to the king. It was exaggerated, hyperbolic but the king knew perfectly well what it was, but it was the way he liked to have people talk to him. He probably got plenty of the other kind behind his back and it averaged up more or less and as far as the interpretation of God's prediction to him was concerned the important thing is the last line in this verse: Thou art this head of gold. Now of course it does not mean Neb. was made of gold, or that Neb. was a head. It means that this head in this image represents you. Then he says, And ~~as~~ after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee. He doesn't say, Another kingdom is going to conquer you. ^{Even} if he believed that it would not be safe to say that. He wouldn't have gotten very far probably. He wouldn't have gotten a chance to tell the rest of the dream probably if he had said that. But he said After you will arise another kingdom inferior to you, and another third kingdom of bronze which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth

kingdom shall be strong as iron, for as much as iron breaks in pieces and subdues all things Now the rest continues something about the lower part of the image, and then about the destruction of the image. We want to look at them later. I won't read them right at this point because we want to look at the interpretation of the images main parts. Here we can speak dogmatically. We can say that one thing is definitely proven. ^{That} ~~The~~ is that the image represents a temporal succession. A temporal succession is indicated. That is a very important thing which we have ~~learned~~ ^{learned} at this point. That in the image a temporal succession is indicated. Now you see an image standing up there like that. That could represent different things that all exist at once. It could represent different parts of an area. It could represent many different things. But he said The image is you and after you there is another kingdom, and then there is another and then another. So, this is one thing we can speak dogmatically about. We can say that a temporal succession is indicated.

2. We can say dogmatically that the head represents Nebuchadnessar.

Then he says, After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to then and another third kingdom of bronze which shall bear rule..... and the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron. All right, if the head is Nebuchadnezzar, does that mean that the shoulders are Evil Merodach who was certainly inferior to Neb., and does it mean that the third kgdm. that bears rule over the earth is Neriglissar, one of Nebuchadnezzar's generals who married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar and who was a rather powerful ruler but rather aged by this time, only reigned for about 7 years. And the fourth kingdom is Lavashi-Marduk who was Neriglissar's weak son, who reigned for less than a year before he was killed, and another man took the throne - Nabonidus.? Are those the kingdoms that come after you? Well, I don't think anybody interprets it that way. He said, You are the head. But he doesn't merely include Nebuchadnezzar. He includes all of these kingdoms. And after you, he does not say "will arise a king inferior to you", he says, "will arise a

kingdom inferior to you." So he is speaking of a different kingdom which will replace Neb.'s kingdom, even though Neb. ^{to be} succeeded by four rulers in Babylon before this second kingdom comes. Now you see that is not obvious in the interpretation as Daniel gives it. But it certainly is obvious when we look at the history. And we in this course, are going to look only at things that are definite and certain from the history, but I think it is right when there is a prediction of future history to look at what evidence we can find from history. We don't want to look here at what Dan. learned 45 yrs. later. That is something that Dan. certainly didn't know now anything he learned 45 yrs. later. And we don't want to bring in unless it is absolutely certain anything from the NT in this particular course. Now we did bring in about the Son of Man because it is so absolutely clear the way Jesus uses the term. And so absolutely clear that the High Priest understood as meaning the One who should come on the clouds of heaven at the end of this age. But aside from things that are absolutely clear on which any body would have to agree, we are dealing just with the book of Daniel and seeing here what he says. But from the history we can definitely say that the head of gold is not just Nebuchadnezzar, it includes these other kings. These are included in the head of gold. I incline, as a strong possibility, to think that what is meant here by the head of gold, is not merely these 5 kings, but is all the kings of Babylon and Assyria. I incline to that, because the 1st grt. empire of which we have evidence is the empire of Hammurabi. We have some smaller ones earlier but about 750 B.C. a king of Babylon, named Hammurabi first brought prominence Babylon into prominentee, and he conquered all the regions round about him and established Babylonian culture all through the near east. And Babylonian culture continues to be dominant in the near east until the end of Nabonidus' reign. And the Babylonians were soon replace by people nother of them -- the Assyrians -- in the control, but the Assyrians followed Babylonian culture, Babylonian system of writing, Babylonian language, and they even pretended

kings
 to be conquerors of Babylon even though rather than conquerors of Babylon,
 even though they actually held Babylon under their power. Time and again
 Babylon revolted from the leadership of the Assyrian kings, and finally
 Nabopolassar who in 626 had been made governor of Babylon, established his
 independence from the Assyrians and then in 612 he and the Medes together
 destroyed the Assyrian capital in Ninevah, and in 606 he succeeded in destroy-
 the remnants of the Assyrian army and his son, Nebuchadnezzar succeeded
 him when he died in 605 and became the first king of Babylon, unless you
 count Nabopolassar ^{as a} the king who served in between you might say. But it
 was a continuation of this same kingdom, this same culture which was very
 great and prominent in the ancient world. Now I wouldn't be dogmatic on that.
 I would say ^{at least} the Head of gold is at least not just Nebuchadnezzar. It at least
 is what we call the Neo-Babylonian regime, which includes these (pointing
 to the blackboard) kings. It's at least that, and I incline to think that
 to some extent at least it means the whole Assyrian - Babylonian empire
 which had its ups and downs in a period of nearly 1000 years. At any rate
 the head represents Nebuchadnezzar. "Thou O king art this head of gold."

ⁱⁿ fashion
 You see you cannot take in strict literal fashion, thou alone art this
 head of gold. You are the head of God gold --- the head of gold represents you
 but it doesn't just represent you. It represents a kingdom over which you
 reign, a ^{regime} regime, the system of culture, the system of government, the general
 thing of a control ^{by} of one nation over many others, the first of these that
 extended ∇ over a great distance of which we know anything in history, that
 extended over many other peoples speaking various other languages and having
 various other cultures. So No. 2 The Head represents Nebuchadnezzar, but
 not just Nebuchadnezzar, at least the whole Neo-Babylonian empire
 which would run from 605 B.C. (or sometime during Nabopolassar's reign)
 up to 539 B.C. -- at least that, and perhaps the whole Babylonian and
 Assyrian power before that during the time when they were a grt. imperial
 power

3. The Other Part Represent Kingdoms not Kings. He says that "after ~~hee~~ shall arise another kingdom, ^{another} ~~and~~ another third kingdom, and a fourth kingdom/ He doesn't say kings, he says kingdoms and we note that if it said kings ~~kingdoms~~+it would not fit at all. They are definitely kingdoms and they come after the fourth ruler after Nebuchadnezzar, not right after him. We had these hyperbolic phrases applied to Nebuchadnezzar above. That was Daniel's way of speaking to him. I don't think we should take that too literal. If you want to you can say that in Jer. and elsewhere we find that God gave Israel over to Neb. for their sin. God permitted Neb. to seize this grt. area. ~~Perhp~~ Perhaps you could say God permitted Neb. to establish his power wherever the sons of men dwell if his power was up to it; that is God put no bar in the way of it. Perhaps it was a permission rather than an actual thing. He had a large area but there were many very large areas that certainly were not under his control at all.

We have these 4 kingdoms then. We raised a question then. What about this image? We have learned that the image represents a succession. That it is a temporal succession. Now how much of the image has a specific meaning and how much is simply part of the picture? Look at the eyes of the image. What do they mean? What does its mouth mean? Does it mean that Neb. was a better speaker than any subsequent kingdom described here? A better orator? Does it mean the Babylonian kings had greater power of expressing their ideas? Certainly nothing like that. They doubtless had eyes, and a mouth and nose, but these are simply a part of the image. They are part of the picture. They do not have a meaning in the interpretation. ~~Whab~~ What about the fact that he is the head which contains the brain. Does that mean that their brains were superior to the following empires? Certainly not. Certainly some of these following empires ~~went~~ went way ahead of anything that had been established in this regard by him. ~~Whab~~ What about the arms? He says that the breast and arms are of silver. Does this mean that the second

kingdom is going to have one main part and two subordinate parts because it has two arms and a trunk? Do the fingers represent something? All these are part of the picture but they do not represent an idea unless we find evidence in the picture or in a precise application to history that shows that they have a meaning. What about the hands? There are 10 fingers. Do these 10 fingers represent something about the second kingdom? We have no reason to think they do. We have no evidence of such a thing. What about the breast? What about the abdomen? What about the thighs? You notice that the third kingdom is the belly and the thighs. Well this word thighs(yered?) is used in the OT a good many times. It represents the loins. It speaks of pro-creation. Does this have any meaning that this third kingdom has more productive powers than any of the others? There is no reason to think so. It is simply part of the picture. It has two legs. Do these two legs mean something about the nature of the fourth kingdom? Why should they any more than the fact there were two arms? Unless we have some evidence bearing on it we have no reason to say that they do. There are some who say that the fact that the fourth kingdom is the legs of iron, represents the fact that the Roman empire was divided into an eastern and western empire. Eastern Roman Empire and a Western Roman Empire. But this does not correspond to history at all, because the thighs are a part of the ~~fourth~~^{third} kingdom so when the fourth starts you have two legs already. Actually Rome was one united empire until about 500 years after it took over most of the territory of the third kingdom. So ~~that~~ that from the beginning of the picture there were the two legs. It was only 500 yrs. later that it was divided into two parts -- the eastern and the western empires, and by that time the western empire was largely imaginary. It was mostly controlled by barbarians who had overrun Europe. The eastern empire did continue another 1000 years, but there was no long period in which the Roman empire consisted of two parts -- the eastern and the western empires. There was a fiction in that

actual fact.
 regard in the Middle Ages, but no real facts. So that the fact that it had two legs has any specific meaning cannot be drawn from this imagery. What about the feet? We are told the feet are part of iron and part of clay. So the distinction ~~is~~ between the feet and the legs, and we are justified in saying ~~it~~ then that the fourth kingdom is to be divided into two phases. That there is a final phase which is different from the earlier phase which is weaker (than the earlier), but the fact that there are two feet certainly does not in itself indicate anything. What about the toes? At this point the toes are not even mentioned, and we have no ^{more} reason at this point to say the toes indicate something specific than to say the fingers do, or the hands, or the eyes or any-thing like that. If we find later evidence of a specific thing we might be able to go back and say there was a suggestion here but I think it would be rather strange to think of a suggestion of the toes any more than of the ~~the~~ fingers. Unless you have a statement here that suggests it specifically has meaning. So that up to this point we have an image showing a succession of four different kingdoms.

Now there is a question I ask, Do the various metals have specific meanings? "The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron, forasmuch as iron breaks in pieces and subdues all things" And those nations that were conquered by the Roman empire and saw its iron ~~fits~~ fist certainly must have thought that iron was a very good figure for the Roman empire, even though in the time of Nero a Roman writer said, the Parthian empire to the east is the strong; that represents strength. They said Rome is wealth and gold. That was the way it looked to the Romans, but to the people whom Rome conquered I'm sure that figure of iron was a very apt one. It was strong because iron represents great strength, and the Roman empire was a stronger empire than any of the three that preceded. But there is no evidence in the interpretation that the gold, silver, and bronze ~~have~~ have any meaning in themselves except that they are different metals. There is a difference. There are different

kingdoms, different types of kingdoms. Of course it is true that these are *not* differences simply such as between having Neruglissar reign and having after his son was killed having this other man Nabonidus reign. They are not differences like that. They are complete differences of culture and of outlook and of type of life. There are great changes between these four great kingdoms. So that these four diff. metals represent 4 diff. types of things, and the fourth represents great strength, but it doesn't mean the other three were not very strong but not as strong as the fourth, but it does not say a thing about their value, nothing at all. They are simply different metals. It is easy to let your imagination run and to say gold would fit well with this one and silver would fit well with this one and bronze with this one, but you could twist them around in any order and make an equally good argument for them I believe.

Another question: Is there any comparison of the kingdoms involved? Immediately someone says Yes. After these shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and I'm sure Neb. says, O yes No kingdom would be as great as mine. He says, Certainly it will be inferior to me. But the Aramaic word used here, so far as present knowledge goes, is never used to mean inferior in any other case. I investigated this and I wrote to a Professor of Aramaic at the U. of Chicago and I asked if this word ever meant inferior. He said "There is no evidence that it ever meant inferior except in this passage. Of course it is perfectly apparent from the context that in this passage that is what it must mean." Well now that is not the way to determine what a word means. By saying it is perfectly apparent ^{from} ~~from~~ the context====. If it is really perfectly apparent, yes it is, but anyone has just as good a right to make a judgment on that as any authority on Aramaic does. If he can show somewhere else where it means inferior fine. Then you have evidence. Otherwise you have merely a guess on his part. Actually the word used here is a very common word. Now we don't have much Aramaic from this period. We only have

six chapters of Daniel and a few chapters of Ezra, and one verse in Jeremiah. of Aramaic from this period. We have much Aramaic from other periods. We have about 13 different dialects in Aramaic of which we have of which we have some material. But Aramaic is very close to Heb. In Biblical Aramaic many of the words are very similar to various Heb. words. In this case this word is identical to a very common Heb. word -- the Heb. word *erris* which means earth. In this case the final consonant is changed from a *tsadh* to an *ayin*, a rather common change between Heb. and Aramaic. Literally it means "and after thee shall arise another kingdom ~~lower~~ toward the earth from thee." Toward the earth could mean inferior, of course. But it could just as well mean lower down on the image; lower down nearer the earth on the image. You look at the image and see the head, and down toward the earth from the head, lower down on the image. Well you could ~~use~~ the word inferior to mean lower down on an image, but when we say inferior it suggests we mean of less value, of less quality. You will find books that will make a big argument of how superior Neb. was to the empire of Cyrus. Actually Cyrus' empire was nearly twice as large as Neb.'s empire. Neb. was a great conqueror; Cyrus was a far greater one. Neb.'s empire lasted 50 years, and Cyrus' lasted 200 yrs. If you compare the two. They are so different you can't really compare them. But if you are going to compare them Cyrus was a far greater figure than and his empire a far greater empire than that of Nebuchadnezzar. But I think that all Daniel said was that it is lower down on the image, toward the earth, literally. I know of no other case in Heb. or in Aramaic where it is used to mean of less value. It means lower down.

We did not get as far as I had hoped today but we opened up a few questions. . . Look on in ch. 2 carefully, and see what we can definitely get from ch. 2 and what there is that maybe a possibility, and what there is we can definitely rule out. Then read ch. 7 and see the parallels with ch. 2. Note the differences also, and have that in mind for next week.

It is two weeks since we met. The snow interfered with us last week so I don't know whether you have forgotten everything that we had looked at in that length of time or not. Very briefly to summarize we began Section II Examination of Daniel 2 . Under that we looked at

A. The Situation. Then we looked at

B. The Dream in which we noted exactly what was stated in the dream that Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar he had had. As we noted this dream simply by itself could represent almost anything. That is to say there would be many things it couldn't represent, but you get from it what the interpretation was I don't think any of us ever would have if we hadn't heard. That is one thing about symbols. Symbols generally can stand for anyone of a great number of different things. I've known people who have gotten very excited about seeing a figure or symbol somewhere because they act as though the symbol always has a certain meaning. Actually figures and symbols are used in various regards. For instance the lion. He's a lion in the fight. Means he is brave, courageous, effective. Somebody is afraid there is a lion in the street -- there is something that is terrifying, something that is dangerous. Quite a different idea. The yellow can stand for cowardice; it can stand for gold, glory. Red can stand for blood and Calvary, or it can stand for bravery. Almost any symbol can have a variety of meanings. When you have a complicated symbol like this, a statue made up of different elements, the question is do the fingers have a meaning, do the ears have a meaning, do the hips have a meaning, do the toes have a meaning? How many parts of it have different meanings? Or does the whole things as a whole just have a fairly simple meaning. Well, we have to have an interpretation as a basis on which to know what this symbol is going to mean. So we looked at

C. The Interpretation. But we did not make C the interpretation of the whole dream. The dream actually has three parts to it, and under C we looked at the first of those parts.

1. The Interpretation of the Image's Main parts. We noticed there that it is very clearly stated, something that would not be at all obvious, that it represents a temporal success. That it represents various events or situations that come one after the other and these do not start at the bottom and go up. They start at the top and come down. Now that could be either way, but it is clearly stated in this case that that is the way it goes. It represents a specific temporal success.

2. The Head Represents Nebuchadnezzar. I saw a letter from a very fine missionary a few years ago in which he said that now he knew what Daniel's image meant. He said these four kingdoms here represented are something that is still future. They represent a situation that is yet to occur, and has not yet occurred in the world. So if it was not for this definite statement in the Scripture that would be a possible interpretation, because there are grave difficulties/with interpreting it as being a picture of the time of Nebuchadnezzar right up to the return of Christ. There are certain grave difficulties which we have to meet, and see what is the proper answer to. And he found ^{Well} an answer to those difficulties by saying, It is all future; the whole four kingdoms are yet to come. But that overlooks the definite statement that is made here in Daniel's interp. of it where he says, Thou art this head of gold. (vs.30). There is a definite clear statement in the Scripture that it starts in Daniel's time. Neb. is the head of gold. We notice however, that this may not mean simply Neb. the man, because the next three are kingdoms. It may not mean Neb. the king, because there were a number of rulers between him and the next kingdom. It may mean all of the realm over which Neb. reigned, and his successors until there was a forcible overthrow. And I think there is strong reason to think that it does not simply mean the Neo-Babylonian kingdom, that is the kingdom of Neb. and his successors,

but that it includes the whole Assyro-Babylonian regime which == with your power sometimes in Assyria, sometimes in Babylon, has been the first great empire in the world's history.

Now the Egyptian empire was every bit as old as the Babylonian empire and it was a very powerful regime, but I think that there is a valid reason for ignoring ^(it) in the picture of those events for the reason that the Egyptian empire, so called, was primarily Egypt itself, with its great wealth, its great prosperity, and its power reaching slightly outside of Egypt, but not a great deal. The Egyptians made incursions somewhat to the south, a little bit to the west, and occasionally up here into this region, but you can see it was mostly confined to Egypt while the Babylonian empire, the Assyrian empire-- not perhaps including any more territory than the Egyptians, but a more settled territory because the Egyptian is mostly right along the Nile and aside from that it is mostly desert. While the Assyrian included what a great many what had been independent kingdoms, kingdoms that had had their own history, kingdoms with a unified language, with a unified culture were conquered by the Assyrians and reduced to their control, so that it was a great heterogeneous control by a ruler which had existed off and on over a period of many centuries. Well now whether you include the Assyrian and the early Babylonian in it or not it certainly includes not just Heb. but the whole period of the Neo-Babylonian empire. It started with Neb.'s father, but which he barely gained complete freedom from Assyria when Neb. was a young man, just before he became actually king, that is just before his father's death, and which continued in the reign of his successors ^{of whom} all/together did not rule as long as Neb. did. So the total time of the Neo-Babylonian kingdom is about 65 yrs. And that gives us a fixed point for these prophecies. It starts there. Now we notice that the two vs. just before this: Thou O King art a king of kings, for the king of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power and strength, and glory, and wheresoever the children of men dwell

the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." Well, "thou art this head of gold" ties it up and shows us where the prophecy begins. The previous statement is flattery to Nebuchadnezzar. You can say that God gave Neb. permission to rule over the world as far as he was able to conquer, but actually when you look at the whole world where ever the sons of men dwell, and think of the thousands that were in China and were in India in that period, there are millions I guess there probably, There were thousands scattered here and there including the American continent even though it was sparsely settled, and then think of this little area which Neb. controlled which was just about as big as 10 fingers would cover on this map, why the statement "Wheresoever the children of men dwell, and the beast of the field and fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand and make thee ruler over them all" is simply flattery to Neb. He had a tremendous power in an area which was quite an empire, yes, but certainly not wherever the sons of men dwell. Certainly the beasts of the field and fowls of the heaven did not obey Neb. He would say "Let all the owls go to North America! Let all the ravens go to India? Why they would pay no attention whatever! They certainly were not under his jurisdiction, or under his control.

The Neo-Babylonian empire though was a very strong empire for a brief time. Neb. had many different people under his control during this period. "Thou art this head of gold" is not an exaggerated metaphor for us at all but it certainly does not mean that it was a far greater empire than any of those that succeeded. "After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." We noticed that this word never is translated "inferior" except in this one case. "Inferior" is a correct interpretation, if you use inferior in its original sense of meaning lower. The Heb. word is simply "toward the earth." "After thee shall arise another kingdom toward the earth."

In other words "lower down on the statue." Just as the shoulders are bigger than the head, the next empire was much bigger than his empire. I think you can get an idea on this map here. (Pointing to map) Here we have Babylon with Neb. headquarters, and he held Syria, Palestine. For a very very brief time he conquered Egypt, but did not hold it very long. He did not hold anything in this direction. Whereas Cyrus conquered an empire which included all of Asia Minor, and which took over all of Nebuchadnezzar's empire, and which eventually took over Egypt and held it for 100 yrs., and which reached this far-- as far as India; included a part of India. So you can see that as far as area is concerned it was 10 times as big as Nebuchadnezzar's empire; as far as population, perhaps 4 times as big. I don't know. Three or four times as many different peoples and cultures within it. The Persian empire was a very tremendous empire which lasted for 200 yrs. as against the 65 of Neb.

Sometimes there are those who try to take every word in a certain passage of Scripture with extreme literalness. You cannot do that with the Scripture as a whole. That is perfectly obvious. But when you restrict your attention to a small portions of Scripture in which you are particularly interested there is a tendency to try to find exact literal fulfillment in every word, and when you try to do that this word "inferior" is sometimes taken to mean "less in quality." Which it does not mean at all; it means toward the earth, lower on the statue. But if you take it that way it is occasionally said that this means the Persians were inferior to the Babylonians because Nebuchadnezzar's power was more absolute and the Persian king was limited by the laws of the Persians. Now any such statement is simply contrary to fact. Because in Babylonia 1000 yrs. before Neb., King Hammurabi put up a big monument in the center of town, which showed the picture of the sun-god handing him a large writing and it said that the sun-god was giving Hammurabi the laws

for his land in order that the people should == that righteousness and justice should be throughout the land, and it's a very detailed code of law. The Babylonians and very full and detailed laws. The kings were not a bit more absolute than the Persian kings, perhaps less absolute than the Persian. Now Neb. himself may have been more absolute than most other rulers because after all he was a great conqueror, and a great conqueror is usually usually able to override a certain number of laws, but Neb. was certainly no freer from legal control, than Cyrus the great Persian conqueror at the beginning of the Persian empire, and he was probably every bit as much limited by laws as any succeeding ruler. There is no way in which, I believe, the Persian empire was inferior to the Babylonian. In fact, it is one of the strange things of history, that the Persian empire is usually not regarded as anything like as great as it is. An interesting thing about history! A thing I think it is valuable for us all to be aware of, is how little human glory lasts. I remember when I was in college reading about E. H. ^{Harriman} ~~Herrin~~ who had been 10 years before had been president of Union Pacific Railroad, and Southern Pacific Railroad, and five or six other railroads including some steamship lines, and the newspapers used to have picture when Theodore/President ^{Roosevelt was} ~~Herrin~~ of Herrin -- of the Board of Union Pacific Railroad meeting, and they would have 8 people around the table and every one of them would be ^{Harriman} ~~Herrin~~ trying to show how absolute Herrin's authority was. Theodore Roosevelt said he was an undesirable citizen, and would not allow him in the White House because his power was greater than that of the President of the U.S at that time. Ten years later I mentioned this to a young man and he said I don't believe a word of it. He said, If there had ever been a man that powerful in the country I would have heard about it 10 years later. Today most of you have probably heard of his son, Averril Harriman who was governor of N.Y. for a time, but very few of you have heard ^{probably} ~~anything~~ anything about

E. H. Harriman, who just 50 yrs. ago was so very, very powerful. Polk was probably the most effective President the U.S. ever had in carrying out his desires. He ^{added} had California and Texas to the ~~US~~ U.S. and accomplished the things he ^{attempted to} intened to ?? when he went in. Most people know absolutely nothing about it. John Quincy Adams founded the ~~Smith~~ ^{Smithsonian} Institute, and made the Monroe Doctrine, named after Monroe because he was President, but Adams was Secretary of State and really did it. He is the only president in our history who actually ~~====~~ who after being president continued to be a powerful force for 30 yrs. as he was as a simple member of the House of Representatives where he had tremendous power, and finally died on the floor of the House. Yet very few people today have ever heard of it or know anything about it. It just shows how things dissappear. And the ~~Persia~~ Persian empire for 200 yrs. was one of the great forces in the world's history. It was a very well organized, and on the whole a very well run empire. Today very few people know anything about it at all. But it is the next kingdom.

Then the Persians were takam over by the forces of Alexander the Great who wanted to be considered a Greek. So we speak of it as the Greek period, or the Greek empire which was another about 200 years. Then came the Romans. So there is no comparrison of the first three kingdoms ^{These} involved. It simply is a succession. But then we notices now something I had not mentioned before

4. (Where is No.3?) The Interpretation Gives Meaning to the Iron, v.40. ¹
 Here is the gold kingdom, the silver kingdom, the bronze kingdom. You could arrange them -- those metals in any order you want. There is nothing any more gold about the Babylonian, than about the Persian; nothing any more silver about the Persian than the Greek. They are simply different metals. But the fourth one, there is a meaning given. Vs.40 says: The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iorn, for asmuch as iron breaks

in pieces and subdues all things and as iron that breaks all these, shall it break into pieces and bruise." So the interpretation tells us that the iron has meaning: it means strength; it means power to destroy. Now the Roman empire had many good features. If it were not that God prepared the Roman empire to make it possible that the early apostles could go without much danger and without interference by borderlines and passports and so on from all that territory across from Asia Minor way across Europe and into Egypt also. The Roman empire has much to be said in its favor. But to the people whom it conquered it certainly seemed like a crushing, terrible force. It put down all opposition with a mighty hand. So the iron has meaning. It means strength and destructive power. Now we'll move on to

D. I mentioned that there are 3 real parts to the dream of Neb. The first of these is that there are four different kingdoms. The second is that about the fourth kingdom there are two phases, so I'll call that D - **The Two Phases of the Fourth Kingdom.**

In ch. 2 we are told very little about the first, second, or third kingdom. Particularly very little about the second or third. Later we have a whole chapter devoted to them. But here we barely told of their existence. But of the fourth kingdom we are told: "But whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay and part of iron" -- and you remember that the fourth one was its legs of iron, its feet part of iron and part of clay, vs. 33. Now vs. 41 says, "Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potters clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with mirey clay. And the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken, and whereas thou sawest the iron mingled with mirey clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not but they shall not cleave to one another even as iron is not mixed with clay."

Here then we have 3 vs. about the 3rd --- about the last phase of the fourth kingdom we have 3 verses, whereas we have only 2 of the 4 vs. about the whole of the first three kingdoms and the first phase of the fourth. So you see how much stress is given here to the last phase of the fourth kingdom, all this description. A description with many words but not a great deal of sense for readers today. Exactly what was said in these three verses I just read to you? --vs.41-43? If I should ask anyone of you now to stand right up and explain very clearly and fully what all these words meant, I doubt if you could give more than half as many words to explain what these words mean. Because it is not a very clear picture. But it is a picture that is repeated in these 3 verses, so that there is considerable stress on the repetition of the fact that this powerful strong iron that is in the legs is going in the feet to be mixed with clay. Now the feet are a very small part, if it starts in the upper part of the leg, or if it only started in the knee, the feet certainly not a third maybe not a fifth of them. The feet are a small part but they are the second phase of the fourth kingdom; and this second phase the iron is mixed with the clay. Now that certainly would reduce its strength tremendously wouldn't it? If I had a big crowbar here of iron it would be a powerful weapon, and I could lift a big automobile with a crowbar. But if you were in that crowbar to have an inch of iron followed by an inch of clay, and then an inch of iron and then an inch of clay and I tried to lift the automobile, it would break immediately. It is a tremendous diminution of strength. But just what causes this diminution of strength? How is it mixed together in this way? They don't adhere to one another. It is partly strong and partly broken. They are mingled together here. in a peculiar way. Now exactly what does this mean? We know that it means a great decrease in strength. Perhaps it means broken up in parts. Egypt

which would have considerable strength if iron is broken up into parts with the clay in between. It might mean that. They don't cling to one another

Just what is the full meaning of it isn't clear. But this much is clear about it that there is a very weak time at the end of the 4th kingdom. Now there was a very weak time at the end of each of the other kingdoms. It's natural when any organization exists for a certain length of time, weakness begins to creep in. The fact that the weakness does creep in is usually what makes it possible for another organization to take its place, and perhaps destroy it. Weakness creeps in. Weakness creeps in here. But we are not told much about it here. Now we will have quite a bit more about it later on in the parallel in ch. 7 so we will not say a great deal about it here. We'll go on now to

E. The Third part of the Division. Now the first two parts of the vision in the vision are static(??) They represent events but they are static. They remain standing. The fourth is dynamic; it is an event, and the event is described in the dream where Dan. said to him (vs.34):Thou sawest until a stone was cut out without hands which smote the image upon its feet that were of iron and clay and break them to pieces. Then were the iron, the clay, the bronze, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the wind carried them away that no place was found for them, and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." Then in the interpretation of it: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed and the kingdom shall not be left to other people but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the silver and

the gold, the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter, and the dream is certain and the interp. thereof sure. Let's just call E. The Climactic Destruction.

Now what do we find about this destruction? A stone cut without hands from the mountain hits the image on its feet and is broken to pieces and all the parts of it mix up with the winds and is carried away and then the stone becomes a great mountain. Of course this is not something that would naturally happen. It is a dream. In the dream this stone just swells and becomes tremendous and fills the whole earth. It is == The stress is not laid here so much on the stone becoming the whole earth, as the destruction of the image before it. Whatever this image stands for, it completely destroys it. All parts of it are completely mixed together, reduced to nothing, the wind carries them away. It is all gone, and it is entirely ^{replaced} ~~replaced~~ by something else. Now what is that picture going to represent? There are various interpretations that have been given. As a possible suggestion I am going to mention something today that may strike you as ludicrous but isn't, but the reason it may is that probably no one has ever suggested it before. I don't think it is the correct interpretation, but I do think it would be a very natural interpretation when we look at ~~this~~ history. We look at history and we see what happened. We see that the first kingdom of Babylonia, was conquered by the Persians. Now he doesn't say here it is going to be conquered. He says that after thee shall arise another kingdom. You notice. He doesn't say something here that would mark him out as a traitor, one who was looking for the destruction of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. He just says, After thee shall arise another kingdom. What happened actually was that King Cyrus took his army and conquered all the territory north of Babylon here, all of Asia Minor, a tremendous area here, and then he attacked Babylon and conquered it and incorporated the neo-Babylonian ^{just} empire into his empire. You don't know/when he made his great attacks to

the east but he did conquer as far as India including a portion of India. And his son Cambyses conquered Egypt and held it for 100 yrs. So here ^{that there} was the establishment of this great Persian empire while lasted with great strength and on the whole a very fine administration. I think it's ^{now} fair/say that that probably one of the best governments in the world's ^{has been} history is the Persian government. Generally people's attitude toward it has been colored by the stories of the Greeks who were attacked by the Persians and drove them back. Of course we honor the bravery of these Greeks who prevented the Persians from conquering them, but when you think of it with the Persians having their headquarters over here coming way over here to attack Greece, bringing an army all that distance and attacking Greece, and then of the Greeks being able to defeat them with the help of ~~a~~+great+~~stree~~+ (in two or three cases) of a great storm, and two or three bad tactical judgments on the part of the Persians leaders, and all that distance from the Persian headquarters, it was a wonderful thing for little Greece to hold back the Persian empire. But for the next 200 years the Persian empire remained in tact holding all of Asia Minor in its hand and constantly interfering in Greek politics. When Athens became the greatest power in Greece, and had quite an empire ~~an~~ in Greece and surrounding areas and Sparta opposed that, it was the Persian help to Sparta that enable Sparta to overcome Athenian colonies. Then when Sparta tried to become supreme, it was Persian help to those who resisted Sparta that prevented Sparta from becoming supreme. Sparta(??)--Persia was constantly interfering these 200 yrs. with Greek politics to keep the Greeks separated and keep them from uniting and becoming a force that would lead thousands of Greeks in Asia Minor to revolt against the Persian empire. But the Persian empire was a great force during this time holding all this great area, and with no air ~~plann~~ planes, with no trains, with no ~~basses~~+ buses, with no good roads to exercise authority over such a

wide area was a very great undertaking, and the Persians succeeded in it for 200 years. Then when Alexander the Great tried to get control of Greece and his father, Philip of Macedon tried to get control of the Greek cities and they didn't want him, they didn't consider him a Greek though he wanted to be considered a Greek. They opposed him, and Demosthenes did his great oration against Philip of Macedon, Philip found a clever way of getting the Greeks to submit to him by offering to lead them in freeing the Greeks in Asia Minor from the Persians. They had been subject to them for 200 yrs. And Philip of Macedon developed a tremendous army; many great generals; He was a very great conqueror, very great soldier, and then was succeeded by a genius. When he was assassinated his son was only 20 yrs of age, Alexander the Great who had been educated by Aristotle, one of the greatest philosophers in the world's history has been his private tutor for a number of years. Alexander the Great took the great army Philip had trained and the great Generals he had in it and asked the Greeks to join with him in attacking the Persian empire. But instead of doing that the Greek cities said, No, Philip of Macedon is dead; we are going to be free now and have nothing to do with it. So he marched his army into Greece, attacked one of its great cities, Thebes, and utterly destroyed the city. But he left the home of the poet Pindar in tact without destroying it because of his great reverence for Greek poetry and Greek learning. And of course the other Greek cities many of which hated the existence of Thebes anyway though Alexander isn't so bad if he spares the house of Pindar. They saw they could not resist Alexander and they rather half-heartedly united with him and he collected a great many soldiers from them to add to his fine army and he led an army out here. First he conquered all the territory a little ways nother, and then he marched through Asia Minor and he attacked the Persian empire, and up here in the North of Asia Minor we have a great battle in which defeated the Persian army, and then the Persian King who was utterly defeated in that great battle sent word to

Alexander and said: Let's make the Euphrates River the dividing line; you can have all the territory on that side of the Euphrates and let us live in peace and harmony." And Alexander said, No I want all of your empire. But he did not start immediately to attack the rest of the empire. He marched down here and spent two or three years conquering Tyre which was a great center for the Persian fleet and then marched down and conquered Egypt which had ~~not~~ ^{only} now been for/10 years under the Persians and was glad to be free from them and welcomed Alexander as a deliverer. Then he took his army and met the Persians in another great battle and he defeated them, he being a remarkable strategist and a very able leader and having an army highly trained during the previous 40 years. He defeated them. The Persian king fled and was assassinated. The remarkable thing was that when Alexander took over the empire for the next 40 yrs. Alexander's Generals fought among themselves as to who would control. But there was no uprising in the empire. They simply changed leaders. That's a remarkable thing. It shows the stability and the general satisfaction of the people with the Persian empire ^{within}. But Alexander defeated the Persian empire and he marched with his army clear over to India and then he wanted to go over to China but the army mutynied, so he gave that up and marched down here to the sea, and then came back along the sea to the desert and had a terrible time doing this, but came on and got back to Babylon and there had a great feast. There after 10 yrs. of ^{conquest} great conflict, the young man at 30 yrs. of age caught a fever and in a few days died. But the Persian empire was dead. But one thing Alexander did after his conquest of the Persian empire was to say, We're not going to be Greeks controlling Persia' we're going to unite with you. So he married the daughter of the Persian emperor. He had a great marriage ceremony at which 600 other of his leaders also married Persian wives, all in one big ceremony before his death. And He was going to unite the Persians and the Greeks into

one great big empire. Now is that what it means here when it says, They shall mingle themselves with the seed of men? Does that mean the Greeks and Persians are going to be mixed together? That occurs here in the lower part of the image. Does it mean that here? Well think about that and give me a yes or no answer sometime. But he was going to amalgamate into one great empire. He died and that ended that. After 200 yrs. of great power and effectiveness the Persian empire came to an end.

Now when Alexander died his generals did not know what to do. So they had a meeting and appointed one of them to be the leader. This one was the real leader and the rest promised to work with him. There was another of his generals whom he left in Macedonia to have control. The minute people in Greece heard Alexander was dead they all revolted against Macedonia. So the general in Macedonia marched into Greece, overcame the cities of Greece one by one, but then instead of treating them as conquered nations he followed Philip's idea and made them into confederacies with Macedonia as a head. They continued that way, because the Greeks were absolutely impossible to conquer and to hold as subjects, but they could be made as associates with him the head. That's what Philip did?) And that's what this general did here in Macedonia. Having done that, having gotten control of Greece he might think that he was in control of the whole empire but the general over here thought he should be in control of the whole empire, and there was another general who had a better idea than either one of them. His name was Ptolemy. He said: Here is Egypt which Alexander has conquered. It is a region of tremendous wealth, great prosperity, wonderful power, isolated by the desert on three sides and by the sea on the north. He said, If I could seize this I could hold it as my own power and nobody can bother me. So Ptolemy rushed to Egypt and got control there. He tells them he is Alexander's representative; he takes control and his successors rule for 300 years in Egypt.

But the other generals for 40 yrs. fought among themselves, and that is one of the great evidences of the excellence of the Persian organization. That during 40 yrs. when the Greek generals, or Macedonian generals probably most of them were Macedonian generals, some were Greeks, while they fought against each other, and one after another would assume supreme power and the others would fight against him and he would be destroyed and then another would try to conquer, and when they could not agree they asked Ptolemy to take complete control he said, No, I've got Egypt, that is all I can handle. He refused to do it very wisely. Finally Ptolemy said, Why claim to be subject to you people, when I'm actually independent. I'm going to call myself king. Then four of the others also took the title of king then. But the struggle went on 40 yrs. and at the end of 40 yrs. you had three great divisions of the empire and several small divisions. Why do we say there was a third empire, if Alexander held it for 10 yrs. and then it disappeared? and was broken into sections, why say there was a third empire?

I think there is a very good reason. This is it. Alexander was not interested merely in establishing his own power. Philip of Macedon and Alexander were great admirers of the Greek culture. ^{In} ~~In~~ Greece - say 500 years before - Homer had written his great work, which the Greeks to the very end of their history thought were absolutely unparalleled - the ~~Iliad~~ ^{Iliad} and the Odyssey, and which in modern times have ~~exte~~ exerted a great influence. Then after the Persian efforts of conquest had failed, during that next 200 years the Greeks developed leaders in science, in philosophy, in literature that have never been equaled since. As a complete unit they have never been equaled by any country and very few individuals have equaled these great Greek writers of these 200 years. And Philip of Macedon and Alexander wanted to be considered Greeks because they so admired the Greek culture and Greek leadership, while the Greeks rather

looked down on them and thought they were sort of semi-barbaric. But Alexander trained by Aristotle, one of the great philosophers of world history a man of as near universal knowledge as anybody who ever lived, Alexander was interested in spreading Greek culture. So wherever Alexander went he founded new cities on the line of Greek cities, and Greek cities were established way over here in Bactria near the ^{borders} ~~borders~~ of India there he established Greek cities. He established them all along. These Greek cities were organized like the Cities of Greece, They had that type of government. The language of them was Greek even though the surrounding area had other languages, and these Greek cities that he established were ^{were} areas where places where large numbers of Greeks or Macedonians lived. And which established Greek culture as supreme through this whole area. So your third is not a unified empire, it is three different kingdoms and a few small ones. But your third one there is unified in the sense that it has one main language, one main culture that is distributed through it all. It is a unified establishment. So Alexander's empire really ^{ly} continued ^{about} 10 years, but Alexander's culture and the Greek system and all that ^{of} continued for a period/for 200 to 300 years; it continues for a long period until the Roman empire comes and takes in these sections one by one. As it took them in one by one and assimilated them, but reduced their people ^{Romans} practically to slavery, as the ~~Romans~~ did that they would certainly seem like the picture Daniel gave where he said: As iron ~~g+~~ breaks and crushes everything so is this third(?) (fourth) empire. Well your Roman empire then which becomes a real empire c. 200 B.C. which takes over a large part of what had been the western part of the Persian empire by 100 B.C. and which at 26 B.C. conquered Egypt and it never did conquer the whole eastern half of the Persian empire, but ~~h~~ this whole western half and then most of Europe too at least of Southern Europe, the Roman empire is hard

to say when it starts. They say at 200 B.C. it becomes really an empire. At 100 B.C. it conquers a large part of the Persian empire. By 26 B.C it has conquered all the western part of the Persian empire. This Roman empire remains in tremendous strength up to 400 A.D. with ups and downs. But the Roman empire lasts as long as the previous two empires put together. In fact almost as long as the previous three put together. Then ~~we~~ when the Roman empire has lasted this long, we then find after 400 A.D. the Roman empire begins to go to pieces, and Germanic peoples filter into the Roman empire. The Roman empire divided c. 400 A.D. into two parts. Some people will say that on the image; the fact that there are two legs of the image shows that two parts of the Roman empire. That is quite unfounded. Because the Roman empire does not start until we get to the two legs, and the Roman empire was one unified empire for 500 yrs. It was not divided into two until it was just about ready to disintegrate. It was not actually till c. 396 (I forget the exact date) that Theodosius died ^{when} that he divided it between his two sons. There had been ~~brief~~ brief divisions ~~divisions~~ before but there had been no real divisions until practically say 400 A.D. Then it was divided between his two sons and it never was united again except under Justinian for a very brief period. So you had your Roman empire, c. 400 A.D., divided into two parts and of these parts, the western part which includes most of Europe -- this Western part of the Roman Empire by very shortly after 400 A.D. was so infiltrated by Germanic troops that it was no longer Roman at all. And by 500 A.D. the Roman empire in the west was merely a name, nothing at all. In the East the Roman empire continued with great power for two centuries, with its headquarters at Constantinople. But then you have a situation let's say in 600 A.D. with your Roman empire in the west divided up like the iron and the clay, divided up for a century with Germanic peoples who have taken over ~~the~~ the different sections and made their separate kingdoms

even though all nominally under the empire, but completely independent. Then Justinus, the emperor in Constantinople, tried to conquer the east west again and after 30 yrs. of fighting completely overcame the Germans in Italy only to have another group of Germans come in and take it all away from him. So his reestablishment amounted to practically nothing, but still at 600 A.D. it looked as if the Roman empire was very strong. In 600 A.D. you had the headquarters in Constantinople controlling all of Greece and all of the area around Constantinople, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Iran, the big area over here controlled by the Roman empire with its headquarters in Constantinople. In the west you have nobody who was considered a Roman emperor in the West. People said, We are under the Roman emperor in Constantinople but if they got any orders from him they completely disregarded them. It was all divided up into lots of petty little kingdoms held by the Goths and Vandals and Burgundians and a dozen other groups of Germanic peoples mixed with the Roman people. The clay and iron had mixed, they had mingled themselves with the seed of men. It perfectly fits with the Scripture's description in these verses. Then suddenly something happened nobody ever dreamed. Suddenly then down here in Arabia there was a man down there who read some of the Scripture or had not read them, because we don't know whether Mohammed could read or not - traditions vary, but at least he knew a good bit about the Old and New Testaments. And Mohammed decided that the Arabs with their beliefs in many different gods were completely wrong, and for a number of years at Mecca he preached there is one God and that we should obey this one God, and people ridiculed him and scoffed at him and threw rocks at him and tried to kill him, and it got so bad he decided that his life was in terrible danger. So shortly after 600 A.D. Mohammed with a very few converts which he had succeeded in winning during his ten yrs. or more or preaching there, fled from Mecca to another town called Yacherin(?) later

changed to Medina which simply means the city, and there at Medina the people were attracted by him, liked his ^{teaching} speech and under his leadership they made an ~~attack~~ attack on a caravan from Mecca and captured the people in it, and Mohammed completely changed his teaching. He == Instead of saying as he did before that there is one God. You know the word for God is Elohim in Hebrew, Allah in Arabic. Instead of saying there is one God and we should obey, he said, There is one God and ^{Mohammed} Allah is his prophet and everybody must be subject to Mohammed as God's prophet. Here at 600 A.D. ^{was} with the great Roman empire with its power in Constantinople, ruling over Syria, Palestine, all this area here, and nominally ^{ruling} over Europe, although/Europe ⁱⁿ was the iron was all mixed with clay, and in 600 that was the situation. And by 670 this little group down here in Arabia had conquered all of Arabia and had led the Arabian troops out and conquered all of Egypt, and conquered the great Persian empire that == power, conquered most of Asia Minor, and gone clear across North Africa and had come to the gates of Constantinople and ~~to~~ would have conquered Constantinople if it had not been for the invention of Greek fire(?) which drove them away from the gates of Constantinople. And the Roman empire ^{Constantinople ca} around/600 in the flower of its power, by 700 was reduced to a tiny area around Constantinople, and this new force had come, starting in Arabia there and spreading all the way across N. Africa and taking all of Spain, and it looked as if it was going to take in all of Europe and that could be perfectly symbolized by a stone cut without hands from the mountain suddenly falling and striking the image and destroying it. So the suggestion that the next empire was the Mohammedan empire which conquered all of this area and held it for nearly 1000 yrs., that is a suggestion which I have never heard made regarding the book of Daniel, but which has many many points at which it fits remarkably well. A stone cut without hands. What does it mean? Well some say it means the virgin birth. Well that could be , but I think that's

reading a bit into the pa-sage. I think we can say it is something that is not what you would expect from a human viewpoint to occur. It is something that is only the power of God. Certainly to the Mohammedan, this man Mohammed despised by his friends and relatives in this town of Mecca suddenly becoming so powerful and his followers conquering all of this area in a comparatively few years and establishing a great empire that lasted longer than all the four previous ones put together, well certainly that is one way, I don't think it is the correct way of interpreting this picture of the stone cut from the mountain without hands, breaking == striking the image and completely destroying it. Now of course it did not destroy it because they were not able to take Constantinople until 1453 A.D., it was another 800 yrs. Though they attacked/~~many+things~~ ^{it many times} they did not conquer it till 1453. During those years though Constantinople was the greatest city in Europe. Cairo was probably a greater city, and the Mohammedan power was a greater power than the power of the emperor at Byzantium and 30 times greater ^{Byzantium} ~~that~~ than any power in Europe during the period of 800 yrs. Europe was ~~the~~ reduced to almost barbarism after the end of the Roman empire and continued so for many centuries gradually getting strength again and gradually ~~getting~~ civilization became established again in Europe. But it does not fulfill the picture here you see because this is an empire which shall never be destroyed that God sets up, and the Mohammedan empire great as it was for so many centuries was gradually reduced in power until it became a comparatively small force in the world. It is not the last empire described here in Daniel. It is not that. The conquest was sudden like the conquest described here. It was one that was seemed to be cut without hands. It came all of a sudden with a power that could hardly be ~~explained~~ ^{explained} ~~empained~~ on a natural human basis, and it had a === Egypt had been a great center of civilization under the Romans, and it continued so under the Mohammedans but an entirely different civilizati~~on~~n. North Africa which was a great

center under the Romans was reduced to almost barbarism under the Vandals and continued almost so under the Mohammedans. The last part of the picture does not work out with the Mohammedans.

