

In this class we are going to take up the study of a book which is perhaps one of the best known and one of the least known in Scripture. The first half of it is known to almost anyone who has attended a Sunday School. Those six chs.--the first half of Daniel--contain incidents and experiences that have been a blessing to Jews and Christians all through the ages. There is much in them that is of great value to study at length.

However we're going to pass over them rather quickly and deal with the last half of the book most of the time. This last half of the book is comparatively little known among Christians. Yet is surely is a very important part of Scripture. Our text-book for this class is the Bible. Now of course this is the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible, but in this course we do not have any pre-requisites. I will not give any assignments from the Hebrew Bible in this course. But those of you who already know Hebrew I hope will follow along in your Hebrew Bible.

I would like you all to constantly have before you the English Bible. I don't care what version of it you use. I myself will use the NIV, but I will correct it at times in order to get a more accurate rendering of the original. Some problems may be raised by it and we may want to go into them. I hope many of you will be using other versions because I would like to have you notice if the rendering is different from what we present here. They may raise problems or questions that you would like to mention. In such a case I would be glad to have you call them to our attention.

However it is not possible to have much discussion in a class of this size. That's obvious. But I would like to have you if I ever make a misstatement(which anyone speaking for an hour is bound to make at least one or two and most of them are not important) but I may say Amos when I mean Daniel or something like that. If it's perfectly obvious don't bother, but if I make a misstatement that would clearly be confusing I wish you would immediately put up your hand and help me correct it immediately. If something I say isn't clear I wish you would ask me to clarify it.

I would like you to be thinking about matters we discuss and matters might come to your mind that would be worth our discussing at some length, but we can't use up the class for that. I wish then you would write out the question that occurs to you Write it out and get it to me--any question that occurs to you in connection with our investigation of Daniel. Or any point where you think I have expressed something that I've not given sufficient justification for. I wish you'd write out a statement, sign it with your name and put it in the box that has my name on it out here in the hall. The post box at the right on top that has my name on it. If you'll put a note in there then I'll consider whether it would be something that would be good for us to take time in class to go into, whether it is something incidental and something I would take care of anyway in a week or two, or it may be something about

I would want to see you personally, and speak to you about. I wish you would do that.

As I said our text is the Bible and in connection with the assignment for study if there are points on which there are particular questions that occur to you be sure and get them to me. I've not assigned in this class study in other books on the Bible. But if questions occur that you would like to look into, for checking encyclopedias, Bible dictionaries, commentaries, etc. I would be glad to have you do it. But do it after you do the assignments. Do the assignments directly from the Scripture. Then after the assignments if you want to check further, that's fine. Then you might add on your assignment something about that, but in that case please tell me what source you used.

I do not give assignments in this class that will be graded. I simply grade you on whether you do it or not, but the assignments are not for purposes of checking your knowledge. They are for the purpose of stimulating your interest on preparing for matters we will discuss in class. So most every week I'll give an assignment which will be due by Friday of that week. Please put these in the box right under the one that has my name on it. Get that in before the next Friday.

The first assignment I'll give you deals with the division of chapters. You don't need to take it down now because it will be posted on the bulletin board (two copies). Let me just say this about the assignment. The arrangement of the book into chs. I hope you all know that the divisions into chs. were not in the original text. In fact we don't have them until the 13th cent. A.D. It is generally believed they were put into the Latin Bible by an English Archbishop. He marked them in his Latin Bible where he thought it would be good to make a ch. division. Then these were taken over from the English Bible into the Hebrew Bible, by the Jews. Although in about one case in ten they changed it a little to make it start in a different place.

So the Archbishop sometimes made a very good division and sometimes a very poor division. In most cases the divisions I think are quite obvious. But there are one or two cases where they are not obvious and the assignment will be to just skim through the whole book. Just skim over it. You don't need to read much of it for purposes of it. Maybe only a heading will be enough. But if you look at the last 2 or 3 vv. of the one ch. and the next 2 or 3 vv. of the next ch., that will give you a clue as to whether the ch. division is in the right place. I'd like you to look at them and indicate in connection with each one whether you think it is in the right place or not.

As I mentioned the book of Daniel divides naturally into two parts. The first part is principally narrative. The second part is principally prophecy. That is, the second part consists mostly of visions God gave to Daniel.

We call the whole book the prophecy of Daniel. He was a prophet and whatever a prophet spoke for God can properly be called prophecy. Prophecy is a Greek word that means speak for or on behalf of. A prophet is one who speaks for God. In our modern English we use prophecy to mean a prediction of the future. In giving the title of this course I used it in the modern English sense, that is we are not going to look at the whole prophecy of Daniel in detail. That is the whole book. Because it all is God's Word. It all is prophecy. But we are going to look at those sections of it in which Daniel looks forward to some future events.