How then are we going to interpret? What did happen at the end of the Roman empire, that can fit this? Or how can you fit it in? Well please read, get chapter 2 well in mind. Glance over it again. Then read ch.7 which is a parallel to ch. 2, a striking parallel with tremendously different imagery, very very different and yet very parallel. Read the two. Ch.2 is well along(?) Ch. 7 comparatively slightly but the two are remarkable parallels fitting together in some places, going away (?) from each other in very interesting ways. We will look into ch. 7 next time. It is hard to know how slow or how fast to go on this because a lot of this history may be old stuff to most of you and may be very unknown to some of us. So it ^{is} ~~is~~ very hard to know how fast to go. Please have ch.2 and 7 well in mind for next time.

And think about that stone. What is it? Is it the Mohammedan empire? Is it the Roman Catholic church? Is it the slow progress of the Gospel? Or is it something else?

I hope that all of you looked over chs. 2 & 7 pretty thoroughly because I want to cover quite a bit of material. We had to lose an hour on this course and had to take a little longer the last couple of hours than I had expected, and there are some very important suggestions so I want to move a little faster on this and yet from the viewpoint of noticing important principles this section we are going to look at today is very important.

We have been looking at III which I called Examination of Daniel 2. Under that C. was the Interpretation of the Image's Main Parts. We noticed there that there is no interpretation given to the three first metals -- the gold, silver, and bronze. There is ~~not~~ no reason to think that they indicate anything intrinsic. They are -- is simply a difference between these parts, but when you come to the fourth, the iron, it is explicitly said in vs.40 that the iron indicates the strength, the iron crushes and as iron is strong and destroys so does this fourth kingdom. Then we looked at D. The Two Phases of the Fourth Kingdom. These two phases of the fourth kingdom are described -- that is the second phase showing there are two phases is described in the dream that Neb. had in vs.33 where he says: its legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. But there is no further description of that at this point. Then in vs.41-43 there is a rather extensive interp. of this. "Whereas thou sawest the feet/^{and toes} part of potters clay and part of iron the kingdom shall be divided, for in it there shall be the strength of the iron, foras much as thou sawest the iron mixed with mirey clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay so the kgdm. shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with mirey clay, it shall mingle themselves with the seed of men but they shall not cling one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. There is then quite a sharp distinction between the first part of the fourth phase of the image -- that is to say the legs that are of iron and the feet that are part iron and part clay. ~~They are strong~~

They are strong but not nearly so strong. But just where the weakness comes or why it is, in all these words in these three verses there is not a very clear understanding given. Now it might be that at the very time that it happens it would be easy to see how it fits. I believe for instance that someone living in W. Europe in the 5th or 6th cent. A.D. would have no difficulty in saying this is exactly what is described here. Because the Roman Empire in W. Europe had become merely a name at that time, and Germanic tribes which had come in had destroyed almost entirely the Roman civilization but kept some of its terminology. These tribes were strong. They were constantly fighting with one another and they would write letters to the Emperor in Constantinople calling themselves the (his) obedient servants, but it meant about as much as a letter I ~~was~~ once saw written by a General in the Confederate Army to a General in the Northern Army during the civil war in which he said, Your men have broken the rules of war; you have done such and such a thing contrary to all the rules of civilized war; you have done this that is utterly wrong; you have done this and so on. And then he ended up, Your Obedient Servant. Well, it was just a type. And certainly in their case it was just a flattering word that meant absolutely nothing, and eventually when the emperor in Constantinople tried to extend his power over Europe, they revolted strongly and refused to pay any attention to what he said.

So that anyone living then would say that here we have exactly what is described here. The so called Dark Ages. The 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries in Europe. I don't know if you would feel quite that way if you were in Palestine because at this time over there the E. branch of the Roman empire was maintaining a strong control and there was peace and civilization at about, let's say at about 400+ 400 A.D. or 350 in W. Europe, I imagine

at least 19 out of 20 people could write and read, and 100 yrs. later I doubt if there was one in 200 who could read and write. A complete drop in civilization is difficult to imagine, but it occurred. But it did not occur in the East in that way at that time, not until the Mohammedan conquest which came a little after 600 A.D. But this is D. The Two Phases of The Fourth Kingdom.

Now somebody living at that time might have been able to say, Look at these 3 vs., some of these phrases here which to us today don't mean a great deal. They would say, They exactly fit with some event. It may be that it is referring instead of that to something yet to come. If so it may be a situation that will arise in which people will say, Look at how exactly these vs. fit with this situation! I don't see myself much relevance in them to situations in the world today. If any of you should think there is I'd be interested if you would write out your reasons. I'd love to look them over and see them, whether you could present something that seems to apply them very specifically to today's situation. Now maybe they do, but I don't just see how.

But we want to get on to E. The Destruction of the Image. That is described in vs. 34-35: (Reading text of Dan.2:34-35) "That no place was found for them" --that's pretty strong language. The wind carried them away that no place was found for them. And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. This picture here in vs.35, one could not tell a great deal about what it represented if you just had it by itself. The image is destroyed; it is replaced by something else. We couldn't go much beyond that if we just had these two verses. But we have an interp. of it in vs. 44-45 where he says: (Reading text of Dan.2:44-45) Now here is the statement and the interp. and we notice in this four elements. So under E. we will say, 1 Elements. There are four clear elements in this account of the destruction of the image.

a. The Divine Origin of what occurs. The stone is cut without hands. Surely that indicates its Divine origin. This is not a human thing. This is nothing that can be explained on the basis of human activity. It is a stone cut without hands.

b. The Apparent Suddenness. Now you notice I put in the word "apparent" We are trying at this point to interpret ch. 2 only by itself. We are not wanting to bring in anything from other sources, although we will make comparisons with history where can. But we will look at other sources later and then look back. (But now we are interested in seeking just what can be learned from this chapter by itself. Certainly as you look at this statement by itself it immediately seems that -- gives the impression that it happened rapidly. "A stone was cut without hands which smote the image on its feet.

Perhaps that is reading into it. Perhaps you can imagine that the stone was cut without hands out of the side of the mountain and began to fly along through the air, it did that for two or three thousand years, and then landed on the feet of the image. It might not be absolutely necessary to say that the whole thing here is sudden and very rapid. But certainly the climactic part of it is hard to imagine from this picture as anything but very rapid. It smote the image on its feet and broke them to pieces, and then the iron, the clay, the bronze, the silver and the gold were broken to pieces together and became like the chaff of the summer threshing flood and the wind carried them away. It is rather hard to imagine that happened in slow motion extending over a period of some centuries. It seems to be a cataclysmic event that happens very rapidly. That certainly is the impression you get. So I say "apparent suddenness."

c. Complete Destruction of the Human Kingdoms. There is great emphasis here both in the dream and in the interpretation on the complete destruction of these kingdoms. The == All these parts of them became like the chaff of the summer threshing floor and the wind carried them away so that no place

was found for them. They certainly are completely gone; there is no slow development here, no gradual change. There is no taking the iron, and the bronze and making them into a different form. There seems to be a picture of a complete destruction and eradication of that which is represented by the various parts of the image.

d. Establishment of a ~~Regeim~~ Regime that Cannot Be Destroyed. This note "that cannot be destroyed" is not brought out in the dream. It simply says there == it became a great mountain and it filled the whole earth. But it is brought out in the interpretation, where he says: This is a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break into pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Certainly the stress here is that it cannot be destroyed. Now that was #1 Note the Elements.

2. Note Possible Interpretations. I am going to make two separate heads. One to note possible interpretations; and two, to examine them. At this point I will merely mention the === four possible interpretations. There might be one or two who had not heard what we said last week at the end of the hour, so a little more maybe.

a. Islamic Rule. Now that is the most natural interp. of it, at least would have been to anyone living in the time of the 7th cent. A.D. Because here was your 4th kingdom, the Roman Empire which x covered about half of the area of the Persian empire, but then added a great deal=== amount of additional territory in Europe. This Roman Empire was a very great and strong thing from a period of from 4 to 5 centuries in length. Then you suddenly out of the desert had this Islamic movement coming, with the armies rushing out of the desert; people who had been thought of simply as wandering nomads for centuries, and no great attention being paid to them. Now they come rushing out of the desert and they attack the eastern(end) of the Roman Empire and the Persian empire, that is it was the new Persian

empire which had come up on the eastern half of the old Persian Empire. They conquered that and seemed very, very strong. They seemed just as strong as the Eastern Roman Empire in 600 A.D. By 640 A.D. it had completely been taken over by the ? They took over the Persian empire completely. They took over 3/4 of the ~~territory~~ ^{territory} of the Byzantine empire- All that remained of the Roman empire actually with its headquarters in Constantinople, They took over Egypt, and Palestine, and Syria. Most of Asia Minor. They reached right to the gate of Constantinople and were only stopped there because of the new invention of Greek fire which drove them back, and then they went in the next century across N. Africa and took over Spain as well. It certainly looked like a complete overwhelming destruction coming against the Roman empire right after the period that would be described by the second phase of the 4th kingdom. So that is a. Islamic Rule.

b. The Papacy. I am sure there were those who would say that== were those who say in the 13th cent. A.D. would have said the picture here was fulfilled in the power of the Bishop of Rome. They would say, This is the ~~power~~ power that was established through Christ, the Divine One who came. Some would go so far as to say the Virgin Birth was represented by the stone being cut without hands. That ~~certainly+may+be~~ ^{could be} a part of it but certainly does not have to be the primary thing indicated. Certainly the coming of Christ was just as Divine as the stone being cut without hands, and they would say that He established this power in the Bishop of Rome and in the 13th cent. the Bishop of Rome deposed ~~monarchs~~ ^{monarchs} -- as happened for two or three centuries before. They deposed certain monarchs. They would give laws which would be bowed to by nations all over Europe. Now their power did not extend to Palestine. It did not then extend to any part of Asia. But in W. Europe it was very, very strong. This idea had been strengthened by

strengthened by a writing == by a man who I don't think had any such idea in mind, but his writing did contribute greatly to this idea. That was St. Augustine who in his book the City of God tried to answer the plea of the pagans that Rome had been a great ^{powerful regime 700 years} power for ~~700+years~~ and then Christianity had come in and weakened it with the result that in the 5th century A.D. a Germanic army was able to take the city and to spend seven ~~years~~ days just seizing and looting whatever the soldiers felt inclined to take. And another one came up from Africa 20 yrs. later with a far worse destruction and nothing like this had happened in Rome ~~for~~ for many many centuries. St. Augustine wrote his book, The City of God to say here was this human city which had great power, which made a situation of peace throughout this tremendous area reaching from Mesopotamia clear to Spain so that Paul and the others could travel back and forth without much danger from banditry or much trouble about ~~crossing~~ crossing borders or that sort of thing that you have to fuss about today to travel through most of these regions. But there was this great civilization the Romans had established and if it is disappearing, well, we don't need to feel too bady about it because after all City of God is far greater and more important ^{than} ~~and~~ the city of man, and that surely is true. St. Augustine never said the City of God was the power of the Bishop of Rome! He was ~~always~~ always glad when he had a point that he stood strongly on, if he heard the Bishop of Rome agreed with him, he would say, Look the Bishop of Rome agrees with this. You see what this great man in Rome says, how he says it fits with what I said. But then one time when he said that within a month later a bone(?)??? arrived telling that there was a new Bishop of Rome who completely reversed what his predecessor said, opposed what Augustine said, and Augustine said, The Bishop of Rome is completely wrong in this. His word has no authority." Well ^{has} his first ~~state~~ statement had been quoted and re-quoted through the centuries

and has been quoted in the form: Rome has spoken, the issue is settled. Of course what he meant was, We've all gone into this; we've had all the arguments; we've presented all the arguments, all the different people have spoken, the issue is settle. But you take the thing alone: Rome has spoken the issue is settled. That's been repeated over and over, but the other statement made very soon after it that the Bishop of Rome was entirely wrong has == is just as true that Augustine said it, but has not been given the same publicity. But I'm sure that in the 12th or 13th century with the great power of the papacy some would say, I have no doubt many many did say, This is the Fifth Monarch; this is the Divine rule ~~that~~ that is represented by the destruction of the Image. That theory, I don't know whether many Roman Catholics who would hold it today or not, but certainly no Protestants would hold that ~~b~~ view today. But there is a third

c. which is held by many today. This is that the stone cut without hands and what it does to the Image is in spreading throughout the world in this way represents the rule of Christ in this age. That Christ was born in Bethlehem and His power began to go out and spread, and His teachings reached people and they were won to the Lord, and the church grew and extended and this is what is represented by the stone destroying all the human wicked anti-God forces and gradually gaining over control of the whole world. That is a view which would have been ~~p~~ expressed specifically in discussions of Daniel by many writers say 50 yrs. ago. Today I don't find recent writers expressing it very clearly. But I do find it entwined to ~~w~~ quite an extent in some recent writings on Daniel. That is they will take a verse which fits into this and make ~~it+s~~ a strong argument upon it, but they don't carry it out to quite the extent it was done 50 yrs. ago. Now the only other possible interpretation I can think of we'll call

d. This is a Still Future Catastrophic Event -- i.e. something that has not yet occurred represented by the destruction of the great image by the stone cut without hands.

3. Examination of Each Possibility. Let us look at each of these four in relation to the four elements in the picture given here in the account of the destruction of the image. As to the first, Islamic Rule.

Examine that as to Divine origin: cut without hands. I'm sure that to all of the people of Islam it must have appeared exactly to have fulfilled this picture. Here was Mohammed who claimed that God spoke to him and gave him messages and after Mohammed had preached maybe 10 yrs. and been attacked and criticized and attempts made to kill him, that when he fled to ^{Medina} Medina and the people there rallied round him and attacked Mecca from which he had come, and then the people of Mecca joined with them and his followers took over all of Arabia and all of those other districts around, it certainly would have been said by any follower of Islam, This is indeed what is predicted in Daniel. Now whether many of them read much or do read much in Daniel, I don't know. But theoretically at least Mohammedanism recognizes the Old and New Testaments as being God's Word. But they say the Jews and the Christians have altered them in many places. The result being that they do not take them as something that can be taken as authoritative today because anything they don't like why it has been altered by the Jews and the Christians. Mohammedans are taught that the Koran is really the Bible of Islam but it is just filled with references to Old and New Testament. There has been a big argument where Mohammed could read and write. There is no proof. But if he didn't read the Old and New Testaments he certainly heard a great many parts of it read or discussed because there are great numbers of allusions. Mohammed claimed that the god he was representing was the god who is described in the OT and he claimed that this one God in opposition to the many Gods of the Arabs before his day, that this God had sent Abraham as a great prophet and they considered themselves the followers of Abraham, the great ^{father} followers of the faithful as they considered him. They took various men from the OT

as being in the line of great prophets and they held --- they hold today that Jesus was the greatest of all the prophets up to his time. He was the paragon of his --- he carried on the succession, and that Mohammed was still greater because he carried it on the next one in the line and some Mohammedan teachers would say that Jesus is coming back again and he will then be greater than Mohammed because he will be later in succession. I don't know how many would hold that view. At least as of the present they would hold Mohammed was the greatest, but they would hold that this was established of God, of Divine origin. So they could on that point make a big argument that this picture in Daniel is fulfilled in Islam.

Now the second point: Occurred suddenly. Here Islam fits exactly, because it must have appeared almost impossible to realize to people in that day how rapidly the Islamic movement arose. Here == First they heard here were these wandering tribes of Arabia constantly fighting one against the other and having little force or influence outside of Arabia and it seemed almost immediately there gathered together, they joined in this and the great Persian empire of that day they defeat and completely conquer, bring it to complete end, bring it under their force. They come down and take Egypt. They take Syria and Palestine. & So much of the E. Roman empire. They take all of Spain even, and it just must have seemed like such a sudden thing. It just looks like the stone falling and hitting the image and destroying it and bringing all into its control and becoming a great mountain and filling the whole earth. So it certainly seems to fit with the second ~~feature~~.feature.

But now the third feature: Complete destruction of the human kingdom. Now they did take over this tremendous territory, an area that had been great centers of civilization and great centers of Christianity came completely under their control. But it was not complete. Here we find the image

completely destroyed so there is no place left for it for these different parts of the image. But they were driven back from Constantinople; they failed to take it, and Constantinople remained one of the great cities of the world perhaps the greatest city in the world for a period of several centuries. Now during these centuries, the Mohammedan power whether at Bagdad or at Cairo, was a very great power. These were the two great powers in the Mediterranean area, and there was much trade between them, much relationship between them although on several occasions the Mohammedans made another great effort to conquer Constantinople. Eventually they ~~were de-~~ ^{succeeded} ~~feated~~ but not until 1453 seven ~~hundred~~ hundred years later. But during this time there remained a very considerable power with its headquarters at Constantinople, even though ~~it~~ only small compared with what it had been before the rise of the Arabs.

And then of course they took in practically all of Spain and came on up into France but were met by Charles Martel the grandfather of Charlemagne and defeated in the battle there and driven back ultimately into Spain. They never took over W. Europe. In E. Europe they were stopped by the power of Constantinople until c. 1400 A.D. when they came with new force -- it was the Turks then -- taking Constantinople and extending their powers clear up through all of ~~the~~ Hungary and even to the very gates of Vienna, but there they were stopped. They did not get beyond that. So we cannot say it was a complete destruction of the human kingdom. As a matter of fact, ^{this} it speaks of the bronze and of the iron and all these ~~is~~ disappearing so there is nothing left of them; the Mohammedans took over a considerable part of the knowledge of the ancient Greek civilization which the Romans had obtained, and the Renaissance in Europe in the 15th Century came to quite an extent through the knowledge of the old Greek advances in civilization being brought up to Spain, and taken from ther

into Europe which the Mohammedans have had and have been a great factor in their civilization during many centuries. So there+~~was~~ was certainly not a complete destruction of the human kingdoms though there == it looked like it for quite a whole, and it did destroy a great many.

d. The Establishment of a Regime that cannot be destroyed. It was the Mohammedan power that was very great and very strong, for a long time. You get up to say 1550 and you find their ~~am~~ armies at the very gates of Vienna and it looks, and it ~~look~~ looks as if all the world is going to be taken over by them, but since that time they have been gradually pushed back and during the last century Turkey was spoken as the sick man of Europe over and over by the powers that had developed in Europe. Now in this century the power of the M. at least in a physical way has been comparatively slight. So we certainly must say NO to the last two factors here. But the first two elements they seem to fit with it.

B. Roman Catholicism -- the Papacy. Here as to a. -Divine Origin, cut without hands., they can make a big argument. They cannot brush the argument aside, at least we should not. I had a very fine chap about 20 yrs., a very very fine chap from a wonderful Christian family who went to seminary and did excellent work and then~~he~~ wanted to g do graduate work and study the claims of Roman Catholicism, the claims of the papacy. We had a large number of students at that time and were very busy. He wanted to know whether he could have considerable direction in this work. I had not the time at that time, and I asked a man who was also working in that field and he thought he could give him a good bit of time but was not sure he could give him enough. So he instead of coming to do graduate work with us he went to another school, I believe was with good friends of ours, I saw~~the~~ man there toward the end of the year and he said to me: I do not know what to do about so and so. I said, Why? He said, Well he's taken the claims of Roman Catholicism and of the Papacy as the subject for his

Master's Thesis and he's coming out with the conclusion they are correct. And he said, I don't quite see how we can give a degree on that. Well, I was glad it was he rather than we who had the problem, but it certainly brought home the ^{fact} problem that their ~~argument~~ arguments for Divine Origin can be made to look very strong. I think they can be fully answered. I believe that they are not consonant with Christian teaching. But we cannot just brush them aside lightly. Many many have felt that on this matter of Divine Origin that they could make a strong claim.

But now as to the second: Apparent Suddenness. Here you certainly do not have an affirmative answer for the basis. Because Christ died in c.30 i.D. and after that the Bishop of Rome is ~~hea~~ hardly heard from for another century or two after that. We know very very little about this. The idea of the papal power seems to have developed rather slowly over a rather long period of time, and it was not until a good many centuries after that the popes were able to exert a wide ~~poert~~ power. So it does not fit for "apparent suddenness."

c. Complete destruction of the Human Kingdom. The ~~R+B++++~~ Roman Catholics have made much of the fact that in 1076 A.D. when the Emperor of Germany denied the papal power in Germany, the Pope laid an == excommunicated him and most of his supporters turned against him, and he made == went to get the Pope to revoke the excommunication and he walked barefooted as a punishment (suffering) down through Germany into Switzerland, and Pope Hildebrand ~~and+Gregor~~ (Gregory VII) came up to meet him and he was in the castle at Kimmosa and there the Emperor of Germany whom the ^{Pope} ~~Popie~~ had deprived of his power as Emperor/and the Pope ^{asked to appear before the Pope} and the Pope made him stay barefooted out in the cold for 3 days before he admitted him to his presence. Then he brought him in and forgave him and told him to be a faithful, loyal supporter of the pope after that. A~~R~~ recently as toward

the end of the last century when Bismarck^c in Germany wanted to show that he was == there was a limit to the things he was willing to grant to the Papacy he said I will not go to Kinnosa. That meant == that became a figure for the power of the pope's claims and this was a dramatic thing' when an Emperor of Germany meekly bowed before Gregory VII. That has been much talked about but less has been said that after the Pope gave him full forgiveness and told him to be a loyal follower and supporter, he went back to Germany and gathered up his power slowly and gradually built it up and then turned completely against the Pope again. That has not been ~~mentioned~~ mentioned so much. There have been cases where the Pope has been able to dethrone a king. Now King John of England submitted to the Pope and turned over England to the Pope as a fief (?) to be governed for the Pope, but the rest of the English did not recognize that and 200 yrs. later the ~~Popi~~ Popes were ~~deam~~ demanding tribute from England because John had given it ~~to~~ to the Popes but Edward III and his successors refused ~~t~~ absolutely to recognize them. So that complete ~~destruction~~ destruction of human kingdoms is far from fulfilled by the papacy. In this last century the papal power has been much less, at least in any outward visible way than it was before. Of course today there is great financial power in the Papacy. I understand that some of the most important buildings in Washington, D.C. (I mean private buildings, rental properties, and that sort of thing) are owned by the Vatican. But this can also be said of Islam. The Arabs now with their billings in oil revenues ~~ha~~ that has been coming to them in recent years are said to have purchased some of the greatest buildings in New York and they are getting large ownership in American corporations. So both both for the Arabs and for the Papacy there is considerable there is considerable financial power today but certainly far from complete destruction of the human kingdoms. Then

d. Establishment of a Regime that cannot be destroyed. Certainly we

cannot say that of the papacy today. It looks in many ways a very weak situation today and the Roman Catholic church is torn with various viewpoints and approaches and attitudes extending from the most extreme ultra stand by what the papacy claimed through the years to the most extreme modernist, anti-Christian stand held by men who are recognized as leaders within the organization. So that establishment of a regime that cannot be destroyed cannot be said to be fulfilled by the Papacy. Now as to c. The idea that it was the Power of Christ through His Church, that that is what is represented in this age by this as to

a. The Divine origin. Certainly in the coming of Christ, everything connected with it, is of definite divine origin. No question about it.

b. Now as to apparrént suddenness. It was a tremendous thing when ^{that within} in three centuries the Roman Empire was taken over by the Christians. Yet it does nto quite fit the apparent suddenness of the picture in Dan. 2. There is a question whether it was rapid enough, in taking over the Roman Empire to fulfill that.

c. As to compelte desturction of the human kingdoms, it is certainly very far from that today. The great powers of today, most of them, pay very little attention to the claims of Christianity.

d. As to the establishment of a regime that cannot be destroyed, well the postmills of a century ago may have felt that with the great spread of missions, with great spread of Christian knowledge and of Christian ideals that the world was being gradually taken over and the stone was on the way to become a mountain to fill the whole earth, but today it is very very far from. The Student Volunteer Movement of 50 yrs. ago had as its great slogan The Conversion of the World within this Generation. There are certainly many more people in the world today who have never heard of Christ than there were then. Of course there is a far greater total population, but certainly in the U.S. the no. of the proportion of professing Christains

today in the U.S is far smaller in proportion to the total population than it was 50 yrs. ago. Now of course these things can go up and down. But it is pretty hard to make an argument that the picture of the stone striking the image is really fulfilled in the spreading of the knowledge of Christ in this age. Yet at this point we are not in a ^{position} ~~position~~ ^{deny} to knock this as a possibility. (I mean this point we are taking in ch. 2 by itself, only. We want to look at it later in connection with other things. But I am very anxious to avoid a very common error of looking at a passage and saying, O yes, but this is proven by that. And then we go to the other passage and say, That is proven by this. Thus we can take a view and read it into two passages. I want to take one absolutely by itself and see what ~~is~~ we find, what could be done with it, and what the possibilities are with the others and then how they may fit together.)

Now the fourth possibility that it is a still future catastrophic event -- no one can say what can occur in the future. So at this point one could certainly ~~say~~ say that ~~is~~ if no one of these three possibilities we have looked at is fulfilled by the stone striking the image, that it would have to be a future catastrophic event. But there is one problem about it. What about the relation to the fourth kingdom? Here is your Roman Empire in its great tremendous power, reaching its greatest extent in the time of ~~Mar~~ Hadrian, say in about 120 A.D. and then never extending further beyond that. Holding what it had for another 2 and 1/2 centuries, ^{but} and ~~then~~ then being gradually pushed back and then you have the situation which corresponds very well to the description of the ~~clay~~ clay and the iron in the feet. We ~~have~~ have that situation and then you have other new regimes taking over quite completely, and it is pretty hard to say that the Roman Empire lasted later than 500 A.D. in the western areas, and the Byzantine empire after 640 say was pretty small, and in == after ~~1453~~ 1453 even Constantinople its captor was conquered. So that if this happened in the days of some leaders of the

Roman Empire it should have happened 1500 yrs. ago. so it is a problem

At that point we go on to IV - Examination of Daniel 7

A. The time and Situation. We must recognize that Dan. 7 is 45 yrs. later, at least 45 yrs. after the time when Neb. had his dream, that Dan. had the dream described in Dan. 7. We must not then assume that Dan. 7 was known to Daniel or to Neb. when Dan. 2 was given. For instance in vs.44 of ch. 2 Daniel says, "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom." There are many writers today who say, "The days of these kings" means the days of the kings represented by the toes of the image. Now there is no statement anywhere in ch. 2 that the toes of the image represent kings. There is no such statement here. So to imagine that Neb. would think that when Daniel said that in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, that he meant the kings represented by the toes of the image rather than the kings represented by the image as a whole, is rather difficult. In answer to that I find some commentaries like Dr. Young's commentary on Daniel - He repeatedly says, It nowhere says there are ten toes. Well I think that is a rather silly argument. If there were toes at all it would stand to reason that there were ten, unless there was some mention ^{given us} in it that this was an unusual statue that had an unusual number. It would seem reasonable that it had ten. But unless you find later evidence somewhere to show that the 10 has a specific meaning we have no right at this point to read into it any knowledge of different kings as being represented by the toes. I would say that we must remember there are 45 yrs. between and interpret Dan. 2 in the light of itself, and in that view these kings must be represented by the four parts of the ^{image} ~~image~~. That is, while this image is still in operation. Of course if later on we found evidence it refers specifically to kings who are 10 in number and that would be similar to the toes, then we can add that to our knowledge, but we cannot derive that ^{from} chapter 2, or interpret this phrase that way. So it is

ch. 2, or interpret this phrase that way. So it is 45 yrs. later when God gives Daniel a vision.

B. The Dream. We notice the dream is given in ch. 7. Daniel had a dream and four animals came up, evidently one after the other. ~~Then~~ Then there were certain things that happened in relation to the ^{fourth animal} four animals and then there was a great change that took place. So there is quite a marked parallel.

1. The main parts of this dream. The main parts have a correspondence with the main parts of the image because

a. The four beasts (vs.2-7) .They are described.

b. A second phase of the fourth beast is described in vs.8 I consi===== at the end of vs.7: It was diverse from all the beasts before it and it had 10 horns. I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, v.8, before which there were plucked up three of the first horns by the roots. Here is a change that takes place. Certainly a parallel to the second chapter. A second phase of the fourth beast.

c. Destruction of the beasts (vs.9-14)

2. Comparison to ch. 2 and to the history. Under this

a. The first beast and its downfall. The first beast here if this is parallel to the image in ch. 2 and it would certainly seem reasonable when there are this many similarities to think that it is; the first beast is like a lion and has eagles wings. And the lion and the eagle were both used a great deal in the emblems of the Babylonian kings. They were figures they often used to show their royalty and supremacy. That fits with the idea that this is Babylon. The fitness of the imagery for Babylon. But then the image used for the downfall is very strange. "I beheld until its wings were plucked and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man and a man's heart was given to it." This is a very peculiar

sentence here. When we recognize that this is the first year of Belshazzar King of Babylon, and the king of Babylon was pretty strong at this time and a few years after that until the Persians conquered the Kingdom, but Cyrus was already active round about there and becoming a menace to the Babylonian kingdom, it might be very dangerous to write something that would sound like treason against the Babylonian leader. We notice ~~that~~ the effusive language used about Nebuchadnezzar ~~wfem+Dan~~ when Daniel was speaking with Neb. Now it might be here that it might be wise not to say And this first beast which anyone might easily was Babylon, this beast was destroyed. Language like this -- I beheld until its wings were plucked and it was lifted up from the earth and made to stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given it. That can sound like the increase of humanitarianism, the humanizing of the ~~regime~~ regime, its standing on its feet like a man. It is quite evident as you go on that there is another beast, and the next beast is to devour much flesh. It doesn't say, To devour the first one, but it says Devour much flesh. It is rather evident that there is a change in the

But this is a very peculiar description of the change. Now I mentioned ~~to~~ it to certain Bible teachers and have said, What does this mean? Oh they say, It is perfectly obvious. It describes Nebuchadnezzar experience. Daniel told Neb. that he would be driven from men and would live among the animals, and he said in 4:16 Let his heart be change from man's and let a beast's heart be given unto him and let seven times ~~a~~ pass over him. And this is described here, they say. Well the description, while it sounds somewhat the same is pretty much different. There ~~is~~ his heart is changed ~~to~~ from a man's. He is given a beast's heart. And that is God's judgment upon him. Then when he is released ~~from~~ from the judgment, he ~~is~~ again begins to be like a man instead of like a beast and recognized God's power. Now here it does not say, Let a beast's heart be

given to him, it says, Let a man's heart be given to him. So it is the opposite of what is given there. It is what happened to Heb. at the end of him rather than at the beginning. So it does not fit. It seems that the language is somewhat similar, but you have to look closely into it, that it doesn't represent at all what happened to Neb. but that it would represent when you examine it carefully the end of the regime. There was Neb. who had a man's heart and he is given a beast's heart. There is declension. But here we have a beast pictured which is a conquering powerful thing, and it is given a man's heart meaning it has man's frailty, man's weakness. It's very different (?) difficult(?) The whole figure there.

But it says his wings were plucked. He no longer can fly like a bird. He becomes like a mere man. He comes to stand on his feet like a man, not as in Neb.'s case instead of growling ~~is made~~ groveling around on the ground like a beast but as this beast here with eagle's wings instead of flying, it just stands like a man and is made human. So the similarity to Neb.'s case is rather superficial, and it may be that there is some correspondence to precise events which if we had been there at that day we would have seen, but which we don't know about. But simply taken by itself it is a rather cryptic statement. At least here is the first beast which is doubtless Babylon, and then which disappears --- well it doesn't say it disappears but there certainly are changes, its wings are plucked, a man's heart is given to it, and Behold a second beast. Now he says in vs. 3, Four great beasts came up from the sea. It doesn't say whether they came up one after the other or whether they all came up at the same time. That's not stated in the dream. But the second beast is a bear and the bear merely represents strength. A powerful, strong thing came which might not have been able to overcome the lion with eagle's wings, but after the wings were plucked became weak like a man with merely a man's heart you can assume it would be fairly easy for the bear to destroy it. The figure of the

bear then is just a different kind of a beast. It is a question of whether we would be entitled to try to find similarities in some way between the Persian regime (the bears) any more than between them and silk(?). Certainly gold is ~~very~~ every bit as representative of the Persian kingdom as it is of the Babylonian kingdom, and I think the lion ~~and~~ with eagles wings could come just as well to represent the Persian ~~as~~ as the Babylonian. But it is another animal.

And so this second one comes -- another animal and also a very strong animal. But then it is described as having three ribs in its mouth between its teeth and they said Devour much flesh. And here comes the question Are these three ribs to be taken simply as showing very destruc-
considerable tiveness ~~====~~ he is very destructive (?) and has taken over/ or are we to try to find a precise to represent them? When you read about Cyrus' many ~~con~~ conquests it is easy to pick out three great ones among them. And the strange thing is that when you could easily pick many great ones among them, to find it stated by some "This ~~is~~ is a possible reference to the threefold dominion of the second empire Media, Persia, Babylonia. Well, that would be the empire itself -- Media and Persia. Why would it itself be represented by ribs in its mouth? That hardly seems reasonable. If you are going to pick something, pick something ~~outside~~ outside of the conquered. ~~Like~~ Like the Lydia, or Egypt, or India, or Afganistan or these great areas they took over. It is highly questionable whether the number 3 is to be taken as specific. It is a general thing that this is one that conquered much. He says, Devour much flesh.

Q. The Third Beast. The third beast is translated in the KJV as a leopard; some translate it as a panther. I don't know of any way we can get a moving picture of exactly what Daniel saw in his dream or that we can get a picture that will show us exactly what the Aramaic word was at that time, what the precise animal was they meant by that word.

beasts before it. Then

e, The Second Phase. Here == There we had the feet and toes that were divided, partly iron and partly clay in the image. Here he says it had ten horns. "I considered the ten horns and behold there came up among them another little horn, before which there was three of the first horns plucked up by the roots" Pretty hard to find any parallel between this and the ~~sum~~ image. We have the parallel that there are the three main parts, that are similar. The four beasts and then the second phase of the fourth beast. But as to ~~just~~ just what this second phase it, it is described in very different figures. Ten horns. The number 10 might be similar to the ten toes, but that is the only similarity, == their number. Because it says that among these there came up an eleventh one before which the three of them were destroyed. That is pretty hard to find ~~an~~ precise analogies in history of any point I know of although there has been so much turmoil through the years I suppose one could find it if one looked for it there are many things that might fit with that. But there is a second phase. We will look at it later when we look at the interpretation.

f. The Destruction. The destruction described is very different from the picture of destruction before, unless you just take vs.11-12.

Oh my it is past 5 of. . . . We must get to the next class on time. I cannot take responsibility for anyone being late. So please look over ch. 7 very thoroughly and ch. 8 also.

As you have noticed in this class we are not so interested in learning all the details ^{we can} about the future as we are in trying to get ^{sound} some methods of interpretation; trying to see what we can see of what is definite in the Scripture, and where the points are where we must reserve judgment and occasionally noticing where interpretations that others have drawn are either out of their imagination or ^{are actually} ~~or~~ contrary to what we find in the Scripture. Somebody suggested that since this is about the middle of the semester that we really ought to have a mid-semester test. Well I think with a one hour course perhaps it is not necessary. Especially if we had it, today would be the day. ^I We would not want to have it the first day after the vacation anyway. We have noticed that in ch. 2 and 7 there are 3 main parts in each of them. And these three main parts are the four beasts in general, the second phase of the fourth beast, and the great destruction of the beasts or parts of the image, or whatever you want to call it. These = It would have been wise if I had asked you, perhaps you have done it, == to make a list in your own use, ^{of} What verses in ~~the~~ each of the ~~chapter~~ chapters 2, 7, and 8 go under each of these three headings. That way you can compare them and see how they fit together. I think in fact you better do that anyway because it is really necessary as a background to ch. 8. Suppose you do that and get them in to me by next Thursday sometime. The list is three subjects which are discussed. First the four beasts in general, or the four parts of the image, or the four kingdoms whatever you want to call it. What vs. are there in ch. 2 that deal with it? You know in ch. 2 first he gives the dream and then he gives the interpretation. So both of them deal with it. Then in ch. 7 what vs. deal with it? Well in ch. 7 it's more complicated than in ch. 2 because in the interpretation he switches back and forth. But what is there in ch. 2 under this head; what in ch. 7? what in ch. 8? Then the second head is the last phase, the second phase of the fourth beast. That is a little different

from the rest as we noticed in ch. 2, also in ch. 7. Do you have a parallel to it in ch. 8? Then the third, The destruction, the ^{cataclysm} ~~cataclysm~~ whatever you want to call it that comes at the end when the image is completely destroyed and replaced by something else. What do you have on this in ch. 2? What do you have in ch. 7? Do you have ~~a~~ something on it in ch. 8? Just having the precise verses in front of you, I have found ^{after} is a great help as you have a question in connection with the one and you switch to the other to see what it says about it.

Now at our last meeting together, when we finished we were looking at section B. which was the Dream, the ~~Vision~~ Vision itself, the Vision ~~that~~ that Daniel had. You remember his vision in ch. 7. It begins with the four winds fighting against each other, a very vivid picture of the situation out of which these kings came, a situation of confusion and turmoil upon the earth which always results when there is not a settled government. Of course in early days every family was a law to itself, and then perhaps a family gets control over a certain district and there is safety and peace within this area ^{then} but there are constantly causes for friction with the next one. Constantly there was constant strife and turmoil until large empires became established. Large empires can be looked at in two ways: On the one ~~had~~ hand they have been a great blessing to mankind because mankind in his strife and turmoil has had areas in which he could travel freely and in safety, and areas in which there were settled methods of procedure ^{for} ~~of~~ taking care of disagreements without having to fight physically in order to settle it. So the establishment of kingdoms, the establishment of empires was a great blessing to fallen man. But it also was a great curse to fallen man, because when you have fallen men in any position in any kind of government you are going to have corruption, you are going to have wickedness, you are going to have oppression of others. In Daniel it is looked at largely from the latter viewpoint.

So we have the coming of the empire with the strife of the winds from four directions with all the upheaval, and then the first beast, the first establishment over a wide area with people of different languages and different cultures, of their being united together under one federal control was the Assyro-Babylonian empire at which Daniel looked specifically at its last stage that under Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Then we have the next three, and we had at the end of the hour spoken very briefly about the fact that the second phase, there is a second phase in the fourth kingdom here, but it is not a bit like the picture in ch. 2 of the second phase. You'd never think it was the same thing except they come at the same spot and have a such a great similarity between the first = in the first four kingdoms in general. Then we mentioned at the end of the hour F. The Destruction. Here again this is very similar to ch. 2, in that there is a complete destruction, In ch. 2 the image is completely destroyed, pulverized, nothing left of it, blown away, it all disappears. In this one the fourth beast is utterly destroyed and its body burned and end is put to him. The other three also come to an end so that you have the ~~±~~ very definite parallel between the parts of the two, but the account of the destruction here is altogether different from anything that you find in ch. 2. You have simply the fact of ^{complete} destruction, of complete end of all ^{force (?)} here, which is exactly like the kingdom of God but how does it happen to have a great deal of details in ch. 7 which is not even hinted at in ch. 2? We see yet how they fit together, they have so many things in common.

Now that was then the vision he had. Then the Lord gave him an interpretation. I'll call that C. No, ^{I'm going to narrow that} I'm going to call C. The Interpretation of the Four Beasts. The interpretation in ch. 7 is so extensive that I'm going to subdivide it into into the three parts all of which we looked at together under Capital B. Daniel's Vision.

So Capital C. under ~~III~~^{IV} is The Interpretation of the Four Beasts. We

notice in vs.17, the first part of the introduction, he says: These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, who shall arise out of the earth."

Now in ch. 2, the last 3 of them were called kingdoms. So it is very evident

^{how} he is using the word king in the same sense there he was using the word kingdoms. There is not a precision here in the use of words. It is very important that we understand what we mean by plenary inspiration or by verbal inspiration, by inerrancy of the Scriptures. Some people have the idea that the inerrancy of the Scriptures means the Bible is like a map or picture that could be made by a satellite far above the earth, having on it a camera far better than any camera that has yet been invented ^{which} ~~while~~ would take a picture in precise detail ~~of~~ of everything underneath. Now you will take that picture and look at it and if the picture were not very large you would not see a great deal of detail. But being made with such a very excellent camera you could ~~it~~ enlarge it and then you could get much more detail. And when you enlarge the picture so that instead of being the size of a page it was the size of this room, you would have a very considerable amount of detail, but then you could take a very strong glass and look in detail at each section of it. They do say that some of the planes have taken pictures which are ~~are~~ taken very high up which are so good that you can see individual automobiles on the ~~to~~ ground. We have very excellent pictures like this which you can look at enlarged in detail. But this goes far beyond that so that every word in the Scripture can be squeezed to (get) the last bit of possible information from it. Now that is not what we mean by inerrancy. By inerrancy we mean that the Scripture ~~probat~~ properly interpreted does not teach something that is erroneous, in error, ^{it} ~~it~~ means no error. We don't mean that nobody can get an error out of the Scripture. Anybody can. You take one vs. by itself, you can get all kinds of error out of the Scripture as you can out of ^{any} other things. But what we mean that

properly interpreted in the light of context, in the light of comparison of passages, in the light of determination of ~~the~~ the meaning of the word, you do not get ^{an} error from it. Like, for instance if it said that Jesus on the way to Emmaus met two women, and he walked with them and talked with them, that would prove specifically there were ~~two~~ two women with whom he came back and with whom he talked. But it does not say, He met two women. It does not say he met two men. Now if it ~~say~~ said He met two men, the word man if ~~is~~ is often used in Scripture in a generic sense meaning human being. So the word men in many cases could include women. But it says, two disciples which very definitely does not tell whether they were men or women. It has ~~generally~~ generally been assumed they were ~~two~~ two men, but there are those who suggest it was a man and a woman. It is just as possible. It was two disciples. Inerrancy does not mean you can take this verse and you can determine which it was. It means that from this verse you know ^{there were} ~~it was~~ two disciples, and so one of them was not an enemy of his. It was not somebody who had never heard of Him. They were two disciples, but it says nothing about their ~~gender~~ gender whatever. So here we find that in these two chapters, here we have two things ~~that~~ that are absolutely parallel and one is called a kingdom and one is called a king, and it shows that in Dan. in this vision we are not really told whether we are thinking of the man who rules or of the realm over which he rules. As a matter of fact the Roman empire in the time of its power never had a king. It says here they are four kings, and in the sense of kings, the Romans had killed their last king at least 300 yrs. before the beginning of the Roman empire and they never had another man in control of Rome whom they called king. So that there is an accuracy, there is a truth, but there is not a great precision. It is a power, whether you think to some extent of the man, to some extent of the realm. And as a matter of fact we know from the fact that the first kingdom, the ~~the~~ head of gold, covered not only Nebuchadnezzar but four successors. ~~***~~ We know that these are realms. They are types

of culture. They are rules of many peoples ^{coming} under one head, with ^{with} under one controlling cultural attitude. That is what these mean as we can determine from it, but we can't take a word and press it to the very extreme. We have to compare how the words are used and what the Scripture means.

So here he says these are four kingd. That's the first thing we notice as to the interpretation of the four beasts. They are four kings.

Now a second thing we notice is four kings ~~white+white~~ which shall arise out of the ~~he~~ earth, he says. No. 1 there are four kings. No. 2 we notice about these four kings the nature of the ^{fourth} ~~four~~ beasts. We are not told anything about the first three beasts. We only have from this ch. such information about the nature of the first three beasts as you can get from the figure of the description of the beast. It is very questionable how much you have a right to gather detail from the picture of the first three beasts. How much ~~is~~ of it is simply there are three different beasts or what ^{this} is there in it you can say this corresponds to something in it, or is it? Certainly you can think of many things in it ~~==~~ in them which do not correspond. ^A ^{The fact they have} ~~The~~ four legs do not correspond to anything in connection with the first kingdom for instance. There are many things that don't correspond. They are simply pictures of four animals, but some of the details do have particular correspondences to particular historical situations. We have to ^{go} ~~be~~ slow and careful though in attributing much to it because there is no interpretation given of the first three except that ^{they} there are three beasts, three kings which shall arise out of the earth. Now the fourth beast we are told more about in the interpretation. ^{vs. 19} Vs. 19 we read: Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceedingly, whose teeth were of iron, and its nails of bronze, which devoured, broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet." Vs. 19 ^{asks} ~~is~~ a question about the 4th beast in general. Vs. 20 asks

a question about the second phase of the fourth beast. Vs. 19 asks a question and it is answered in vs. 23: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces." That doesn't tell us much that we have not known about the previous ones. Again the word "the whole earth"; we must not press to its ultimate because the Roman empire did not conquer America, it did not conquer China, it did not conquer Africa south of Egypt south of N. Africa. It did not conquer N. Europe, but it did hold a greater part of the then known civilized world. It conquered a tremendous area, much larger than the previous ones had held although some parts of the previous one were not included in the Roman Empire. We learn from this ^{that} the fourth kingdom is different from the others, and it certainly was different. The first kingdom, Neb. and his successors, ruled by terror, ruled by ~~===~~ completely by force, by taking peoples away from one area and moving them to another where they would be ^{completely} subject to their power. The second one, the Persians, ~~de~~ dealt with people in a very diff. way, giving the people a great amount of freedom, not interfering much with their local customs and local manners. Cyrus claimed to be a representative of the gods of all these different areas, and allowed the people and encouraged them in ~~followed~~ following their own customs, their own habits, their own religions, and enforced general peace throughout the whole region and subservience in certain ways to the Persians giving to them ^{the} of Persians soldiers and giving them certain amount of taxes, but was very different from the Persians(?) (the Babylonians). And then the third was different from either of the first two in that Alexander and his successors had a great idea of the superiority of Greek culture to the culture of either the first or the second and was anxious to extend it through their domains. They did not do it the way the Babylonians tried to - by force and terror - though they did use terrible

terror against individuals who fought against them or resisted them, or rebelled against them, but they tried to exert it through establishing colonies, building new cities which would be ^{the} Greek cities, and making these ^{cities} / the dominant ^{commercial} ~~promotional~~ and cultural influences within these ~~re~~ areas. And way over in what is now Afganistan and the regions south of Afganistan. Glance at the map here, as we see Babylon in here and way over in this region here next to India. In this region of Afganistan and little regions around it there was a section over there which was called Bactrai in ancient times. That section == in that section the / reek governor who was put in established Greek towns in different places, and after the empire broke up there == their control by Seleucus was very very slight, but they maintained the Greek culture, the Greek attitude, the use of the Greek ~~language+fo~~ language for centuries afterward even when their connections with the west were largely ~~p~~ broken off. There was a great area of Greek ~~e~~ influence way over there in what is now Afganistan, nearly twice as far from Palestine as Greece itself was. So this spread of Greek culture through all these areas ~~is~~ intentionally worked out by Alexander and his successors was a distinctive feature altogether different from the first three.

So we have the three different. Then the fourth, the Roman empire. Rome made everything subject to Rome, but did not interfere a a great deal with their local customs in most cases/ ^{with their} Their local customs, local habits, local ~~religions~~ religions simply insisting that they introduce the Roman Emperor into their == among their gods as one of their leading gods and that is where they came into trouble ~~is~~ with the Jews because the Jews said Our God is the supreme God. There can be no others. Whereas the other people said, We believe in this god and this god and this god, now if you also want us to worship Nero as god we will add him to the other gods and we will even ~~you~~ when you are around say he is the leading god. But the Romans did not

interfere a great deal with individual life of a nation. Either the Greek culture continued to be dominant under the Roman empire. Rome was never quite the sense a ~~king~~ in the same sence the others were. Way up until almost the end of the Roman empire the emperor simply claimed to be the leading citizen of Rome and theoretically went all through the forms of republican government even though everybody knew that what the emperor said was to be done and would be done. It was pretty dangerous not to be done. But the Roman was ~~diff~~ very different. So it was diverse from ~~the~~ are the others, and it was more powerful than the others and the regime lasted as long as any two ~~of+an+any~~ of the others put together. Perhaps as long as the three others ~~put together~~ ^{breaking it} put together. Its stamping the residue with its feet, devouring it/to pieces is good description of the way Rome treated the Jews and treated the other ~~people~~ people== and treated any other people that were rebelling against them, but it is not a true of most of the people that Rome conquered. If they were subservient they were individuals who got tramped under foot but as a whole they had an area of general ~~freedom~~ ^{peace} and opportunity of travelling through territory and carrying on their lives with no great interference except for the taxation which at times was very heavy. So/the nature of the fourth beast as described here in No. 2 vs. 19-23.

Now we will go on to Section D. The second phase of the fourth kingdom. We noticed that there really is no similarity in the picture of the ~~second~~ second phase of the fourth kingdom in the image and here. In the image it is simply that ^{there is} mirey clay mixed in with the iron, that there is == it is not a unified, not strong. That's all it says there. Now what it says here is not the least bit like that. ^{coming at} But/on the same place in a vision so similar we figure that it is a picture of another side, another view of that same general period. Under D. we notice first

1. The Ten Horns, ~~7+20~~ 7:7 mentioned that the ~~best~~ ^{beast} had ten horns. Now from that picture you would imagine the beast coming and you look at it and you see

you see ten horns on it. That is a very strange thing. I never heard of a ~~best~~ beast that had ten horns. So when you get something that is ordinary -- a beast that has toe ~~nails~~ nails, a beast with legs, a beast that has perhaps fur on it, things like this are just part of the natural picture. But when you get ten horns, there is something unusual, something strange about it. We don't need to stress the fact that there were ten toes on the image. That is an interesting similarity but here we have it explicitly stated there are ten horns. Now Young's book on Daniel three or four times stresses the fact it is never said that there are ten toes. It seems to me rather a waste of space, because after all how many toes did it have? It is mentioned it had toes, and I don't think it makes much difference ⁱⁿ what it means. Here we have ~~this~~ ^{just} specific -- it has ten horns. But are these ten horns all on it when it ¹ comes? Well, you certainly would get that impression from ch. 7. You get that impression except that you notice that after he describes it -- "a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly and had great iron teeth and it devoured and broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it AND IT HAD TEN HORNS. You kind of wonder, why did he not say: He saw a beast come up and it had ten horns? Why does he not put it at the beginning? Well, you could not draw from that alone, but that is an interesting fact and suggests although does not prove that the ten horns are late in the history of this beast. But then it is referred to in vs. 20 where it says: And of the ten horns ~~that~~ that were in its head, and of the other which came up before whom three fell" --- that is he inquired that again tells us nothing about it. But in vs. 24 he says, "And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them and shall be diverse from the first." Well, ^{do} ~~are~~ these ten horns all there when the beast starts: We have not been told that they are not. Except it says here "they shall arise." The fact that they arise suggests

here "they shall arise". The fact that they arise \ddagger suggests that they were not there at the beginning, but I'm not sure just how much you can draw from that. They shall arise, and another shall arise after them and shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. Except for the mention of the other "after them" you would not know for sure whether these ten kings came up one after the other. They are ten kings that shall \ddagger arise, or that whether the ten arise more or less at the ~~tim~~ same time. You are not told. But when it says this latter one, this one that rises after them -- it could be just the eleventh one, "but he shall ^{subdue} ~~subdue~~ three kings" Well that suggests that probably the three kings were still in existence when he saw(?) three, and it suggests that all ten were in existence simultaneously rather than one after the other. It does not prove it, but it seems the most natural way to interpret it in view of this little horn subduing three of them this way. So we have the question, Are they successive or are they contemporaneous? And we have good evidence to suggest though not enough* to prove up to this point that they represent ten contemporaneous kings that come near the end of ~~th~~ the history of the beast rather than being characteristic of it all through.

Now of course if you want to characterize Rome, the natural way to characterize Rome is by the number seven, because Rome was always spoken of as the city on the seven hills. The seven hills of Rome are very famous and are referred to in the book of Revelation. But here all we are told about it is that there are ten kings. So there is a strong suggestion here that this is a second phase and ~~hee~~ here perhaps we can add to our strength of feeling that this is correct the fact that we have the two phases in ch. 2 of the fourth kingdom suggests that there are two phases here, and that this is the latter phase.

2. The Little Horn. What are we told about the Little Horn? In the dream we saw(v.8) that: "I considered the horns" and that suggests coming

right after vs.7 that he does not say anything about whether the horns were on the beast when it first came up; he did not even notice them. They might have been there and they might not have been as far as he knew. But now after seeing it destroying everything ^{then} he notices them. So it does not prove at this point whether the ten horns were from the beginning, but it does show that after the great destruction he notices it had ten horns. Then he says: I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before which there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots -- this suggests certainly the three were in existence at the time when the eleventh came up, not that they were // destroyed // one after the other.

- - that would be possible but would seem far less likely, and would suggest that all ten were there at that time. "He plucked up three of them, and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things. The eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things. What do we find then from this, and from the later mention about this little horn?

a. (under 2) His Victory. That is one thing that is clear. He overcomes three of the others. His victory is definitely mentioned.

b. His Arrogance. He was speaking great things. What does this mean? Great philosophers and great scholars speak great things. But ordinarily we don't use it in quite that sense. It is more the sense of how great he thinks he is. See what tremendous claims he makes. That's more the impression we get from it. We certainly get the impression of arrogance. Look at vs.11 where he says: I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and its body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. So that ^{the} speaking of the little horn is before the end of the great beast. Then in vs. 20 -- he wanted to know the truth about the ten horns that were in its head, and ~~of the other~~ ^{ANNOUNCED UNTILL} which came up, before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spoke very great things, whose look was more stout than its fellows.

Well that sounds like arrogance. His looks were more stout. It does not say he looked more stout than he was a little horn. But his looks were more stout than his fellow. So we certainly have arrogance expressed. Then when you get to verse 25 you find: And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High. Here you get a new thought. You don't get so much the arrogance ~~XX~~ in vs25 as you do in the previous verses. In vs. 25 you get

L'd. His Opposition to God 7:25. And he shall speak words against the Most High. You notice KJV has great words, but the great is in italics. Whether they simply inserted it from the other passages, or whether there is something in the context that suggests it, I did not think to check in the Aramaic. But I shall do so. He spoke words against the Most High. They have "great" inserted in italics. They may have reason for it. One thing about italics in the KJV, everyone should be well aware who uses KJV that italics do not stand for emphasis. Like the case where it tells in 1 Kings 13 of the prophet who said to his son, Saddle me the ass. And they saddled him and the him is in italics; it was not he that was the one saddled, but that ~~it~~ ^{Hebrew} just says they saddled, and in English KJV inserts the word him. Here ^{simply} but it does not always mean that there is ~~simply~~ an insertion of what was not there; it may be something that is carried (??) ^{by} from the context, that it really is there. That they saddled the ass. ~~it~~ There is --- It is required in English. I don't think "great" was required in English. But there may be something in the context that suggests it.

(Student question: You had said that the Little Horn conquered three kings, and that was a picture of the ten kings co-existing???) No, No. I said there are ^{two} ~~three~~ ways you might think of these ten horns. They may represent here a king who reigns. Here's another who reigns. Here's another who reigns. Here's another who reigns. Or it may suggest ten kings all

reigning at once. Which do they suggest. Well, the fact that he conquered three suggests that the ten did not ^{all} reign [^] all one after the others. It suggests that the three were reigning at once. Now I said if the three were reigning at once, it is a rather natural supposition that at least the last three are not to be taken as successive ^{as} but/at the same time and if the last three are at the same time it seems a likely thing that all ten were at the same time. You see what I mean? It does not prove it, but it suggests very strongly that when he destroys three the other seven are still there.

(Student question: Could we just as likely assume that seven kings had reigned in succession and that the last three were at that time (indistinct -- unable to get the rest of the question) That would not be impossible. I would say it would be very unlikely. Because I would think that if that is what he saw that he would have said, I saw seven kings reigning and then they disappeared and then I saw three and then the little horn destroyed the three. I would think that very unlikely but I don't think we can rule it ~~out~~ out. One thing about future prophecy It is not given to satisfy curiosity. It is given to show that when the things come to pass, the people of God can see that God spoke truly. So there are many many things in all future prophecy ^{that we cannot understand} until the time of its fulfillment (?) The NT has quotation after quotation from the OT that it ^{is} fulfilled in the life of Christ. And you can look at Christ and say, Look its exactly like the OT said, but I don't think anybody could have taken those things out of the OT and ^{then told} ~~quoted them~~ just how they were going to happen. When they happened you see what it says. So we want to see how much we can take out. And if we can take up Now we can talk about these kingdoms which existed and then disappeared Now can we find in ancient history something that exactly corresponds to this and therefore say, This is a picture say of what happendn in 300 A.D.

and is fulfilled the way it says? If we can't/^{do we}we say, This is a picture of something yet to come? See what the possibilities are. See what we can see clearly but not be dogmatic where we can't see == be sure from what we see. I appreciate that w question and it is hard to know just how fast and how slow to go on with this so ~~anytht~~ any time any of you has a question I'd appreciate anytime your raising it about anything you think is not clear or anything/^{you think}is not proven from the context, is not a fair presentation of what is given, please raise the question. If you have a point where you feel quite definitely that some other interpretation is better than what I have given I would appreciate it greatly if you would write it out and give it to me, and I will look into it and discuss it with you at the next hour. Because we have a lot of ground to cover and I don't want to take time going into other -- into things which contradict the view I'm presenting, but to ^{be sure}insure it is clear what is said here in the class. Something that anyone feels contradicts it, or I might misspeak myself, -- I might say Rome when I meant Greece or something like that and if I do I wish you'd speak up, but any place where you think another interpretation (would be better), I wish you would write it out. I would appreciated it greatly, and I will look ~~it~~ into it, and discuss it the next time.

Now we were speaking of his opposition to God. This is only brought out in this one statement in vs. 25. He will speak words against the Most High and shall wear out the saints of the Most High. That is definitely opposition to God. I am ^{going to}not/make opposition to the saints a separate statement. I'll consider the two here as in the same: opposition to God.

d. w. His changing times and laws. "And think to change times and laws" in vs. 25. How very ^{crips}crips the phrase. Back in 1941-42 or was it ^{before that?}45? Franklin Roosevelt decided that Thanksgiving instead of being the fourth Thursday in Nov. should be the third Thursday in Nov. so as to have a

longer time between it and Christmas instead of having the two so close together and he issued a Thanksgiving proclamation a week earlier than it had ever been issued before. And there was great opposition aroused for that departure from the old traditions of America to the third Thursday instead of the fourth. Tremendous opposition, and there were many people who said he is the little horn who shall think to change times and laws. There were many who said that about FDR at that time. I have not met anybody ^{recently} ~~recently~~ who said this was a picture of F. Roosevelt. But the strange thing is that within these last two or three years they have changed -- they have not touched Thanksgiving ^{Day} ~~yet~~, ~~XXX~~ they still keep it the fourth Thursday but they have ~~de-~~ changed Washington's Birthday, they have changed Veteran's Day, they have changed a lot of days, and I have not heard anybody say that our present leaders are the Little Horn, though they have gone much further in this direction than FDR. Just what does it mean: He shall think to change times and laws? We don't know. At the time of the French Revolution laws in France were completely changed. There were all sorts of changes, some of which have survived, and most of which were completely eradicated within the next 20 yrs. But at that time the French --- the Revolutionary Government said we are going to have a ten day week and the ten day week will have a day of rest the tenth day. Now that was a very definite change of times and laws. But it did not last. 6 It was found that God had made man such that he needed one day in seven for rest, and He has given us the Sabbath ^{which} ~~while~~ fits with the needs of man as God has made man, and they found that a ten day week just does not work and they gave it up. That you could say is what is described here, but I don't think it is the event described here. But it may be similar to this. You could find various times in history when there is somebody that did something that to some extent would fit into this. Just what it fully means is rather hard to say. Then it says, They shall be given into his hands. What shall

be given into his hands? The three kingdoms that he has conquered? The whole ten kingdoms? Or the saints ? Well the nearest subject to it is the saints, or no maybe the ["]times and laws["]. Is it the times and laws will be given into his hands? Is ~~the~~ is the saints? Is it the kingdoms he has conquered? It does not say. "They shall be given into his hands until ~~the~~ a time and times and the dividing of time." In other words three and a half times. Well what is a time? Is it a minute, an hour, a day, a year, a century? What is it? It does not say. It is three and a half times." But the judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end." So

e. His Limited Continuance is three and a half [months(??) years.] His time is limited, but how long it is is not expressly said. It ~~x~~ is three and a half of something. Then

f. His Downfall. That's very clear in vs. 26 "The judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to ~~destroy~~ ^{destroy} it unto the end." His definite downfall, but it does not say how it is going to take place. It does not say what is going to bring it about. So this is all we can draw from ch. 7 about this ~~fourth~~ ^{second} ~~beast~~ ^{phase}."

(Student question: About this use of the word times

cryptic?

(Indistinct: unable to hear it)

I doubt it. I think it is like you might say periods. Seven amounts of time. I doubt if this is easily understood. Now it == we have no evidence outside of the Book of Daniel, and as we go on in Daniel, we find things that may throw evidence on it. It may be that taking what comes later in Daniel one could look back and give an interpretation ^{to this} and if so we will look at that later, but we are going through trying to relate Daniel to his trying to see what we can find clearly from it.

Not looking at others parts of the Bible except where the relation is absolutely clear so that no one can disagree. And not looking at later parts of Daniel, but looking at each section as we come to it and then when we come to a later ^{thing} then going back and ^{see if it throws any light} such as to draw anything from the ten toes in ch. 2 would certainly be going without warrant to ch. 7. Now in ch. 7 we find ten horns and there was a mention of it

so you may say there was a suggestion of its being explained later but you would not be sure unless you came to it later. I would say at this point all we can say is ^{it is} three and a half periods of some length or other. Now as we get on we ~~may~~ find that

I don't want to look ahead. I want to look only back.

Your question of course is an altogether valid one; there is often a possibility in a book of the Bible, particularly when it is dealing with a culture -- that of Babylon here is so different from what you find in most of the OT, there is a possibility that there is something that we don't understand that would be perfectly clear to the people of that time. That is a possibility. It is possible that something will be discovered that will throw light upon it. I am not nearly as far as I want to go at this time, but I do think this is an important enough point that I am just going to draw an interesting illustration. If you look at the Book of Nahum, you will find a ~~very~~ peculiar statement in vs. 12 of ch. 1. Now the Book of Nahum is an attack against the Assyrian empire which was destroyed in the early days of Neb. (indistinct)
 But speaking ^{? it starts} ~~historically~~ of the burden of Ninevah; he is speaking about the Assyrians, and he says in Nah. 1:12: Thus saith the Lord: Though they be quiet, and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down, when he shall pass through." That makes absolutely no sense for us today. "Then they be quite and likewise many." Now the word there translated "quiet" is

Daniel 3/18/74

29

similar to the Hebrew word for "peaceful" which would not make certainly any sense at all. It is the three consonants shin, lamedh, mem. It really does not make any sense. And the translators of the Revised Version of 1901 translated it "though they be perfect and likewise many" because "peaceful" - the word sometimes has the idea of perfection -- though they be perfect and ~~also~~ likewise many, but that/does not ~~doe+not~~ does not convey a lot of meaning ^{in English}. It is ~~pretty~~ ~~pretty~~ ~~QUESTIONABLE~~ questionable to draw that meaning from the word. "Though they be peaceful and likewise many" would be a more accurate rendering than "though they be quiet and likewise many". But it really does not make much sense. But now within the last 100 yrs. there has been discovered in Assyria and in Babylon thousands, yes hundreds of thousands of clay tablets some of which are historical accounts and that sort of thing. But many of them are e simply contracts made by individuals and a great many of these have never been read. They have been glanced at and there have not been enough b people trained in cuneiform to read them all. And most of them, we are not greatly interested in the fact that Teckitilla in a certian little town in Assyria bought a piece of land and paid a certain amount of for. So we can glance at most of them. A number of theses have been written in which a certain group of them has been carefully studied. But you can find by == just by ~~glancing~~ ^{glancing} over them you can find certain big features and one is that in the Assyrian ~~concept~~ ^{contrasts}, those around Ninevah there, there is a phrase that occurs over and over, and this phrase does not occur in the Babylonian e tablets. This phrase we prnounce as shamucain(??) and in the Heb. here the letters just correspond to this phrase = though they be shamucainu. The kenu is here translated likewise in the English text, and then the word many follows. Though they be shamuchainu many, yet shall they be cut down. Now in ^{these} the Assyrian contracts of which I have read a considerable ^{number}, this phrase occurs repeatedly and the context makes very clear what it

means. Five people borrowed a sum of money from a money lender, and they say that they == we will be shalmuchainu in ^{borrowing} buying this, and the context makes it perfectly clear that ^{what they mean is} we will be --- what we say in modern technical language -- is jointly and severally responsible. In other words, this sum which we have borrowed, each of us is responsible to ^{repay} ~~repay~~ his share, but if any one of us does not do it and falls, the others have to make up the difference. If ^{or unable} only one of us is left and the rest are all killed or out of the way, ^{for the whole thing} that one is responsible ^{to} pay it back. We are shalmuchainu as a group responsible for this obligation. So here Nahum says of the Assyrians, the Lord said== says Even though you severally and jointly every one of you take the responsibility and take it all together, nevertheless he says you will be cut down and He will pass through. ~~ZTBBB~~ ^{Though} I have afflicted thee --- then He turns He will not afflict Israel any more but he is going to destroy Assyria. And Assyria was definitely and utterly destroyed.

So here is a phrase which meant absolutely nothing. "Likewise many" - what sense does that make? It makes none. As though you will be shalmuchainu many yet the Lord will overcome. Even if none of you run off the Canada to get away from ^{taking} your part in defending your nation, ⁴ you all together ~~all~~ stand in defending your nation against it, yet ~~we~~ God will cause you to be overcome and destroyed, ^{despite all you do} IT is very clear what it means in the light of the customs of the area which have been discovered lately and were unknown for 2000 years, completely forgotten. Well now there are little things like that in the Scripture which don't affect the general thought of the Scripture -- they don't affect the doctrines at all, but they are things that cannot be understand without the light of the cultural situation at the time and the Lord has ~~pp~~ put them in there as little evidences ^{to show the} of the accuracy and truth of it. So it may be that God will bring to ^{light} ~~us~~ something that will show that this ~~was~~ ^{word} "time" as used there in Babylonia has ^a ~~this~~ specific == had a specific technical meaning. But no such thing

4/1/74

DANIEL COURSE

Copy 2

7th lecture

I hope those who are here remember what we were talking about last time. We were discussing, you remember, Daniel 2 and 7, and we had ---we were dealing with in the outline, No. 4 Roman Numeral IV which was on chapter 7. In Roman Numeral IV we called Capital D, The Second Phase of the Fourth Kingdom. And under that just at the end of the hour we were looking at the Little Horn, and we had E. His Limited Continuance (3 and 1/2 times), and F. His Downfall. And there are no details given about his downfall just that he ended. Right at that point somebody asked about the meaning of "times" and we spent a bit of time discussing that and also discussing the quotation from Nahum which really isn't connected with this course, but was interesting in showing how we don't just always understand everything in the Scripture yet ~~as~~ with new light that comes it may become clear. Also there are matters in the Scriptures which are of great importance in certain situations, and if we are not in those situations those passages may be difficult for us to understand. God has written His Scriptures for all periods, and He knew that when He made that reference to the Assyrian phrase, it would be completely forgotten what it meant for a period of nearly 2000 years, and people would try to interpret it and could make no sense out of it - "they shall be quiet and likewise many" - What sense is that? It just did not mean anything, and now we have discovered that it is a little seal or a little emblem of the truth of Scripture, of its accuracy, of its dependability. Now/we have this evidence from Assyian. So we don't need to think that we are going to understand everything in the Bible. The worst things we can ~~xxxxxxx~~^{do} is to try to force things into a mould, and try to make them fit what we have gathered from other passages. I used to be quite disgusted when I was in Seminary, particularly in the class in Systematic Theology, because a verse would be quoted so often as proof of ~~e~~ something, and I would say, Well that doesn't prove it;

That is given as an objection, it is not stating something. It says, But thou wilt then say - But he would say, But then yes but it summarizes the passage. Maybe it summarizes the passages, but if it's introduced with the words, "thou wilt then say" it is given as an objection. You have no right to take it as summarizing the passage anymore than if you quote something from some other place. Passages were so often taken out of context.

I remember the one ~~that~~^{thing} that disgusted me particularly, and yet I think I was less justified in being disgusted at it than on any other occasion, was when the professor said that when it says in the Apostles Creed that when He descended into hell it means He went to heaven. Now that seemed to me at first sight to be making something mean the exact opposite, yet when you look at it closely it isn't because the fact of the matter is that we don't know ^{much} what is going to happen after death. We don't know. And the Heb. word that is often translated "hell" may simply mean the condition after death, and is used of good people as well as of evil people although it is used more in connection with evil people. And the word that is translated "heaven" is used far more often for the sky than it is for our condition after death. We know that if we believe in Christ that we will be with Him and that is wonderful beyond anything we can conceive, but when we try to put out into compartments just what conditions will be after death, we are apt to be using our imagination. The Scripture tells us very little about it. We know that there is misery ahead for those that are lost; we know that there is wonderful joy ahead for those that believe in Christ. So I was terribly disgusted at the Professor's use of that, but actually it was not the Bible he was twisting, it was the Apostle's Creed. So I've completely forgiven him for that and also I'm not sure he was twisting it. But I do think there is a tremendous danger of our thinking that everything in Scripture has to be understood. I used to find that the professor gave

a great truth, and somebody would bring up a verse that seemed to him to contradict it, and often he would explain the verse in such a way that it meant nothing. It may as well not be in the Bible. Now I think everything in the Bible is there for a purpose. We should try to understand what it means but we should not feel that we have to understand. There are things that in the Bible that we will understand when we are in the situation to which they apply. And that may be a situation in our lives; it may be a situation in the history of the world. We can't tell how it will be. Instead of taking a verse or a little passage and saying, We've ^{got to} ~~got to~~ know exactly what this means, let's take the Scripture as a whole and get everything we can of what it means. And then we go through it further in the light of what we've already got and we ^{understand} ~~just add~~ more, and the next time we go through we understand still more but we never expect to understand it all. I think this is very very important in our attitude of interpreting Scripture; but I also think it is ^{good that we} ~~to be~~ remembered that God did not send us out necessarily to teach everybody to interpret Scripture. I think it is good to teach people to interpret Scripture, but our primary purpose is to present the Scripture's great truths. And people tend to go to two extremes. On the one extreme they present everything as if they knew it all, and they have the answer to everything, and ^{with} 90% of the people (~~think?~~) ^{that is} it's wonderful, but 1/10th of the people or less will find that there is something he's said that just does not hold up and then they will turn against ^{everything} everyting you say. But the other extreme is to go out and to treat the general public to whom we present the Word of God as if they were a group approaching it as we are now, and say I'm not sure what this means, and here there are these possibilities, and pretty soon they decide you don't know e anything about it. So I think we have to keep separate two distinct activities. One is ~~to~~ determining what the Word of God means; the other is taking the truths of the Word of God and making

them clear and strong for those who listen without going beyond what we are sure is clear in the Word of God. That is not easy to do; it's easy to err in one direction or the other. But if we have the dangers in mind we are more apt to strike the balance that the Lord wants us to.

Now in this case we were speaking of the Little Horn ^{as} ~~and~~ Capital D. And we go on now to Capital E, The Destruction and Replacement. There is not great emphasis here in ch. 7 on the destruction of the Little Horn. But the emphasis is on the destruction of the beast. The destruction of this fourth beast. And he simply says in vs. 8 that he saw the little horn before which there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." Then when he gives the interpretation in vs. 20-21 he says: And of the ten horns that were in his head, one of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld and the same horn made war ~~ag~~ with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was ~~ti~~ given to the saints of the most High;" See there is very little given in this chapter of the destruction of the Little Horn, but there is a great deal said about the destruction of the fourth beast. In fact the destruction of all the beasts. It says further down, it speaks of it again: (v. 15) He shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints . . . Vs. 25-6: But the ~~s~~ judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end." So we don't know much about the destruction of the little ~~horn~~ ^{horn} here but we have repeatedly stressed the destruction of all the animals which represent human anti-god government. So this Capital E then, The Destruction and Replacement refers to the destruction of all these systems of human control, and particularly of course to the first beast.

Now Under Capital E we will look at No. 1, A Comparison with Chapter 2. We won't take time now to read the verses here about the destruction and the replacement. You have noticed that they are much more extensive than the account of the fall of the image. In ch. 2 we read that the stone strikes the image on its feet and ~~the stone~~ == ~~the image~~ is crushed and utterly destroyed, and the wind carries it away, there is no place left for it, and the stone becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. We do not find any great dimilarity between this and the account of the destruction and replacement in chapter 7. We would hesitate about saying they describe the same thing, except that in each having four beasts, and a second phase of the ^{fourth} four beasts and then a destruction and replacement, we have such a parallel that I think there is no question that we can say that this is the same thing, at least the same period, the same general series of events as is described in that figurative way in ch. 2, but what is said is: I beheld till thrones were, the KJV says, cast down, which is a mistranslation at that place unfortunately. The Aramaic word is used for casting down the foundation of something; for placing that which is to stand solidly. When you say, Thrones were cast down it sounds as if thrones were eradicated or destroyed, but that is not what the Aramaic means, and that has been changed in the NSRB to say: I behid beheld till the thrones were placed. Then in the margin it says: KJV cast down. I believe you will find that all recent translations give something like "Placed" for it for there is no question but that is what the Aramaic means even though in the Old English "to cast down" means to lay the foundation of something. That after all is the great reason why I believe it is tremendously important that the KJV be ^{replaced} replaced before too long by something in modern English. It is not the fact that the KJV has statements like "I do you to wit of the grace of God" or "he prevented the dawning of the morning" with ^{his} ~~these~~ prayers and other cases where the

English word has so completely changed its meaning that it's perfectly obvious in the light of context that it means something entirely different from what the words sound like or that the word is quite meaningless to us -- those cases are fairly easily recognized, and don't do any great harm. But it is cases like this -- "cast dow-" -- where through the course of the years there has come a rather slight change or perhaps a rather great change in the meaning of a word and we don't recognize it, and we can get an erroneous impression not because of any error in the KJV+~~hec~~ but because the English language has changed. I think it is safe to say that at least one-fourth of our words in English today have quite a different meaning from what they had in King James' time.

Now in King James' time if you say that is a very nice fellow, you mean he is a fellow who is always arguing about little minor points and is very obstreperous and obnoxious, and today if you say, he's a nice fellow you mean he's a pleasant and kindly. The meaning is utterly different but fortunately the word nice never occurs in the KJV so we don't get confused by it. But there are of course dozens of other words which have changed meanings slightly and can thus mislead us in a translation made 300 years ago. ^{as} An excellent ^{as that} translation ^{was} for its own day. But here he beheld until thrones were cast down, that is they were laid as a solid foundation. They were placed ^{is a brief way to do it, but it gives} us something of the idea, while cast down today gives us an idea very different from what it means. It does not mean that the thrones of the kings were eradicated; it means that the thrones of God and His followers were established. And the Ancient of Days sat and His garments were white as snow; the hair of his head was like pure wool, and a fiery stream issued from him. The beast was slain and its body destroyed and given to the ^{burning} ~~baring~~+flame. Vs.12: As for the rest of the beasts they had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and times." Does ^{this} ~~this~~ ^{eyes}+mean the fourth beast was killed and the other three were allowed to

continue to live? I think in the context it is quite obvious that's not what it means. In the context I think it is quite obvious that vs. 12 is a pluperfect, "As for the rest of the beasts their dominion had been taken away, yet their lives had been prolonged for a season and time." And what it means of course is that these beasts had one after the other had replaced the previous ones, but that there had not been a complete demolition as the Communists have endeavored to make in China where they are trying to make people forget everything about everything that existed before them and to do away completely with the previous culture. That was not done in the case of any of these four. The Babylonian empire was conquered by the Persian, and the Persian retained a great bit of Babylonian culture, Babylonian outlook, Babylonian attitudes though most of this gradually disappeared during the 200 yrs. of Persian power. And then the Persian empire was conquered by Alexander the Great but the system of government established by the Persian empire was mainly retained. Many of the Persian officials were retained until replaced by Greeks but ~~the~~ ^{there was a} gradual replacement of Persian culture by Greek ^{and} even though there was an immediate and complete change of government at the top. Then when the Greek was overcome by the Romans, the Romans took over the Greek culture and Rome was tremendously influenced by Greek culture. So this describes something that had happened when each of these was replaced by the others. It does not -- this one vs. 12 is quite obviously if you consider the beasts as successive, and in view of the parallel with ch. 2 I don't see how we can take them any other way, it is quite obvious that after telling the terrible destruction of the fourth beasts, then he says the rest of the beasts had lost their dominion but their lives had been prolonged for a season. It does not mean that after the kingdom of the saints was established that situation in which ch. 2 tells us that the whole image had been annihilated and the wind carried its parts away and there was nothing left of them

that then the three first ones were prolonged a while, but it means that each of them had^{been} prolonged its life into the time of the rule of the next one, even though their dominion had been taken away. That is I think a good illustration of the fact that Scriptural statements don't always go forward in chronological order, but that often there is an insertion of something dealing with a logical point rather than a chronological, and unless the Scripture definitely says this ^{happened} after that we have no right to assume that it necessarily does. In the Gospels we have the order of the temptations of Christ given in a different order; ~~but~~ we have the same ^{three temptations} presentation, but we have them given in two different orders, and the result is that some who try to press Scriptural meaning beyond what human words will take have said, It must be that Jesus was tempted on two or three different occasions with ~~two~~ the same temptations but ~~t~~ given in different order. That is utterly unnecessary to believe. I don't believe ^{his} the temptations occurred more than once, this demptation described in the Gospels. But in describing it the particular phases of the temptation may be mentioned in a different order for different ^{says} reason. Unless it is said specifically ^{that} ~~tht~~ it is a chronological order, we have no right to assume that it necessarily is. I may say that I have spoken on this subject in Brazil, and in Germany, and in Switzerland and in Canada, and that does not mean necessarily that I spoke in that order in those different countries. I may simply be going logically a certain direction around the world, I may just as well have ~~gone~~ gone in the ~~or~~ opposite direction. There may be a particular logical reason for the order, unless I say I spoke in this one and later on in that one. It's all too easy to read into things something that is not there, ^{it is} in the nature of languages. I think we have a very good warning against it in the use of this particular verse.

When you compare this with ch. 2, this account of the destruction and replacement, you find that the account is very very different ^{though} ~~so~~ it is quite obvious from the parallel that the same thing is being described.

Now we noticed in ch. 2 that the elements of the destruction of the image were that which destroyed it, or the destruction itself was of divine origin. The stone was cut without hands. We notice second the apparent suddenness of it. We notice, as I called it C then, the Complete Destruction of the Human Kingdoms. We noticed as D, the Establishment of a ~~REGIME~~ ^{Regime} that Cannot be Destroyed. And we looked at possible interpretations, and we saw that the Islamic Rule in the eyes of those of ~~establishment~~ ^{established} it had a divine origin. They ~~claimed~~ ^{claimed} to be following God in making this great overturning and destruction of the Roman Empire. We noted that it came remarkably suddenly, the way the Arabic tribes that had never had much influence outside of Arabia suddenly erupted out of the desert and attacked and destroyed two very great empires. We noticed that the Islamic rule fulfilled these two very excellently, but that they failed to make a complete destruction. And that as far as the establishment of a regime that cannot be destroyed though their ~~regime~~ ^{regime} was very great and very powerful, and lasted far longer than the Roman empire had lasted that it pretty well declined, and largely disappeared and today is a very minor factor in the world today. So that the Islamic is not a fulfillment of ch. 2.

We noticed second, that the Papacy, while the claim is made of divine origin by its supporters, we believe we can see human ~~elements~~ ^{elements} as fully explaining it. We noticed that it was not sudden, that the Pope was not recognized for many centuries after after there was a Bishop of Rome was not recognized by other parts of Christendom, and he never was recognized by the eastern section of Christendom at all as having a supremacy. We noticed that there was no destruction of human governments, but that while the Pope was sometimes able to mould them to his will more often he had to mould some by getting others to stand with him, and in recent years his power over various human governments has been comparatively small and it certainly is not the establishment of anything that fulfills the picture in

replacement, and I said under No. 1, comparison to ch. 2, small(a) The Divine action is Stressed Far More. In ch. 2 the stone is cut without hands, and God will establish a kingdom that cannot be destroyed. That's about all that's said about divine action in ch. 2. But here thrones are placed, the Ancient of Days sits, a fiery stream issues from Him, and One like the Son of Man comes with the clouds of heaven and brought to the Ancient of Days and is given dominion, glory, and a kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him. There is far greater stress on the divine action here than in ch. 2, but certainly an agreement is in both.

Then **B** (b) The Suddenness of the Picture of the Stone Coming and hitting the image and destroying it, that is neither affirmed nor denied here. The suddenness is neither affirmed nor denied except for the inference we can take from vs. 13. It is a question how much we can draw from vs. 13 if we did not have the quotation of it in the NT. The picture here: I beheld till the thrones were placed, a fiery stream came from Him, the beast was slain, its body destroyed -- it perhaps fits a little better with the idea of something that is done rather quickly than something that is spread over a long period, but it's not strongly affirmed. **F** It's certainly not denied though,

(c) The Completeness of the Destruction. This is greatly stressed here. Greatly stressed in vs. 11 and in vs. 14. The complete destruction of the beast. It is equally strongly stressed in ch. 2, and it's pretty hard to say it has been fulfilled with the spread of the spiritual knowledge of Christ, that came after His first coming.

(d) The New Kingdoms Indestructibility, vs. 14, 27. (reading verses of text). Some interpreters have tried to parallel this vs. 27 with vs. 14 & to say that since vs. 14 says one like the Son of Man comes and he's given dominion, glory and a kingdom, vs. 27 says that the kingdom and dominion

shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, that therefore the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven is simply a figurative picture for the saints of the Most High to whom the kingdom is given. Some have suggested that as an interpretation. I don't think that most really Christian interpreters will take it that way. I don't see how any can in view of ~~the~~ ^{the} quotation in the Gospels where Jesus specifically refers the term to Himself, and applies it to his second coming and ^{where} the High Priest very evidently understood it also in that way. So that we have ~~the~~ ^{then 4 ✓} same ^{qualities} or we examined these same qualities and found three of them very definitely here. One of them neither affirms nor denies.

Now in this destruction and replacement, No. 1 was Comparison with Chapter 2. No. 2, Combination of the Symbolic and Literal. In ch. 2 we had a symbol given - the image. Then we had the interp. given: God will destroy those kingdoms and set up His own kingdom. There was first the symbolic and then the literal. Here we have a strange ~~combination~~ ^{combination} of symbolic and literal. Vs.9 (reading text . . .) Is this entirely figurative? Certainly the term the "Ancient of Days sat" is a term for God displaying His power but is this purely a figurative statement or will there actually be some thrones? It's part of the picture he sees of the vision, and ^{yet} ~~it~~ ^{it} seems to contain various literal elements - some at least but just how much we can't say. In vs. 10 (x reading text) Surely there is a strong literal element in this though it is part of the vision that he saw, a vision which is a figurative vision with beasts and horns that don't stand for anything in the animal kingdom but stand for human governments and human ^{rulers} ruling. And then in vs. 13 (reading text) This is still part of his vision and yet in the NT Jesus Christ takes it very specifically as a literal thing that the Son of Man comes with the clouds of heaven and comes to the Ancient of Days, and they bring him near before Him. Now if you are going to take vs. 13 as rather literal as the NT does,

and answered nothing. Then the last half of the verse is particularly germane. Again ^{the} ~~the~~ High Priest asked him, and said to him, Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the High Priest tore his clothes and said, What further need have we of any witnesses? So the High Priest recognized that this was a ^{claim} ~~claim~~ to be the Christ the Son of the Blessed, to be the God, the divinely appointed one who should come to this earth on the clouds of heaven and set up the permanent kingdom described in Daniel. Thus the High Priest recognized that Jesus meant that He was deity, and also the HP recognized that this was an event that had not yet occurred, but something that would happen sometime in the future. So we have these two elements brought out quite clearly in this picture here in Mk. and similarly in Mat.

Well that was ~~the~~ 4 e. No. 3 The Son of Man. ~~the~~ No. 4, Let's examine the suggested fulfillment in relation to ch. 2. We noticed how the establishment of the Arabic empire, the Islamic empire, could fulfill certain features of the picture in ch. 2, but it certainly does not at all fulfill the picture in ch. 7. Then we noticed how some claim that the papacy fulfills certain of the elements in ch. 2, but it certainly does not fulfill the picture in ch. 7. Then the third, that it is the spiritual kingdom, the rule of Christ in the hearts of His people which began at the time of His first coming, there is so much ~~the~~ that is figurative in ch. 7 that it would be very difficult dogmatically and immediately to say No, that could not be it, that is to say it would be about ^{like} ~~right~~ in ch. 2 ^{that} as you look at it closely it does not fit. But to absolutely dogmatic might be very difficult if it were not for Jesus' quotation from it to the HP. But this quotation in Mt. and in Mk. makes it clear that he was looking to something that began with the Son of Man coming with the clouds of the heaven. And I believe that most evangelical

interpreters, unless they adopt the critical view of the Book of Daniel, (which very few evangelical interpreters do, though most non-evangelical interpreters do) -- most evangelical interpreters say v.13 is looking forward to the second coming of Christ, and so the strange thing is to see how some of these interpreters try hard in ch. 2 to say that the stone cut without hands/^{which} becomes a great mountain, is a picture of the gradual spread of the spiritual belief in Christ to completely overcome human governments and cover the whole world, and yet when they come to ch. 7 they/say this is a picture of Antichrist, the Little Horn, and of the things that are going to occur at the return of Christ. When they do that they of course abandon recognition of the parallel between the two. If ch. 7 is a picture of the return of Christ as Mt. and Mk. certainly present Christ as saying that it is, if it is it certainly seems reasonable to take ch. 2 in the same way, except that we come to a great problem which I'm going to call

No. 5, The Problem of Continuity. We think of the image now. The picture of the image in ch.2, and laying aside the three interpretations of the destruction of the image and its replacement, laying aside those and taking it that it is a picture of the return of Christ, we then have the problem that the head of gold represents the reign of Neb. and his successors say a period of 65 years, and then that the shoulders and breasts of silver represent the reign of the Persians, c. 200 yrs., and then we have the thighs representing == the belly and thighs, representing the reign of Alexander and his successors, again a period of about 200 yrs., and then we have the Roman empire which if the feet, the stone hitting the feet is the return of Christ, must be thought of as having already existed 2000 yrs. -- in other words 3 times as long as the other 3 put together. Well now if you have an image whose legs are 3 times as long as the all the upper body it's a bit disproportioned. To have legs quite that long you would think Daniel would notice what a peculiar image it was, if the legs were 3 times as long. But the difficulty is even greater than that.

Because the Roman empire actually lasted about 4 centuries or a little more. And so the legs represent a period of about 4 centuries, and then the Roman empire largely disintegrated, and if you are going to say as some interpreters do that the period of the second phase of the fourth kingdom lasts from the *end* of the Roman empire, after its disintegration until the return of Christ, then you've got the legs about 400 yrs. which is quite parallel to the upper part being about 500 maybe, quite parallel. But then you have the feet going on for 1500 yrs. which would be a pretty funny looking image, with the feet twice as big -- representing twice as long a period as all the rest of the image put together, is a very peculiar thing, very strange. Then in addition to that we noticed that the conditions at the end of the Roman empire, while it fits very nicely with the situation that is represented with the feet and toes being made up of iron mixed with clay and they are not united together, it is a very good description of conditions in Europe between 400 and 800 A.D., a very good description of that. But it certainly is not something that ^{has} continued to such an extent that we can say the Roman empire is continuing through all this period.

Now I was reading a commentary last night which does say that the 10 horns in ch. 7 come out of the Roman empire and so we must have three kingdoms which represent a continuation of the Roman empire at the time of Antichrist and the return of Christ. Well to think that that condition which is described so briefly in ^{both} ch. 2 and in ch. 7 actually continues two, or three, or four times as long as all the other beasts put together is a rather peculiar thing, very difficult to hold and a strong argument against our fourth view, ^{a very strong argument against it} unless you can introduce the possibility that in the picture of the future which the prophet sees, he is somewhat like a man who looks at a group of mountain ranges, and he sees these mountains here and he sees another range=~~bein~~= behind them, and another range behind.

And he cannot tell how much space there is between the two. In other words there is an interim which is not mentioned in the view of the prophet, and which the prophet may have been aware of and not mentioned, or may not have been aware of at all. But that the picture gives us certain things which are true but not necessarily continuous, and that there is a break somewhere. And that between the legs and the feet of the image there might be a period of a few hundred or even a few thousand years which the prophet would not see, which would not be pictured in the image. And so a break there, an interim in between. Now that may seem like a strange idea, but unless we adopt such an idea it is pretty hard to take the fourth view that this represents the return of Christ in view of what has happened, historically. And the same would be true in ch. 7 though the 10 horns grow out of the fourth beast there might be a period in between which the prophet did not see and then a situation developed which would have some similarities with the condition of the fourth beast, perhaps not a great deal of similarity, but there would be this break in between this interim.

Now ^{at this} ~~a fifth~~ point in our examination of Daniel, we are not in a position to say whether there could actually be such a thing or not. I think we get to ch. 11 before we are able to speak positively on the matter, but we have*
 we*to present this as one of the difficulties with this fourth interpretation of ch. 2 and ch. 7 which makes the ~~destruction~~ ^{destruction} of the image and the establishment of the kingdom be not until the return of Christ in view of the fact that historically such a long interval has come inbetween the end of the Roman empire and the return of Christ. We know that this interval is at least 1900 years between the first coming of Christ and His second coming. We don't know how long it will be. I'm sure St. Augustine in 400 A.D. thought it must come within the next very few years. If anybody had told him there will be five times as long a period before He comes he would have been absolutely aghast. Just as he would be just as much upset

as anybody would be today if he were to suggest the possibility that there might be three times as long yet before the Lord returns as there has been yet, but the Scripture does not say. There are many reasons. The Lord tells us that we are to be ready for His coming. We are to look as if He might come today, but we have no right to say that we know that there cannot be another 2000 years before He comes back. We have absolutely no right to say that. We have a right to say that He commanded us always to be ready that He may come right now. We must be ready. That is stressed over and over in the Scriptures, and that is very much in the minds of the early apostles and He wants us to have it in mind. But they were wrong if they thought He would going to come in the first century A.D. or second or third or fourth, and of course the more time goes the nearer it is, and I have no hesitation in saying that the return of Christ is a whole week closer today than when we last met. In fact I'll even say it is two weeks ~~closer~~ closer than when we last met, and it might come today. I believe the Scripture clearly teaches that it might come today. But when somebody says it is going to come within the next 100 yrs. they are simply going beyond the Scriptures. We do not know. There have been many situations which have looked very much like what the last days will be. And we may be in it and we should be ready, but we have no right to say with certainty that we are in ~~it~~ it.

Well, this problem of continuity is a real important question. We cannot interpret Daniel with any certainty until we make up our minds whether there is a possibility of such intervals occurring.

Now ch. 8. In ch. 8 I asked you to give me a paper, last week, in which you place next to each ~~ete~~ other what is said about each ~~k~~ kingdom. Most of you put ch. 8 as opposite the second kingdom and the third kingdom, and I think that is clear when we look at it. That ch. 8 is entirely speaking about the 2nd kingdom and the 3rd kingdom. There were two or three

papers which said that the latter part of ch. 8 dealt with the second ^{phase} ~~phase~~ of the fourth kingdom. That I believe, whoever wrote that were a bit hurried, and did not read the ch. carefully because ^{as} ~~if~~ you read the ch. it makes it absolutely clear that there are ~~to~~ two kingdoms spoken of. The first is Media v.20" The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia" - that's the second beast, "and the rough goat is the king of Greece -- that's the third beast. And v.23 says "in the latter time of their kingdom when transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences shall stand up." Now maybe I'm wrong, maybe it was not those who said this was the last part of the fourth kingdom who did not read this as carefully ^{as} ~~carefully~~. They might. Maybe they read it more carefully than the rest, and it ~~is true that~~ ^{assumed that} between vs. 22 and 23 there is a break of a couple of thousand ~~year~~ ^{v.23} years or more and that v.22 tells about the third kingdom and then that 23 jumps to the second phase of the fourth kingdom. I don't know any commentary I've seen that does it ? ? The critical view considers that this is the fourth kingdom, the kingdom of Greece. It considers it is the fourth kingdom. Well they put it all in the fourth kingdom But we do not follow that of course the critical question is not within this particular course. But (in) evangel- ical interpreters consider that v. 23 is dealing with the same kingdom as is spoken of in v. 22, and therefore that this is describing a historical figure which occurs in the latter part of the third kingdom, and that the fourth kingdom and the final destruction are not mentioned at all in this chapter. Now we will look at the chapter under ch. 8 which will be our Roman Numeral V, Capital A will be, The Vision. We noticed in v. 1 the time of the vision - in the third yr. of the reign of k. Belshazzar, the vision appeared unto me. I mentioned very ~~specifically~~ ^{specifically} that ch. 2 and ch. 7 have 45 yrs. at least in between them, and consequently we can't say that ch. 7 is in mind when he has ch. 2 .

We cannot say that. And even that ch. 2 was much in mind when ch. 7 was given we can't be dogmatic on because that's a long period in between. But ch. 2 is given in the first yr. of the reign of Belshazzar and this in the third. So ch. 7 and 8 are closely related. There is no question of that that ch. 7 would be very much in Daniel's mind when he saw ch. 8. Then we also noted under this, The Place of the Vision. The place of the vision is given in v. 2 (reading text.....) Now had Daniel ever been there (at Shusham....in Elam) that was not a part of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. This was the capital later of the kingdom of Persia, and it was an important place in the rising Median power, Median and Persian power, at the time of Belshazzar. And he says he ^{Saw} saw in a vision I was there. So most interpreters take it he does not mean he was there when he had the vision, but that in his vision he was over there. And the only reason for that ^{to occur} is to tie it up with the fact that this beast he saw represented the kings of Media and Persia.

Now Capital B - The First Animal. The first animal is described in vs. 3-4. "Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold (reading text). Now this is not just a picture of the animals. We are not justified in saying, Here's a ram; what does its hair indicate; what do its horns indicate; what would its feet indicate; what does its tail indicate? It doubtless had all these things but that's just part of the picture, not necessarily having a meaning. But this is an unusual thing. The two horns, one being higher than the other. There is nothing unusual ~~about~~ about having two horns, but they were high horns, and one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. And we are immediately reminded of ch. 7 ⁱⁿ of the bear tht had one side higher than the other. And I'm not sure in ch. 7 that we can justify ^{Medo=} by itself in interpreting that as describing the/Persian kingdom, with the Persian coming up to be higher than the other. But here it certainly is possible. He would be justified two years later in carrying this back to the picture of the bear, and saying ^{this} that represents the same thing.

Of course what actually occurred happened just a few years later. Well I guess our time $\frac{1}{2}$ is up and we'' have to continue there next time.

Please look into ch. 8 very carefully, and then jump to ch. 11. I want to take up ch. 9 after we^{have} examine ch. 11 and 12. So please examine ch. 8 very carefully for next time. Ch. 11 please run over rapidly and see if you can get a general idea of the main things in ch. 11. There is a tremendous amount of detail there, and I'm not asking you to look at the detail for the next meeting, but to get the general idea of what you can of ch. 11.

We had begun last time to look at ch. 8, and I called that Roman Numeral V, and on that we gave ^{us} Capital A. The Vision. We noticed that this was two years after the previous vision, and that in the vision Daniel was over in the kingdom of Cyrus; he was over in the Province of Elam. Then we called B. The First Animal, and we noticed that the first animal is described in vs. 3-4: A ran which had two horns; and the two horns were high, but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last." Now as we mentioned, if it said the ram had 4 legs, we would not think that necessarily meant anything. If he said it had a head, it had a tail, it would not necessarily mean anything. If it had two horns it would not necessarily mean anything. But when it says the horns were high, and more particularly when it says, one was higher than the other, and still more particularly when it says the higher came up last, we have features here which are not common to the picture. Therefore when you have a vision in which something is singled out, and something that is unusual that is not what you would think -- normally expect in a vision, in a picture of a ram or of a statue or whatever it is, you have reason to think that it probably ^{indicates} ~~indicated~~ something in the meaning. If it is simply an ordinary part of the figure, you can have a meaning but you want to be very slow and careful about being dogmatic that it does have a meaning in it.

So we noticed that it does correspond with the idea of the kingdom of the Medes and Persians in which there were the two horns, the kingdoms of the Medes and the Persians but the second horn came up last. The Persians were subordinate and then became supreme and took over the kingdom. We were right at that point at the end of the last hour. We were ready to take up No. 3 under B. The First Animal.

As you know in this course we are not interested in trying to find out everything we can about spiritual lessons for today from Daniel. This is a very valuable book for that purpose, but that is not what we are

== that is not our purpose in this course. We are not interested in Daniel in seeing what we can possibly conjecture as to the political developments of our day or as to what may come in the near future. That is an interesting thing to do but that is not our purpose in this course. It is not even our purpose in this course to ^{try to} fit Daniel into the rest of the Bible and to see what God's plan is for the ages. In this particular course we are interested most of all in getting methods of Biblical interpretation, particularly of prophetic interpretation. We are interested in this course in seeing just what can we say with absolute certainty that Daniel said, and what are the points on which we must say there are various possibilities. What are the points on which we must say, This we simply cannot draw from it, this is an erroneous interpretation. So we come now to a rather interesting point in that direction.

No. 3. ^{under B} The Rapid Conquest in Three Directions. We find that brought out in vs. 4: I saw the ram pushing (reading text) . . . "Now we have it stated in vs. 20: The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are these the kings of Media and Persia." So we can say with absolute certainty, This is the picture of the Persian conquest. This is a picture of Cyrus ^{conquest} coming. Now it says, Cyrus pushed westward and northward and southward, and this is == part of it at least is what Daniel might have seen with his own physical eyes at the time when this vision was given. At that time he was in the kingdom of Babylon, but Cyrus had obtained control over the empire of the Medes making it an empire of the Medes and the Persians, and then he had pushed westward and conquered the territory north of the ^{Babylonians} ~~Babylonians~~, and pushed northward from there up into Asia Minor and had conquered Asia Minor and all the region of Lydia, King Croesus the most wealthy man of antiquity a man whose very name is a ~~symbol~~ == a synonym for wealth. He had conquered practically all of Asia Minor with its great Greek cities and its high civilization, and then he was about to turn, when this vision was given,

he was about to turn and push southward. You notice over here on the map over here you have Babylon; in here, and you have Persia over here. He had conquered this territory north of Mesopotamia, then all of Asia Minor here and now he was starting to turn and push back and conquer Babylonia. So this is a picture of what had happened when Daniel had his vision or what was about to happen soon thereafter when he conquered all of Babylonian and increased the size of the Persian empire to take in all the previous Babylonian empire.

Now you notice he only mentions 3 directions: westward, and northward, and southward. So here is a very important question of Biblical interpretation. When something is omitted how much can you build on what is omitted? Can you say that this means that Cyrus never conquered anything to the east? The fact that he says the ram pushing westward and northward and southward. Well, that is not at all a method of interpretation that is never followed. Because we find that when we look at this commentary on Daniel by E. J. Young, a commentary written c. 20 yrs. ago, on the whole a very scholarly commentary, a commentary that has much that is very excellent in it, we find that it says: (in the discussion of this verse - vs. 4 on page 167, it says: The ram pushes to the west, north and south, but not to the east, for not until the time of Darius did the Persians make many conquests in the east and these were not of a permanent nature." Now you see how exactly then it fits with the history according to Young. The fact that Daniel does not mention its pushing eastward at all. But now let's look at the actual facts of this. He says, Not until the time of Darius did the Persians make many conquests in the east and these were not of a permanent nature. Now the fact of the matter is that Cyrus conquered this territory all up through Asia Minor here (pointing to map), and then down here had conquered all of Mesopotamia, and then he went to the east and he conquered all of Afghanistan, and conquered all of N.W. India, and established that as part of his kingdom and it remained so for 200 years, and was taken over by

Alexander the Great, all of the Punjab in N.W. India, and then he had some difficulty with ~~some~~ little tribes up to the north here in the region he was conquering, and he was killed there in a fight with some of them. But the territory he conquered over there is as big as all the territory that he conquered N. and S. and W. So Cyrus conquered more territory to the E. than in any of these directions. Cyrus conquered more than in any of these directions. Cyrus was succeeded by his son Cambyses who conquered Egypt, and Cambyses was succeeded by a usurper who only reigned a couple of years before he was killed by a cousin, Darius who ~~pushed~~ (put) down rebellions in many parts of the empire but added nothing to the empire. He ^{says here that} == Not till the time of Darius did the Persians make many conquests in the east. Darius made no conquests in the east; he put down some rebellions in the east, but he held the territory that had already been conquered by Cyrus and it remained in their hands for 200 years. All of it Cyrus had conquered. Egypt which Cambyses his son had conquered revolted after 100 yrs. But all the rest of that territory remained in Persian hands for 200 yrs. ~~after~~ and the conquests to the east were greater than in any of the others. I think this points out the great danger from an omission in the Scripture drawing conclusions. Why did Daniel not say that the ram pushed eastward as well as the other direction? Because Daniel's purpose was to describe the overthrow of the Babylonian Babylonian empire, and its being taken over by the Persians, and therefore he describes what happened ~~to~~ up to and including the taking over of the Babylonian empire. That's what he saw in his vision. His vision did not cover this tremendous sweep to the east that Cyrus made as great as the others all together. It is not tremendously important for our prophetic view. It is passed over in the picture. But to say as Young does, He does not push to the east because actually there were'nt any conquests to the east, not till the time of Darius did the Persians make many conquests to the east and these were not of a permanent nature, shows the great need when we talk about the Bible of sticking to what is there and not speaking about areas

which we have not investigated. I think this is not tremendously important as a fact but it is important as a matter of method that we take what is in the Scripture, but where the Scripture is silent we do not necessarily assume that that means it is non-existent. So much then for No. 3, the Rapid Spread in Three Directions.

Now we asked the question last time whether there is absolute continuity or whether there can be any interval, any space the prophet does not see. We do not find an answer in ch. 8 but perhaps a very slight something locking in that direction that Daniel saw this ram ^{pushing} ~~pushing~~ in these directions and it became great: Vs. 5 says: "And as I was considering (reading text)....." Vs. 6: And he came to the ram that had two horns (reading text) . . . Well now this is 200 yrs. later. Daniel says, As I was considering, this happened. The history is foreshortened. Well that's rather obvious. It is not a very important fact, but there is a jumping over of 00 years with no mention of it. When we look at the interpretation of it it says, vs. 20: The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are these kings, of Media and Persia." Vs. 21 And the rough goat is the king of Greece. So that the fact that the one leads right on to the other here does not imply an ~~immediate~~ ^{it came immediately} There is a 200 yr. space in between. Now under V, C. The Second Beast, The He Goat, vs. 5-8, we mention No. 1 The Interpretation, vs. 21-22. Under that, small a, The Rapidity of the Conquest. The picture which he gives of the rapidity of the conquest, something that happened 200 yrs. after Dan. spoke is a remarkably vivid picture of what actually occurred. Because the Persian empire had stood for 200 yrs. and never looked stronger than it did at the end of its time. At the end of 100 yrs. Egypt revolted and became independent, but 90 yrs. later the Persians reconquered Egy. and they had ^{held} ~~held~~ it for 10 yrs. And the Persians were constantly interfering with Greek politics, taking the side of one nation or another. The Greeks (the Persians) were giving money

the people of
 to [^]one faction or another in each of the cities of Greece, and their force had much to do with the Greek events during those years. The Persian empire looked tremendously strong in 335 B.C. Then Alexander the Great became king and in 12 yrs. he conquered that whole tremendous & vast area, and completely subjugated the Persian empire. It is one of the most rapid conquests in all history. I know of hardly anything that is comparable to it unless it be the early days of Hitler's overrunning Westery ^{the way} Europe, with that tremendous speed with which he overrran all those countries, but he was stopped by the Channel, and he took in most of Russia. In Europe he failed to hold it and was stopped and completely destroyed. Alexander on the other hand in these 12 yrs. conquered that tremendous area. So this picture which is so vividly given to Daniel 200 yrs. before was exactly fulfilled 200 yrs. later.

But now in the interpretation of it, it says the rough goat is the king of Greece and that is a general statement, it is a rough statement. It is a statement that is accurate but not precise. Because Alexander was king of Macddonia. And Macedon~~(???)~~ had been held by the Persians for quite a bit of the time. In fact when the Persians attacked Greece under Darius and E Xerxes they overran Macedonia with no difficulty. It was this terriroty further south, the territory of Greece, that resisted them. And during the next 200 yrs. Greece was made up of many little cities, independent of each other, often fighting against each other, forming alliances and large groups of them opposing one another. It was a time of great flowering of Greek culture, Greek life, Greek civilizatiønn, but politically it was a time of near chaos. And after 100 yrs. in which Athens had become a great commercial and political power, Sarpta gathered forces against Athens and Persia helped Sparta, and Sparta overcame Athens and even thought of destroying it, it ~~redene~~ reduced it to an comparatively unimportant position. Then Thebes rose up and overcame Sparta, and Greece ^{independent} was a lot of/separate sections but very very proud of their independence

and their liberty and often working with the Persians to resist other ones but ready to unite together against the Persians attack. Philip the king of Macedon, of Macedonia, a region that had been a very backward region of small tribes in the hills at the time of the beginning of the Persian empire had gradually settled down into more civilized life, and then Philip the king of Macedon had gone down and lived in Thebes and worked with a very wonderful general in Thebes, this Greek city, and had learned much of strategem and tactics ^{from him} and had improved on his methods. With these rather wild tribes of the north there, Philip had developed ^{from them} a very powerful warlike army with very little ^{of the} civilization and culture from the Greeks, but very excellent fighters. Philip was always wanting to be considered a Greek and the Greeks always thought of him as a barbarian. He was always trying to make out he was a Greek, but and he called himself a Greek, but the Greeks would not recognize him as a Greek. And Demosthenes, perhaps the greatest orator in all history, devoted a great part of his life in Athens to attacking Philip of Macedon, but Philip got the great mind, or one of the greatest minds in Athens - Aristotle, perhaps as great a ~~philosopher~~ ^{philosopher as} who ever lived to come up and to train his son, and so he was the tutor of Alexander, the young son of Philip. So Alexander was trained in Greek culture by Aristotle. Trained in war by his father Philip, and his warlike Mother who came from a less civilized tribe than the Macedonians were further north of them. But he was highly trained in these two directions, and when he was less than 20 yrs. of age, his father was suddenly assassinated, and Alexander became king. Well now to call him as this does "the king of Greece" would have horrified the Greeks at that time. He was the king of Macedon which wanted to be considered a part of Greece. And Philip of Macedon had fought against the Greeks at various times and had found he could not conquer them and had tried instead by guile to get leadership from them. And so Philip had persuaded many of the Greek cities to form a confederation of which he was the president. He was

king of Macedon but president of a Greek ^{conf} federation. Now as soon as Philip died the Greek cities mostly revolted and tried to throw off the Macedonian yoke altogether. And Alexander, a young fellow, took his army and marched down into Greece and attacked the leader of the opposition, this city of Thebes and utterly destroyed this city of Thebes. But when he destroyed it he found the home where one of its great poets had lived, and he had that spared to show his admiration for Greek culture. Of course that made the other cities of Greece think better of him. The other cities of Greece left with the choice of being destroyed like Thebes was, or throwing in their lot with Alexander, elected him the president of the confederation like his father had been.

So you see it is not incorrect to call him ^{as Dan. does} 200 yrs. ahead of time "the king of Greece", but it is not precise. He was never king over Greece, he was president of the confederation which held Greece under his power, but nominally it was not part of his kingdom at all. He was the king of Grecia. In vs. 21 it says "the great horn that is ^{he} between his eyes is the first king." Now he was not king of Greece, and ~~he~~ was not the first king of Macedonia, but he was the one who conquered the Persian empire and he was the first ruler of a new ^{great} ~~greatly~~ extended empire. So you see the term "the first king" is not incorrect, but it is a term which you have to understand. You could easily if you ^{knew nothing} ~~reading~~ of the history draw the conclusion that he was actually a king of Greece and that he was the first king ~~of~~ that Greece or that Macedon had had. I think these are important points in the ^{study} ~~study~~ of prophecy, People are so apt to take two or three words, and pound them to death and build a great deal on these two or three words, on the presence of or absence of them. This is a true picture, but it is not a precise picture.

Now we want to go on to something that is even more distincting than that. I mentioned ~~B+The+Term~~, b. the Term Greece, and c. "The First King

Understood correctly that term is quite all right. But he was the first king of the ^{great} empire which he established, but he was the only king of the great empire, which he established. But he was not the first king of Greece, he was not the first king of Macedon, he was not actually a king of Greece at all.

d. The Division of the Kingdom. We find this brought out in vs. 8 "and when he was strong the great horn was broken." Now "when he was strong" is a very accurate statement of what happened, Alexander spent 12 yrs. in almost uninterrupted fighting, but it was very cleverly done fighting. He started in to gain control of Greece, control of Macedon, control of the region north of Macedon. He went over into Asia Minor and fought The Persians brought a great army which met him there and he defeated it, and instead of following them into Greece, he took some years going down the coast getting Syria and Palestine. Went into Egypt and conquered it. Got a strong stand in the East? -- in the West here in that way, and then went across and again met the Persian force and this time defeated them again. It was not that the Persians were weak by any means; they were a great powerful empire with a great powerful army, but Alexander had wonderful tactics, highly trained and experienced soldiers, ^{generals} ~~a general~~ whom his father had well trained and he was able to defeat them in ^{these} two great battles and with his careful planning and arrangement of all this territory so he could not be attacked from the rear, then he took the Persian empire over and went clear across to India and back. ^{He} It was in Babylon, a young man, only c. 30 yrs. of age when he was taken with a fever and within a few days, about a dozen days in bed, he died. When he died this great Persian empire had been conquered, and I think it is an evidence of the strength of the Persian empire and the excellence of the administration that Darius had established and that had continued through this time that during the next 40 yrs., while the generals of Alexander's armies fought over who would have control of what he would

conquer, there were practically no uprisings in the great empire that he had conquered. But this Persian empire was so well organized with its local rulers, that it continued with the people as a whole remaining at peace and taking very little part. It was not until years later that there were many revolts among them. But Alexander's generals fought for 40 yrs. over the territory that Alexander had conquered.

Now the division of the kingdom is mentioned in vs. 8. It says "the great horn was broken, and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heave." And it says in vs. 22: Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power." Now this term "not in his power" means that these 4 parts, no one of them was as strong as Alexander was. And there is not question of that. These 4 parts were much inferior to Alexander. They did not stand up in power similar to Alexander.

But now we have the statement, "there were four kingdoms that came up in its place." That is a very definite statement, and it very natural to think: Alexander died; four generals divided his ~~empire~~ empire into four parts, and you have four kingdoms. It's a very natural interpretation. But history is a very confused thing. It is very difficult to predict how going to history is ~~going to~~ come out. God did not give us His Bible simply to satisfy our curiosity, but He gave it for certain definite great purposes. Therefore+ Therefore He covers a large areas of history with a few strokes of the brush which are true and correct, but not necessarily precise. And has just about every interpreter I know of of the Book of Daniel, has tried to take this statement and get a precise historical event as a result of it and it does not work that way. It is an excellent general statement of what happened. But it is not a precise statement. I do not think this in itself is a matter of great importance, but I think as a matter of approach to the Bible that it is of ^{very} considerable importance. So I want to go into

1

this a little bit, this division of the kingdom. Now the earliest that I know of who took the book of Daniel and drew a conclusion from it that was not justified is the book of Maccabees. This book of I Macc. is considered an excellent historical book. The R.C.'s consider it the inspired word of God. We do not consider it so. But we consider it as a good ^{historical} ~~sidoral~~ book, not like II Macc., a book that we think of as largely myth and legend. Incidentally II Macc. historically describes events before the beginning of I Macc. I Macc. is an account of the history of Antiochus Epiphanes, ~~asking~~ ^{living} 150 yrs. after Alexander's time, and his persecution of the Jews and the way in which they fought and gained deliverance from ^{him} it. It begins with these words: Alexander, king of Macedon, the son of Philip, marched from the land of Chittim, defeated Darius king of Persia and Media and seized ~~his~~ ^{his} throne, being already king of Greece. In the course of many campaigns he captured many fortified towns, slaughtered kings, traversed the earth to its remotest bounds and plundered innumerable nations. When at last the world lay quiet under his rule, his pride knew no ~~limits~~ ^{limits} built up an extremely powerful army and ruled over countries, dominions and nations All paid him tribute." Now that is a very rough statement. Actually he was still conquering up to his death. He built up a powerful army before the conquest rather than afterward. But then it says, "The time came when he fell ill and knowing that he was dying he summoned his generals, nobles who had been brought up with him from childhood, and divided his empire among them while he was still alive. Alexander had reigned 12 years when he died. His generals took over the government, each in his own province. On his death they were all crowned as kings and ^{their} there descendants succeeded them for many years. They brought untold miseries upon the world." Now that is the statement in I Macc. That statement is utterly incorrect historically, because we have very considerable evidence about the last days of Alexander. We know what his condition was each of those days.

We know who he saw. We know how about 3 days before he died he had his soldiers allowed to come through his tent and speak to him one to by one and say good-bye to him. M We know of how the generals were hoping he would recover and not knowing what they could do. We know that he died without leaving any rules for disposition of his empire. We know that when he died the generals got together and the aristocrats and they said, Alexander - one of his wives, a Persian whom he had married recently, was expecting a son (a child) within three or four months. Now they said, If this is a son, this should be the successor of Alexander. So the aristocrats and the generals gave out when Alexander was dead that if Roxannas' son -- if she should have a son, he ^{should} ~~could~~ be the ruler of Alexander's empire, But the common soldiers, and the people of Macedonia said: We don't want a half-Persian to rule over us. We want somebody of real Macedonian blood. They said, Alexander has a brother, a half-brother, of the same father but a different mother, named Philip, ~~named~~ his name was Arideas+ Arideas really, but they named him Philip Arideas after ^{his} ~~---~~ giving him his grandfather's name. They said, We want him to rule because he is 100% Macedonian with no Persian blood. So they made a compromise and they said Philip will be king unless Roxanna has a son. If she has a son the two will reign jointly. Now the reason they didn't want Philip for king in the first place was because Philip was a half idiot. He was absolutely incompetent to reign. Everybody knew it, at least all the aristocrats and the generals knew it. But ~~max~~ maybe the common people did not know it, and he was a Macedonian and they wanted one of their own to reign. So they said We want Philip. Well that is utterly different from what I Macc. says. Then not only was there no arrangement made in the life(time) of Alexander as to who should succeed him (of course Daniel does not say ^{there was no} ~~an~~ arrangement ~~was~~ made then), but Daniel says that this horn was broken and 4 f horns came up instead of it. And his kingdom was divided to the four winds of heaven and there were four kingdoms that ~~teit~~ took his place.

Now the question is: What about that number four? What are these four kingdoms? Well historically they had no thought. Macc. says that these four took the title of kings. Alexander died in 322 and it was not until 305, seventeen years later, that anybody except Philip or Alexander that is the ~~tott~~ little boy born of Roxanna, that anybody ^{else} was called king of Macedon, not for 17 years! And 17 yrs. after that there were four men who took the title of king, one of them lived only a very few years after that. So you see that the statement in Macc. is completely wrong. But of course Macc. is not inspired. But Macc. was taking, I believe ^{the statement} in Daniel, and building on it with imagination. Now we have considerable historical evidence, and we know from the evidence that for a nearly 40 yrs. Alexander's generals or their sons after them, fought as to who would control all of Alexander's empire. No one succeeded in doing so. In the end there were 3 who established themselves in ^{power} ~~power~~ over large sections of Alexander's empire. Then there were 4 or 5 small sections of the empire that managed to -- of which local Greeks or Macedonians got power in them and established themselves as independent kingdoms. So actually you have somewhere between 3 and ⁶ small kingdoms that came out of his empire, and three big sections, and four is a pretty valid statement of what happened. But it is not a detailed precise statement. ^{of what happened} But the interpreters all try to find ~~++~~ exactly four. You just don't. I think this is quite important as a warning ^{to us} in interpreting prophecy.

Let me read you what some have said. Here was Hypollitus in c. the 3rd cent. A.D., a great early Christian writer. Hypollitus said: For Alexander when near his end, partitioned his kingdom among his four comrads of the same race, namely Seleucus, Demetrius, Ptolemy and Philip. Now Philip was the idiot half-brother whom they wanted to take the whole empire, and who actually was kept by one of the generals who claimed to control the whole empire and another general got a hold of

Alexander, the baby, and his mother. And these generals fought against each other and in the end they killed all the children. They killed Philip and they killed Alexander, and they killed his mother, and they killed Alexander and his mother, in the end. But all of this happened in the course of the next 20 yrs. These generals fought about it. So to mention Philip as one among whom it was divided is quite wrong.

Then the second he mentions is Demetrius, and Demetrius did not come into prominence at all for 20 yrs. after Alexander died. We can't hold that against Hypollitus in the 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D. You would not know a great deal about the precise history of those days. The material was all available in MSS but the MSS were not easy to get at.

Jerome was c. 400 A.D. As great a Christian ^{scholar} as ever lived - SD. Jerome. He wrote a great commentary on ~~Dan~~ Daniel. He tried to do the same thing. Daniel says, The great horn was broken into four. So he (Jerome) says, he does not say as Hypollitus does that (Daniel ???) Alexander died + divided them among his generals. He knew better than that. of course. He says: When Alexander died in Babylon at the age of 32, his ^{and} four generals rose up in his place/divided his empire among themselves Ptolomy the son of Lagus(?) seized Egypt; Philip who was also called Arideas the brother of Alexander took over Macedonia; Seleucus Nicanor took over Syria, Babylonia, and all the kingdoms ^{of} the east, and Antigonus reigned over Asia Minor. You notice that his statement is different from the statement of Hypillitus, somewhat different. He puts in Antigonus instead of Demetrius, which is rather logical because Antigonus was the father of Demetrius. Certainly if you are going to put one it it would be the father who was an important figure for 20 yrs. rather than the son. Now, as I say, if I were to go into the whole history f of these 40 yrs. it would take two or three ~~hourset~~ hours, and I would have to refresh my memory on a good many details, because it is

a period of kaleidoscopic changes with these generals claiming to rule the whole empire, and when one made such a claim the others gathered together against him and defeat him. And then another makes ^{the claim} it and they gather together against him, and defeat him. And eventually it settles down to three ^{kingdoms} ~~generals~~ plus a number of small regions. But in recent years when the historical facts are better known than they could have been to Hypollitus or Jerome, nobody any longer mentions Philip as one of his four generals. But Kyle and Delitzsch in their Com. on Daniel, in the Com. which Kyle wrote, he notes the fact that in the year 305 Antigonus looked at though he could get the full control. Ptolemy who had seized Egypt was able to maintain himself alone, and took the title of king in 305. ~~Daniel~~ Antigonus then got in touch with three others who ^{were} against Antigonus and he said I'm going to call myself king of Egypt, why don't you take the title of king too over the sections where you have ^{some} power. So each of these three did. So you have in 305 four men claiming to be king over particular ~~ea~~ areas, and one man claiming to be ruler over the ~~h~~ whole empire. And the four join together and defeat the one four years later ~~in~~ and killed him. But his son Demetrius became an important factor for many subsequent years. So Kyle simple takes the names of these four and says these are the four. Kyle is on the whole a very good commentator, and he has been followed by all that I have come across since. For instance in Young's commentary I find that Young says: These horns represent four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was broken up. These are: Macedonia under Cassander, Thrace and Asia Minor under Lysamachus, Syria under Seleucus, and Egypt under Ptolemy. Originally, he says, there were five diadochi, but Antigonus was soon overthrown so that in reality there became four kings. " Well, it is too bad he did not read the history a little before he wrote that ~~sentence~~ ^{sections} in his commentary, because there

are about a dozen errors in that one brief statement. But he has simply taken it over from other commentaries. You'll find most recent commentaries that say substantially what Young does here, and it does not fit the history. **was as I have described it.** The history is what I have described

Now just to say a word about these names. He says Macedonia under Cassander. Well, when Alexander died he had a general named Antipater whom he had left in Macedonia as regent in that part of his empire, and as soon as he died all the Greek cities revolted, and Antipater set to work to bring them again into loyalty. So Antipater marched down into Greece and the leaders of those against him seemed to be Athens, and in Athens you had Aristotle who had taken the side of the king of Macedon, and you had Demosthenes ~~opposing~~ **great** opposing the king of Macedon, and the result was that each was afraid of the force on the other side and each of them killed themselves, so two of the leading Greeks perished at this particular situation. But Antipater conquered Athens, overcame one or two other cities, and the rest of the Greeks recognized Antipater as the regent for the new king. Antipater was killed within a few years - he was a man along in years I believe anyway and (he was) succeeded by his son Cassander, who ruled in Macedon with considerable strength for about 10 years and tried to get control over the whole empire but eventually was killed and no descendant or successor of his continued at all. So you see to put Cassander in this list is rather ridiculous. And then he says, Thrace and Asia Minor under Lysanachus. After Alexander's death, they assigned sections of the empire to be run by satraps and they ^{picked} Greeks and Macedonians to take these positions and there were about 20 or of them. One of them was Lysimachus who was sent to rule in Thrace. Thrace is east of Macedon, NE of Greece. Lysimachus had about 10 yrs. to get control of the region there because the local tribesmen there didn't ---- Alexander had conquered with some difficulty. They weren't very anxious to be under any foreign rule. But

Lysimachus got control pretty well in 10 yrs. and then set out to conquer the empire. He was able to become king of Macedonia, and continue to be king of Macedonia until about 283 ~~AD~~. when he was ~~completely~~ defeated and his regime completely destroyed and no remnant of it left. So Cassander and Lysimachus, neither of them belong in this list at all.

Now Syria under Seleucus and Egypt under Ptolemy definitely do and they are in all the lists we've looked at . But Antigonus, he says, was soon ~~v~~ overthrown. Actually Antigonus' son Demetrius fought for many! years to get control of the whole empire, unsuccessfully. But his son, Antigonus II, managed to become controller of Macedon, and his descendants continued for 150 yrs. So you see the history is a kaleidoscopic thing which Daniel gives in big figures, big general figures, and does not enter into the precise details of it. I think myself that we should try to avoid this sort of statement that tries to ~~pour~~^{force} history into a brief picture. Here's Leupold's Commentary on Daniel which was written at about the same time as Young's was, 20 yrs. ago, and Leupold says of it: "The natural meaning of the four horns toward the four winds of the heavens, is that the entire area of the empire conquered by Alexander ultimately came under the dominion of four rulers who practically quartered the territory among themselves." That definitely is unhistorical. But Leupold, while he has done a lot of work, and a lot of valuable work, is not as much as a scholar perhaps as these others we have looked at. So I think we can forgive him the unsholarly nature of his statements. He says: Such minor details as the fact that some 20 yrs. elapsed before they could get control of the situation and parcel out the empire among themselves, need not be recorded in the vision which is throughout marked by a certain lapidary(?) style. " That's a pretty good sentence. He says, History knows about these four" That's where he's wrong. History does not know about four specific ones. He says: History knows about these four. To Lysimachus went Thrace

and Bythinia. Some say practically all of "Asia Minor." The fact is that Lysimachus became king of Macedonia, and conquered a good bit of Asia Minor and then lost it again. He says, "Some say practically all of Asia Minor. Cassander took over Macedonia and Greece." Cassander ruled over Macedonia for a while, and then was killed and Cassander took it over." To Seleucus went Syria, Babylonia, and the eastern countries. Some say Asia and Syria. Ptolemy became master of Egypt to which some add Palestine and Arabia (?) " The fact of the matter is is that Ptolemy had Egypt and had Palestine and Syria for 100 yrs after which they were conquered by the descendants of Seleucus. Now these details can get very involved, and I'm not asking you to remember them all by any means, but simply to note how dangerous it is to take a precise figure like four and say there must be exactly four kingdoms. It just does not work that way. There were three kings and there were several some little areas which may be some say four. Yes.

(Student) Part of the problem is that some statements are very precise, and other ones are not, and I guess it is only after looking at the history that one can know just what to take precisely and what not to take precisely."

Yes, I would say that you have to judge each one by itself. Now if the statement, ^{in the} say like 40, or 10, or something like that, it sounds a round number. It may be ^{fairly} ~~fairly~~ precise; it may be exactly precise. But if they say 37, I would say, There is an unusual ^{figure} thing. He probably means exactly 37. I would think you have to make a judgement in each case. It is true some things are quite precise, but in history things are not usually quite that precise. We, of course, now have exact boundaries with customs offices on the border and all that, but a lot of modern technology enters into that which was not so available in those days. Do you have a particular...

(Student) Well for example, when it talks about Alexander and the swiftness of his It is necessarily precise, so it seems natural

that one would want to take the format as being precise and look and see . . .
would

I'm not sure I would use that word precise in that way. Precise
conquered
would be ~~for~~ *four* It's vivid that he conquered rapidly, and its vivid
just before that Cyrus conquered rapidly , and the impression you get is
that Alexander's conquest is even more rapid ^{was} that Cyrus' and that is a true
impression. But it does not, for instance, say that he took 12 years on it,
in his conquest. It does not say he was king of Macedon who wanted to be
considered king of Greece, and was actually President (King). He does not
go into those details.

Where for instance would one obtain
(Student) the history of this, is this Herodotus?
and afterward

No. There were a number at this time/who wrote, some of which
books have disappeared but copies have been And yet yes

(Student) Is there any significance in making Alexander
rather than
the he-goat? ~~Could~~ it say a bear or something else?

Yes, I think that the average person would think of a goat as
scampering along. Whereas they would think of a bear as kind of lumbering
along. Alexander, while he was very ^(careful?) careless, yet the 12 years, was a very
rapid conquest of this whole territory. I think the he-goat pictured the
rapidity. Now, I doubt if you could find anything else in it. Yes.

(Student) I have heard it suggested that his mascots were goats
and he wore goat skins and named his sons goats.

Well, that is just an example you see of the type of suggestions.
that people make. It's just like to say the bear symbolizes the Persian
empire. Say it was strong, that is the only thing that is like the bear.
It was rapid. Maybe the bear is rapid, but we don't usually think of them
in that way. There is usually just one thing so Did we finish?

The thing about these figures. There is gold for Nebuchadnezzar's,
silver for the Persians. You could just as well turn it around, and say
silver for Nebuchadnezzar, and gold for the Persians. Bronze for the Greeks.

Well bronze could have been for any of the three. There are just three different metals. But when you come to the fourth it says as iron destroys, and breaks things so this kingdom shall destroy and break. The iron indicates strength. But the other three just indicate three ^{different} valuable metals, that's all. ~~There~~ -- It's a thing, I think we have to learn in dealing with' and a symbols is that there may be preciseness to a considerable meaning; there may be just one thing in the symbol. Yes.

(Student) In the image it goes ~~f~~ in succession from the head to the toes, from the valuable to the not so ~~b~~ valuable. Does that ~~not~~ ^{succession} have any significance?

In actual fact it went the other way. In actual fact the Persian empire was much larger than the Babylonian empire. The Greek empire included much territory that was never in the Persian. The Roman empire included much territory that was not in the others. So the fact that it goes from valuable to less valuable, can raise the question, Is there a progression from more valuable to less valuable. We have to give an answer: There is none. There is not. You see we can jump to conclusions. We can say there is a progression in value, therefore there is a progression in value. Well, you look at the history and you find there isn't. So you find that it merely shows different symbols, except that it says iron destroys. The iron is strong. So the Roman was in some ways stronger than the others.

See I'm most interested in principles of interpretation. You take what is clearly taught in Scripture and you stand on it, but be careful about reading more precision into it than is warranted. Yes.

(Student) Are you going to develop ^{next time} fruther the significance of the four kingdoms as Daniel speaks of them, the number four? Were you going to elaborate more on that? Did you consider that Ptolemy and Seleucus

Yes Ptolemy, Seleucus and Antigonus. They were the three, and then there were several small ones.

(Student) But why the four then?

Three big ones, and a lot of little ones. It can be summarized that way. You see all these commentaries try to force it into four.

Now here is a thing I have mimeographed that I would like each of you to take one copy of. I have put into it the four kingdoms, the second phase of the fourth kingdom, and the divine intervention. Ch. 2,7,8,11. I wish you would write on this the figures for ch. 8 and 11. You have already done something similar, but I think ~~it~~ with the further study we have done you may be able to do it a little more precisely. I wish you would write it in pencil because you may want to revise it later. I wish you would write this out and bring it to our next meeting. So each one please take one of these. I have done the second and seventh which most of you quite well. Some were a little bit (incorrect??), but most were quite accurate. There were some places where there are a couple of possible of ways to take it. It is time for us to stop. . .

4/15/74

Daniel Course

Lecture 9

- 1

At this point as a result of our discussion last time, I decided to make an excussus. Instead of going straightforward with the outline now there are certain fundamental concepts that I would like to discuss which are important in our discussion of Daniel or of any other part of the Bible. So Dr. Phillips was kind enough to write five words on the blackboard. I trust you can all read them there. Infallibility, inerrancy, truth, completeness, and precision. I think it is useful in interpreting any part of the Bible, and particularly in interpreting the book of Daniel to have a clear idea of these 5 terms and of their relevance in relation to the Bible. First is the term infallibility.

That is the term which has historically been used a great deal in connection with the Bible. It is not used quite as much by fundamentalists now as it was say 20 years ago, because it is used in a much looser sense by some others. Very often this has happened in Christian history, that a word has had a definite meaning and then the meaning has gradually been changed, and when that has happened people have taken a new meaning. Thus 100 yrs ago there were many books written on the divinity of Christ and what the writers meant was that Jesus was God. So they called their books the divinity of Christ. Then there arose a large group in nominally Christian churches who said, Certainly Christ is divine. There is a spark of divinity in all of us. He had a little more than the rest of us. I doubt if in the last five years you have heard any fundamentalist speak of the divinity of Christ. We have taken instead the term the deity of Christ. The two terms mean actually the same thing. But divinity can be made into an adjective "divine" and applied to us. Nobody can possibly say that any of us has deity. So we now use the term deity to mean that Christ is utterly different ~~fer~~ from us. Well, this term infallibility is the term which was used up until/the last 30 yrs. I would say, was used almost entirely by fundamentalists through the ages to mean that the Bible is God's Word

and can be completely trusted. The infallibility of the Word of God.

Now within just the last 10 yrs. a seminary which had become known for its having been formed to be a great institution standing for the Word of God, changed its creedal statement to do away with its former position. And it has declared, We believe in the infallibility of the Bible, but we do not believe in its inerrancy. So today, fundamentalists are more and more speaking about inerrancy, not about infallibility. Now infallibility means it will accomplish its purpose. It will not fail to accomplish its purpose. Of course, we have an excellent vs. for that idea in Isa. 55:10
 "For as the rain cometh down^{and the snow} from heaven and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my Word be that goeth forth out of my mouth. It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and it shall prosper in the things whereunto I sent it." Here is infallibility! It will accomplish what it sets out to do. It will not fail.. However, there are those today who say, It's purpose is a spiritual purpose. It's purpose is to convey spiritual ideas. It is to help us to grow spiritually. That is its purpose and it cannot fail of that purpose. But they say, If it talks about material things, such as the creation of the world, if it speaks of the nature of the universe, if it speaks of historical matters, ^{these} ~~these~~ are not its purpose, therefore we can believe in infallibility but ~~we~~ still find many mistakes in the Bible.

Now the trouble with that statement is, We do not know what God's purpose is fully. Is it God's purpose to tell us how to grow spiritually but not his purpose to tell us anything about His creation of the world, or about the constitution of man? Where are we to draw the line? We do not believe that we are able to determine God's purposes, and therefore we believe that the Bible teaches not merely that the Bible is infallible but that the Bible is inerrant. In other words, we do not believe merely

what it sets out to do; we do not believe merely that it is true spiritually in religious matters; we believe that it is true in all matters. We believe that it sets out to give us God's truth and it may give us a great deal of His truth in certain areas and very little in other areas, but whatever it gives us, we believe is true. Now this may seem thus far as like sort of a rational, semi-philosophical argument for believing in inerrancy. I do not believe we should accept it on that ground. I believe that if you examine the attitude of Jesus Christ and of the NT writers toward the OT writers -- which would take us quite a while to do, of course, and there have been excellent works dealing with that, you'll find that it is unquestionable that this was the attitude of the Jesus and of the NT toward the OT. Of course toward the whole Bible. That every Word of God is pure. That God's word is true. That God's Word does not contain any error.

Now of course, then you have immediately With infallibility we have certain problems as we noted. The problems that we have with infallibility, I do not believe apply to inerrancy. But we have other problems with inerrancy. One of them is these is the matter of human words. Human words are always changing their meaning. Many words had a definite meaning when I was a Boy and have a very different meaning today. I was just reading last week a writing by Jane Austen Austin, written c. 1830 and in this she uses the word ^{nice} ~~nice~~ to mean disagreeable, unpleasant. When I was a boy the word nice meant pleasant. I think today nice is something good. Back in 1830 nice was in general something bad. In 1611 when the Bible was trans. into the KJV they did not even use the word nice at all. But the word has just about completely altered its meaning. When I was a boy if you had a terrific time it meant you were so uncomfortable and so disagreeable you wish you had not been there. Today if they say they had a terrific time they mean it was grand, lovely. That word has within my lifetime has completely shifted its meaning to the exact opposite of what I

was when I was a body. Words are constantly changing their meaning so there is a problem to know what the words mean, what they mean in context, what the expressions mean. When you mean the Bible is inerrant, you don't mean you can grab three words like the Episcopal clergyman who preached a great sermon on "hear the church", based on the words in Matthew, "if they will not hear the church then treat them as a so-and-so." You can't take three words, you can't take a verse; you have to take the Bible as a whole, compare Scripture with Scripture. Study what the words meant at the time they were used. Inerrancy does not mean you just grab something and say, Here we can stand on this; we must take something and investigate it carefully. It means that, ^{at the original time} correctly interpreted the Bible is free from error. So I have no hesitation in declaring that the Bible is inerrant and I believe we should take our stand on inerrancy which includes infallibility rather than on infallibility today.

Now we look at the next word I have written there. It is the word truth. The concept which I consider to be represented by the word truth is a concept that something corresponds with reality. That what these words correctly, carefully interpreted means, corresponds to what actually is in the world outside of our own minds. That they correspond to ^{reality} reality. A statement is either true or untrue. The word truth is absolute. A statement is not half-true. Of course there you come into the question of what you mean by a statement. Because a man writes a whole book and you say he ~~makes~~ ^{makes} a statement on this subject. But if you take a statement and narrow it down to particular statement about a particular thing so that a church will contain many statements. Each of these statements will be true or untrue. No statement is partly. Truth is not a relative matter. It is an absolute matter. No statement is partly true, while a part of a statement may be ~~partly~~ ^{but} true and a part false, because it's really two statements. One statement is either true or false. One statement may be true. Another

statement may be false. They be put together into one sentence. But a statement is either true or false as to whether it corresponds with reality. When it says that the Persian king moved with great rapidity to the ~~West~~, to the North, and to the West, and to the South, we know that it is true, that he did not crawl along at a snails pace. He went. He went fast. He went in those directions. The statement is true. If somebody says that he conquered this territory in 15 yrs. The statement he conquered would be true. The statement he conquered in 15 yrs. would be false because it took him c. 30 yrs. to conquer what he conquered. They would be two statements, each part is either absolutely true or false.

But now we come to a fourth matter. The matter of completeness. And this matter I believe is very important. I think it is important that we recognize that no writing, no discussion of any subject is complete. Completeness is impossible to ~~in~~ fallible human beings. I would find great difficulty of conscience to stand before a court and swear to tell the truth the ~~t~~ whole truth and nothing but the ~~ttth~~ truth. I could tell the truth, I could tell nothing but the truth, but to tell the whole truth -- what does that mean? Does that mean you tell absolutely everything you know. Very very frequently in court cases it is eventually found out that some very important factor had not been mentioned. And I've known cases where they said, Why did you not say so and so? And he said, I was not asked. And there are cases where there are witnesses who have endeavored to say something and they have stopped him. They say, That's not w you were asked. That's not the question. He's not telling the whole truth. What is -- How can you tell the whole truth? Would one of you tell me everything you have done in the last 48 hrs.? You could not remember it. It would be impossible. You would probably have to write a big book to tell everything you have done in the last 48 hours. Is there a complete history of the US? Some of the ~~p~~ things people think this yr. are comparatively unimportant that they will not even bother to write down, are the very things that

40 yrs. from now people will be trying hard to find out about, because their results were so very important in the history of our nation. It is impossible to be complete. Marco Polo made his grt. trip to China. He was there on business. I guess he was (there) 20 yrs. He had many many interesting experiences. A fellow prisoner in jail after he came back was interested in his stories and got him to dictate them to him and he wrote them down. Marco Polo told about the wonders of China, and among them he mentioned the fact China had paper money that they did not have to carry around a lot of heavy metal every time they wanted to buy like people did in Europe. They had paper money. That struck Marco Polo as perfectly wonderful and he told about it. M. Polo never mentioned the fact that the Chinese had printing. It was almost 200 or 300 yrs. later that printing was discovered, invented in Europe and all European civilization was revolutionized by the invention of printing which they already had in China. I don't think they were using it a great deal in China but the paper money that M. Polo was so thrilled about was printed! And he never bothered to mention that the paper money was printed. That had not impressed him. His account you see was incomplete at the point which we think of as tremendously important. The thing that he thought of as so important about the paper money we are so used to now we do not realize its importance hardly now at all. But you cannot be complete. If the Bible were to tell all about God - - well, it says in the Gospel of John, Many other things did Jesus do, and I suppose that if all was written down I do not suppose that all the books in the world could contain. That seems like rather a strong statement, but when you think of what it would take to write everything that anyone of you has ever done or thought or experiences in the last 24 hrs., why what He did in His whole life perhaps it is not such an exaggeration especially ^{as} there were a great many less books in the world then than there are now. But completeness is something we cannot expect. Look at Ps. 139:15: "My substance was not hid from thee when I was

made in secret and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth." Now what are the lowest parts of the earth? If you'd dig down into the earth to get the very center, is that where he was made? Or if you'd get a place right next to the ocean, is that where the Psalmist was made? There are those who have tried to make this refer to the existence of the soul previous to its being combined with the body, that it was somewhere where they would call the lowest parts of the earth. But very few commentators follow that. It is usually thought -- Incidentally, this is not an accurate translation - "the lowest partsof the earth" == there is no "the" in Hebrew. It should be "very low parts of the earth." Most commentators agree that it is an expression referring to the womb of the mother and referring to that which no man can see and which is very imperfectly understood even yet with all the discoveries in recent years of medical investigators, and which contains many elements which are absolutely not understood, the formation of the human body from something microscopic inside and yet at the time of birth haveng millions and millions of separate parts, wonderfully made, fashioned together. It is absolutely beyond human conception. So the picture given here is a true picture but it is very far from complete. A description of the origin of the human body even what's known of it today would take ^{many} ~~many~~ chapters and this statement rightly understood is absolutely true, but it is far from complete. "A low part of the earth", referring to that which is hidden away from human sight, from human observation. That which contains many elements which human beings certainly do not understand now and may never understand in this life. In the lowest parts, in secret, in that which is hidden away. We find in the Bible many clear matters about the nature of God, many things told with absolute clarity. Everything it says about the nature of God is true, but it is very far from giving us a complete understanding of the nature of God, and I personally think it is a great injury in our Chhstian circles that most statements about it are

simply based on what some creed has said, or what some thinker has said, and the greatest thinkers have some statements that are absolutely provable from Scripture, and others that they infer reasonably from Scriptures and others that they guess in order to fill in the gaps in their knowledge. If we would all go back to the Scripture and say this is clearly taught in Scripture, we stand on it; this we don't know, we don't understand about the nature of God. I think we'd get a lot further in really understanding the real nature of God when we do with the amount that is given to speculate in philosophical thoughts about the nature of God and His relation to the universe he is making.

This is particularly true in the trinity. I've always been impressed that the Chalcedonian creed is mainly negative in its nature. It says that the ^{natures} ~~natures~~ of Christ are not mixed, but they are not separated. It denies all the various explanation given to try to understand how it is that Jesus Christ is God, and that there is only One God and yet that He is distinct from the Father. We don't know how it is. We cannot understand it, and our attempts to explain simply go beyond our knowledge. We know as a fact that Jesus is God, and that Jesus is distinct from the Father, but when we try to explain interrelationships, unless we find clear evidence in the Scriptures, and we find ~~find~~ comparatively little of that, we are getting into a realm which we just don't have the data, we don't have the material for understanding. It is not complete. We ^{noticed} ~~noticed~~ last time that Cyrus went so rapidly to the North, to the West, and to the South. It does not mention the East. I read you from Young's commentary, that his conquests were very slight to the East, and they did not last. And actually he conquered far more in the East than in the West, and it last 200 yrs. -- longer than some of the Western conquests lasted. But it was not the purpose to give us a full account of Cyrus' conquests. It was to tell what happened before he conquered Babylon, leading up to the establishment of the Persian empire occupying the place of preeminence formerly occupied by the Babylonian

empire. It was not a complete statement. It was a true statement. Everything said was absolutely true, but it was not complete. No statement is complete. When we make a negative statement, such as "it isn't said, therefore it isn't true" we have to be very careful. It is very difficult to make a negative statement about anything. I have a book I got out of the library here recently on Heaven. There +++ It is a big think book, beautifully written, and it quotes all kinds of humns about heaven, and it quotes the beautiful statements ever made on this. It quotes from somebody's sermon. And the lov^eliest statement ever made on this from somebody else's sermon. It has a lot of beautiful things in it, but when you go through it to try to find how much of evidence it has as to what heaven is like, you find very little, because the Bible tells us little, very very little about the life after death. Very, very little is told in the Bible. In the OT extremely little; in the Pentateuch, almost nothing about life after death. We know that God greatly blesses those who are in Christ after death. We know that -- "to depart and be with Christ is far better," than anything in this world. But detail of it? We just don't have. It is not complete, and it is perhaps more incomplete on this † subject than any other. with which the Bible deals.

The fifth word. These words, infallibility, inerrancy, and truth we commonly find in discussions about the Bible. The last two I have not happened to come across though I have not read extensively in discussions about the subject, but I have not happened to come across the last two anywhere but I think they are tremendously important in having a correct understanding of the approach to the Bible. I think this matter of completeness is very important. It doesn't set up to be 100% complete. That would be impossible, that would take thousands of books to deal with. What it gives is true, but what it doesn't deal with you cannot say Yes or No. You just don't know.

Now this last statement I have not found anywhere in what little I have read on the subject, but I think it is also of tremendous importance perhaps even more important than "completeness" in understanding the Scripture completely. - This question of precision. Now between the statement of truth and precision, there is a very great difference. That something is either true or false. It is not ~~==~~ there are no gradations, there are no relative truths. Truth is absolute. As I said, a what seems to be a statement may be two statements combined. One of them may be true and one false, but each of them is absolutely true or absolutely false. But when it comes to precision, precision is a relative term. There is no such thing as absolute precision. I remember ~~reading~~ hearing years ago about some ancient thinkers who proved that there is no such thing as motion. ~~These~~ They proved that there is no such thing as motion, because they said if you shoot an arrow, on any particular instant that arrow is at a particular spot, and you name 100 instances and it's always at a particular spot, so there is no such thing as motion. Of course that is an utterly ~~sp~~ sophistical argument because there is no such thing as an instant. There is such thing as motion, but there is no such thing as an instant, anything ^{any more} more than there is such a thing as a sheet of paper that has no thickness. If you have a sheet of paper that has no thickness, you have no sheet of paper. If an arrow goes a ^{in a minute} 600 yards, then in a ~~second~~ second it goes 10 yards, and in 100th of ~~seconds~~ a second, it may go a tenth of a yard. But any length of time has length, and if the length is a billionth of a second that arrow if it is ~~a~~ in motion has moved a certain length of distance in that time. But absolute precision is impossible. If I ask you how far it is to San Francisco, a you say it is 3000 miles, and that is a true answer, but it is not a precise answer. I don't know precisely what it would be but if you were to say, No it is not 3000 miles, it is 2800 miles, that

might be more precise, but it still would not be precise. I say it is 2839. That would not be precise. Maybe it's 2839 miles and 3 ~~ft+g+~~ feet and 2 inches, and 100th of another inch, or something. You could not get it exactly. There have been attempts ~~to~~ made to say the Bible is in error, it is incorrect, because of the ~~statement~~ statement in 2 Chron. 4:2 where we read about Saul. "Also he made a molten sea of ten cubits from brim to brim, round in compass, and five cubits its height; and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about." Now the statement has been made, The Bible is in error. Because if you have a circle 10 cu. across, it will be more than 30 cu. around. The Bible has an error as to pi, the proportion between the diameter and the circumference. The answer, of course, is that the degree of precision with which this statement is made is in groups of 10 cubits. Ten cu. across, approximately, just as the distance to San Francisco is approx. ~~3+ft.~~ 3000 miles. Ten cubits across ~~is~~ approx. will give you 30 cu. around approximately, one and three. Now some will say if the Bible is going to be accurate, it should have said that it is 10 across and 3 and 1/7 tenths around. Some have tried to get around this by saying, Well, the 10 cu. of course represents from the outside of the rim, and the 30 cu. represents the inside of the rim. That is an attempt to defend the correctness of the Bible by inserting an idea for which we have no warrant, and more particularly by assuming a desire for precision beyond what is involved in the situation. If you want to ~~p~~ be precise, you will say that pi is three and a seventh, but that is not very precise. You can be more precise by saying it is 3.1416. But somebody says, It is not that at all. It is 3.14159. And that is not precise. And I understand they figured it out two or three hundred decimal points, and still it goes on. We cannot be precise as to the diameter. So he gives it in sections of 10 cubits each, instead of sections in the millionth of an inch as some people might want him to. Inerrancy does not mean that it has absolute precision. Absolute

precision is impossible! That it has absolute precision is impossible. It means it has the degree of precision that ^{it} ~~is~~ set out to have.

Now in Mk. 14 we have a statement which some have said, shows an error in the Bible. In Mk. 14 cf. with Mat. In Mk. 14:68 we read about Peter and he denied saying I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest And he went out into the porch; and the cock crowed. And a maid saw him again and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. And he denied it again. . . . (reading text through vs. 72). That's what Mark says what happened. But listen to what Matthew says about it.

Mat. 26:74-75 (reading text of vs. 73-75). Did Peter deny Christ three times before the cock crew or before the cock crew twice? Which is it? Mark says one; Matthew says another. If you take either one of the two surely you are going to say the other one is in error. Arn't you? Unless you study the meaning of the statement. What does he mean "immediately the cock crew"? Which cock crew? Did they have one particular rooster ~~and~~ that was the one that counted, and it was only that one that mattered? What does it mean - the cock crew? Well, there is a reference in Mk. 13:35 that I think makes it quite clear. There Jesus said, "Watch ye, therefore; for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at evening, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or in the morning." In other words, the cock crowing is a term used at that time for the period when they did not have clocks all around, and sun dials would not work at night, it is a term used for the period which it is just beginning to get light, and the roosters look up and ~~the~~ see the light beginning to come. And you hear one and you hear another, and pretty soon you hear them all over. Jesus is not saying, Before any rooster in Jerusalem crows you are going to deny me thrice; when he says, Before the cock crows, He means before the time of cock crowing. Before that time in the morning. And you might hear one rooster crow, and you might say, Well one rooster is a little bit more alert than the others. But the cock crowing is the time when a lot of them begin to crow.

So Mark which is the statement that Peter explains in Mark, remembers it more precisely than Mat. gives it. Mat. refers to the period of cock crowing -- "before the cock crows" But Mk. remembers the fact that he had one rooster crow, and that had not impressed his mind, and then two of the denials were after he heard one, but then probably the whole chorus started and it was brought back to his mind. You see people ~~has~~ have said, Mat. and Mk. contradict each other, how can you trust the Bible? Well, understand what it means and there is no contradiction. It is not an attempt to speak with precision about one particular cock crowing. We read the accounts of the resurrection and some speak of their seeing an angel, and some speak of there being two angels, one at the head and one at the foot. Well, when they were so excited under those circumstances, it is quite easy for one to notice only one of them. The fact he says there was an angel there, and an angel spoke to him, does not mean there were not other angels there. There is no contradiction; There is a situation in which one describes it more fully than the other. There may be more precision. So that this matter of precision, unlike the matter of truth is always relative. Cyrus comes rapidly to make his great conquest. And Alexander comes more rapidly. Cyrus makes great conquests in 30 years; Alexander makes them in 12 yrs. Neither went as fast as Hitler did but of course they did not have the modern machinery that Hitler had. But they went tremendously fast. They did tremendous exploits at that time and those of Alexander were more rapid than those of Cyrus. There are statements of truth which we get from the Book of Daniel, and we look at history --- what has been preserved to us through history -- and we find that it exactly corresponds. That as to truth the rapidity of the movement of Cyrus and the greater rapidity of the conquest of Alexander are predicted by Daniel 300 years before and carried out with absolute truth, but we are not told with precision how long it would take, or exactly how big an area they will conquer. And then the historical events that would occur which were known to the Lord, in full detail, He reveals to Daniel in brief. He gives him a summary

of them. In the summary he says the great horn is broken and four horns come up in his place, which is a good symbolic representation of what happened. That Alexander died and after a short time of trying to hold his empire together you found 10 or 12 generals each claiming to -- each attempting to hold the whole empire together and to be the leader of it, and eventually after 40 years of conquest it settles down to a situation where you have three main kingdoms, one of them occupying perhaps half the territory of Alexander's former empire; a second one being perhaps just as important as this one because it was a very important powerful area held, an area easy to defend, but somewhat smaller. And then a third one still smaller than these but still a very important empire because it held the center of Greek civilization with considerable power over Greece and absolute power over Mesopotamia with Asia Minor sort of divided up between these three with it varying a little from time to time, and Syria also somewhat divided up, and then a few small sections which broke off from this smaller and these smaller ones are sort of lumped together into a fourth one, so that God could have chosen that at Alexander's death He would divide his army among four generals, he would divide his empire and they would hold it and that would be the situation. But history rarely works in quite that exact exact way. Sometimes it does work in most peculiar exact ways. I know just a few years ago a strange thing, before Alaska and Hawaii were states; I noticed that of our 48 states, exactly half of them began with the first half of the letters of the alphabet, exactly half began with the last half of the letters of the alphabet. That 1/3 of our 48 states began with the middle two letters of the alphabet, and another third with the letters before those and another third with the letters after that. A very peculiar thing. If you are going to use Biblical numerics, you might use historical numerics and show the inspiration of the system of 48 states. It's all ruined now of course, because we have 50 and these two are in the first third. But history does not ordinarily go in those precise ways. I think in the U.S. there is only one point where four states come together. Now if you took a map

and you said, Let's make states, you'd probably make them all squares. There would be a couple hundred points where four states come together. But there is only one. History, like geography, is a thing that has all sorts of variety to it. God in the Bible has told us how to know the Lord and how to be saved. He has given us glimpses of many factors of His creation. Every glimpse He gives us is a true one, and when He gives us future history He gives us true glimpses of it, but it is not His purpose to simply to satisfy curiosity. It is not His purpose to give us a complete picture of future history. It is not His purpose to give us absolute precision, but it is His purpose to give us a certain amount of precision on everything which He ~~gives~~ deals and this varies of course because precision is always relative though truth is always absolute. Now this is a little excursus which took is a greater part of the hour today, but I thought it rather important as our approach particularly to Daniel, but it is valuable I think to consider these matters in dealing with all Biblical studies.

Did you have a question? (Student) I'm a little confused about the relationship of precision to truth. Maybe you could help me by defining what you mean by absolute truth, because it would seem to me that the preciseness of a statement would affect its true value. Maybe we could not make an absolute statement about the circumference of a circle given the information about the nature of pi. So what do you mean by a statement being absolutely true or absolutely false, and how does that relate to precision?

I would say that in the US California is definitely West of New York. It is absolutely. It would not be considered North, or East, or South. It is West. But it is not precisely West. It would be a little North of SW, in fact quite a little North of South West. It would be inbetween SW and W. Now to give it an exact precision with a 360 points of the compass, you could do. But when you do you'd have your degrees, but then you'd get down to your minutes or seconds of your compass. You see what

I mean. The statement that it is West is true. But it is not precise. In order to say precisely that Denver is W. of Philadelphia you would have to draw an exact line W from here. Now an exact line W from here might go 10 mi. N of Denver, for all I know. It would be approximately Denver, but it would require an very expert surveyore to tell you what is exactly W of here. But the statement W means in that general portion of the World. So the statement is absolutely true. If I said that it is East of here, of course it is true if you go clear around the world but w that would not be the way we use the term East. It would be a false statement to say it would be East of here. No one whose primary purpose was to get from here to California would go East.

(Student) A large number of statements then would not be absolutely true or absolutely false, from what you said?

No, I said that every statement is absolutely true or absolutely false, but no statement is absolutely precise. There are degrees of precision, but there are no degrees of truth.

(Student) The statement like California is rich state. It seems to me like vary much balance (?) or a particular period of time and the particular relativity of richness to the culture of some other states, and so on. So it's hard to see how/^{the statement}California is rich can be absolutely true or absolutely false.

Well, certainly the comparative wealth of the different states of the Union it would certainly be in the top third. That would be near enough to make it a correct statement. You have not said any thing about the (time?) Of course when you say "is" it would imply today. You are not talking about the time of Christ. Your term is means today. If you say, California was ruled by the Spanish, that is absolutely true. You have not said when it was ruled by them. You have not said how long it was ruled by them. You have not said when they came or when it was

4/15/74

Daniel Course

Lecture 9

17
16

it was taken from them. But the statement we have made that it was ruled by the Spanish is absolutely true. It is something that has happened in the past. But you have not gone into precision. You might say, California was ruled by the Spaniards in the 18th century. Well that it would be a true statement - it was ruled by them in the 18th century - but it would not be a precise statement, because it was not until 1776 that the Spanish took over what we today call California. They had lower Calif. 150 yrs. before that. But if you got down to precision, you would have to tell the day they came and the day they left and so on.

(Student) Well in that case that you just gave, wouldn't the thing involved be completeness rather than precision?

The two do run into each other. That's right. The two do run into each other. You can't draw an absolutely hard and fast line between the two.

(Student) Referring to completeness in the Scriptures, could a person say with truth that the Bible is complete as to its being God's Word to man now? Yes.

The Bible gives what God felt was necessary and desirable for/the ^{during} men to have / period in between His coming and the return of Christ. Now there may be matters just as important as anything in the Bible that He'll reveal to us after He comes that are not there.

(Student) The incompleteness then would partly be then what many men would say they want to know? Yes.

Yes. And the trouble is when people want to know something and they don't find it in the Bible and they make a guess They say, Well that does not sound that way so it must be this way. And then some other writer says, So and so says the Bible says this way. Then so and so - the next writer - just makes it a statement - it is this way. That's why I feel we should always go back to the Bible in order to know truth in those matters we cannot touch or handle or get direct information from others who

who have touched and handled. And if we don't have information in the Bible and if it isn't something we can reach and examine ourselves or someone in whom we can have confidence can, why I prefer to say, I don't know. I think there is a great harm in people insisting on having an answer on things we don't have the data on.

(Student) How can you know something is true? In other words can we know is there any truth outside the Bible, and if so how can we determine what this is? I think you have just now touched upon that?

I think that as we are brought up to have certain things impressed on our consciousness, we assume that they are true. We have heard our parents talk about what happened years ago. But how do we know that the world was not created yesterday? With all these impressions of past events in our minds, that our minds were made that way with all that with all that knowledge, we don't know. But the Bible says it's at least 6000 years that the earth has been here so we have Biblical evidence that the world was not created yesterday. I don't think we have any other way of knowing. We assume an awful lot in our lives.

((Student) Does infallibility and inerrancy refer also to the KJV as it does to the ?

well if it was good enough for St. Paul shouldn't it be good enough for us?

I gave a talk to an Inter Varsity Camp in Canada once on the *darice* ^(p) ~~derricks~~ or in the books of Chronicles and Ezra, and someone came up to me and said, My you have wonderfully increased our faith in the Bible, but you've destroyed our faith in the KJV. Now that was an extreme statement. But the fact of the matter is that we should note that God knowing the difficulty of interpreting Lunar words did not choose to invent an artificial language in order to give us the Bible. So we have difficulty if words change. And this being the case, He saw no point in writing the Bible on tablets of stone kept in a room at exactly the right temperature.

so that no little mark on the edge of a letter would be removed or anything, but he let them be copied by human beings, and in the copying through the centuries have come in, but they are comparatively few, far less than any other work of antiquity. So that our present MSS have variations, and where they have variations we have to compare and make our own judgment as to what is correct, but there is nothing that we have reason to think is of great importance in which there is a variation in our MSS. All the important things, that we would consider of real importance we find hundreds of MSS agreeing on. Then when it comes to translating you just can't translate exactly from one language to another. It is impossible, because words don't exactly correspond. I heard Prof. Montgomery at the U. of Pa. who was a liberal and wrote commentaries in the ICCG series, say he believed the KJV was as good a translation that was ever made of any book into any language. That does not mean it is a perfect translation by any means, and our language has changed greatly in 300 yrs. So that my notion if you want to know exactly what the Bible means, one thing you could do is to spend a few years studying Elizabethan literature in order to know just what words meant 300 years ago, to know exactly what the KJV translators meant. A better way, I think, is to study the Greek and Heb. to know what the original writers meant. Of course what the KJ translators thought it meant is of value, often they had excellent ideas, but we have to check carefully to be sure the words still mean today what they meant then. Like when he said, I prevent the dawning of the morning with my prayers, he did not mean he performed a miracle and made it stay dark all day, but prevent in those days meant come before. That meant that before it got light he was praying, but nobody would get that meaning today from it, unless it was explained to them. It is too bad that against the anti-Christian attitude of so many today, that in reaction against that some fine Christian people are taking the stand that the KJV is the true Bible, or still large number that the

particular Greek and Hebrew used by the translators of the KJ is the correct Bible because we have many more MSS available than they have. And it does not affect any thing of any great importance, but ~~if~~ it affects a lot of things of comparatively small importance. I believe we should check the evidence and see what it is. ~~What~~ of what is our text and also of course of what the ~~a~~ words mean. Because the Greek and Hebrew words

Now take the word end. It was his end to do something, it was used in the KJV times, and used in the Greek to mean a purpose. We speak of teleology, it is the science of purpose. We also use ~~ed~~ end to mean how a thing stops. We today, I'm not sure that we use the word end for purpose much, I think ~~we~~ still have it. But it was used quite a bit, it was used in the KJV in that sense. We use it in the sense of it stopping, of there being no more of it today. Those are quite different, those of stopping and of purpose, But our word end has both meanings. In present day English there are very few words that don't have two ~~re~~ or three or four meanings, which makes it a very cumbersome language, at least today. I don't think it was as bad in KJ's day but there were some bad differences in words where you have to decide from the context which it is.

I'm afraid our time is up. We did not get very far in Daniel, but got some material of importance I think.

Class over. (Student) In Puerto Rico the ^{rooster crowed} ~~rooster~~ cross any time day or night. (Isn't it a different kind of chicken.) I never investigated, but that's one thing we were struck with. We had thought roosters crowed in the morning. But there they don't, they crow any time.

We were looking at ch. 8 when I interrupted our examination of it in order to discuss the matter of exactly what we mean by infallibility, inerrancy, truth, completeness, and precision. I think it is good we have in mind the difference between those various concepts. We believe ~~that~~ that everything in the Bible is true; it is ~~g~~ free from error, but that does not mean that it is complete on any subject. That would take many encyclopedias, not one book of this size. It means that it gives us what the Lord desires to give us on every subject, but it does not necessarily go into great depths into any particular subject. It does not mean it is absolutely precise. Absolute precision is quite impossible, but it gives such measure of precision as He chooses to give us.

We would looking at ch. 8 when we ^{interrupted it} dropped it for this purpose. In ch. 8 we have a ch. which is probably relatively neglected among the prophecies of Daniel. I think the ~~e~~ reason why it is relatively neglected is because people of today, at least conservative, evangelical Christians, tend to look forward rather than back. They look with great interest upon prophecies of things which have not yet occurred, but they tend not to have great interest in ^{prophecies of} things that have occurred. Antiochus Epiphanes ^{in his} attempted to completely destroy the Jewish religion was one of the most temtuous and crucial events in all the history of Israel, but it is not described in the canonical books of the OT. Consequently the average Protestant of today knows very, very little about it., and tends not to realize its significance. What was the purpose of the writing of the book of Daniel? Well, you ~~e~~ might say the book of Daniel was written to tell us ~~about~~ certain things that happened, and of course, if we are historically minded we are interested in everything that happens, but they have been millions of things that have happened -- millions of things even among the history of the Israelites that happenend, that God did not cause to be put in a book.

What was His purpose in telling us about these events in the life of

Daniel and his associates? The purpose certainly of the ^{Event of the} history in it was to show that God is supreme, God is in control, that people can trust Him in great crises, in great emergencies. Well that then is intended to benefit His people in all crises, in all emergencies About 300 years, no 400 years after Daniel's time, there was to be one of the greatest crises in all the history of Israel, a crisis in which might have completely brought an end to a knowledge of God among the Israelites, and certainly it would be utterly unreasonable not to say that one of the great purposes of the giving of the book of Daniel was to ~~protect~~ prepare God's people for that great crisis. People today sometimes speak about the historical -- chapter 8 - about the historical interpretation of the prophetic, as if anything back of 1900 A.D. is historical and anything after ¹⁹⁷⁴ ~~1970~~ is prophetic, but from Daniel's time as you look ahead, something 400 years future, and something 2900 yrs. future would both be way off in the distance and something 400 years off would probably seem almost as far off as something 2900 years off. You just probably would not have the concept of something 2900 years off. So that in the early days of the Christian church there was a pagan writer, Poryphry, who made a great attack upon Christianity, and one of his attacks was centered on the Christian attitude of taking the book of Daniel as a book which describes events in the life of Daniel and which told what was going to happen at the return of Christ. Poryphry said this is all nonsense, the book of Daniel was written in order to encourage the Jews to resist Antiochus Epiphanes. He said it was not written 400 yrs. in advance; it was written right at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; and it was written to encourage them at that time. So he interpreted everything ^{in it} in relation to that particular time. Now that particular interpretation which Poryphry gave is held by all modernistic interpreters today. All of them take the book of Daniel in this way. And there are a number of writers who can be considered as generally conservative who have been affected by this to the

extent that thought they may accept the great doctrines of the NT, they will say that Daniel is dealing simply with the time of the Maccabees. This is what he (Dan.) is looking at entirely." Now I don't think we should react to that with the opposite extreme and say Daniel has nothing to do with Antiochus Epiphanes. I think we should recognize an immediate -- well not immediate, 400 years, but a very vital soon purpose of the book preparing the people for that terrible crisis of Antiochus Epiphanes. And also the purpose and all other crises in the history of God's people and looking forward to some extent to events that have not yet occurred.

Now against Poryphry's attitude, St. Jerome wrote a commentary on Daniel in which he endeavored to show that Poryphry was wrong. That the book does indeed look forward to the time of the Macabees, that it has a great deal to do with that ^{period} ~~period~~, but that it also looks way beyond and looks to the time of the coming of antichrist. So Jerome said the book was written 400 yrs. before Maccabees and looks forward to both things. Well now the argument in a way reaches a crux on ch. 8 here. The liberals and those who adopt the ~~three~~ theory that the book of Daniel was not written until that time, say ch. 8 is parallel to ch. 7 with the same thing being stressed again. Some who take the opposite view, say ch. 8 and ch. 7 look at the same thing, but it's something that is at the very end of this age. Well, I think this latter view is a ^{reaction} ~~reactionary~~ from that which is quite unjustified. We have already looked at the beginning of ch. 8 and noted/^{how} that there is a picture of a ram making a great rapid conquest, and then a he-goat. He said, "As I was considering, Behold a he-goat came and it touched not the ground, and it drew near the ram and attacked it and destroyed it. Here we have these two animals doing this, and after the ram has been destroyed the he-goat becomes very strong and when he was strong his great horn was broken and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. That of course is new. There is no parallell to that in ch. 7. But then, he says, Out of one of them came

forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Is this little horn just the same as the little horn of ch. 7? The critical scholars all say Yes, they ^{both} all refer to A. Epiphanes. Some writers in the last century - I don't know any recently - but some within the last century said: Yes, these are the same; they both refer to antichrist. I don't know of any present writer who refers them both to antichrist. But as you look at them they both have a little horn in them, and this little horn magnifies itself. In ch. 7 it destroys three of the ten horns that were there before. In ch. 8 it waxes great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground. So there is a similarity. It is a little horn that becomes great and magnifies itself and opposes God and His work. There is a similarity.

But there are two great differences. The lesser of the two great differences is that in ch. 7 he comes out of the animal and destroys three of the previous horns. In ch. 8 he comes out of one of the four horns of the animal. But the greater difference between the two is that in ch. 7 it comes out of the fourth animal; and in ch. 8 the animal from which it comes is definitely designated in vs. 21 as the king of Grecia. Well of course the critics say that the fourth kingdom is the Greek kingdom. But that is utterly unhistorical, and is contradicted in the book of Daniel. In several cases, in one clear case is vs. 20 of ch. 8 where it says "The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are these the kings of Media and Persia." Well ~~is~~ according to the critics in order to get four kingdoms they have the second one be Media and the third Persia, and there is absolutely no evidence of such a thing anywhere, and here the ram is the two of them together, which is pretty clear proof that the book of Daniel takes Medo-Persia as one kingdom, not two. So that the little horn of ch. 8 comes out of the third kingdom; the little horn of ch. 7 comes out of the

fourth kingdom. That would seem to make them different, and to my mind it is very important that we objectively take what we find in the Scripture and where there is a difference recognize it. I think that is very important.

Now most writings on Daniel go to it with a definite position gathered from a study of the Scripture as a whole, and try to show how everything in the book fits into that complete position. That There is value in books like that. But I think there is great value in trying to study it the way I am trying to in this course - to look at the book of Daniel by itself and try to see what you can be positive about, and I think one thing you can be positive about is that the little horn in ch. 7 and the little horn in ch. 8 are two distinct things. I think we confuse ourselves when we try to make them one. I think that is unfortunate and harmful. But most of our recent premil writers do that. Most of them do, and I think that is very unfortunate that they do in ch. 8. I think they confuse the approach to prophecy. I think the great thing about premil is that it does not like amil and postmil, spiritualize -- take statements about a great kingdom and make them into the spread of the church, ~~but~~ or take statements about great prosperity on the earth and make it purely a matter of spiritual advance. This sort of approach. To my mind premil on the great essentials takes the Scripture as it stands, accepts what is there, instead of trying to twist them, and that's the reason why I believe premil is the clear teaching of the Scripture. But unfortunately most premil writers, being so interested in the last days - and we should have considerable interest in in them - being so interested in that, at this particular point in ch. 8 abandon their principles. The principle of objectively seeing ^{what the} Scripture really says, and try to make ch. 8 relate to the ^{antichrist.} ~~enemy(?)~~

Now to say there were some great scholars, great premil Christians a century ago who said ch. 8 is entirely taking about the antichrist, but I don't know anybody today who does that. I have two commentaries here written within the last few years. One just came out this last year by wood

of Grand Rapids. One that came out three years ago by Walvoord of Dallas. Both of these commentaries say specifically that everything in ch. 8 about the little horn can be understood as describing A. Epiphanes. Both of them say that. But then both of them go on to say, However it also looks to the antichrist. And that I think is unfortunate. When we describe Julius Ceasar's conquests, why do we have to say we are looking forward to Napoleon's conquests? And Julius Ceasar after he conquered, he revised the calendar, and the French Revolution tried to change the calendar. Ceasar improved the system of measurement, and Napoleon introduced the metric system all through Europe. You can find all sorts of similarities between matters but that does not prove one of them is a foreshadowing of the other. I believe we should take ch. 8 here as a picture of Antiochus and ch. 7, I think the critics are completely wrong in saying it is also Antiochus. It is clearly in my opinion the Antichrist.

We could spend a long time on this. The big argument, in fact the only argument that I find in either of these books that is at all valid for saying that this must have anything to do with antichrist, is the fact that the term "the time of the end" occurs in it. "The time of the end" -- that is in vs. 17 where the voice says, "Understand, O son of man; for at the time of the end shall be the vision." Now we have the phrase "the time of the end" used twice later on in ch. 11 and 12. "Time of the end" looking to the end of the present age. But if you have a phrase like that used three times and two of them refer to a certain thing, that does not prove that the third looks to that certain thing. We can find the phrase "the end of the Egyptian empire", "the end of all things", "the end of the world", but that does not mean that when we read "the end of the Lord" or "the end of your faith" that that means "end" has the same meaning there as it has in these others. In fact its meaning is quite opposite. The end -- You have seen the end of the Lord, we read in James. It means the purpose of the Lord. It's exactly the same word in the NT.

Now of course that is the word telos which is used generally to translate this OT word qets but this OT word is used for a border, any kind of a division. It is used many many times for the end of 40 days, the end of 300 years, at the end of such a thing. It means a border. It does not necessarily mean the same border. The fact that it refers to the end in this chapter does not in itself prove that this must come at the very end of the age.

Another verse that can make such a statement is vs. 19: Behold, I will make these know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed the end shall be." The word "indignation:" is just a word for strong anger. The end of the indignation. Of course God's strong anger does not come to a complete end until you have the very last final judgment at the end of the millennium. But it says there is an end of his anger at many many other points. God's anger ended with Christ's death on the cross, when He bore the results of God's anger at sin and established the beginning of righteousness through what He did. That is an end of a phase of God's indignation. Now in this particular case I think that this particular phrase "the last end of the indignation" can just as well refer to the time of A. Epiphanes because that was the end of the period when Israel was subject continuously to foreign rulers. They were conquered by Nebuchadnezzar. They were held in bondage under the Babylonians, under the Persians, under the Greeks for a period of several hundred years, and then after A. Epiphanes death his successors tried to establish control over Israel again and they resisted it and they made a treaty with Rome, a mutual defense pact, and Israel was independent for about 50 yrs. That was the end of the long period of Israelite subjection to these foreign powers at that particular period. Now of course after c. 50 yrs. Rome Rome+ then which was supposedly their ally took over complete control of them, and they were incorporated into the Roman empire for another 50 yrs. Then at the end of that time they w revolted and were scattered all over.

So this phrase "the last end of the indignation" certainly does not prove that this relates to the antichrist. These books quote a number of writers who^{try} while holding that it is Antiochus Epiphanes show how it also is Antichrist. One way is to say the vision is A. Epiphanes, but the interpretation is antichrist. That does not make much sense. Because the interpretation starts in "The ram that thou sawest having ^{two} horns, are the kings of Media and Persia." and the rough goat is the King of Grecia. The interpretation is dealing with that very same thing. Others say there is a break further on where it stops talking about Antiochus and starts talking about Antichrist. But there is no point at which you can make a division like that. We had quite an argument when we were making up the New Scofield because I believe there were 4/^{of us}out of the 9 - I know there were at least 3 there may have been 4, I forget who thought that we should simply say that ch. 8 discusses A. Epiphanes. But others thought it also relates to Antichrist, and they had a majority of the vote. So they say it is an antumbration of antichrist, a foreshadowing of antichrist. Well, I don't think that Jacob's wrestling with the angel at Peniel is a foreshadowing of Jesus' resisting the devil in the Temptation, or of the final struggle with antichrist. I think that sort of - We can use anything for an illustration. It is all right to use things for an illustration, but don't use them to prove something unless unless they are actually talking about it.

To get into the details of ch. 8 would take us quite a bit of time. We spent a lot of time on one thing - about the 4 horns which I tried to show represent three great kingdoms and the other one just stands for the fact that there were several smaller ones. There was no one kingdom of Asia Minor. Asia Minor had about three small kingdoms, and most of Asia Minor was sometimes held by the king of Macedonia, sometimes it was held

by the Seleucids. And one list I saw it said that, it referred to the four horns, one of them being western Asia, one of them being Persia. That is absolutely unhistorical. The Seleucids held western ~~Asia~~ Asia and Persia. There are many other ~~details~~ details in this chapter, and some of them we will come back to after we take up ch. 11. Because ch. 11 deals with the same thing with much more details. So details of this that we could look at now but we could not really get into well, we can get into better by comparing with ch. 11.

So I want to go forward now. We have been talking about Roman Numeral V. We haven't really completed it because I don't want to go fully into it except in connection with ch. 11. So I'm going to call Roman Numeral VI, chs. 10-12. In ch. 10 and 12 which I call Roman Numeral VI we notice it begins with Daniel's vision described in ch 10 which is merely a vision of how it came about that he was given a prediction. There is nothing that can be taken out specifically to show a prediction of something future to Daniel's time, ^{in ch. 10} but it is introductory to ch. 11. It ends with vs. 21: (reading 10:21 and 11:1,2) There the Prediction starts, and of course the ch. division here has confused a great many people because the first verse certainly should be with the previous chapter. But the real prediction starts in 11:2: "Now I will show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia." Now when was this vision given? The very first verse of ch. 10 tells us, ~~not~~ not the first vs. of ch. 11 - that is referring back to something previous. The angels says to him, And in the first year of Darius, the Mede, I did something." But this whole vision is given to him. The first vs. of ch. 10 says, In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed to Daniel." This then is in the reign of Cyrus king of Persia, and he says, "Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all . . ." Now the one of the most useful commentaries on the book of Dan. is in the International Critical Commentary, the Com. by Prof. Montgomery,

of the U. of Pa. Wilbur Smith in a bibliographical article written c. 30 yrs, ago said this book was absolutely worthless and useless. I think his later statements have revised that, because most other evangelical writers say that though they disagree with most of Montgomery's conclusions it is an extremely valuable book. And the reason is that, unlike many of the volumes of the ICC series many of which are superficial, but this one is a very very thorough in which you cannot read the pages of it without being amazed at the great amount of material that Montgomery studied through and compared and dealt with, and he dealt with dozens of commentaries from the earliest days up to the present. He went into all the related linguisted matters. He accepted the critical view but with a certain hesitation, but in general he stands by them. But when you have a definite statement you can usually fairly well depend on it. The only one place where he wasn't quite so dependable was on this fourth division of the four kingdoms. There though I should not say he was not dependable, I would say he ~~teh~~ there says different people have taken it differant ways and he tells what some of them are and he says, Probably the best way to take it is such and such. And that's the way that all later writers copied from Mntgomery. But I think there he is simply giving his opinion rather than going into the history.

But Montgomery on this statement here has a very interesting discussion. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all." Now who are these kings? He says, "The writer finds himself in a small minority as identifying the four kings of Persia as Cyrus and the three yet to come, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, Darius III Codomaeus." That's the last king of Persia. He says ~~there~~ these are the four Persian kings named in the Bible, the last one being noted as the Persian in Neh. 12:22. Then he gives other interpretations people give. He says, There is much disagreement who these are, and he says that probably the writer did not know much about the history of Persia, and when he says there

yet three kings and a fourth he is simply talking about the ones mentioned anywhere in the Bible. Because he would go through it and he would find mentioned in the Bible ~~mention of it in the Bible~~ these particular kings, including the last king of Persia. Well in this particular case I don't think Montgomery read the statement very clearly. Because Daniel says: Behold there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia, and the fourth shall be far richer than they all." Does that mean there are only going to be 4 more kings? ~~It~~ It means rather there are going to be after this present one to be three and then a fourth of whom he tells something. And that's the way that practically all our evangelical commentators take it now, that the fourth will be far richer than they all, and by his strength through his riches shall he stir up all against the realm of Greece." Now I have here the names of the kings of Persia: Cyrus, 559-529; Cambyses, 529-522; Smerdis, 522-522; Darius I, 522-485; Xerxes I, 486-465; Artaxerxes I, 465-424; Xerxes II 424-423; Darius II 423-404; Artaxerxes II 404-358; Artaxerxes III 358-338; Ar ? 338-336; Darius III 336-330.

Now of course if the writer of Daniel was ~~shown~~^{as} Montgomery thinks and all the critics think i.e. somebody who was writing 400 yrs. after the alleged time of Daniel, and 200 yrs. after the end of the Persian kingdom, why he might not know anything about the kings of Persia and just find the names of four in the Bible and put them in. But if God is giving a prediction of what is going to happen, He does not have to name all the kings of Persia. He says, After this one there will be three and then the fourth will do something he wants to talk about. That's what our evangelical commentators all take, and I think undoubtedly rightly. You have then a statement, There are going to be three more kings of Persia, and a fourth through his riches will stir up all against the king of Grecia. We find that King Darius - the third of these - tried to conquer Greece because the Greek people were helping the Greeks of Asia Minor who were revolting against him for the fourth time. And so he sent a great expedition in 490 which the Greeks

were able to defeat. Then he spent nearly 10 yrs. gathering a force to make a really conclusive conquest, but he died before it was all gathered. So his son, Xerxes, in 480 sent this tremendous force, one of the greatest forces ever assembled in history. A force with people from dozens of nationalities, hardly able to talk with one another but all marching forward to conquer this land of Greece, far far away from the Persian kings' headquarters. And a ^{force} ~~force~~ which under ordinary circumstances should certainly have overwhelmed everything before it. But they struck bad weather, they struck disagreeable conditions. It was hard to control them directly, -- all these various groups of people. And the Athenians were fortunate in having unusually able commanders at that particular time. The strategy of the Greeks was more clever than the strategy of the Persians and this great expedition was annihilated. That is exactly what it says here that he by his strength, through his riches shall stir up all against the realm of Greece.

Then the next vs. (3) says: And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. And when he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken, and be divided toward the four winds . . . (reading text of rest of vs. 4). And I believe that all commentators agree that vs. 3 and 4 here are talking about Alexander the Great. But the thing that the ~~amil~~ commentators, like Leupold and Young, fail to notice, is that fact that after telling about Xerxes attempt to conquer Greece, he goes right on to tell about something that happens nearly 200 yrs. later, right off with no break whatever. "Through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece, and a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule a with great ^{dominion} ~~dominion~~, and do according to his will. And when he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken." Clearly Alexander the Great, and there is nearly 200 yrs. in between them. So here you have a historic gap! You have a gap; you have a jump yump. And I don't know how they overlook it. A big jump, well over 150 yrs. between these two verses, according to the

way I believe every commentator interprets these two verses. Well, if you can have a big jump like that here, is it not necessarily true that the prophet's vision which sees great mountain peaks ^{of fact? events} can overleap big plains inbetween them without giving any idea even of their existence? If Xerxes == To say Xerxes makes a great attack against Greece and a mighty king stands up and rules according to his great power, which runs over in fact all his conquering the Persian empire; it merely implies it, but then tells how his kingdom is divided, not to his posterity because these different generals seized the different portions of it. It's exactly what happened to Alexander the Great ^{& his followers} and there is this big gap in between. So we have here a very definite evidence of the interval that may occur in a prophet's vision. I don't see any way possibly to get ~~around~~ around it. And Leupold and Young don't even notice it. ^{They} It describes Xerxes and then there is Alexander the Great! And they don't seem to notice the fact that there is more than 150 years in between that ^{once} ^{this} is not even mentioned. Of course/we recognize the fact that it makes unnecessary the problem that all the liberal commentators raise about there ⁴ being only 5 kings of Persia mentioned when actually there were 9 or 10 kings that reigned in Persia. He describes exactly what happens up to a point and then he skips over a big space.

Then he says this king's dominion is broken and divided toward the four winds of heaven, and to his posterity, nor according to his ^{dominion} ~~dominion~~ which he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those." This would be a very natural thing for someone to say ^{who knew} a little bit about the history in the ~~it~~ time of the Maccabees, if Daniel was written then as the critics say. But it is a very remarkable thing to be said by Daniel. Only Divine inspiration, no other way, could such precise -- no precise is not the word to use here. Well such ^C dealing with certain ~~details~~ details in a remarkable way, could such a view of these particular things be given which happened at that period. I don't know of

any other period that happened exactly as described here. It does not describe it wholly. You could not say exactly what was going to happen, but it gives \pm you certain details ^{of it} which you certainly could not parallel with the end of the Babylonian empire, or with the end of $\#$ the Persian empire, or not to any extent with the end of the Roman empire. It's a situation which is just exactly what happens when a number of different details fit together that occurred there that did not fit together at any other time.

Then he goes on here. In the vs. up to vs. 20. ^{From} In vs. 4 up to vs. 20 he deals with two of these kingdoms. This is probably (in the predictive parts of Daniel) the most neglected portion of all. Because it is not of great interest to those who are interested in what is going to happen after our time. Everybody recognizes that it ^{is supposed to} describes things that happened before our time. And it does not give you ^{enough} detail to tell you what is going to happen in any great detail during that period, but it ^{take up} an event here and here - events that everybody would know about among the very complicated and confused history of the relationship of the kings of the Seleucid empire and the Ptolemies of Egypt, as they fought back and forth, not continuously. There were long periods of ~~of~~ peace. Every now and then there was strife between them. There was much territory that was disputed among them. ~~and when they~~ And they would make friends. And when they would make friends they would immediately have an intermarriage, to make the relationship permanent. But usually tht did not make any difference. They were soon fighting again. They were back and forth. In these vs. from vs. 5 to vs. 20 you have the account of the events, just a few of the main events, during the next 100 yrs, and then you have one king described in 7 ~~of~~ 8 vs. - Antiochus III, the father of Antiochus IV. Antiochus III is called historically Antiochus the Great because he conquered all of Asia Minor and he threatened to get all of Egypt into his hands. He was very victorious in the east there, but the

Romans interfered, and defeated him and took away much of the territory he had conquered. And he had for a period of maybe 40 yrs., he had a tempestuous reign, a very effective ~~na~~ able man, but he had this tremendous ~~effective~~ Roman force from a long distance away which was interfering with him and which in the end resulted in his losing just about everything he had gained.

The details of just how this fits with history can be found discussed in just about any com. on Dan. There is not matter here of much disagreement. The critical view ^{would hold} ~~which holds~~ that Antiochus III had lived during the previous few decades before the bk. of Dan. was written, and the ^{facts} fact would be well know, and are given here in somewhat cryptic way, and yet with enough detail that it could hardly fit anything else, and it remarkably fits Antiochus III -- Antiochus the Great.

Conservatives too agree that this is describing the Seleucid empire which is called the King of the north because it was N. of Egypt in relation to the K. of the South which was the K. of Egypt, and describing their inter-relation during these periods, and describing Antiochus III. The whole reason for this is that someone in the time of Antiochus IV would be able to see all this detail is leading up to what is coming ahead. It is pointing a way to the situation. It is not important in itself, but it is important in pointing the way to the time when these things when ~~== wje~~ when this great crisis ~~rises~~ is going to come and it is important, of course, as the crisis approached of the Maccabees, you would look back and see how God had predicted all these events, and therefore you would trust the Lord that the rest of what he predicts will be carried out and that Antiochus also will not succeed. You could trust the Word of God, by seeing the fulfillment of these various things that had been predicted. And the account of Antiochus III comes to an end in vs. 19 (reading text.) "Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom . . . (vs. 12). In other words the son of Antiochus, the Great, his son who succeeded him saw that on account of the interference of the ~~Romans~~ Romans all this great amount of money that

Antiochus III had gathered in order to build a tremendous empire had been lost. Many soldiers had been lost. The fiscal situation was very difficult. So his son who succeeded him at this point, took over and set himself to get these things stabilized. He raised taxes. That's the principal thing he did. - - was to get the economic situation stabilized and to get the treasury in good shape. After a few years he was killed not in battle -- he never ~~call~~ carried on any wars. He was not killed in anger -- not by somebody getting passionately aroused against him, but by a scheme of a general to usurp the power and to seize control. When Antiochus VIII had been defeated by the Romans, the ~~Romans~~ Romans did not take over his empire but they collected a big indemnity, and took away a lot of his territory and made him send his sons to Rome as hostages. So his sons, the one who succeeded him here, who was the raiser of taxes, and the younger brother Antiochus IV, they were in Rome for a number of years. Antiochus was raised in Rome and knew the Roman people well, and gained a lot of knowledge and training among the Romans. When Antiochus III died, his son -- his oldest son - - became king in his place, and the Romans were not interested in keeping as a hostage the brothers of the king. Most men are going to get not/terribly excited about what happens to their brothers. They took his sons to be their hostage, and they let the brother go, and that was Antiochus IV - later called Epiphanes. This Antiochus went then to Athens and got himself elected to a high position in Athens. He became an Athenian citizen, and seems to have been a man who was settling down to live in Athens. His brother was king in Syria and he does not go to Syria or anything. He stayed in Athens, and his brother's son was in Rome as a hostage now. Then when a conspiracy killed the brother and the general there tried to take control of the land, Antiochus in Athens got in ~~teaght~~ ^{tough} with one of the smaller kingdoms in A. Minor that had a good bit of money in it and they gave him money in support on sort of a gamble to see if he could get established in his brother's place as king. This is described in the next vs

11:20 he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle. v.21 And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom; but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom some by flatteries." He came in with this money that had been lent him. He came in there and said, Now the people would not accept this general who had killed the previous king, but he persuaded them^a them instead of getting the son who would be a legitimate heir from Rome (who was then a hostage in Rome) to let him ^{became} be king. So he came in and got the kingdom by flattery, got the control, and reigned for a number of years. It goes on and describes the things he would do and there ^{is} is considerable detail about him, very interestingly. But one of the most interesting things in it is (It describes his ^{conflict} conquest with Egypt) - and one of the most interesting things about it is after an expedition in Egypt which succeeded very well, then he made another expedition to Egypt. The first expedition had been had been to support one of the Ptolemies against the brother who were disagreeing as to who should reign in Egypt. He went down and helped the one, expecting this one to stand with him. Then his second expedition he went down in order to take over the control of Egypt. We read in vs. 29: "At the time appointed . . . (reading text of vs. 29,30). Now you read that in the time of Daniel and you would not know what^a what that thing means, what is going to happen. But you could see lots of things happening that you would know pointing to. What actually happened was that on this second expedition to Egypt, Antiochus was able to gain control of the N. part of Egypt. He had spent a lot of money doing it, and quite a number of soldiers. But he had gained control of that Northern part, and he had the power ~~wh~~ with which he could take over all of Egypt. Then he heard that a ship was coming from Rome. It says here "for the ships of Kittim shall come against him." He heard a ship was coming from Rome. So he knew what the Romans had done to his father, and he had lived in Rome

for years. So he went down to the shore to meet the men from Rome and see what they had to say. And it is a very dramatic story that the Romans love to tell about - how the Roman Senator landed there, and he was a man Antiochus had known as a young man. They had played together in Rome. They were good friends. (Forget his name this minute) But as he came Antiochus stepped up and said, L. Pompeyus ^{how are you?} My it is nice to see you, And the man put on a very stern face, and he said: I have a message for you from the Roman senate. O, Antiochus said, That's interesting, I'll be much interested to hear it, but first tell me how you are; how's the family let's have dinner together, and you can give me your message tomorrow. He said: I must deliver my message immediately. Antiochus said, If you must What is your message?" He said: The Roman Senate says, You must leave Egypt and go back to Syria and be content ^{with the area you have there} whether ^{and} have or not interfere with Egypt. Rome did not claim to control ~~et~~ either of these kings. But the Romans were interfering with them frequently at this time. Later they conquered both of them. But that's what they said to him. (Antiochus) said, Well that requires consideration. The man stepped forward with his walking stick and he drew a line in a circle in the sand around Antiochus. He ~~said~~ said, You may consider it just as long as you stay within that circle. Antiochus from that knew it was serious. He said, All right, I'll withdraw. Immediately the man's face changed and he smiled and he said, My it's nice to see you Antiochus, You remember those good old days when we were in school together. So they went and had dinner together and had a very jolly time together. Antiochus took all his forces and ^{from Egypt} withdrew and went back. But as the next vs. ~~said~~ says: "Therefore he shall be grieved and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant." In other words when he found out the Romans would not let him do anything more in Egypt, he went back and took out his anger on people who could not do anything against him. The news had spread in Israel, and people were rejoicing over what had been happening to Antiochus, and he

came back filled with indignation against them, and he had the power up there and he used it in a very ferocious way. He had already had been trying to introduced what he considered to be the blessings of Greek culture ^{to these} ~~into~~ the backward Israelites. To get them to stop worshipping their God, and to worship his great gods and to have his g Greek customs in those days and all that. Xhe leaders of the Israelites, many of them by this time, had begun to accept his ideas, and they were High Priests. Joshua the H. Priest changed his name to Jason, ^{to have} /a Greek name . And his successor changed his name to Menalaus, another Greek name. The leaders of the people were coming and turning over and they could have peacefully have done away with the Israelite religion except for a few old fanatics who would still hold to it. Except when as a result of his defeat here he began to strengthen his activities against them, and tried to force them and gave orders they must not worship their God, they ~~must~~ must ~~b~~ not observe the Sabbath day, they must ~~eat~~ swine's flesh and they must do all the things they considered abominations, ~~b~~ why then the Macaabeans began their revolt against ~~them~~ him. So the Lord used these things to prevent his efforts from succeeding, which was in a way succeeding by peace and flattery. But to prevent a thing from succeeding there was a terrible persec~~tion~~. As far as world history is concerned this was small potatoes. The rest of the world was not much interested in what was happening in the little land of Israel out there ruled by this petty figure Antiochus. But as far as the maintenance of the knowledge of God, the preservation of the preparati~~on~~ of Christ, it was tremendously important. So this description here goes into some detail in a general picture as through a glass darkly, and yet enough detail to make it absolutely clear it is a picture of Antiochus andhis relation with the Jews. And here is the description of this leading up to it. And there is no purpose to the description of those leading up to it and the long descriptionof his father, if it is not to lead up to this and show when this crisis will occur and

to show that God is going to deliver them ~~through~~ it and prepare them for it. So this is so important in ch. 11 that to say that ch. 8 well, it talks about Antiochus, but it is an adumbration of the Antichrist, it seems to me is just the wrong approach to ch. 8 altogether. We have A. Epiphanes as one of great ~~importance~~ in the book of Daniel. We have the fulfillment of all these historical events. Remarkable that anyone could have predicted these things so far ahead. In fact in ch. 11 Boufflower who is a very conservative interpreter, who defends the Scripture as a whole, says this is such a detailed account of history - it is 400 yrs after the time of Daniel - he says Scripture does not do that sort of thing so he says this ~~detailed~~ section must be a later interpolation. It is not ; it is not original. He is In general he is good, he is conservative in his view. But at this point he says, It just is contrary to the analogy of Scripture. Well, it is a wonderful thing ^{believe} We believe that Daniel is as a whole what God gave to Daniel. It's a wonder^{ful} thing He would give a picture in so much detail. These things leading up to A. Epiphanes. There have been one or two commentators who have taken it as all a picture of these different events there -- the K. of the North and the K. of the South, and all this, and all about Antiochus III and his son, the Great Raiser of Taxes, and then they say It is Antichrist! right after that. And it seems to me that is rather ridiculous. You don't find hardly anybody that ^{does} says that. Most will recognize that it is at least through vs. 35, it is A. Epiphanes that it is speaking of. And then a funny thing is that Young who is so much against the ideal of any intervals, of jumping forward or anything like that, after he discusses v. 35 and shows exactly how it describes Antiochus, Then he says, Vs. 36 on What is that talking about. There have been many ~~these~~ theories --- this this, this and this. What is the correct theory? The correct theory is that it is Antichrist. He does not say anything about the fact that he is making an interval of at least ~~25000~~ 2500 yrs. between two verses of which

there is no suggestion in the text of the fact ~~that~~. I think he's right. I think it's there. Jerome said it was there. I believe/ it is the only way you can fit it together because you have the resurrection afterwards. You have an interval somewhere. And if you can have it in these places, why can't you have it in ch. 2? Why can't you have it in ch. 7? So you see the evidence is clear in many places in Dan. that there is an interval in many places in the prophetic view. It is very clear in these places. And these writers who in some places wax indignant over the idea of an interval, tacitly admit^f in at least these two places I mentioned here.

Out time is up for today. You might look over ch. 11 and 12. You notice I skipped over ch. 9. Ch. 9 deals with a matter tht is a little outside the line we have been looking at. We have these four pictures which is a progressive revelation, and I feel that we can interpret 8 better in the light of ch. 11, and 11 in the light of 8. Ch. 9 is a little beside, so I'm leaving it until last.

(Student) Could the K. of the North be Rome?

No, the K. of the North is Antiochus' ancestors. (Student . . . ???)
Yes? (Student? How did Rome come to be called Kittim?

Kittim actually means Crete, but it is used in general for any western areas in the Scripture at times. Ships coming from the sea and from the western area often in the OT they speak particularly of their coming from Crete, but in general it is used as a figure of ships coming from a distance. That's a good question. I'm glad you asked it. We'll continue then next week.

On these papers mark in what's from ch. 8 and 11. I'll collect them next week.

Instead of moving straight forward as we have been doing, I'm going to go back a bit today, and I want to look at a few principles. First I want to note that our course is in the prophecies of Daniel, and we are using the word prophecies specifically in the sense of prediction in this course. All the predictions Daniel made were naturally future to him. I've heard people speak about whether something was historical or prophetic, by meaning whether it was before now or after now. Well, if it was after Daniel's time it was equally future, equally prophetic whether it occurred 100 years after his time or 3000 years after his time. I think that is important for us to have in mind. It is the predictions of Daniel we are interested in and in this course we are just as much interested in predictions that have been fulfilled before this time as we are in predictions that are yet to be fulfilled.

Now Daniel --- some people have the impression that Daniel sat there in Babylon, 600 yrs. before the time of Christ and looked forward to see the things that are going to happen in our day or afterward, and that was his primary purpose. Well that was very far from his primary purpose. 2500 yrs. have passed since his time. There have been tremendous things that have happened since that period, things of great interest and importance to the followers of the Lord, and Daniel was interested in these things. He was also interested in things after our time, but that's not his major interest. It certainly is not his primary interest, and I think we make a great mistake, if we go to Daniel simply with the idea that this is to tell us what is yet to occur. The main way we can tell what is yet to occur is to see what has not yet occurred. But what has occurred is of tremendous importance in showing us proper methods of interpreting what is yet to occur. What has already occurred is of even greater importance as evidence that the Bible is God's Word, that God truly spoke by Daniel, and that God truly predicted through Daniel things that are going to happen.

In our second meeting together we discussed these prophecies that were given in the chapters that we don't think of as the six primary prophetic chapters. We looked at those chapters to see what there were of predictions in them. A number of the things we looked at were/very definitely predictions. They were maybe guesses as to the future maybe by somebody else, or statements that for instance that three friends of Daniel said that God is able to deliver us, "God is able to deliver us, but if not we are still not worship your image. In other words, they were not predicting God would deliver them. So it's not really a prediction. There was one definite prediction that related to the very near future that was given. Does somebody recall? What prediction relating to the ~~ne~~ very near future was given by Daniel? Would somebody ~~suff~~ suggest one?

(Student) Did it not concern Nebuchadnezzar's insanity during his lifetime? Yes I would say that was the prediction, I should say the first one concerning the very near future that Daniel gave. That prophecy was the one given in Dan. 4. There we had Daniel saying that the dream Neb. had of the tree which was sawed down and just its roots left, and it was left till seven times would pass over it, that this was a dream that showed that Neb. himself was to loose his mind, loose his control, be driven out like the beasts of the field, and 4:25 says: They will wet thee with the dew of heaven, and eat grass like oxen until seven times shall pass over thee. Whereas they commanded to leave the tree roots, thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule." This was a definite ~~de~~ prediction made to happen sometime in the near= future, we don't know just how soon == well it does say in vs. 29 at the end of 12 months, Neb. walked in the palace of the king of ^{kingdom} Babylon, and the king spake and said ~~te~~ Is not this great Babylon that I have built? for the honor of the kingdom, by the might of my power, for the honor of my majesty?" And if you are

And if you are ever in Berlin, go into E. Berlin, go into that great museum and see that great Ishtar Gate that Neb. built. It is one of those great spectacular things in Babylon. He was a tremendous builder. There are over a million bricks that have his name stamped in them. A very great beautiful thing it is with about a fourth of these bricks from there with of the Ishtar gate and put them up there in the Museum. ^{They brought} ~~which~~ ^{This} was done before the last war. It is made so it looks so realistic. ~~Aw+y~~ As you walk down you can just about imagine you can hear Neb. saying, Is not this great Babylon which I have built? We read there at the end of 12 mo. as he made this statement and felt his greatness and success and everything then at that time, there fell a voice from heaven saying, O Neb. to thee it is spoken thy kingdom is departed from thee. They shall make thee eat grass as oxen and seven times shall pass over thee. We are told this was fulfilled. This is a very interesting story showing God's power as over against human pride. But it is of no value for proving the Bible is God's Word because we have no other evidence regarding it. We simply have the Biblical statement that this which he predicted was definitely, specifically fulfilled.

There is one evidence but unfortunately it is not a clear one. There has been discovered within the past 10 yrs. I believe a tablet which describes an attack of insanity coming on a man in which he was a condition like this, but it says it was Nabonidus, the fourth ruler after Neb. to whom it happened. So of course the critics say the incident really happened but that the writer of the book of Daniel got it all mixed up and said it was Nebuchadnezzar. So it is not a case where we have proof that the event did happen. It is just as likely that the writer of the tablet got it mixed up and attributed it to Nabonidus as that the writer of Daniel got it mixed up, but since you don't have proof one way or the other, all we can do is say, This is God's Word. Jesus Christ set the seal of His approval upon it as God's Word, as true, as free from error, so we believe it. So ~~z~~ here is a prediction of something in the near future which happened

according to the Bible, but we have no proof otherwise that it happened. But it happened literally; it happened as describee here. When it says, You will eat grass as oxen, it does not mean you will have to eat your words and give up your claims over some people you have conquered or something like that. It specifically, literally means what it says according to what it says was fulfilled. Now there is one term in it that is a bit peculiar. He is to be in this condition until 7 times pass over you. What is 7 times? That unfortunately is a vague term. A time can be any period of time. It is like day in the Genesis One account. There have been those who I have been falsely accused of denying that God made the world in 6 days of 24 hours. I have never said he did not make it in 6 days of 24 ~~hours~~. I don't know how long the days were. God could have made it in 6 days of 24 seconds. He could take a billion years for each of them if He choose. The Bible does not say how long they were. The word day used there means a period of activity. Just as we say, Back in Lincoln's day they did not drive authmobiles. Or as Jesus said, Abraham saw my day and was glad. It is a period of activity. But this word time is even more clear is not something we can be positive how long it is. Does this 7 times mean 7 days? Does it mean 7 weeks; 7 years? I think the most usual guess is that it is 7 years, but I don't know of any proof of the exact length it is. Probably it was either 7 months or 7 years. At least it was a considerable long period which could be spoken of as 7 times. That is the first time ^{Daniel} ~~Danie~~ gave a prediction that was specifically and literally fulfilled in his own day. In the very first chapter he said to the chief of the ^{eunuchs} ~~eunuchs~~, Give us pulse to eat and let us try it for a certain number of days and let us see if we are in worse condition than the others. Well, he did not predict they would be in better condition. He was going to be true to God whatever happened, and God did bless him and made him look better. But that was not a prediction, but this is a prediction.

Now what other prediction did he give that was fulfilled in his own day?

(Student)

Yes, in Daniel 5 there is a very specific prediction which in view of the critical interpretation which we oppose, I prefer to say the coming of the Medes and Persians, rather than just the Medes. But it is the prediction of the death of Belshazzar. It says, In that night was Belshazzar king of the Chaldeans slain. This is Dan. 5:30. In the previous verses it tells what Daniel had predicted. He said, It means God has numbered thy kingdom and has finished it. Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and the Persians. Now the critics say there was a kingdom of the Medes and then a kingdom of the Persians, which are the second and third of the four kingdoms predicted in Daniel. Now he does not say that. He says, Thy kingdom is given to the Medes and the Persians. They base that on v. 31 which says, Darius the Median took the kingdom. But this word "took" is literally received the kingdom, and if this is one of Cyrus' generals who became the governor of Babylon, that fits with the idea of that a Median was the ruler under Cyrus the Persian. Some ~~4+4~~ interpret Darius the Median as another name for Cyrus the Persian. I don't know how much proof they can advance for that. That doesn't sound so likely, but anyway here is a specific prediction of the downfall of the Babylonian empire and of the conquest by the Medes and Persians. That was fulfilled specifically and literally in Daniel's time. Of course anyone who heard what he had said would say, There is a proof that God spoke through Daniel. But that was not a remarkable proof, because at this time the Persians had already conquered great areas round about and they were threatening the kgdm. of Babylon, had been threatening it for some time. So it is in a way as though somebody a week before the end of the last war would say, the Americans are going to conquer the Germans. It could have come the other way even then. But at least -- or let's say it the other way. Suppose somebody in Berlin would have said, Hitler is still going to win out. Well, if he had won out, you would say, there are only two possibilities. So this

is a definite prediction, specifically and literally fulfilled, but not a remarkable thing because actually it was a very probable thing at the time.

Then we have the predictions in ch. 2. And in ch. 2 we have certainly some very remarkable predictions, because this is right in the ~~center~~ second year of Neb. In the second yr. of Neb. when he was continuing the Assyro-Babylonian empire which had existed off and on for nearly 1000 yrs, the first really great empire, the first empire that embraced within it a large number of people of different languages, different backgrounds, different ^{customs} ~~customs~~. There was an Egyptian empire but it was mostly Egypt itself with a few smaller areas near it. But this was the really great empire. At that time for him to explain to Neb. that Neb.'s dream of a great statue which was destroyed and the empire given to the saints, that this statue which was made of four metals represented four kingdoms which would ^{one} come/right after the other, that was a tremendous prediction. Of course that has been literally fulfilled. We have Neb's great kingdom described by the first - "after thee shall arise another kingdom" unfortunately translated "inferior to thee" (below thee, below him on the statue, a kingdom that comes next after you, really it was greater than Nebuchadnezzar of course). Then a third kingdom, represented by brass which shall rule over all the earth. It does not mean the whole globe of course. It does mean a very large area, a tremendously large area. Most of the area that was then known to civilized people, that is to people who wrote and travelled, most of the area that was known to ~~be~~ them was embraced in this third kingdom and then there would be a fourth kingdom which would be stronger than any of the other three and as iron breaks things it shall break in pieces. We have of course this historically fulfilled over a period of centuries. Neb's kingdom lasting 65 more years than the Persian kingdom two centuries. Then the Greek lasting, breaking into several parts, and these parts eventual

eventually being conquered by the Romans, one after 150 yrs, the last of them after nearly 300 yrs. But all of it eventually -- well, I should not say all of it, but most of it being taken in by the Romans, and the Romans of course adding a lot of other territory that was not in it. Then it says the toes of the feet were part of iron, part of clay; the kingdom will be partly strong and partly broken. It will be in that condition when God puts an end to these human kingdoms and establishes His kingdom. As we noticed this could very well describe the latter days of the Roman empire from the period say from 400 to 600 A.D. could be very well described by this, but God did not put an end to human govt. at that time, and has not yet. In fact the denial of God is perhaps more widespread today than ever in history. If you'll pick up almost any of the so-called Learners Books today, histories, or accounts of literary history, that sort of thing, the sneering words that at Christianity and the religion of 100 years ago all through them, just pervades it. It is hard to find anything that does not have some of that in it. Like I was reading a history of literature in New England last week, and he referred to how the great literary men of the last part of the last century of New England referred to the days from the Pilgrim fathers up to the Revolution as the 'ice age'; the ice age, the period of the old fashioned ideas that they had. They certainly don't have the reign of saints now. Daniel says it is coming. That is future prediction, but you notice it seems so closely tied to the condition at the end of the Roman empire that it just seems there must be an interval. And the place for it, it does not seem as if you could have the toes all described in a certain condition and then you have a big interval before the destruction with a whole lot of tremendous changes! It seems more reasonable to think that the change comes just above the feet, and there is an interval anywhere from 1500 to 5000 yrs. say between there. That seems more reasonable. But now we are looking at fulfilled prophecy, and these four kingdoms in their

strength and power are literally fulfilled in a remarkable way.

Then we look over to ch. 7, and in ch. 7 we find that again he has a vision describing much the same thing that as ch. 2, but under an entirely different figure. The four beasts came up from the sea diverse the one from the other, and the first one we would certainly be justified in thinking represented the same first one as before, because this comes in the reign of Belshazzar, king of Babylon. It is still in the time of the Bab. empire. It does not sound as if ~~he~~ he is describing the one that comes up and destroys it; it seems reasonable to think that it is there pictured. More particularly the fourth of these is described in terminology very similar to the fourth in the early picture. So that I think that that suggests that the two are parallel. Here again it fits with history that occurred after Daniel's time. The first one, like a lion with eagles wings, I beheld till the wings were plucked and it was lifted up from the earth. We have the Bab. empire destroyed.

Then the second like a bear raising itself on one side -- certainly people must have said, Doesn't that fit the Medo-Persian, raising up on one side with the two great forces in it but the Persian a little higher than the other. They said, Afise devour much flesh, and the area the Persian empire took in was about 4 times as big as the area of the ^{Babylonians} Babylonians.

Then the third beast, we have four wings and four heads and dominion given to it. We are not told much about it here but the number four is mentioned later in connection with the third one. It seems to fit together.

Then the fourth one is described and the parallel to the third (??) Great iron teeth. This is the first specific similarity of substance to the other. The iron is mentioned in connection with this as with the fourth kingdom in the other. The other metals are not mentioned again. And it devours and stamps and is diverse from all the beasts that were before it. The the new feature that it had ten horns -/ there comes up a little horn
and among these 10 horns

before whom three of the others were plucked up by the roots, and in this horn were 7 eyes like the 4 eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things. If you take the whole history of the period between 400 and 600 when there were all sorts of petty rulers in Europe fighting ^{against} between each other why you perhaps could find something to fit this in some way if you looked hard, but not strikingly fitted as far as I know. It seems more likely ^{parallels} that it ~~parallels~~ with the first one that there are == is an interval between this beast and the situation represented by its ten horns. So we have fulfilled prophecy up to there very strikingly fulfilled in ch. 2 and in ch. 7.

Then we look at ch. 8, in the third yr. of Belshazzar just two yrs. after this. Now I warned you against interpreting ch. 2 too much in the light of ch. 7 because there is 45 yrs. between them, but here we have two yrs. between them, certainly this would ~~be~~ be visibly in his mind. Here we have a vision appears to Daniel and he sees a ram with two horns and one higher than the other, and that ^{seems to} suggests that it is similar to the second beast in ch. 7, but when you look further down he has an interpretation which says, vs. 20 "The ram which thou sawest having two horns ~~and~~ ^{it} are the kings of Media and Persia" So that would seem to tie ~~as~~ very closely to the second kingdom. So he sees a vision of the second kingdom coming and conquering westward, northward and southward == the three directions that Cyrus went in the early part of his reign, in the order in which he went ~~to~~ them in the early part of his reign. An interesting little touch that was ~~see~~ exactly fulfilled in history. The order in which he went in the early part of his reign and the great conquests in these direction in the early part of his reign. It does not deny that in the later part of his reign he went eastward and made ~~even~~ wider conquests there even than those in the west. But these were the first ones and these are the ones of immediate interest to the reader of Daniel. Then he says, While I was considering a he-goat came from the West. Between vs. 4 and 5 he saw this. And While he was

considering a he-goat came from the west. There is an interval of 200 yrs. there. That certainly is a big jump right there. And we have noticed the picture of looking at the mountain ranges the one right behind the other. And here there is certainly a big flat interval between -- two hundred years! It == You would almost think as you read this that it is like Hitler who made his tremendous drive and conquered France, Belgium, and Holland, and all this great area and then eastward took in all the territory to the east and went right to the gates of Leningrad and tremendous conquests like the first of these, and then within the next 3 or 4 yrs. you find the other forces completely annihilating him. That's the impression you get immediately reading it. ~~It is very evident~~ There is very evidently - - - "while I was considering " is an interval of 200 yrs., 200 yrs. of great success and effectiveness for this Persian empire, which he passes over, an interval in the history. But he specifically and very remarkably describes what happens under a symbol. The he-goat came ~~from~~ from the west and touched not the ground. When you think of Cyrus' great rapid successes in 30 yrs., well here is 12 yrs. in which all this happened. Much faster! He touched not the ground. He had a notable horn between his eyes, and he stamped upon the ~~gr~~ ram and smote it and broke its two horns so there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him to the ground and stamped on him, and there was none to deliver ~~him~~ the ram out of his hand. Well, that's exactly how it must have looked to Darius III the last king of Persia when Alexander came and this little area back there in Macedonia way in the west that he had held for a little time. It had been part of the Persian empire for a brief period, that from this little area an upstart king begins to attack him and comes with an army and goes into Asia Minor and then defeats him in a tremendous battle. And Darius says, Well, what tremendous power that man has' i'll give him half the empire, and he's have the next 500+ 50 yrs. trying to ~~manage~~ organize and manage this half the empire, and probably he'll make ~~such~~ such a poor job of it ~~5/5~~ 3/4 of them will

of their own will want to come back to me long before that time! He offers to make a division and give Alexander half of his empire and Alexander says, No, I've got to have it all. Alexander goes down the Syrian coast and conquers Tyre and then goes in and takes all of Egypt, and then marches East and then in a great battle subdues the Persian empire, and then goes clear to the end to the end of it clear to India. In 12 years it certainly is very specific, exact fulfillment of the picture here, of the he-goat that touched not the ground and came and smote it and knocked it to the ground, smote it stamped on it and none could deliver the ram out of his hand. The Tyrians tried to with their great fleet and the people of Tyre that controlled the Mediterranean and there was no way Alexander could get at them and they were half a mile out in the Medeteranean Sea and Alexander's great troops could not get at them so he simply set his troops busy taking land and dumping it into the Mediterranean Sea and built a causway out three quarters of a mile out to the island of Tyre and then his soldiers marched out and took the city and put an end to it. No one could stand against ~~it~~ him. Of course he took nine months I guess doing this but he did not march into Persia and leave the rear where he could be attacked, he did away with those who could have been an enemy to him there. So there was none could deliver out of his hand. Very figurative, symbolic language but it's not in exact language. It's very specific and exact how these predictions were fulfilled. Then the he goat waxed very great and when he was strong the great horn was broken. For it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. Here is a summary of events that took 40 yrs. when the successors of Alexander fought over who would control his empire and eventually three of them controlled 9/10 of it, and then there were about six small areas that had their independence, and so the figure four is a good approximation of the situation that developed. The four notable ones that came up, three real strong kingdoms and a number of

small ones which you can summarize together making it four. Then between vs. 8 and 9 we have another interval. Out of one of them came forth a little ~~one~~ horn. Out of one of them nearly, well more than 150 years, just about 150 yrs. after Alexander there comes a little horns out of one of these four. So you have again quite an interval between vs. 8 and 9. "And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south" and here we have Antiochus who made great attacks on Egypt and practically got Egypt into his hands. And also made attacks toward the east and toward the pleasant land, which to the Jew would certainly suggest Israel. He tried to make Israel completely a part of his culture with them adopting Greek customs, Greek religion, and so forth. Yes, he magnified himself even to the Prince of the Host. He made them declare that they must not worship God any more. And by him the daily sacrifice (understood) was taken away. And the place of his sanctuary was cast, and the host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression. The Jews while they had maintained the sacrifices since the time of Ezra had become pretty lax in their general life, and while there were many many pious, godly people among them there were a great many to whom their religion was just a form and by reason of their transgression, God permits Antiochus to cast down the truth to the ground, to destroy the sanctuary, to put up an altar to Jupiter/there ^{in its place} and offer swine's flesh on its altar, and then I heard one speaking to another How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? He said unto 2,300 evening-mornings: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." If you say 2,300 evening-mornings, do you mean the evening sacrifice and the morning sacrifice 2300 altogether, or 1150 days? or do you mean 2300 of each? Nobody knows. Here is something that my guess is that if you lived in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, you'd say, Look how exactly this has been fulfilled. Isn't that marvellous! But we don't know today. We just know what it meant. People try to take it as 2300 days, and

they get about 7 yrs. and they find a period when A.E. was very bitter against the Jews, and then a period when he was busy with Egypt and did not pay much attention to them, and then when he actually made this tremendous attack and 7 yrs. would come right in the middle of that. So it just doesn't fit. And so some say, Well it is 3 and 1/2 yrs., and it 3 and 1/2 yrs. from when he ~~sepped~~ stopped the sacrifice until ^{when they were} he was able to reinstitute it but we don't have evidence that it was. That's a guess that is possible. So here's a case where it would seem to be likely that there was a specific wonderful proof of the truth in those days, but you can't prove it now. You just don't know exactly what this 2300 means. But when we get to this point now we say, Daniel has not been simply intending to satisfy people's curiosity toward the future, that has not been the purpose -- it has never been the purpose in God's giving His predictions - simply to satisfy ~~h~~ our curiosity about the future. His purpose is to encourage His people to believe His ~~wredt~~ word, to be true to Him, to follow Him and to know that everything will come in accordance with His will eventually.

So here we now have a little horn predicted and told exactly when it is going to be. We find that the time it is going to be is during the latter part of this third kingdom. But we don't know when in the kingdom, there is a big interval between the beginning of it and this. But during this third kingdom there is going to come this time when == which was perhaps one of the three or four greatest ^{crises} in the history of the religion of Israel because it was the time when Antiochus by cleverly promoting and helping and advancing those who would do what he wanted, and ridiculing and pushing aside those who did not, he won many of the leaders of the Jews to the Greek religion, and then he began to persecute and it looked as if he would dispose of the rest of them and that was the end of it. But the rest of them stood up and fought and they succeeded in maintaining themselves and actually getting their independence. So that within 15 or 20 yrs. ^{after} Antiochus

after Antiochus began this the Jews were completely independent of the third kingdom and did not come under the power of the fourth kingdom for at least 50 yrs., so they had a 4 period of complete independence. They had been conquered by the Babylonians, they were held in subjection from 586 up to the time when the Bab. empire was taken over by the Persians in 539, held by them, it was taken over by the Greek in about 330 and continued to be held under the Egyptians until c. 310. Then under the Syrians until c. 180. Then they were independent again. So this is the period when they were under foreign control. They became again under the Romans but there is an interval in between.

So that now we have revealed a purpose in the book which fits with before all this stress on being true to God, and how God can protect, how he has blessed these who have stood true in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. Here we have a tremendous crisis ahead.

Now here we have this little horn here, and we have the little horn in ch. 7. We have two little horns, and they must be the same, mustn't they? If you have two different automobiles and they both have a horn they must be the same, same horn, mustn't they even if they are two different cars? Well, it is perfectly obvious here that this one comes out of the third kingdom and the one there comes out of the fourth kingdom. That's perfectly obvious, and it seems to me that the sensible ^{it is} to say, There is a prediction in ch. 7 of something that is yet future. Here is a prediction of something that was way in the future at the time of Daniel, but is way back to us today. So there are two entirely different things. Well, they are both represented as horns, yes. But he uses horns to represent many things. Both of them are little horns, but certainly out of the thousands of horns there can be many that are little. They both are enemies of God. Well, there have been millions of enemies of God and hundreds of great men who have spoken greatly against God. Voltaire, 200 yrs. ago, he declared that the fact that a great mind like Sir Isaac Newton would think that the

Book of Daniel was dependable shows how a great mind can be led into foolishness, and he said that the Bible was a lot of Nonsense (so Voltaire said.) And after Voltaire's death, I understand that the house he had lived in was made into a depot ~~wa~~ for the British and Foreign Bible Society and thousands of Bibles in various European languages were distributed from that building. Voltaire ~~sa~~ said, Sir Isaac Newton said that where it says knowledge shall be increased and many shall run to and fro, Newton said, Why this may mean that people are going to travel so fast the day may come when they will even travel 60 mph. Voltaire said that shows how a great mind when it gets to studying the Bible can get into utter foolishness to think that people ^{could} ~~coult~~ travel 60 mph. Why they would not even ~~t~~ be able to draw their breat if they travelled that fast? They'd died of course, Voltaire said. Of course to us today, 60 mph is nothing, as we think of what's happened today. Now I think ^{Newton} ~~Newtowa~~ misunderstood the Scripture when he made that particular prediction, but Voltaire's ridicule of it shows how these who speak with great swelling words against God's Word, they may speak truth, they may speak falsehood, but there is no foundation to it. ~~F~~ It's only God's Word that gives us a solid foundation, because God can change things if He chooses, and what He does not change, what He keeps the same, we have not understood. We're still even today, like Newton said -- Newton was perhaps the ^{greatest} great scientist up till this century -- one of the greatest minds in all history, and Newton said at the end of his life ~~a~~ that he felt like a boy who walked along the shore of the great ocean picking up a pretty pebble here ~~w~~ and there, with all the great ocean and all the great thousands of pebbles he did not see. I think we are still in that position as far as really understanding the universe God has made is concerned. But these particular elements God has given us showing that His Word is true. We can trust it. Things come out the way He said they would. And preparing the Jews for the coming of this one who is described in ch. 8 and preparing

in ch. 8 and preparing His people in some way for the coming of that other one described in ch. 7. Well now should we say the one in ch. 8 is a type of the one in ch. 7? What does that add to our understanding, to say he is a type? Was Napoleon a type of Hitler? Was Julius Caesar a type of Napoleon? Was the inventor of the telegraph a type of the inventor of the telephone? It seems to me that is just using words without any meaning. Say there is a similarity between them, but when you get a certain similarity it does not say it is going to be similarity in all regards. You have thousands of similarities among things.

Now this matter of type is one I want to discuss. It is a very important thing, but perhaps not right at this point. Perhaps at this point it is better to continue along the idea we have been speaking of -- the thing that had been fulfilled in such a way we can point to it and say, Isn't this wonderful how Daniel was able to predict these things that were so remarkably fulfilled. In this ch. he does not tell us what is going to happen, greatly about this. Except that in the description of it toward the end of the chapter at the interpretation says, The ram is Media-Persia; the rough goat is kingdom of Grecia, and the great horn being broken and four stand up for it he says in vs. 22: Four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power." That's an interesting statement, because no one of these rulers that succeeded Alexander was worth mentioning as a comparison to Alexander. They would have been nothing if it was not for the great conquest Alexander had made first. In the case of the most successful one of them I think you could say, he'd have been nothing if it was not for the conquest Alexander made first, and also that the Persians made before. Because Egypt had been proud of its independence, and Egypt was never to be subject to any foreign domination. But Cambyses conquered Egypt at c. 500 B.C. and for 100 yrs, Persia held Egypt in subjection and got Egypt accustomed to being in subjection to the Persians, got them *then*

and deliver them from the Persians.

accustomed to it, organized it, directed it, had their armies there, their representatives and so on. Then after 100 yrs. of Persian control the Egyptians revolted and gained their independence, and for c. 90 yrs., they were independent, and then the Persians again conquered them. The Persians had held them for just 10 yrs. ^{when} before Alexander came, so Alexander was able to represent himself as a deliverer of the Egyptians from the Persians. He was welcomed as a deliverer, and he took the names of the Egyptian gods and said he was their representative and went out to the Egyptian shrines and worshipped and all that sort of thing. He was a deliverer from the Persians ^{if} whereas the Persians hadn't conquered them first he'd have had twice the job to conquer them. Then when Alexander died and ~~his~~ several of his generals began to think, How am I going to get control of this empire, how am I going to rule this empire. There was one ~~Philip~~ of them who had more sense than any of the others, and that was a man named Ptolemy. Ptolemy Lagos as they called him, one of the generals, when they divided the empire into 20 sections (over 20 sections) and made a satrap over each, Ptolemy said, Let's make ~~the~~ me satrap of Egypt. And they said, All right, nobody was particularly keen which of these satraps they had. But he figured that Egypt had the Mediterranean sea on the north, had the desert on the east, had the jungles on the south, ~~h~~ on the west they had desert. It was the easiest section to defend, and he went to Egypt and he ^{paying} paid little ~~to+the~~ attention to the others but trying to interfere when any one of them would seem to be able to get control of the empire. He sent an army to those who were opposing him. Ptolemy managed to hold Egypt and to establish a control in Egypt that lasted longer than any other section of Alexander's empire. Many many years longer than any other section, of Alexander's empire. So Ptolemy was powerful there largely because of Alexander's conquest, and the previous Persian conquest, and the natural borders around Egypt that protected it. It was very shrewd on his part.

It was very shrewd on his part, but it was nothing like Alexander's power. "Four kingdoms shall stand up, but not in his power. And in the later time of their kingdom when transgressors are come to the full a king of fierce countenance -- this was Antiochus of course. He says "their kingdom"; he does not say which of these four. The later part of their kingdom, this man is going to come up. It tells a little about it. It fits Antiochus very well, but the end of vs. 25 says: He shall be broken without hand, Antiochus, while he was trying to raise some more money in the east in order to carry on his efforts to control the great area he ruled over, he was taken with a nervous disease and died. He did not die in battle. He was broken without hand. So here we have very specific predictions.

Vs.26. The vision of the evening and the morning is true. Therefore shut up the vision; for it shall be for many days. It's true, but exactly what it means probably the people in the time of Antiochus could see, but we can't see today very well.

Now ch. 9 is a very difficult ch. which I am going to look at by itself. It really does not fit into the progress of these others. It's a separate, and I want to spend one or two hours on it. But we jump forward to ch. 11 which is again a parallel to the ch. we have been looking at. There we see in vs. 2, But now will I show thee the truth, Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings, in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all. . ." Now there certainly were ~~more than~~ three more kings in Persia; actually there were seven or ~~eight~~, ~~although~~ so it is not untrue there were three. Some have tried to make out that this ~~means~~ "there were three and the fourth shall be far richer" means those are the only ones named in Scripture, and therefore the writer did not know about any others which I think is rather absurd. It seems to be clear language that you are going to have three kings and then a fourth we are going to talk about; not that this fourth is the last. This fourth, through his riches shall stir up all against the realm of Greece.

They say it took I think a couple of weeks for the great army that Xerxes gathered to march across the bridge of boats that he made across the Hellespont from Asia to Europe. Tremendous army made up of people from maybe 50 different languages, and it was hard to communicate and to direct them but he was able to gather these together from the great empire in order to put an end to this Persian menace that was interfering ~~to~~ with his holdings in Asia Minor and causing people to revolt against him. He gathered this tremendous force against the realm of Greece and it does not tell us here how he was defeated, and how he was defeated in the battles of Marathon and Platea and the battle of Salamis, and how he failed in this effort of gathering this tremendous force in order to conquer a power that was much further away from him in terms of transportation in those days than Vietnam is from us in terms of transportation today. But it is exactly true as far as it goes. He will by his strength stir up all against the realm of Greece, and that's as far as he goes with the Persian empire. There is another interval.

12:3 And a mighty king shall stand up, that ~~sh~~ shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will. If you just had this vs. alone you would never think of Alexander the Great. It doesn't say anything about his conquests at all! It does speak of his great power. That's all. But in the light of what we learn in ch. 11 you ~~could~~ ^{could} make a good guess that what he means here is that Xerxes gathered all his force against Greece. In Greece there's going to be a great king rise up and rule with great dominion and do according to his will. Of course the word "Greece" is used in a rather rough way, not in a precise way, because this king did not come from Greece. He came from Macedonia. While he wanted to be considered a Greek, the Greeks did not want to consider him, so. At least they did not want to consider his father so, and were perhaps a little more ready to (consider) him because Aristotle had been his ~~that~~ tutor for all ~~this~~ the the years of his adolescence. But he is certainly is no doubt it is

Alexander he is describing, as the reaction against the Persian attack, and it's truly said to be a reaction against the Persian attack because during the period of 150 yrs. in between that was the thing the Greeks were celebrating was their tremendous victory over this great Persian force that tried to attack them. The Persian king was constantly interfering in Greek policies during those years. He would take the side of one party or another in each Greek city, wherever he thought would be most helpful for Persia and the other side in a campaign would naturally talk about the Persian influence and so on and how they had beaten the Persians before. So it was - though it was 150 yrs. later - it was really a reaction, and the two verses here, while it is not stated, ^{it is} implied here. And the ^{implication} ~~inference~~ ~~was~~ ~~borne~~ ~~out~~ in the history 200 yrs. after the time when Daniel wrote.

Then we have "when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken." That's a vivid way of showing how soon it happened! Alexander for 12 yrs. went on conquering and overcoming and subduing, and it went to his head to where he began to make his old comrades that he used to be on equal terms with and he would rush into the battle to save their lives and risk his own time after time, now he began to make them want bow before him and treat him as if he were a god, or an oriental potentate at least and all that. He was standing up there having conquered all this, his kingdom shall be broken, and suddenly he is taken with a fever in Babylon and after 2 wks. of lying ill he died. His kingdom is divided toward the four winds of heaven -- of course no one ever dreamed of that when he died. They certainly were going to carry on the whole kingdom, but they could not find any one man who could do it and they did not even have a man to be a claimant for the throne, because all his family consisted of ^{one} was his idiot half brother and a illegitimate child, and one child who was not born until a few months after his death. These eventually in the next 10 yrs. were all killed, but in the mean time each of them a general would take and claim this was the ~~region~~ real ruler and he was his

representative, but it says "his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven, and not to his posterity" -- his two children whom people claim would be his successors. They were babies actually. Both of them were killed. There is no posterity. "Nor according to his dominion which he ruled" -- it was broken up into these smaller sections. Seleucus had the biggest section which was 3/4 of his empire, but still was very small compared to what he had, and the wealthiest parts of his empire were held by Ptolemy in Egypt and the most powerful by the Macedonians. It says, "Not according to his dominion which he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those." Very specific prediction of things that happened 250 yrs. after described it. Then between vs. 4 and vs. 5 we have another interval, not a big interval -- ~~not~~; no, I mean between vs. 5 and 6. Vs. 5 is immediately what happened during these years. "The king of the south shall be strong." Now of these generals who were trying to get control, we noticed that there was one of them who immediately seized a large area and felt satisfied with that because it could be so much more easily defended. That was Ptolemy. That area is far further south than any other part of Alexander's empire. So the king of the south is a very proper designation for Ptolemy. Ptolemy seized Egypt right at the time of the death of Alexander in 323. He never called himself king until 305, eighteen years later. He took the title king. When he did he persuaded four other contenders to also take the title king. But it is proper to call him the king of the south. He was strong. His kingdom endured longer than any of the other parts of Alexander's empire and his kingdom was a vital force for the next 200 yrs. He will be strong, and one of his princes, and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; he dominion shall be a great dominion (v.5). Now who would ever know in Daniel's time what that would mean? It's a rather cryptic statement, but when you look at the history you find that Seleucus, one of the minor generals under Alexander, was made the satrap of Bwbylon, and he ruled in

Babylon over that small area around Babylon for a few years. But these generals were fighting among themselves back and forth and it is a very interesting evidence of the stability of the regime. ~~The~~ the Persians established that the people of the empire as a whole just carried on their lives and paid no attention to it. There were no ~~upset~~ uprisings among them; ~~not~~ no attempt to gain their freedom or anything. The fighting was all among the Greek conquerors and their armies. Though this fighting went on for 40 yrs. Seleucus ruled the little area around Babylon then when Antigonus, one of the strongest of these generals, overcame that region, ^{Seleucus} ~~Seleucus~~ fled to Egypt and become one of Ptolemy's generals. So we read that the king of the south and one of his princes; one of the leaders under Ptolemy was Seleucus who had been expelled from Babylon. But we read that he shall be strong above him and have dominion. In 312 after Ptolemy had had a great victory over Antigonus, Seleucus was able to take a small force and to rush over to Babylon and establish his power in it and declared himself ruler over that whole great section of the Persian empire, and he was able, and his successors, to maintain his power there for the next 150 yrs. So he had an area far greater than that of Ptolemy. So he was one of Ptolemy's princes but he came to have a far wider dominion than Ptolemy had. Interestingly that 312 when he went back, he immediately counted his reign from 312 and that yr. became so established that it is the first date in history that has been taken ~~for~~ as a date for starting to count years 1,2,3,4, and on into the hundreds. And even into the Middle Ages copies of the OT are dated by the number of years after 312 when ~~Seleucus~~ Seleucus established his power in Babylon. It became the first system of dating over a long period in all history. So this vs., we see how remarkably it was fulfilled.

Now I was hoping to get to this (matter of) types today, but we did not get to it. We have a little more to do along this line, but I think the most of this is things we've mentioned already, I think pulling them together this way is necessary. We'll continue there then next week.

Would you please give me the sheets that I gave out some time ago for you to write on the parts of each chapter. I'd like to have them turned in now. Give out one of these in exchange for the other. I have not given many assignments in this course. I've expected you to keep up with your reading of Daniel and with the class, and I want now to give a fairly long assignment which i'd like to have in next Monday. Spend as much time of= on this assignment as you can, but whatever you put on it I want between now and next Monday, because I want to discuss it then. This assignment has three parts to it, but it is an assignment I can't predict how much you will be able to do. On the first part, I want you to answer certain questions in view of your own investigation of the Bible. These are about the so-called 70 wks. of Daneil. I would like you not to use any helps other than a concordance or general Bible dictionary. Don't look up any discussion of the 70 wks. of Daniel, or any commentary on Daniel in connection with this first part. Simply look at these verses in the Bible and other passages in the Bible that you may think are relevant, or that you may find in the concordance in connection with these questions that are indented in the 3rd par. down. It may be that after reading these questions and looking at the passage in the Scriptures, you will say I cannot figure anything in the Bible about it myself. I hope you won't be that helpless, but if you should be it is perfectly all right. Just say, No. 1 nothing. Then go on to No. 2. On the other hand you may find that all the time you can possibly put in between now and next Mon. will go on No. 1. In that case it is perfectly all right. You don't do 2 and 3. I am giving you three divisions of the assignment, but whether you put all your time on one or whether you skip one ~~is~~ is entirely up to you. I prefer you put quite a bit of time on No.1. But if you should want to skip No. 1 I have no objection, go on to 2. I hope some of you will do a good bit of work on 2. But if some of you spend all your time on No. 1 it will be perfectly

satisfactory. It may be there is somebody here who has already done a good bit of work in this particular area, and therefore can answer No. 1 rapidly and No. 2 rapidly. In that case I gave No. 3 which you could put some time on. So as you see there is no requirement to ans. all three of these, but the requirement is to turn the paper in next week at beginning of ~~each~~ class because I want to discuss it next week.

(Typographical error at the end. The 17th is Friday a week. It would be the 14th. No the 13th. Change to May 13. At the bottom make it May 13. I'd rather have just a little bit you have done by that time than a tremendous amount handed in at any later time.)

We were looking at Dan. 2 and 7 and 8 and 11. We have skipped 9, because 9 is a distinct subject. Ch. 2,7,8, and 11 ~~p~~ form a progressive revelation. You have the thing in brief in ch. 2/ You have certain aspects of it repeated, certain aspects enlarged, certain additions in ch. 7. You have a certain section of it in more detail in ch. 8. Then you have a certain section of it in very great detail in ch. 11. Consequently I have been looking at those and have skipped ch. 9, because ch. ~~8~~ 9 ~~is~~ does not dovetail tightly into these four. These four make a definite succession. Next week we will look at ch. 9 which is why I gave you this assignment for ch. 9 now so you can be ready for it next week. Three vs. in ch. 9 are very dogmatically described in many books and I'd like you to decide whether that much dogmatism is justified or not just by your own investigation. But it is a bit aside from these others we have been dealing with.

Now in these we noticed that ch. 2 ~~sia~~ simply said there are going to be four great kingdoms. These four, the end of them and the Lord's kingdom established in their place.. We noticed that in ch. 7 it gave more detail about these kingdoms, and when it spoke in vs. 8 about the fourth of them, ~~t~~ it said, I considered the horns and behold there came up among them another little horn before whom there were three of the first horns plucked

5/4/74
2/5/74

up by the roots, and behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things." Then in ch. 8:9 --Out of one of them waxed forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great to the south, toward the east and toward the pleasant land, etc." Are these two the same? How many think they are not the same? Why would you? Mr. Goodman, are they the same or different? (Not ready) Mr. Baker? (They are different) Why? (Because they are in different kingdoms?) Ch. 2 tells of four kingdoms. Ch. 7 says, Out of the fourth kingdom there were 10 horns, and then the little horn came up. Ch. 8 says, Out of the third kingdom, the great horn was broken into four, and then a little horn came up out of one of them. The description is quite different. That does not prove they are different because you can look at a thing from different angles, and describe it different ways. But the fact they come from different kingdoms would seem to put them in entirely different categories. It would seem to make it positive that they are different. Yes?

(Student: Is there any possibly way that those who say they are the same could base it on different kingdoms?)

There are two groups of people who say they are the same. There is the group that consists of those who say that everything here relates to A. Epiphanes. That includes the greater number of commentators. It includes all the liberal commentators, and some who are rather conservative. They take the position that these 4 kingdoms described in Dan. 2 represent the k. of the Babylonians, the k. of the Medes, the k. of the Persians, and the Greek kingdom. Consequently according to that where ch. 8 says this is the Greek, this would be the fourth kingdom. The two would be the same. Their view is that the Bk. of Dan. is written in the time of A. Epiphanes and it is all written for the purpose of encouraging people at that time to know that God will deliver, and it was not written in the time of Dan. and it does not refer to anything, with any positiveness, with any truth

after the time of A.E. That is the view that all the liberal commentaries take. Now there are many arguments they give for that view, and they have been pretty well answered. All of them except the one point that they deny the possibility of predictive prophecy. They deny that Daniel could predict this 400 yrs. in advance. From our viewpoint we don't need to discuss that in this class. We believe in the possibility of predictive prophecy, and we believe that our Lord said that this was His Word, and that it is true and that it predicted Him as the One who was going to come on the clouds of heaven. Therefore we believe Dan. did predict it.

The other point is they say, there was a Babylonian kingdom, a Median k, and a Persian k. Bht then they will admit that the writer of Daniel in the time of A.E. was all mixed up in his history, because actually there had not been a Median kingdom at all. But the fact that Dan. twice refers to someone whom he calls Darius the Mede is their basis for saying there isa Median kingdom. But ~~if~~ in Dan. 5 he says, Your kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians and represents it as one kingdom, the k. of the Medes and Persians. That's historically what it was. So unless the writer of Daniel was a man 400 yrs. after Daniel and was very mixed in his history, we have to say that the Greek was the third kingdom, not the fourth and that these are two different horns. To my mind it is very important that we recognize that one of them talks about something connected with the third kingdom, one of them talks about something connected with the fourth kingdom. The modernists are sure everything must deal with A.E. We should not go to the opposite extreme and say, Everything has got to deal with the antichrist! But the majority of conservative interpreters will say that ch. 8 while it is talking about A.E. is also talking about the antichrist. Now I would admit the possibility that there might be inserted certain vs. dealing with the antichrist, I admit the possibility, but I do not think you can find any evidence of any such thing in this ch. But ~~today-it-is-~~ say it is talking about both of them, to me that intorduces

utter confusion into Scripture. When it says that the Lord went down to the sea of Galilee = = ~~that is~~ you can't take that as being fulfilled in = = John the Baptist went to the Sea of Galilee, once and the Lord went another time. It means one or the other. Unless it says they went, and then it covers both. I would say that when the prophecy speaks about an event it is talking about one or the other. Now it may talk about one thing, and then turn its attention to another. But in that case one sentence refers to one and one to the other. It is not that one sentence refers to both unless he uses a plural.

That problem comes into focus again when we come to Daniel 11, because there we have a most remarkable prophecy of events year after year, and as we noticed last time we have certain very definite gaps, certain definite intervals, but we have events going year after year in the history of the Seleucid kingdom which was one of the kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided. We have events one after the other of the relation between the Seleucid kingdom and the Ptolemaic kingdom, until you get up to vs. 21. These events go step after step until you get to vs. 19 which describes the end of Antiochus III who was called Antiochus the Great. Then you have in vs. 20 Antiochus' son who succeeded him after Antiochus had spent all his money in great wars hoping to greatly increase his territory and would have succeeded if it were not for the Roman interference. Since the Romans interfered and put an end to his efforts he was left with his treasury empty and his economic situation bad, so we have in vs. 20 we have what we have abundant historical evidence for that his son, Seleucus IV, was a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom. That is, instead of going out and making great wars and great conquests he devoted himself to trying to reestablish the economic situation of the country. But it ends with "in few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." We know that one of his leading men killed him. He was not killed in battle. He was not killed in anger. It was not a murderous passion, a murder of passion, not an

excitement when somebody lost his head; it was a plot. This man killed Seleucus IV and pretended that Seleucus' baby child was to be the successor tho Seleucus already had a son who was in Rome as a hostage. But he pretended that this was his successor and he tried to ~~raise him in~~ ^{reign in} his place so he was destroyed neither in anger nor in battle. Then vs. 21 "And in his estate shall stand up a vile person/^{to}whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom, but they shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries." We know that is exactly what Antiochus IV(so called A.E.) did. The description then goes on with this king whom everyone thinks represents the little horn of ch. 8. The description goes on about this king which continues on tho the chapter. We find at vs. 45, He shall plant the tabernacle of his palance between the sea in the glorious holy mt. yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." And of course Antiochus IV did kind of peter out in the end. He came to his end and not one helped him.

is this

But if it is Antiochus IV he is talking about at the end? Now there have been --- The modernist view let's speak of first. This is(and some conservative writers have adopted it) a view presented by an antiChristian writer Prophry in the 3rd cent. A.D. which was answered by St. Jerame in the 4th. Their view is that here after telling about Seleucus IV in vs. 20 you tell about his brother, Antiochus E. He is a vile person who came in peaceably and obtained the k. by flattery. Then it keeps telling about him right straight through to encourage the Jews who were fighting against him. They admit that some of the statements ~~to~~ toward the end do not fit him at all well. It says things about him that we have no historical evidence of whatever. So they say, What happened was that the writer of this book wrote during the reign of A.E., and he historically describes events leading up to A.E. but represents them as if they are prophecies given 400 yrs. before! Then he describes what A.E. did during the first two yrs. of his reign, correctly. Describes it as a prophecy, but really it's things that have already happened. He claims Daniel did it. Then he goes on & in his prophecy

in order to encourage people and describes Antiochus what he is going to do in the rest of his reign and how he is going to come to his end and makes a lot of guesses that did not work out. So the modernist says that this is all an account of A.E. Well, historically that does not work. The last half does not fit A.D. If we had time we will look at the details of it. It does not work out, but they do not expect it to work out because they think they are the guesses of this man who is guessing what's going to happen in the future and pretending it is a prophecy made 400 yrs. before.

That's one extreme. Now the opposite extreme to that is the view that some Great Christian Bible students took particularly about 100 yrs. ago. These men said at vs. 21 he jumps to the antichrist. So after telling about Antiochus' father, given about 10 vs. to Antiochus' father, and then giving one vs. to Antiochus' brother, then in vs. 21 he jumps to the antichrist. "And in his estate shall stand up a vile person." This is the little horn, according to them, not of ch. 8, but of ch. 7. This is the antichrist, and from vs. 21 on to the end of the ch. is about the antichrist. Now I do not think that most Bible students today, I doubt if there are any today who will take that view, because it fits, the first part fits so exactly with what A.E. did, And if you are going to tell about all these people who are not of much importance to us, detail after detail through 20 vs. about these, and tell about Antiochus' father in nearly 10 vs., and tell about Antiochus' brother in one verse, and then skip to antichrist, jump forward at least 2500 yrs., what's the point of telling^{all} about these people before? Now of course, one writer says, that this is all -- this first part of ch. 11 -- is all a later interpolation; it doesn't belong in the Bible. And this is quite a conservative writer, but he says the Bible does not give details like this of future history anywhere else. So, he says, this is somebody's insertion!

Well, we certainly do not accept that view. It was in the Bible that Jesus Christ had. Christ set His seal of approval upon the Bible that His people had at his time. There may be cases where a vs. has become confused. In copying there may be a verse or two that have gotten in that do not belong. There may be a word or two that got left out, but no important doctrine, no important teaching is affected by those little changes that have taken place in transmission. But that any sizeable section of the OT has either been added or taken away since Christ's time is something that we as Christians do not believe. Therefore, we accept it, that it gives us all these details before leading up to A.E. and then when it gives us detail after detail about A.E. we say this is a prediction that Daniel made about a great crisis in the history of Judaism, in the history of the belief in one God and of carrying on of the tradition in the preparation for the coming of Christ, this was one of the greatest crises in history, -- the attempt of A.E. to completely ^{destroy} ~~destoy~~ the worship of God in Palestine. Therefore we say, when it says "In his estate shall stand up a vile person to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom, but shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries" it is talking about A.E. I believe that all Christian -- I believe all interpreters today will say that vs. 21 about A.E. But some try to make it both and now I noted here in this commentary -- here is this commentary by Dr. E.J. Young on the Book of Daniel and in it he says: The prophecy is confessedly difficult and the present writer believes that it cannot in its entirety be applied to Antiochus. He adopts the view that Antiochus is portrayed as a type of Christ, but that such a ^{antichrist} portrayal ^{only at} begins/in vs. 36. He adopts the view that Antiochus is portrayed as a type of the Antichrist. That is the view which --- Now there is considerable variety in that, but that is in ~~general~~ general the view that is held by most interpreters today. -- I -- that is by most ~~who~~ ^{except those} who accept who take the critical view. I would like to say I consider that as utter

It occurs in John 20:25 where our Lord invites the disciples to put ~~their~~ their hands into the prints of the nails in His hands, and in his feet. Hb invites them to feel the prints of the nails. It is an impression then that is made. It is used == it is translated example sometimes, and ensample sometimes. Now what is the difference between an ensample and an example? I'm sure I don't know, except that the word ensample has completely disappeared from present day English, and as far as I know it means exactly the same thing as example, but the KJV sometimes used one and sometimes the other. Maybe just for variety. I don't know. But we are told to be examples for the flock. It says, these things in the OT happened for our examples. This word tupos is used in that way, ^{nearly} Nearly half of the times it is used in the NT. In Acts 7:43 it is trans. figures, and in the next vs. it is trans. fashion. In Acts 23:25 it is trans. manner. So this modern use of the word type, does not represent this Gk. word tupos. But it is a word that developed from the habit of Christians in the Middle Ages. There were many in the Middle Ages who took the OT as entirely mythical. Actually the way they took it is getting pretty close to the way Bultman and other extreme modernists take it today. That is they say said, Adam and Eve, they didn't really exist, but they represent -- one represents Christ, one represents the Church. It's just a story representing Christ and the Church. All these OT stories are just symbols to give us an idea of spiritual things. Now that attitude of the Middle Ages has been abandoned by all true Christians since the Reformation. We don't believe that about the OT. Any true Christian today who speaks of something in the OT which is a type, believes that that thing actually was in the OT, and I believe that figures in the OT that are used to represent NT truth should be thought of under ~~to~~ two heads. The first of those is: Things that God specifically gave in order to represent ideas He wanted to drive home to the hearts of His people. For instance you take in the wilderness, the people were bit by snakes. Now God could have said, Call out to Moses and Moses will put

something on it and you will be rescued from it. ^{He} It could have said any one of many different things. But what He did say was Moses take a picture of a snake in bronze, put it up on a pole, and when anyone is bit by a serpent let them look at the brazen serpent and they will be healed. Why did God do it that way? He did it that way to show them that He would ~~prove~~ provide something as deliverance from the serpent's bit, and similarly that He would provide something that would deliver them from the serpent's bit of sin, that His provision would be made, and that we would look in faith to that provision and be delivered. Jesus said, As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the wilderness so the Son of Man must be lifted up. Of course Jesus was lifted up on a cross suffering for our sin. Now there is no suffering in that bronze serpent, and the bronze serpent represents the serpent that bit them (us). Well Jesus of course had our sin laid upon Him. He was made sin for us, but He was not himself sin. So it does not exactly fit, but it brings out a number of ~~of~~ ideas very important about the atonement. When the Israelites were about to be freed from Egyptian bondage, God said to Moses, Tonight I will kill all the firstborn in Egypt. He could have said, Now when the Egyptians are all feeling terrible about the firstborn being killed, Rameses is going to ~~as~~ say, "You can go, get out." Now you be ready, and the minute he says that, you get out of Egypt. But God did not say that. God said, Every family of the Israelites must take a lamb, and kill the lamb, and put the blood on the door and when the destroying ^{angel} ~~angel~~ comes by he won't kill the firstborn in that house, where the blood is on the door. Now why did He say that? He could just as well have done it without this. But God gave this as a sign to impress upon their minds the fact that they were sinners even as the Egyptians were. That they deserved death just as the Egyptians, did. But that God was providing a sacrifice through which they could be delivered, and when he saw the blood he would pass over them

and the innocent lamb -- quite different from the ~~picture~~ picture of the serpent -- yet showing another phase of the same idea. The innocent lamb, a lamb without blemish must be killed in order that they could be saved. He made them take time when Pharaoh was going through to start up with his armies to try to bring them back, instead of telling them go at once, he made them take time to kill this lamb and put its blood on the door and go through the service of the Passover in order to impress on their minds the fact that they could be delivered from their sins through the provision of the spotless lamb that God would provide. So here we have a divinely given sign. So we can very properly say that there is something that happened then, that God ordered them to do in order to impress upon their minds a certain truth. And as they would tell this story and think about it in later times this truth would be impressed upon their minds.

When He build the tabernacle the same was true. The tabernacle was a place where they could all come together and hear religious exhortation, ~~have their~~ have their unity developed and their knowledge of divine things be explained to them. But God ordered them to put in certain things. A laver to wash at. An altar of ~~brai+~~ burnt offering, An ~~inner~~ inner place where the Mercy Seat was. All these specific things He had put in order to impress upon their minds certain spiritual truths. Paul said, ~~cannot~~ cannot The blood of bulls and goats did not take away sin. This did not specifically accomplish anything for them. But it did give something that was ~~spri~~ specifically ordered to be carried on in order to impress something on their minds. Then God wonderfully brought it about that 40 yrs. after Jesus' death the sacrifices would be done away with. All this extensive ritual of Lev. that looks forward to the death of ~~Christ~~ Christ came to an end 40 yrs. after it was fulfilled, and has not been performed by the Jews since in their synagogues they read about all that should be done, but they never do it. They never do it because of a foolish tradition that came up that the only place it could be done was at the temple at Jerusalem. God brought

it about that the Temple - - - that wasn't the original order. They did it in the wilderness; at many places when they came into the land they did it at Shiloh at first. It was done at various places before it was done in Jerusalem. The Bible never said it had to be done in Jerusalem. But the tradition developed among them and God used it in such a way as to do away with this type looking forward to Christ after the actual lamb had been slain. Now these are types, if you want to use the word in that sense. That's the sense in which it is used by a good many. These are definite types. They are things God ordered to be done in order to convey a specific idea to people.

Now it seems to me personally we ought to make a sharp distinction between types and illustrations. Anything that has ever happened can be used as an illustration of something else. You can say that just as G. Washington went with great ideas of what was his duty and what was his office into which he was going when he became president, so a new president goes with certain ideas. That does not mean that G. Washington is a type of this new president. He could be an illustration. You could say that as the President of the U.S. who was elected in 1860 was shot similarly the President who was elected in 1960 was shot. There is an illustration, a remarkable similarity, but it is not a type. It is an illustration. When it says that even as Adam loved Eve, Christ loves the Church, Adam + Eve is used as an illustration for the church, and the love of Adam for Eve as an illustration of the love of Christ for the church. But whether you could call that a type any more than any other married couple in all history, I question very severely. It says that Adam was the first man. He was the man through whom sin came into the world. Christ is the second adam. He's the one through whom we are delivered from sin. There is a wonderful illustration. Should you really say Adam is a type of Christ? It is very different from what was done in putting up the brazen serpent. It's very different --- to draw a comparison between one

event and another is very different, so I question the use of "type" in that sense. But even if you used "type" in that sense, you see, something happened. Abraham left his home and went out into a land way off, and similarly the Pilgrim Fathers left England and came way across the sea to try to have a new home away from the idolatrous influences they left. Does that mean Abraham is a type of the Pilgrim Fathers? I think Abraham is an illustration. But to carry it still further and say that God predicts something is going to happen and this thing He predicts is going to happen is a type of something else that is going to happen later on. To me that is carrying it to an ultimate extreme of absurdity. Yet the amazing thing is that practically every conservative commentary I have seen anywhere that speaks about Daniel, practically every one that does not take the critical view, uses this phrase - it looks forward to ^{Antiochus} ~~the+antichrist~~ 400 years after Daniel, but the Antiochus is a type of the antichrist. Say there are similarities. They are both represented by the figure of little horns. Both are kings. Both do bad things. Both attack God. There are similarities, but to call one the type of another ^{other} to me that is introducing absurdity into the word type, and absurdity into the interpretation of Daniel. But now when you look at the description here you find in vs. 21, A vile person will stand up to whom they will not give the honor of the kingdom, but he will come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flattery. The fact of the matter is that A.E. was the second son of Antiochus III. The oldest son, Seleucus IV had been king, and had been killed. Antiochus had been taken to Rome and had been for 10 yrs. or more a hostage in Rome. When his brother became king he was no longer a good hostage, so they made the brother give him his oldest son and as a hostage, his son Demetrius. And Antiochus was liberated and he went to Athens. There he became an Athenian citizen and he was even elected chief magistrate of Athens. I'm not sure that tells ~~most~~ much in his favor because I think at that time the election was largely a matter

of casting lots rather than of voting. At any rate historians say he was the chief magistrate of Athens when his brother was killed. And there was a king of Pergamos - a section of Asia Minor - with whom Antiochus had made friends, and this king of Pergamum lent him a considerable sum of money in order to go down there and see if he could become king instead of the son of the man who had just died who was a hostage in Rome. And Antiochus went in there, and disposed of the man who had killed his brother and obtained the kingdom by flattery. And we read in vs. 33: He shall work deceitfully, he shall become strong by a small people. Vs. 34 He went in peaceably even upon the fattest places of the provinces and he will do that which his fathers have not done nor his father's fathers; he'll scatter among them the prey and spoil the riches and forecast his devices against the strongholds for a time.

And Antiochus spent money lavishly. He built a great temple to Jupiter in Athens with the money he got from his kingdom. He built big temples in the various cities in that land. He built a tremendous palace for himself. He was a queer sort of fellow. He called himself Antiochus Epiphanes which means Antiochus the manifest god. But when he wasn't looking the people called him Antiochus Epimanes. Epimanes instead of Epiphanes which means "the mad." ^{Because} because he would say, Now tomorrow we're going to pretend we're in Rome, and I'm going to run for election as Counsel. So he put on a toga and he'd go about and ask everybody he saw to vote for him, and then pretend he was elected and take his position as if he was a Roman official in the city. Of course if anybody did not vote for him it was pretty dangerous [for him]. But he was ^{always} ~~always~~ doing queer things. He went from one extreme to the other. There was ^{probably} something rather peculiar about his character, but he found the people as a whole quite ready to follow him, his ideas, except the Jews. And he found that many of the Jews were very ready to adopt his ideas, but many others strongly opposed them and he became quite indignant against the Jews.

Well now our time is going rapidly so we won't look at many details, but every interpreter I know of agrees that vs. 21-24 exactly fit with Antiochus. Vs. 25, he stirs up his power against the k. of the south, and the king of the south is stirred to do battle with him (his attack against Egypt) Vs. 27 when he meets with his nephew who is the king of Egypt, and they meet and the speak lies at one table, and his nephew agrees to be pretty much a servant to him. Vs. 28, then he returns to his land with great riches and his heart is against the holy covenant, and he returns to his own land. But then vs. 29, at the time appointed he returns and comes toward the south, but he won't be as successful as he was in his first great attack against Egypt because the ships of Chittim come and we discussed that last week exactly what that means. Chittim is a word that means Crete but is used in the Scripture/for anything west in ~~in+the~~ the Mediterranean west of Syria. They would ~~+++~~ look out there at the islands and the whole thing was designated in general as Chittim, and we noticed how that vs. 30 was fulfilled and how he came back to Palestine with great indignation and anger and took it out on the Jews. Vs. 31 he will take away the daily sacrifice, and they will place the abomination that makes desolate. He stopped the sacrifices in the temple, took away all the Jewish insignia and put up the altar to Jupiter and they offered swines flesh on the altar and such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries - he gave much help to individual Jews who changed their names to Greek names and who would become associated and those who were circumcised had operations to make themselves uncircumcised so that they would give up the whole idea of being Jewish and he had many who were following him -- Yes.

(Student: Could you comment briefly on the abomination that makes desolate?)

That term is used 3 times in the bk. of Daniel, and this time it is

used expressly in the discussion of Antiochus Epiphanes. Those who think that since there is a later case where that term is used in reference to something the antichrist does they think it must always refer to the antichrist, therefore they will say that all this must be just about antichrist. But I don't think anybody, any commentary I have seen still holds that view today. But the term abomination that makes desolate, if it always means the same thing and certainly Jesus predicted the antichrist would put up an abomination of desolations, if it always means the same thing, then this would all have to refer to Antiochus. That is the only strong argument I know of for it. But one term does not always have to mean the same thing in Scripture, anymore than the little horn always has to mean the same thing.

(Student: What is the Abomination here?) Answer: In this case it would be -- it was the altar to Jupiter I would say.

And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries, but the people that do know their God shall be strong and there were many. It says "shall do exploits" - I'm not sure whether it should be exploits yet. You notice it is in italics. I saw a statement just today in the newspaper. It said, Don't use any Bible that does not have italics in it. It said, If it doesn't have italics it means they are not inserting words that are necessary to understand the thought. Well, I read the other day an attack on the Bible where it said that no translation is any good that adds anything. The KJV adds a great deal but it usually puts it in italics. Like this. But when it puts it in italics ^{that's the guess of the} ~~that+suggests+to+the~~ interpreter. I would suggest (it simply means) Those who do know their God will be strong and they will be active, they will do, rather than they will do exploits. I would think this refers to the many who were martyred. To the many who refused to submit to Antiochus and were martyred. But of course this might mean that this does mean to do exploits, that this is looking forward a year or two to the time when many of them instead of

submitting to Antiochus or being martyred, fled into the wilderness and gradually gathered themselves together into guerrilla bands that attacked Antiochus' forces and eventually drove them out of Palestine under the leadership of the Maccabees. But vs. 33, They that understand among the people shall instruct many and they shall fall by the sword and by the flame and by captivity many days. Now when they fall they shall be helped with a little help but many will cleave to them with flatteries, and some of them with understanding shall fall to try them. . . . because it is yet for a time appointed." Maybe that means -- till the time of the end -- means that all this opposition, this difficulty is going to come to an end. It's a little difficult to say to talk about A.E. ends with vs. 35 because there is no strong statement as to how his efforts are going to save him, but that many of his people are going to refuse to give in to him and some of them will fall, but they will be helped with some help. But when you get to vs. 40 --- vs. 40 on, from vs. 40-45, you have a description of another attack upon Egypt which Antiochus did not make. So the modernists say this shows that the writer of the book wrote after his attack on Egypt from which he came back and caused his attack on the Jews, but he guessed he was going to make another attack on Egypt but he did not do so. That's the way they make it. Now if you don't take it that way, it does not describe what A.E. did from vs. 40 to 45 there are many statements in vs. 40-45 which A.E. definitely did not do, and cannot fit A.E. and therefore it is a very reasonable to believe that from vs. 40-45 is a description of antichrist. From vs. 36-39 is also difficult to apply to Antichrist. But the modernist interpreters all try to say vs. 36-39 actually fits A.E. but vs. 40-45 were bad guesses on the part of the writer and can't fit A.E. Now you have an account of Antiochus' character, and then an account of his events to vs. 35, then 36-38 seems to be largely an account of his character. So to many it seems reasonable that first you

have the character and the accomplishments of A.E. described, then that you have the character and accomplishments of Antichrist described. The funny thing is that Young who waxes eloquent against the idea that there is any break between the Roman empire and the coming of the antichrist, that it must go straight along, for there is no such thing as a break, a jumping forward! Here he says that vs. 35 ~~at~~ it stops ~~s~~ talking about A.E. and from vs. 36 on he talks about Antichrist. To me that is a very reasonable interpretation. That's why I'm hoping that many of you on your papers where I have filled in, ~~that~~ that you will consider vs.36-45 as the second phase of the fourth kingdom and 3-35 as part of the third kgdm. Because there is a break here from v.35. Vs.36-38 is very difficult to apply to A.E. The modernists say it fits A.E. but they have to do a lot of twisting. "The king shall do according to his will." Of course that would fit anybody. "He shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god." Now that's pretty hard to apply to A.E. "He will speak marvellous things against the God of gods." That's true. Vs. 37 "Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers." A.E. Built temples for Jupiter in many places. He was constantly worshipping the Greek gods. How can this fit him? "Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers." The only way they can do is to ^{say} ~~say~~ He called himself the manifest god which is what Epiphanes did, though previous kings had also been called Epiphanes. And he put that on his coins that he made. Antiochus Epiphanes. One of his ancestors they called Theos, the God. But he was only called that after his death. But A.E. put that on his temples. Therefore they say "he shall not regard the god of his fathers" that he did ^{himself} not because he made ~~himself~~ ~~a~~ ~~good~~ ~~god~~. But that does not fit Paul(?) at all. He could call himself a god and still admit that Jupiter and Appolo were much greater ~~than~~ gods. "Nor ~~wh~~ shall he regard the desire of women." We know nothing about A.E. that would fit with that at all. Some say that he turned against the licentious religion of Syria, but we have no evidence he did nor any evidence that the desire of women would fit that.

And again "nor regard any god." He was constantly trying to get them to worship the Greek gods. "But in his stead shall he honor the god of forces." They say, who is this god of forces? They say maybe it is a translation of meozim -- instead maybe he'll worship the god meozim, but nobody knows about any god meozim. To anybody in that day that would not make much sense, but in our day when people are denying there is any ~~b~~ god and believing in great forces of materialism, why to worship the god of forces would be an exact description of the athiestic rulers of our day and therefor would seem exactly to fit Antiochus(?) ((Don't you mean antichrist?)) And a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold and silver and pleasant things. So that as I say vs. 40-45 does not fit A.E. Vs. 36-39 I don't believe fit A.E. So I feel there is an interval between vs. 35 and 36. Joe Young makes that foolish statement that the whole thing is a picture of A.E. as a type of antichrist, yet in his discussion he talks of the first part as being A.E. and the next part as being Antichrist., which I feel is sensible.

we'll

Well we've talked more about this probably more the week after next because next week I think it would be good for us to talk about the 70 weeks. So you bring in your papers to me next week and we'll discuss that next week and we'll turn to ch. 11 and 12 in our last week.

Copy 2

I have changed our order a little from what I expected to do originally because I don't want to finish the semester on a negative note. I had thought I would deal with ch. 2,7,8, and 11 until I was completely through with them - through with 12, because this all is closely related to each other. There's a very steady development in it. I thought I would deal with that first, and just at the end of the semester that we would look into Daniel 9 because Daniel 9 is quite distinct from these chapters, distinct in many ways. But we have not quite finished with 11 and have not looked at 12 yet. I want to finish this semester on a more positive note than we possibly can with 9. So we'll take today on 9 and then go back to 11 and 12 next time.

Daniel 9, the 70 weeks is a prime example of the point which I have in mind as our primary objective in this course, that is the objective approach to Daniel's prophecies. I've been trying in this course not to say, Here is our view of eschatology; now let's fit everything in Daniel into it. I've been trying to avoid that approach very definitely. I'm not saying that approach is wrong. I think it is good to have books, particularly of a popular nature that take various parts of the Bible and fit them into the whole framework and the whole idea. For popular use I think that is excellent. But the thing that saddens me is that in connection with Daniel 9 I find all of the scholarly books at some point or other forsaking a scholarly approach when they get into Daniel 9. They all look at Dan. 9 in the light of their interpretation of the rest of the Bible, take a definite approach toward it and then try to force ^{everything} ~~everything~~ into that approach. With some writers it takes a little forcing, with some it takes a lot of forcing. Our purpose in this course is to look at Daniel objectively and to say not what do we find here that fits with something else in the Bible, but what do we find here definitely which can be taken as a basis to go to other parts of the Bible and then use it in interpreting.

them rather than use them in interpreting it. So it really discourages me to see so many scholarly books becoming so very unobjective and so very dogmatic regarding details of Dan. 9, on some of which they differ very very widely from each other, and yet speak so dogmatically. I believe that where we don't know we simply say we don't know, and where there are two possibilities that are nearly equal that we recognize them as possibilities in our study at least. Now I don't say that is the way to approach in the general church services. Most people ^{don't} ~~don't~~ have sufficient background for that. We have plenty that is definitely clear in the Scripture to be positive on without spending a great deal of time on the things we can't be positive on. I believe for study, for getting things correctly it is the right approach to have.

Let's look at Daniel 9 together. We look first at the very beginning of the chapter. There we find that he says that in the first year of the reign of Darius who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans -- You notice he says "who was made king." The critics, of course, all of the interpreters of the critical school say that Daniel's fourth kingdom was the Greek kingdom, and there was a third kingdom -- a second kingdom a median kingdom between the Babylonian and the Persian according to Daniel, ~~though~~ though they all agree there never was any such kingdom as a great empire (?), and they point to the references to Darius the Mede as proof of that. You notice here it says "he was made king" which does not sound like a conqueror coming in and taking over. It is doubtless Cyrus appointing him to this position under Cyrus. Here is the occasion for ch. 9 -- "In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, concerning which the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem."

This 6 70 years is evidence of the fact that rarely if ever does God give us precise chronological evidences of what is going to happen in the

future. He does not tell us exactly when things are going to happen in the future, and Scripture does not try to give us a precise chronology in the past. We have to try to reconstruct it and often we have great difficulty, though many of the places that seemed to be impossible to fit together 40 yrs. ago, today all will admit that explanations have been found where the chronology fits in pretty well. But a prophetic statement that he will accomplish 70 years like this, does that mean precisely 70 years of precisely 365 and 1/4 days each? or does it mean somewhere between 65 and 75, - a general period of 70 years? Well, the place where he doubtless was looking ^{when} where he made this prayer was the book of Jeremiah though he does not say == explicitly refer to Jeremiah. We find two passages: Jer. 25:11-13. Jer. 25 is given in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. So that dates it exactly 607 or 606 B.C. We never can == we rarely can say a date like this has precisely, because as you know their years stated at different times than ours do, and in different countries the year started at different times. So when we say 607-606 it does not mean we are not sure, but it does mean there can be that variation of one year in our statements.

There he says that in this time in 607-606 B.C. the Lord said, It shall come to pass when 70 years are accomplished I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations." When did God make Babylon perpetual desolations? If this is 607 B.C. did He do that in 537 B.C.?

(Student ? ? ? ?) Babylon continued to be a great city, it was a very great city at 300 B.C. 300 yrs. after this time it was a very great city. When Seleucus went to Babylon == returned to Babylon in 312 B.C. and started officialy the period of the Seleucid kingdom, they began figuring dates from that date, and some continued even into the Middle Ages, figuring from that date, 312 B.C. But Seleucus, very soon after that, within the next 15 years, he decided to start a new city named after himself - Seleucia.

which would be maybe 50 mi. N. of Babylon, and he moved most of his government to Seleucia, and Seleucia gradually became the great city and the people moved away from Babylon, so over a period of a couple of centuries Babylon decreased until it came to be simply a deserted waste as it has remained practically till this day. So when he says, I will make it a perpetual desolation, that was not fulfilled after 70 years. That was at least 350 maybe probably at least 500 years later before that statement was fulfilled. So the 70 yrs. does not apply to his making it a perpetual desolation, but he says, When 70 yrs. are accomplished, I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans. Well, when did God punish the Babylonians for their iniquity? That would be when he enabled Cyrus to conquer it, and put an end to the Babylonian empire and made it simply a part of the Persian empire. Consequently that would be 539 B.C. which would be approx. 68 yrs. -- 67 to 68 yrs. after this time. You see mighty close to the 70 years. So there was a 70 yr. period after this prophecy was given before God punished the Babylonians for ^{their} iniquity by putting an end to their empire.

Then the other reference to this 70 years is found in ch. 29 -- Jer. 29:10: For thus saith the Lord, After 70 yrs. are accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return even unto this place." Now that declaration was given at the time of ^{Jehoiakin} ~~Jehoiakin~~ being taken to Babylon, shortly after that as we find mentioned in the beginning of the chapter. So that would be around 596 or a little later, about that time. We find a period thus of 70 yrs. between the time that Daniel was taken to Babylon, or shortly before the time when Jerusalem came under Babylonian control -- between that time and the end of the Babylonian empire we find a period of just about exactly 70 yrs. Most commentators will say, That's one 70 year period. There's another 70 year period between the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and the completion of the Temple in 517 B.C.

Now that's very interesting that that is a 70 year period, but I don't see how you get the finishing construction of the Temple out of either of these passages. So I don't see how it is relevant. Now we would naturally think of the destruction ^{of Jerusalem} in 587 B.C. at the beginning of the devastation. ^{as} But in this use in ~~connection~~ ^{connection} with the 70 years they begin it with the time when Jerusalem fell under Babylonian control in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, when Daniel and his companions were taken out to Babylon. I think that is a warning against feeling we can be over precise or over certain about the exact bearing of these dates.

Our chapter 9 began with this reference to the 70 years. Daniel saw that it was nearly 70 yrs. since Jerusalem had been under Babylonian control Babylon had now been conquered by Cyrus and he was hoping that now would come the end of the desolation of Jerusalem. So he says, he has read that it would be 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem, so he prayed that the Lord would fulfill His promise. Then we have this long prayer by Daniel, and then the Lord gives him the answer beginning in vs. 24.

He says 70 weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, etc. Seventy weeks are determined. Here is a 70 yr. period which we expect soon will be over, and God will fulfill His promise and allow the people to go back. But that is not the end of God's dealing with the people for their sin and their transgression. God has further things in mind upon thy people and thy holy city which will take not 70 years, but 70 weeks. And this phrase "weeks" immediately is a problem of course. Some are very dogmatic one way, and some are very dogmatic another way. The term weeks or sevens, & certainly does not mean ~~mea~~ ^{we could think of} weeks of days. That is quite obvious. There is nothing ~~here~~ that could fit what is described here. It took place in the next 70 seven day period. So if it is not weeks of days, it does not seem reasonable either that it is weeks of months. So we are left with two possibilities: the possibility that they are weeks of years - 7 year period, and a very strong evidence

for the possibility of that interpretation is found in the sabbatical year of the OT. The land making up for the sabbaticals with this devastation. These references in the OT to the seven year period suggests that when it says weeks here it means seven ^{yr} period but does not prove it. I think ~~of~~ a very strong argument can be made for that, but I don't think it is absolutely convincing. It seems a very likely interpretation that they are 7 weeks of years.

There are a number of commentators -- ~~Keil and Leupold~~ Keil, one of our best conservative commentators; Leupold, a conservative Lutheran commentator; Young in his commentary -- they insist that these are not exact periods, that these 70 weeks are a general period divided into certain subsections. While it seems to me that the other probably fits all the facts better and they are weeks of ~~a~~ years, I think this must be recognized as a viable option not to be simply cast aside at the start but considered as we look at the various possibilities and interpretations of it.

So we have then two possibilities: that these are 70 periods each of which is 7 yrs. in length; [?] or that they are general periods which can be referred to as 70 weeks.

Now he tells about what the purposes of these are in vs. 24. Seventy weeks are determined to finish transgression, to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, to ^{bring} ~~bring~~ in everlasting righteousness, to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

This commentary of Young's has got some very excellent material in relation to the critical theory, and some very good answers to the attacks of the critics upon the book of Daniel as an authentic book from Daniel. The critics all believe it was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it describes as if it was prophecy what had happened before that as far as the writer knew and he was mistaken according to them about a lot of things. Then he (the writer) makes guesses about the future. Well Young attacks that view all through and does a very good ~~job~~ job at many points

in dealing with that theory. But Young while he is fighting in that direction very strongly, he is fighting almost as strongly in this direction against what he calls dispensationalism. I wish we could get him to give a definition of dispensationalism. I don't know of any word used in theology today that is more confusing and has less definiteness in it than the word dispensationalism. I know people who think that if a person is not a dispensationalist he is absolutely worthless. And I know others who think that if a person is a dispensationalist he is absolutely worthless. Some who would take this attitude and some who would take that toward the word ~~the~~ hold views almost absolutely identical on most important questions. I think unfortunately it is ~~not~~ a word that at present gives heat rather than light. If you take the word in its simple sense it means you believe in dispensations. Well if there is anyone that everyone would agree is not a dispensationalist in the sense in which Young uses the word it would be Hodge and Hodge has a section in his theology on the four dispensations. He certainly was a dispensationalist in the sense of believing in dispensations. Some take the word as meaning that men were saved in a different way in other dispensations than they are now. I don't know any evangelical scholar who holds such a view as that, though some use expressions that sound unfortunately somewhat far in that direction. But actually to believe that, I believe that all evangelicals believe that no one ever has been saved or ever will be saved except through the death of Christ on Calvary's cross. But the strange thing is that the term as used by Young refers to a whole body of ideas, and to Young one of the main things to being a dispensationalist seems to be to think that Daniel talks about anything but the first coming of Christ! That seems to be his attitude wherever he can carry out that attitude. Thus ~~th~~ in ch. 2, the stone that hits on the image, that must be the first coming of Christ and it is the growth of Christ's spiritual kingdom which is described. Well now how anybody could think that meant the complete destruction of

the image, or could come anywhere near it, is a problem that Youn does not go into. But he is very rabid against anyone who takes it as referring to something yet to happen. You'd think that he did not believe in any events at the end of the age. One thing that he is very strong against is any gaps or parenthesis. The 70 weeks, he insists, must go right straight along. There can be no breaks in it. No breaks at all between the four kingdoms and the setting up of the kingdom of the Lord. There can be no breaks according to the way he talks time after time. Yet in Dan. 11 he insists that vs. 36-45 are the antichrist? He insists on that, and how does he get from vs. 35 about Antiochus to vs. 36 about the antichrist? without having an interval in there of at least a couple of thousand years? But he just passes the interval without mentioning it. In another place he says he says it is perfectly ridiculous to think there are gaps or parentheses anywhere. In ch. 7 he certainly does not hold that the Son of Man returning on the clouds of the air and described there, comes in the days of the Roman Empire and yet he insists this cannot be a reconstructed empire; this has to be the actual Roman Empire. He has a gap of 2000 years at least which he just jumps over without mentioning it. And he mentions Antichrist thus in ch. 7 definitely as the Little Horn and in ch. 11 with these several verses. So he mentions these things where they are very clear in the teaching but otherwise he rules them out as far as possible.

Now this vs. 24, he insists everything in vs. 24 refers to the first coming of Christ. I know of hardly any other writer who takes it that way. The seventy weeks are determined to finish the transgression. Was it finished at the time of Christ? To make an end of sin. Was an end of all sins made at that time? To make reconciliation for iniquity -- that can certainly describe the atonement, the most important event between the fall and the return of Christ. But "to bring in everlasting righteousness" -- was that brought in at that time? Then you get the statement "to seal up the vision and prophecy." Now how does that relate to the first coming of

Christ? Well, Young has quite a lengthy discussion of that on page 200. Let me read it to you. He says on p. 200 that for sealing vision and prophet - "Many take this/^{action}to refer to the impression of a seal upon a writing so as to accredit it. Thus to seal up vision, etc. is said to mean the prophecies are accredited. Some believe that the reference is to this particular prophecy of the seventy sevens. This use of the seal how-^{to}ever does not appear to be supported from the OT." Well now that's a pretty strong dogmatic statement. This use of seal being a making an impression on a writing so as to accredit does not seem to be supported from the OT. Actually the word occurs maybe 20-25 times in the OT, and approx. half of them are when a man affixes his seal to something to accredit it! So to say it has little evidence, about half the ^{instances}evidences are good evidences. But it is true that half of them are not. You seal something to accredit it, yes. Or you seal something to close it up. So either is possible. Seal can be either. And he insists ~~h~~ it must be the second. Now I don't say he's wrong to say it could be the second, but to say ~~e~~ It has to be the second, is certainly dogmatism that is not supported. He says the reference is not to accrediting the prophecy but to sealing it up so that it will no longer appear. Its functions are finished and it is not henceforth ~~needed~~ needed." Now that is a dogmatic statement; we can't say it is impossible, but it certainly is not the usual sense of sealing. To seal it up so it will no longer appear. We seal it up so as to keep it closed, to protect it, to continue it so it ^{can't}~~can't~~+be looked at, but not to show that it is finished and so it will no longer appear. He reads that into it. He says, This is not done by way of punishment to Israel, but because the period of prophecy is now at an end. Keil thinks that this ~~exten~~ extinction of prophecy is not to be sought in the period of Christ's first advent since that concluded only OT prophecy. NT prophecy and its fulfillment are yet to be sealed up. Hence Keil believes that this prophecy is to be fulfilled in the future, and of all

commentators previous to him, the one Young thinks most highly of is Keil. But here he strongly disagrees with Keil. He says, However the particular description herein chosen very clearly refers to the OT period. The vision was a technical name for revelation given to the OT prophets. Cf. Isa. 1:1; Amos 1:1. The prophet was the one through whom this vision was revealed to the people. The two words vision and prophet therefore serve to designate the prophetic revelation of the OT. This revelation was but temporary, ~~preparata~~ preparatory typical character. It pointed forward to the coming of One who was the great prophet. When Christ came there was no ^{further} ~~further~~ need of prophetic revelation in the OT sense." So he says that for sealing the vision and prophecy means ending the OT. Because the Hebrew word hazion that means vision in the OT does not appear once in the NT, and the Hebrew word nabi which appears there in the OT, does not appear once in the NT! But what he seems to overlook is that there are hundreds of other Hebrew words that don't occur in the NT either, ^{yet we don't consider that it means} but it does not mean they were ended when Christ came.

The Greek word for vision, the Greek word for prophet occur frequently in the NT, and Peter says that this is what was promised that you old men will prophesy and your young men will dream dreams. There is prophecy in the NT period. Your NT books have much prophecy in them. And just because they do not have the Hebrew word -- to say that to seal up the vision and prophecy means to end the OT period is certainly an argument which is strange to me that a man of Young's intelligence would make such an argument. The only way I can understand it is that he is determined to insist that this refers only to Christ's first coming, but it certainly is illogical at that point. "To seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the Most Holy." Now Young will say "to anoint the Most Holy" must refer to the first coming of Christ. The fact is that people don't really know what "to anoint the most holy" means. Most commentators point out that this

phrase "the Holy of Holies" which is here trans. the most holy, is used many times for a part of the temple. There is only one case in the OT where it may seem to refer to a person, and that one is questionable in the context whether it is describing a person, or whether it also describes something in the tabernacle or in the temple itself.

The ~~thing~~ thing I am trying to bring out about v. 24 is that the phrase "to make reconciliation for iniquity" could very well refer to Christ's first coming. But that there is no other phrase in which here which cannot refer just as well - and most of them much better - to the end of the whole world as we know it. ^{To} The end of this age as to the time of Christ. Much better: to finish transgressions; to make an end of sins; to be in everlasting righteousness. Those phrases would certainly seem to look forward much further. To anoint the most holy would very well mean to establish a new millennial temple. You ~~can~~ cannot be ~~ed~~ certain that is what it means, but in the light of the usage of the world, that seems ^{more} likely than any other suggested interpretation for it.

So to say as Young does, this whole 70 weeks relates only to the first coming of Christ -- he differs from practically every other commentator in so saying. It's an instance of reading into it, taking a general approach and insisting it must be so. And if he does ~~so~~ so, he ought to do away with Antichrist in ch. 11 and in ch. 7. I don't know how he could do that. He does not try to do that of course.

Now I have these questions I gave you and I said the third was if time was still available to study the purpose of the 70 weeks. I put it third because it is very difficult to be dogmatic about. I think all we can --- Many ^{writers} ~~writers~~ are dogmatic. Young is very dogmatic, but I don't think one can be dogmatic. I think we can say that it is pretty hard to relate it entirely to the first coming of Christ, but that the phrases are in general quite general. To seal up the vision and prophecy, does that mean to accredit it, to prove it was true? If so, it is pretty hard

to say it fits one particular time rather than another when every particular OT prophecy that was fulfilled would come under that category in that case. Does it mean to close it up, to seal it up, as at the end of Daniel we have the same word: Seal up the vision for it is for a time yet to be? Have it not understood until a certain time? Well that does not seem to fit the context here at all.

So as to the purpose of it it is something looking forward to God's great work. It's determined upon ~~they~~ people and thy holy city. It may include the first coming of Christ, but that is certainly not stressed in any clear way in this particular statement. It seems to fit much more with His second coming than with His first.

The first question I asked you was, How many periods of time are mentioned here? Now of course we have one ~~p~~ big period, 70 weeks. But there are divisions in it which we can also call periods. How many are there?

(Student: Three). You would say three. That's not what the translators of the KJV said. (Student: The Hebrew says it a little different)

What do the rest of you think? Practically every commentator except --- well, I don't even know if you can say about the liberals -- but certainly/^{practi-}cally every evangelical commentator treats it as if it were two periods. And the KJV translators considered it two periods. You notice how they translated it. They say that, There shall be 7 weeks and three score and two weeks colon. Now the Hebrew has the athnak after the 7 weeks, showing that according to the Massorettes they said, this will be 7 weeks, and 62 weeks something else will happen, and after 62 weeks something else will ~~appear~~ happen. The way the Heb. points it makes it three periods. Now of course these points were put in the Heb. by the Massorettes, ~~at~~ at about the 9th cent. A.D. They did not get them out of their heads. They put down what was the tradition passed down to them. ~~But~~ But tradition passed down by word of mouth can change more easily than something copied.

So we do not take them as necessarily authoritative, but we consider them as always worthy of attention. I don't think we have any right to just cast them aside. As the Heb. points it with the athnak it is three peridds. Now I mentioned this some years ago to a very fine Christian scholar, and he was quite shocked at it. He said, Yes the athnak is there but certainly the first period is 69 weeks; look at the KJV here! The KJV certainly does take that position.

(Student: 7 weeks and then three score and two, instead of three score and nine ^{terms} It just mentions seven, people's minds think in thers of two separate).

Yes, if you would say there will be 60 and 9 weeks, or there will be 60 weeks and 9 weeks, that might be one way to make (take?) 69 weeks - 60 weeks and 9 weeks. But to say 62 weeks and 7 weeks is a very very strange way to say 69 weeks. So that the way it is expressed certainly strongly suggests they are different periods. Some make a great deal of the fact there are 10 toes on the image. I think that is a mistake. There are 10 horns on the beast, there is no question of it. And when there are 10 horns on the beast, it is reasonable to say the 10 toes may relate to them. But the fact that the image has 10 toes does not prove anything ^h. It is just what you would expect the image (of a man) to have. If they said the image had ^{four} ~~for~~ toes ^{and} on one foot and three on the other, that ^{would} would be an unusualy thing which/suggests it has a meaning. When it is normal it may have a meaning but you need evidence elsewhere. You can't get your evidence simply from it. Now in this case, if it said 9 weeks ⁶⁰ and 7 weeks, that would be a natural way to say 69 weeks. Just like in Germany, when I wanted to call a phone no. in Germany, I always had to say - suppose the number was 3279, I would have to say 2 and 39 and 70 .In those days before they dialed, you always had to say to the operator 3 and 20, 2 and 70. That's their typical way of saying it.

among
 ← Now 9 and 60 would be a common way for many people to say 69.
 But 7 and 62 certainly is not. I think that is a very strong argument
 (Student: Can you make anything of the fact in 26 they talk about
 after
 the anointed one coming ~~in~~ three score and two; not three score and
 nine again? He is adding up the 7 and the 62)

Exactly. To me that is the clinching point. After 62 weeks this is
 going to happen. If he was referring to one period of 69 weeks, I would
 think he would say, After 69 weeks, rather than after 68+ 62. The 62
 shows very specifically he is thinking of that as a unit. He would
 otherwise say, After 69. So it seems to me that the evidence --- that is
 one thing I feel we can be dogmatic about. That there are three periods
 here and not two despite what the KJV is.

(Student: Are there any arguments culturally or anything that might
 explain why they would group the 69 and 62?)

No, if they said 9 and 60, that ~~would~~ would be a cultural argument.
 That would be the way they would say it, just like in Germany they say
 3 and 20. But to say 7 and 62, I know of no parallel anywhere for that
 as a way to say 69. I know of no parallel.

(Student: When you say how many periods, you are not counting the
 interim between these?) That is not mentioned here. Just what is mentioned
 here. What is mentioned here is 3 periods. It mentions 7 weeks; it
 mentions 7 62 weeks; it says the middle of the week, so it ~~mean~~ mentions
 one week. So it says 6 70. It mentions specifically 7; it mentions
 specifically 62 and then it refers to the week, which would clearly
 mean the other week. So we have 3 three perids. That I think we can
 be dogmatic on, that there are 3 periods instead of two. Now how did
 people ever get to figuring there were two? It's easy to see how the
 liberals do. The liberals say that from Cyrus' conquest up to the time
 of Antiochus Epiphanes, the writer thought was exactly 7 times 69, but
 when you figure that up it is 60 yrs. off, so they say the writer simply

was confused on his chronology. Conservatives have figured this must refer to the first coming of Christ. So it must be that 69 times 7 will give you a reference to the time of Christ's first coming. So it must be one period. But I don't think we should reach our conclusions that way. I think we should go by what it says, and what it says here is that there are three periods.

Now we have these three periods then, and the first one it says that from the going forth from the word (the Heb. is *dabar*) to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks. Now Leupold insists that word must mean commandment like the KJV has, but "the going forth of the commandment", but the Hebrew is simply "word". Now "word" could mean "commandment" but it does not have to. The Hebrew is "word." "From the going forth of the word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks." Now these who make it 69 wks. up to the first coming of Christ, have nothing to say for the end of the seven weeks. There is no way of proving anything, any specific point to make a change from the seven weeks to the 62 weeks. But for they say "from the going forth of the commandment to Messiah the Prince" will be 69 weeks; now 69 times 7 figure that back from the time of Christ and you get about the time of Artaxerxes, about the time of Extra-Nehemiah. So some try to make it a specific prediction of Christ's coming. Maybe at that time there were people looking for the Messiah very soon, maybe some did on the basis of Daniel think it ought to be about this time. Sir Robt. Anderson tried to figure exactly from the second decree ^{so called} of Artaxerxes up to the triumphal entry, he tried to figure that to be just exactly 69 times 7. But in figuring it he came out a few years too long, so he said they are figuring Babylonian years of 360 days instead of real years of 365 and 1/4 days, and his book on that has been copied and recopied by many evangelical interpreters, but the trouble is there is no Babylonian year of 360 days. It is purely imaginary.

The only way you could possibly find any similarity, is the Babylonians have a month of 29 to 30 days, but they figured their month according to the moon, not according to an arbitrary division like we do, and they put in an extra month every now and then, so that they ~~followed~~^{followed} the sun in their years definitely. There is not such thing.

(Student: When ^{the} was claiming to be ~~teh~~ Messiah did anybody use, have an argument against him saying that Daniel says the Messiah had to come at the time of Christ and therefore you cannot be the Messiah? If so, I would think it would be a very good argument against him.) Yes, Montgomery says -- we don't have a great deal preserved from those days, and Montgomery says that the first evidence is from the end of the second century of anybody ~~th~~ taking it this way. That's what he says. He says, for instance in Justin Martyr you have no evidence of it at all.

How are you going to figure it is only 7 weeks till Messiah the Prince? Keil, who Young thinks so very highly of, at this point Young does not agree with at all. Keil says, Messiah the Prince is Christ. He says the seven week period is a general term for the period from Cyrus till the first coming of Christ; then the 62 weeks is from that period until just before the second coming of Christ. They are just general terms according to that.

(Student: This reference here to Messiah the Prince, has been held by some to be Cyrus ~~because~~ because Cyrus was called the Anointed ONE by Isaiah in his prophecy and it would be from this first Messiah (the reference here) rather than to Christ, it would be to Cyrus, and it would work partially out in the chronology this way).

How could you call Cyrus the Messiah?

(Student: Well he was called that by Isaiah in the fact that he was called the Anointed of God in the time to deliver Israel out of Babylon.)

And he certainly was a prince. No question of that. In Isa. 44:28 and the next verse. (Reading text)

So he calls Cyrus his anointed. Now the word anointed as used in the OT (is used) many times of Hebrew kings and a number of times for the high priest. We know God commanded Elijah to anoint Elisha so that the term anointed means one set apart for a godly task by the Lord's command. The only time it is used of anyone in the OT other than an Israelite king, or an Israelite priest, or a prediction looking forward to the Son of David, the king, is ⁱⁿ this reference to Cyrus whom God said He has anointed for a particular purpose, and He calls him -- this word his anointed, the Hebrew is Messiah. So we have here Cyrus called His anointed. And the period of time from the destruction of Jerusalem to Cyrus' conquest of Babylon, or rather to his letting the people go back from Babylon, was exactly 49 years. So it fits exactly with the idea of being 7 weeks of 7 yrs. each if you take Messiah the Prince here as being Cyrus.

(Student: What year are you taking for Cyrus' edict?) About 538. And from ~~587~~ 587 to 538 would be exactly 49 years. Of course the modernists point that out to. They say the first period is ^{7 wks.} from Cyrus up to then but then they can't be get the 62 weeks coming right from Antiochus to Epiphanes. It goes much too far.

Sir Robt. Anderson and those who hold that we can take it definitely pointing up to this time of Christ (69 weeks), they say it comes from Artaxerxes permission to Nehemiah to go back and rebuild the walls. ~~57~~ They say, that is the first edict to rebuild the city. But that edict does not actually speak of rebuilding the city either. It speaks of building the walls. ~~Cyrus~~ permitted them to go back to rebuild the temple. Now if 43,000 people went back and started building the temple, it stands to reason they build a city. IT fact you get Haggai who criticizes them for living in their nice houses while the temple of the Lord is not yet complete. So even if you did not have walls build, you certainly had the

city. In this passage in Isa. God predicted that Isa. would -- that Cyrus would build my city. So to say the edict to build Jerusalem does not come until 120 yrs. later than this, is simply reading it into it. So that we have definitely 3 periods, I think we can definitely say. The first of these periods we can definitely find a 49 year period. Now it says that the next period -- "in 62 weeks the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times." Those times "street" and "wall" are not the common words. It is quite an obscure statement. The street will be built again and the wall even in troublous times. And after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself." If after 62 weeks means immediately after 62 weeks, will Messiah be cut off but not for himself, that could very well fit into a period of 62 times 7 years ending with the death of Christ, "not for his own sins." The trouble is we cannot take the phrase as necessarily meaning not for himself, but that is a possible interpretation. It may be to have nothing, and that is rather hard to fit into the context. So we can't be dogmatic that it describes His dying for our sins, but we can say it is a strong possibility. That he will be cut off but not for himself, and in that case the 62 week period would have an interval between the 7 weeks and it, and just what starts it we don't know. But it would be a period ending with probably with the death of Christ. If you don't take it that way, perhaps it could ~~mean~~ be a period that runs to the destruction of Jerusalem.

(Student: The street will be built again and the wall even in troublous times. Could this refer to the period before the 62 weeks?)

No, I don't think so, because he says ~~at~~ and 62 weeks the street shall be built again.

(Student: I did not check this in the Hebrew, but we have a colon here after the 62 weeks, and it has been suggested and I don't exactly get this straight that this would be then coming up to Cyrus, and then

there would be a gap here until the streets and the wall would again be built - this would be after the time of Nehemiah, and that you ~~wat~~ would start dating again from the time of Nehemiah ^{at the end of} your 62 weeks.)

Well, we are in the area of guesswork then. We don't know. Could be.

(Student: That would bring you up to the end of the last reference according to Mr. Dunzweiler, and Nehemiah would be about 408. If you would take your 62 weeks then that would bring you to 26 A.D.) From 408 is that so? Well I could not (Student: Against that is guesswork)

It seems to me then there are two possibilities: One possibility is you have the 7 wk. period up to Cyrus, from the destruction of Jerusalem up to Cyrus. Then you have an interval. Then we have a 62 wk. period coming either to the death of Christ, or to the destruction of Jerusalem. I'm not sure we can be dogmatic which. Then we have another interval, and then we have the one weeks period, the time of Antichrist -- the period which could be represented as one week, perhaps as 7 yrs. before the return of Christ. In that period it says, In the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease. Young says that means that Christ by his death on the cross will render the OT offerings no longer of any meaning and therefore they will cease. But actually they continued for 40 yrs. after His death. So that is not very logical. Young tries to relate all this to the first coming of Christ, and he is very scornful of the idea that this could look forward to the time of antichrist. But many interpreters who are very similar to Young in many other points, believe this is looking forward to antichrist. Keil does and Leupold does, and I think most of the others do. But you have then the two possibilities. Here is this period. Then there is a gap, or an interval. Then there is the 62 weeks, and I don't know ^{what starts} just when it starts the 62 weeks. But ending either with the death of Christ or with the destruction of Jerusalem. Then you have an interval and then you have the period of antichrist just before

the return of Christ. That is one view that seems to me probably the best.

Another possibility is the view of Keil -- that the ~~70~~⁷ weeks represent a general term for the whole period up to the first coming of Christ; the 62 weeks, the period from that up till the rapture; then the ~~period of~~ one week, the period after and in that case you have continuous, but you have general periods rather than specific eras. There are difficulties with both views. I think the first has less difficulties than the second. But I feel this is the place where it is unfortunate that someone like Young will be so dogmatic on ~~some~~ so many of these phrases that either are unclear or certainly do not mean what he says they do. I think it is unfortunate on the other hand that people can be so very dogmatic that it is 69 weeks and reaches exactly to Christ. I wish we could avoid dogmatism on what is not clear and say we don't know.

He will be cut off, but not for himself. That would be a clear reference to the atonement ~~for~~^{of} Christ, if it were not for the fact that the worlds could just as well mean "and shall have nothing." Various people try to make interpretations of what it means in that case. In that case it does not refer to the atonement. Someone may say, Isn't it terrible if the atonement of Christ is not mentioned in Daniel. Well, I'm not sure it is mentioned in Jeremiah. It's not mentioned in Ezra, or Esther. There are many books in which it is not mentioned. It is the most important thing in the Bible. It is predicted and stressed in the OT repeatedly, but that does not mean that every book or every ch. has to deal with it. I'd like to have it refer to the atonement here. I think "he shall be cut off but not for himself" may~~be~~⁺⁺ very well refer to it, but I don't feel we can be dogmatic on it. I don't think we can say it has to refer to the first coming and nothing else in the Book of Daniel does.

(Student: One thing that bothers me is the prophecies ^{is} given to Daniel as though Daniel is unaware of the edict, and yet Darius ~~is~~ has been

appointed king of the Chaldeans; it's in at least the first year of Cyrus and yet -- and that would make it very very close to the time of the edict. So would you feel that it would be just like a year difference between the giving of the prophecy and the actual edict.)

No, according to the interpretation I've been suggesting, ^{this} it would not be an edict. This would be "from the going forth of the word -- the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem" would be Jeremiah's prediction in ch. 32 that the city would be rebuilt, a prediction that was given at the very year of its destruction when the Babylonian army was round about. Leupold refers to Jer. 25 and 29 and says ^{these} we cannot possibly fit the 49 years because they are 10 yrs. or more earlier. But it seems to me he does not mention the possibility of ch. 32. In ch. 32 the Babylonian army is all around; the destruction is very immanent, and God tells Jeremiah to buy a field in Anathoth. And of course this is in Jerusalem, and Anathoth is in enemy hands. He buys this field and seals it in the documents in Jerusalem and says this is an evidence that the day is going to come when fields will be bought and sold here again. That is a word from the Lord that Jerusalem is going to be rebuilt, and ~~that+from~~ from that to Cyrus is exactly 49 years. That 49 yr. period would be just about finished when Daniel was given this picture. From that to just about now would be 49. Then there would come the interval, and then the 62.

(Student: Then there would be quite an authentication (?) to Daniel if he saw that right at that time Cyrus comes along and then that authenticates the whole 70 weeks thing starting authentication with the first 7 weeks.) I would think it would. Time is up. We will have one more hour to look at chs. 11 and 12. If anyone has any definite questions on this we could deal with in just a few minutes, you might bring them at the beginning of the next hour.

From any viewpoint we don't know what started the 62 weeks.

I'd like to begin this morning with summarizing what we looked at in Dan. 9. There has been a great deal of confusing material printed about Dan. 9. So many people get a theory which seems to fit with certain aspects and then they force everything else in to fit it, and I think it is very wise that we endeavor to see just what the facts are and then proceed to see what explanation of them as a whole fits best.

Now we have this section in Dan. 9:24-27. The first thing I think we should be very positive on is that there are three periods mentioned. Seventy weeks are determined for bringing in everlasting righteousness, and for these other purposes. And he says, Know therefore that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks shall the street be built again and after three score and two weeks shall such and such happen. Then vs. 27, And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.

You might ^{think} say that seems rather obvious that the 70 weeks is divided into three periods. But I believe that you will find that the majority of commentators make it two periods -- 69 weeks and one week. We discussed that rather fully last time. I believe that there we can be positive. Here are three periods of time. Now about these three periods there are certain questions. The first question that immediately comes is, Are these weeks of years or are they indefinite periods? We cannot dogmatically say that they have got to be weeks of years. The phrase weeks, meaning weeks of years is very rare in Scripture. The only certain case that I can think of of it is in relation to the Sabbatical year which was the seventh year. But the term week being used specifically for the week of years ending with the Sabbatical year, I don't recall any precise examples of that. It's a seven of sevens is what it literally says. There are 70 sevens. But they are certainly not days, they are certainly not seven week periods. They ^{certainly} are/not months. It would seem that if they are more or less exact periods of time they must be years. In just in speaking about the period of 70 yrs.

and he says they are 70 weeks. Unless they are actual weeks, if they are specific periods of time surely weeks of years is the only reasonable way to take it.

Now there are a number of commentators who are very scornful of that idea, but I don't know of any alternative they can offer except that they are indefinite periods. So I don't think we can be as dogmatic as we can that they are three periods rather than two in saying that they are either --- that they are weeks of years. I don't think we can. But I think we can say they are either weeks of years or they are indefinite periods. If they are indefinite periods we would rather expect something somewhat proportionate to 7, 62, and one in them. Not precise necessarily but somewhat proportionate. That is the interpretation that some take. Edward Young rather strangely insists they are indefinite periods and yet makes the last one week exactly 7 yrs., at least the first half of it is exactly 3 and 1/2, because that would correspond to the first half of Christ's earthly ministry. But then the last half of it he makes ^{from there} run to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus -- about 40 yrs. which is quite a confused way of looking at it. It would be much more logical I would think if he would do like Keil and simply say they are indefinite periods. But we certainly should try to take them as weeks of years before we give up the possibility.

The next question is, Do these three periods come in immediate succession, or are there intervals between them? Young insists they must come in immediate succession. The majority of the commentators take the first two as if they were must one period. They take it as if it said, 69 years weeks and one week. As if they were just one period. So that would mean that they take the first two as in immediate succession. Young ~~insists~~ insists there cannot be intervals. They must be continuous. But Young ~~in~~ in ch. 11 between vs. 35 and 36 jumps forward from A. Epiphanes to Antichrist -- a period of at least 2000 yrs. If you can have a big jump like that there it seems rather inconsistent to say you can't have any jump within the 70 weeks

of three different sections. As we have noticed there are various other places where there are intervals. So are they immediately successive or are they intervals? Well, may the modernist commentators try to make it 69 weeks from the time of Cyrus to the time of A. Epiphanes. If they do that it is 60 yrs. too long. So they just say the writer of Daniel did not know. He got it mixed. Of course we do not take that attitude toward the Scripture. But your evangelical interpreters, the bulk of them, take it that it runs from some period which point they try to find and they agree pretty much that it is Artaxerxes' second decree, that it runs from that up to the time of Christ. Sir Robt. Anderson tried to figure it came exactly to the date of Palm Sunday. But he figured it by figuring a new type of year that we have no evidence of anywhere, and by taking a date for the death of Christ that most scholars today believe is two years off. He insists on one period of 69 weeks which most evangelical commentators do but it is not what the text says.

This question then was, Are they in immediate succession or interval? The only way you can take them as an immediate succession is to take them as ~~indefinite~~ indefinite periods. Of course that is what Keil does. Keil says, The first is from Cyrus to Christ. That's 7 weeks. The next is from Christ to the beginning of antichrist's reign. That's 62 weeks. Then there is a week of antichrist's reign. That may be so, but if it is we have got another two or 3000 years before Christ comes back if they are anything at all proportional. I don't think many Christians are ready to accept that as a strong probability today. It does seem anyway very vague way to take it. Comparatively few do take it that way. But that of course is the way Keil takes it.

The next question is, Specifically when do these periods begin? What is says is simply that from the going forth of the word ^{word} "to restore and build Jerusalem to the Messiah - The KJV translates ~~וְיָבִיאוּ~~ as commandment, and the word can be a commandment but it does not have to be.

So that I believe that translation is too precise. *Of course it is a big problem in making translations is how precise can you make your translation?* You take a word in one language and it has a certain ^{content} ~~context~~. In another language there is no word that has that same content. It may have a word that is smaller in content. It may have a word that is larger. Which are you going to take? You cannot make an exact translation. It is impossible because words do not exactly correspond. We have to get an approximation. And a word may be a commandment, but it may simply be an announcement. It may simply be a declaration. But it does not say building of Jerusalem. It says the command to restore and build Jerusalem, or the word more literally to restore and build Jerusalem. Is this a specific command or is it simply a prediction? If it is a divine word it is in a way a command, but probably more properly a prediction. If it is a human word, it has got to be a command. There are three possibilities for it to be a divine word:

Jer. 25:11-12 - that is the prediction of the 70 years. Jeremiah says there will be 70 yrs in which Babylon will be supreme. He says, This whole land will be a desolation, a horror, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 yrs. And it will come to pass when 70 yrs. are accomplished I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation and the land of the Chaldeans. It doesn't say anything about rebuilding Jerusalem. You may think it is implied, but it is certainly not stated.

Then Jer. 29:10 again predicts the 70 yrs. "After 70 yrs. are accomplished at Babylon I will visit you and perform my good word toward you in causing you to return even to this place." That prediction was given about 15 yrs. after the previous one. This one is given just a few years before Jerusalem is destroyed. In this prediction he says that after 70 yrs they will be able to come back. So that that might be taken as a prediction of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. But you notice that it does not say anything whatever about rebuilding at all. It could be taken as the beginning of the period. Now most commentators mention these two and they don't mention

any third possibility. But personally ⁽³⁾ I think the third possibility is better. This is the possibility that was given about 7 yrs. later than that -- the declaration that Jeremiah gave when Jeremiah was in prison in the time when Jerusalem was under seige just before it was destroyed. At That time Jeremiah purchased a field and had the deed recorded there in Jerusalem. Of course that seemed like a crazy thing to do when the Babylonian army was all around Jerusalem and it looked certain that Jerusalem would be taken and destroyed and ~~the~~ the people carried off into exile then for him to buy a field on land that the Babylonians were already occupying, and register the deed there. It looked like a silly thing to do. Jeremiah said, I did this on the word of the Lord. It was the Lord's commandment that I do this in order to call the attention of the people to the fact that even though I am giving this land into the hands of the Chaldeans and they are going to destroy Jerusalem, that the time will come when houses, ^{and fields} and vineyards will be possessed again in this land. That does not specifically say Jerusalem is going to be rebuilt, but it certainly implies it strongly if the people are going to be buying and selling lands and vineyards in the area and registering the deeds in Jerusalem. While most commentators don't mention this as a possible ~~th~~ time when this going forth of the word to restore Jerusalem, it seems to me that it is the most likely of these three. If it is a human word Then there are three possibilities: (1) There is the edict of Cyrus which is given at length in Ezra 1. This edict was that the people would be allowed to go back to the land and they would be allowed to build the temple and they would be given help for building the temple, which certainly implied that they would build the city. There would be no point in a temple with nobody living there. It certainly implies they would be able to build the city. In Isaiah we have the ^{prediction} ~~prediction~~ of Cyrus where Isaiah says in 45:28 that God said of Cyrus, he is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built and to the temple, Thy

foundations shall be laid. So if it is going to be a human commandment surely it is Cyrus commandment that the people go back and rebuild the temple which implies they be allowed to rebuild Jerusalem and which has been predicted by Isaiah ~~a~~ that Cyrus would say that they could rebuild Jerusalem. Most conservative commentators do not take this as the command. They take it (2) as one of Artaxerxes' commands. These are found in Ezra 7:11 and in Neh. 2. In Ezra 7:11 we have the copy of the letter that king Artaxerxes gave to Ezra the ~~a~~ scribe. ^{In} This letter, Artaxerxes told him he could go back to Jerusalem and take with him certain things in order to make sacrifices there in the temple. But there is nothing said about an original rebuilding of Jerusalem. That had already been done 100 yrs. before under Cyrus' permission. Most conservative commentators take it as the 20th yr. of Artaxerxes - 13 yrs. after this when we find in Neh. 2 that king Artaxerxes in his 20th yr. saw that his cup-bearer Nehemiah was very sorrowful and asked him why, and he said because the sepulchre of his fathers was in such bad condition and he wanted to build up the city of Jerusalem where his ancestors were buried and so the king gave him a letter to allow him to pass through the various areas on the way, and to give him material to build the walls of the city. Most conservative commentators take this as being the commandment to rebuild the city. But actually Haggai shows that the people 100 yrs. before this had been living in ~~there~~ their good houses/ ^{in Jerusalem} They ~~a~~ just did not have walls. But in these days under the Persian empire walls were not greatly needed. They did not have walls. They were living in security there for over 100 yrs. before this time. You might say this is an off hand word to Artaxerxes to the man whom he liked (as) his cupbearer, allowing him to go back. The only reason I can see for taking this ~~is~~ as a commandment is the thought that you can get 60 yrs. up to Christ's time because certainly the city had been rebuilt over 100 yrs. before that time, even though the walls were in bad condition. So if you are going to take it as a divine word, I believe it should be Jer. 32.

If you are going to take it as a human word, I believe it has got to be Cyrus. I believe he was the human being who gave the command to rebuild the city as predicted by Isaiah and described in Ezra.

Now if you are going to take it as a human word, and so it beings with Cyrus, I don't see any way of interpreting it then other than Keil's interpretation that your first 7 weeks run for a period of over 400 yrs. up to the coming of Christ. If you are going to take it as a divine word as Jer. 32 when lands would be bought again in this region, then it is interesting that from that time to the time when Cyrus permitted its rebuilding was just about exactly 49 yrs., and he said there will be 7 weeks. So that the first period, if you are going to take them as weeks of years, it seems to me ought to start with Jer. 32. He says in Daniel's prediction that it will be seven weeks unto Messiah the Prince, and Messiah means the Anointed One . The term anointed one is regularly used in the OT of the priests who were anointed and also of the kings who were anointed. It is ~~always~~ always used of Jews except in one case, and that one case is in Isa. 44-45 where it says: Thus says the Lord to His Messiah. The English is Anointed; the Hebrew word is Meehiah, to His Messiah to Cyrus. So Cyrus certainly was called in the OT a Messiah, an Anointed One because God anointed him for a purpose. Cyrus certainly was a Prince. So "to Messiah the Prince" could be Cyrus undoubtedly. It must be one of two. It msst be Cyrus or Christ. A number of commentators insist it must be Christ because they say when you say Messiah the prince, the word Messiah implies he is a priest, and the only one who is both a priest and a prince is Christ. But Messiah does not imply he was a priest at all. It is used more ~~of~~ in the OT of kings than of priests, though it is used of both. So the phrase Messiah the Prince, can properly refer to Christ but it is used in the OT to refer to Cyrus. So either is a possible interpretation and it is just about exactly 49 yrs. from when Jeremiah gave this divine word that Jerusalem would be rebuilt until Cyrus would come.

In the prediction, Know that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be 7 weeks. Then your semicolon should be there, it is in the Hebrew. In the KJV it has a comma there and then says in three score and two weeks and then a semicolon. But your semicolon certainly should be after the seven weeks since vs. 26 starts and after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off. So our first period is seven weeks. If you take them as weeks of years, it is unto Cyrus. Then it says nothing about the beginning of the second period. It just says 62 weeks the streets shall be built again and the wall s even in troublous times, during a period of 62 weeks. What is the particular event which starts this period? We are not told. But we are told ^{nothing} ~~something~~ about the beginning of the period, but we are told about the end of the period be very specifically because it says "after 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off but not for himself." Of course to a ~~the~~ Christian reading these words in the KJV it seems obvious that when you say after 62 weeks Messiah will be cut off but not for himself, what better description of the atonement could you get than that? But then it goes on, "But the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and the end of it shall be with a flood, and until the end of the war desolations are determined." A very vivid picture of the destruction of Jerusalem - ^{between} 40 yrs. after the death of Christ provided there is an interval ~~after~~ the 62 weeks and the last week. But between the 7 weeks and the 62 weeks there is also got to be an interval if this runs to the time of Christ. So we say there is the 7 wks. period to Cyrus, 49 yrs., then there is an interval. How long we don't know. What brought the interval to an end we don't know. Nothing is said about it here. But the 62 weeks comes to the time when Messiah will be cut off but not for himself. Right there you find that all your recent commentators conservative or liberal say it is a mis-translation of the KJV, "but not for himself", that is should be "shall be cut off and have nothing." They all insist on it - "that he shall be cut

off and have nothing." Of course the modernists say this describes a high priest who was ~~moved~~ removed by Antiochus Epiphanes, who was taken away and everything was taken away from him, he was killed and had nothing left. He was cut off and had nothing. Of course Bible believing interpreters do not think this refers to Antiochus. If it refers to Christ, as most evangelical commentators think, it refers to Christ, then they think this means He will be cut off and He will be forsaken. No man will stand with Him; everyone will flee and He will have nothing. That's readingg into it certainly. But that's in all the recent evangelical commentaries I have looked at that think this is Christ. That's what they think it is. Some of them wax poetic about how alone He was and so on.

(Student: How does Isa. 53:8 fit with that?) I'll look at that in just a minute, thank you.

Then there are commentators like Leupold, I believe, who says this does not refer to the death of Christ. Keil too. Keil says the 62 weeks goes from Christ to the coming of Antichrist. So they say that the 62 weeks runs up to antichrist, and when Messiah is cut off it means that antichrist destroys all Christian testimony in the world. So he is cut off in the sense there is no Christian testimony and there is no one who claims to be a follower of Christ. He has nothing. There are a few who take it that way. As referring to the coming of antichrist. Not many.

I think that all of these are wrong. I don't think the KJV translation is incorrect here. It ~~is~~ must be said it is not a translation; it is a paraphrase. The translation would be, he will be cut off and there is to him (not there will be_ there is to him nothing. Which could be he is cut off and here's the situation. But it could just as well be he is cut off at a time when there is to him nothing; he is cut off even though there is to him nothing, or while there is to him nothing. But the question is Nothing of what? While he has nothing. It is regular Hebrew way of saying that he has is there is to him. Nothing what of what is not stated.

This interpretation, Not for himself, is found in the Theodotianic version of the LXX which is found in all our copies of the LXX, the Greek translation, what is generally thought to be the original LXX is full of mistranslations and inaccuracies and ~~at~~ was in very early days abandoned and only recently rediscovered. So our copies of the LXX contain what is considered to be Theodot. translation into Greek. In that trans. he renders it this way: "shall he be cut off but not for himself." So this ~~is~~ does not begin with the ~~K&E~~ KJV. It begins at least about 2000 yrs. ago this trans., but not for himself. It is not a translation; it is a paraphrase. You can't make an exact literal translation. He shall be cut off and there will be nothing to him. That does not make sense. But it is an Hebrew idiom. He shall be cut off and ~~there~~ there will be nothing of something or other to him. He will be without friends; without glory. Is it without associates? What is it? Montgomery whose commentary takes the Antiochian view, the view that it is Antiochus. He takes the liberal view but he is a very excellent scholar and has done very thorough research on the terminology --- on the meaning of the words and the way it is used in all the different versions, etc. -- Montgomery says Theodot. paraphrase ~~is~~ an excellent paraphrase. He thinks it ~~gg~~ gives the true sense of the passage. In other words it is not that there won't be to him any friends; not that there won't be to him any glory; not that there won't be to him any property. But that there won't be to him any guilt. That He is cut off even though He has no guilt. That is an exact picture of the atonement. Of course this paraphrase does go a little beyond that. When you say not for himself, He is cut off but the guilt for which He is cut off is not His but that of others -- now that goes ~~at~~ a little beyond what the original says, but the original does say He is cut off though not deserving it, having no guilt. If you understand the word guilt as what is understood, and something must be understood. Rather than glory or supporters, or one of these other

interpretations that recent commentators suggest. So I believe that Montgomery has put his finger on a very real thing there that the idea here is correct and that it is an excellent presentation of the atonement of Christ.

(Student: Is Montgomery generally a good commentary for Daniel?)

Montgomery is a commentary that if you want precise examination of what has been said by the ancient interpreters and what the words ^{mean} ~~mean~~ how they have been interpreted, how the ancient translations were and all that sort of thing, ~~is~~ is a very technical commentary and from that viewpoint it is very excellent. But he takes the viewpoint that Daniel is not a genuine book, that it was written in the time of Antiochus E. and pretends to be predictive and so he tries to fit things into the interp. that it all refers to A. Epiphanes. So for general ideas I would say that any of the recent ^{commentators} commentaries would be far more useful. But for precise study of precise facts he is excellent, and the fact that one whose whole prejudice is toward the view that takes it unauthentic and would not think of it having any relation to Christ, thinks this is what the words actually mean, I think is an even stronger argument for it than somewhat who wants to make it refer to Christ. But for a general commentary I would recommend one of the two latest commentators -- Walvoord about 4 yrs. ago got out a very good commentary on Daniel, and Wood of Grand Rapids just last year got out a very good commentary. And they both on the whole are very excellent commentators. About 20 to 30 yrs. ago Leupold and Young both got out commentaries, both of which have got a lot of excellent material in them particularly in answering the critical problems, but ~~when~~ ^{particularly} which when it comes to/future prophecies both of them have some rather wild interpretations.

It seems to me then that this "after the 62 years shall Messiah be cut off" but have no personal guilt for which he deserves to be cut off, which I think is well translated but not for himself. Add as I mentioned last week in Isa. 53 we have a vs. which is a pretty close parallel to this

expression where we read that Jesus was killed but that He had no guilt that would == for which He deserved to die. Vs. 8 He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was He stricked. Maybe Theodot. had that vs. in mind when he trans. "but not for himself." It certainly is a very close parallel. to the last half of Isa. 53:8.

If you have your first and second periods, and you have these exact point, the word of the Lord through Jeremiah, the coming of Cyrus who can be called the anointed one, a prince, then an interval, then a period of 62 weeks ending with the death of Christ which is followed by the destruction of the city and the sanctuary then you have another interval of indeterminate length, and that interval == and at the end of that interval you have one week, the period in which antichrist is active. That would be what is described in vs. 27. Young in his commentary insists that vs. 27 must be about the first coming of Christ. "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week" in some way means that ~~Christ~~ Christ establishes His covenant with His people. I don't know how he fits it in. I mean I can't see much reason for it, how he can fit that into what Christ did. Then in the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease, he says means that after 3 and 1/2 yrs. of ministry Christ by His death brought an end to any reality to the Jewish sabbath, but it is not true that he made them to cease by his death because they continued for 40 yrs. after His death. So it seems to me he is twisting the language pretty strongly to make this be a prediction of the death of Christ. Vs. 27 most commentators, regardless of viewpoint, take as a description of antichrist. Young is so anxious it can't have anything to do with antichrist and that it must be related to Christ -- he is so anxious for that, he you would think he did not believe in antichrist. Yet he insists that Dan. 11:36-45 is all about antichrist. If you have got all that about antichrist there, why be so anxious to prove that antichrist can't be here? It seems very illogical.

Well, so much for a review of Dan. 9. Now we have looked in considerable detail at Dan. 11 and seen these predictions from vs. 2 up to vs. 35 which were so amazingly fulfilled. It seems to me that is one of the great things of the study of the book of Daniel -- to see the many prophecies in it which have been so amazingly fulfilled which no human intelligence could certainly have predicted ~~before~~ these four kingdoms with as much --- extending over a period of 300 to 1000 yrs. after Daniel's time, and giving so much detail about them as Daniel did. No human intelligence could have described the events two or three hundred yrs. after his time as in the beginning of ch. 11, and then gone into such detail about the Seleucid rulers and the rulers of Egypt as is given in vs. 5 of ch. 11 on up until of vs. 20 -- precise detail about so many rulers of that area, and their relation with the rulers of Egypt. Then vs. ~~31~~ 21-35 so much specific detail about A. Epiphānes which exactly fits with the history. Boutflower who is quite conservative in his general interpretation says all this must be an interpolation because the Bible never predicts so many historical political events in detail. Of course we don't believe that. Christ set his seal upon the OT as being God's Word. There have been cases where there have been small errors that have come in the course of copying or recopying, but that a whole passage anywhere like this has been interpolated, we certainly cannot believe in view of Christ's attitude toward the OT. So if we take it as genuine we have most remarkable predictions in ch. 2, in ch. 5, 7, 8, 11 that were fulfilled precisely. and of course in ch. 9 the 49 yrs. up to Cyrus. Predictions that were fulfilled precisely in historical political events, and it is a great evidence for the authenticity of the Word of God that God spoke through these writers, and that there are these many wonderful predictions of events exactly that historical documents show us to have occurred exactly as Daniel predicted they were.

Then in 11:35 we have that sudden jump forward to vs. 36 which must be an interval of at least 2000 yrs. as the prophet looks forward to certain

events and then his eye skips over the large valley in between and sees the events further on about antichrist. I don't think that anything is gained by saying that Antiochus is a type of antichrist, or such terminology. I think that just confuses ideas. But I think that he looked at one thing, and then he looks beyond it at the other thing. The interval in between the two. We have many of these intervals in the Book of Daniel, as we have in all prophecies. A prophet never sees everything that's going to happen. He'd need a few encyclopedias rather than a book of this size to describe everything. And he does not & try to give precise details on everything. But whatever he says is true through there are many things that he does not go into. Many things that he lumps together as when the prophet said that Alexander's kingdom, one great horn was broken into four and we find that what happened historically was that there was 40 yrs. of fighting back and forth trying to hold the whole kingdom together, and then eventually there were three large kingdoms, but there were several small sections that gained their independence. So instead of saying three big ones and a number of small ones, it simply said four which is a general way of stating the situation exactly what happened. We do not look for full details of history, either past or future in prophecy. We look for statements that will be true and -- but not giving all the detail which is impossible in a book of this size. So we have the account of antichrist which I believe none of us will see because I don't see any way to interpret the Scripture except that the rapture of the church will occur before antichrist is revealed. In fact Thess. says "then shall that wicked one be revealed." I believe that is after the departure of the church. It is interesting to think about the things that are going to happen after true believers are gone. It's interesting, but I don't think we can expect to understand it in full detail. I believe these passages about antichrist will be a great blessing and help to those who come to believe on Christ after the rapture .and perhaps the Jews also who believe on Christ at that time, and perhaps are lead to Christ through reading them

So they have a special significance for that time and we can't expect to understand all their details. But we have this long account of antichrist from vs. 36-45, and we don't have any detail about how it finishes. It simply says, He ~~will~~ shall plant the tabernacle of the palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him. A very brief statement of the destruction of antichrist - events which may run over quite a period of time which may be tremendously detailed and tremendously thrilling, ^{if you are there} /but is just summarized in the words "he shall come to his end". Then vs. 12 summarizes that period: it is a time of great distress. Then in vs. 2 we have the resurrection.

"And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. Some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." We notice they are divided into two groups. I was greatly disturbed when I attended Dr. Machen's ~~funeral~~ funeral and the man who conducted == who prayed at the grave was very much against the view that the saints who die Christ are raised at the ^{beginning} ~~beginning~~ of the Millennium, and the ungodly dead at the end, which seems to me the only possible way of interpreting Revelation. But he was very much opposed to it, so in the prayer at Dr. Machen's grave he prayed that at the general resurrection == that we look forward to the general resurrection when he will be raised up again. Of course we believe he will be raised up in the resurrection of the just, in the resurrection of those who are justified through Christ. But the Scripture never speaks anywhere about any general resurrection. It says "as many will awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." It does not say these two will happen at the same time. It does not bring out the fact that they are to be at different times, but it does speak of them separately. Christ did also when he said the time is coming when they will hear his voice. He speaks of their being raised from the dead, of the two groups. It is always ~~an~~ always a distinction made of them, but you can't expect that every time it is done all the details will be given, and it will

be explained that some will be at this period and some that. Someone might have said of the father of John Adams that two of his descendants would be presidents of the USA, and one would be -- save the country from destruction through his activities as an ambassador to Great Britain. Well of course all three of these descendants of John Adams were ambassadors -- I mean of John Adam's father were ambassadors to Great Britain at one time or another, but they were different times. And the son and grandsons who were presidents of the USA, there were several presidents in between, and of course the son of John Quincy Adams who was ambassador to Great Britain during the Civil War and prevented England from intervening and dividing this country into two parts, he was a good many years after his father had been president. But in a statement like that you don't give all the details. What you say is true as far as it goes. So the attempt to say that there cannot be two resurrections because the two are spoken of together, is simply reading into Scripture.

Similarly there are those who say that the kingdom established in ch. 2 and ch. 7 the kingdom that the saints establish cannot be the millennium because this is an everlasting kingdom which cannot be destroyed. Therefore they say it cannot be the millennium which only lasted 1000 yrs. But that statement which I find in a number of commentators rests upon a ~~misunderstanding~~ misunderstanding of what the Scriptural teaching about the millennium is. Because Scripture teaches that at the end of the millennium there will be an uprising but this ~~is~~ uprising will be put ~~down~~ down; the kingdom will not be destroyed. Then Christ will turn over the kingdom to the Father that God may be all in all. But that is not a destruction of the kingdom in any sense. The kingdom continues perhaps under some other form, perhaps there are changes in the situation, but it is the saints which continue forever. So that argument which Young makes is a not a valid argument against the millennium, though the millennium is not specifically taught in Daniel, but it is ~~is~~ ^{certainly} not denied in Daniel. Now this great prophecy that begins with Dan. 11:2 and runs into ch. 12, really the ~~is~~ ^{is}.

11
 chapter/should have included the first few verses of ch. 12. We find after the statement about the resurrection, we find in vs. 4th Thou O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased. Some have said here are signs of the latter days -- great increase in travel and great increase in knowledge. I believe Sir Isaac Newton, one of the greatest minds in all history, one of the real founders of modern science, who wrote a commentary on Daniel, he took it ~~as~~ that way. It was Voltaire who was a great admirer of Newton as a great scientist said that the foolishness that Newton would write in a commentary on Daniel shows how even a great mind when he turns to studying the Bible can get into nonsense. Because Newton said, on the strength of this verse probably the time would come when people would be able to travel as fast as 60 mph. Voltaire said, What utter ~~is~~ nonsense; of course nobody could draw their breath if they ~~tr~~ travelled as fast as 60 mph, to think of a great mind being so perverted by reading the Bible as to make such a ^{foolish} ~~foolish~~ prediction. Of course we know now that Voltaire was utterly wrong and Newton was completely right in what would happen, but I don't think he properly drew it from this verse because I don't think this vs. is referring to increase of knowledge in general, and I don't think it is referring to people travelling though they both did take place. I believe what it is saying is Shut up the words and seal the books even to the time of the end, that means for a long period -- to the time of the coming of the things predicted. It does not say what it is the end of. You can have the end of the semester, ^{of the} ~~of the~~ year, of the century, you can have all sorts of endings. To try to make "end" a specific term referring to a particular exact time whenever end is used, is simply reading into Scriptures. But he says there will be much in this that people will not understand. "Seal the book" so that it will be preserved, kept carefully, but don't expect people will ~~nd~~ understand all of it, until the

time when these things are taking place. Then he says, this word run to and fro is really more hunt to and fro. It is not just aimless going but it is going with an objecting of seeking something. It can be used of a person travelling about looking for something, or it can be used of -- if his fingers are doing the travelling through the book, doing the searching. Many think that that is the correct interpretation in the light of the context of the verse, that it means that many will hunt through this book and other books of the Scripture and in the time to which these things refer will gain very important ideas from them that will not be clear to people before you have the situation in general established. I think that is a very reasonable interp. of the verse, that Daniel is ^{told we are} giving you in this prophecy some great predictions of what is going to happen in the next few years, or in the next few centuries. People are going to be able to see that these things have been fulfilled, and it will be a wonderful evidence that God's word is true and dependable. We are giving you assurance that through the difficulties of A. Epiphanes' time God will deliver His people, and that Christ will come and be cut off but not for himself, and God will give the answer to the problem of sin there. And that when Antichrist comes and those terrible things come that God is going to give deliverance ~~from it~~ out of it and through it, and that he will come to his end and none shall help him. He is giving these things that anyone can see but that in each particular period, those who study Daniel and the other prophets will find in them real blessing in matters they had not previously understood when the ~~matter~~ situation was not clearly before them. So it seems to me that is the main thought of this vs. whether that many will investigate back and forth whether that investigation is just done in this book, or in the whole Scripture, of in general research and increase of knowledge. I don't think it is giving increase of knowledge as a sign of the latter days, but is referring specifically to the increase of ~~the~~ knowledge of the meaning of these prophecies.

Then that should really be an end here of this section of the book. A chapter should end at vs. 4 because vs. 5 says, I Daniel looked -- then Daniel saw someone whom he asked certain questions referring to matters earlier in the book and the answers which are given to him are ^{ans. that are} not very clear for us to understand. From vs. 5 to vs. 12 there have been various interpretations. Some have tried to apply them to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It may be that there is that here that exactly fits that time and was a blessing to people then, though we don't now have the data to see how it was. Like some try to make it that the period ~~was~~ which it gives of = = = It says in vs. 11, From the time the daily sacrifice is taken away and the abomination ~~o~~ that maketh desolate set up, there shall be 1290 days. Some try to make it that that is the time from after Antiochus stopped the sacrifices in Jerusalem and put up the altar to Jupiter in the temple, that from that time it was 1290 days until Antiochus died. Whether that is what this means, I don't know. They try to show that that would fit rather well with that length of time. It would seem to me that if he is going to give an exact number of days, it would be better to give the days until the sacrifice started again which was about a year after Antiochus' death. So I'm not sure whether that is it or not.

But then vs. 12 says, Blessed is he that waits and comes to the 1335 days. You notice that from 1290 that is 45 days longer. Some say it took 45 days for word of Antiochus' death in Persia to get back to Palestine. But there is no evidence of it. If we lived in that day we could have seen this was exactly fulfilled and that it was helpful to us, or we could say ^{would} it did not have relevance to our time. ^{that} Maybe it refers to the time of Antichrist. Maybe at that time it will be possible for people to see exactly what it means, and it will be a blessing to them. But I think for us today, I think any interpretation of those particular figures is purely a matter of guess today. I don't think we have the data today to know what

they mean. I've been trying in this course to take the attitude toward Daniel of being careful not to read anything in anywhere. No to go to it with a preconceived scheme. Not to try to force anything, but to see what the possible interpretations are, and what there is we can stand on as certain and what the possibilities are. Thus I say there is a possibility that these are three indefinite periods, but it does not seem to me extremely likely. There is the possibility that the periods of the 70 yrs. are periods of pretty close to this number of 7 yr. periods, and that seems to me extremely likely. But I think we can be definite that it refers to three periods, not two. I think we can be pretty definite that there are intervals between these.

I guess our time is up. Next Friday is the exam. It is only a one hour course so it won't be a long exam. We will deal with these matters we have dealt with in class.