Prediction is a part--an important part, but by no means all of prophecy, and in modern English the word prophecy has come simply to mean prediction. We are interested now mainly in the predictions we find in the book of Daniel. There are probably more great predictions of the future in the book of Daniel than in any passage of similar length anywhere else in the Bible. (How about the book of Revelation?)

Daniel begins with a statement that tells us when the events occur. Dan. 1:1 says "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiada king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came to Jerusalem That was 605 B.C. as we know now. I heard someone say once that he had heard of an archaeologist who discovered an ancient coin and they discovered the date on the coin was 605 B.C. That story is apocryphal. Actually nobody ever makes a B.C. date before Christ. But neither was A.D. used until about 500 yrs. after Christ. Then in the 5th cent. A.D. somebody tried to figure back to the time of Christ, and we started the system of dating we have now.

So we figure from the various systems we have and various records of different kinds just how much earlier an event occurred. There are some dates of which we are not at all sure as to the exact date. But scholars are pretty well agreed on this date of 605 B.C. as the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, when Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem. The book of Daniel begins with Nebuchadnezzar taking off a certain number of people from Jerusalem off to Babylon, tho Jerusalem still continued to have its independence for a few years longer after that, in fact, up until 586 B.C., or 587 it is usually said when Nebuchadnezzar came and besieged the city again and destroyed it.

But in 605 he took some of the brightest young men from there, carried them off to Babylon in order to employ them in his court. One of these was Daniel. The first ch. of Daniel tells a story I believe most Christians have heard in Sunday School--the story of how Daniel refused to partake of the food that had been offered to idols, and how God took care of him and did not make him suffer for being loyal, but instead promoted him.

The first thing that might be considered a prediction is in 1:11 where they had told Daniel and his associates that they should eat the royal food and wine, and Daniel asked them to let them not eat it, but eat simple food. The official said, I'll be in

great trouble if you don't help after I've taken care of you for a while, and the other young men. Daniel answered (v.12) Please test your servant for 10 days and give us nothing but vegetables to eat and water to drink. Then compare our appearance with that of the young men who eat the royal food and treat your servants according to what you see.

You know how God blessed Daniel and caused that they should be fine as any in human knowledge and understanding. They were promoted in the king's service. Someone might think Daniel made a prediction. "You let us eat this food and you will see that we look better." I don't think it is a prediction. It is a hope. Daniel hoped God would enable them, in spite of the fact they did not get the rich food the others got, God would enable them to come through it in excellent condition. It was a hope. I think there's a lesson for us in that. We may have to if we stand for God and do what is right, God will bless, but he won't necessarily bless us immediately. We may have to suffer for being true to the Lord. God wants us to be willing to suffer, willing to take whatever comes, for being true to Him.

I think Daniel was here that they would lose their loose their opportunity, but they were not willing to go back on what they considered was God's will for them. But it could possibly be the other way interpreted, but I think wrongly. We have another very similar case a little later, in the book.

When we come to ch. 2 there we have a long passage of prediction. It's a passage that's well known among Christians to some extent. But there are many points in it that are not very well understood. There are some points on which we're not absolutely sure, exactly what is meant. Incidentally one point I want to stress in this class, it is very vital for us in studying the Scripture to go to a passage and see what the passage says and be careful not to read into it.

Someone was saying the other day that there are many denominations that wrongly oppose each other on various points, and yet claim to be absolutely true to the Bible and to take the Bible as their final source. They said, This proves you can't be sure what the Bible means. There's such a difference between people. Now I don't believe it works that way. I think the reason we have differences is one of two. We may read into the Bible the answer to some question that God didn't intend to give us the answer to. Because there are many many things we don't know in this life.

Some heard me refer to it already --the ad I saw on TV that if you took all the knowledge it took to create a human being, all the knowledge it would take for one individual and of every part of his system, how it works, etc. it would take 1000 books to contain it. Yet all of this is contained in a small cell so small that 1000 of them could stand on the point of a needle. It is a marvel--the tremendous intricacy of the human body!

And the tremendous intricacy of this world God has made. All our scientists have learned is but a tiny fraction of what God knows about the creation he has made. So when we go to the Bible and find facts about God, His plans and purposes we cannot expect that we will be given a full knowledge of them. There are bound to be many matters on which we there will be a great deal that simply isn't stated. He hasn't gone into it. And when we go to it and assume that it has the answer to a question that isn't answered and we read into it things that are not there, I believe that a great part of the disagreements among truly earnest Christians comes from people going to the Scripture with an idea for which they look for a proof text to support.

They look for evidence to fit with it. It may be a true idea contained somewhere else in Scripture, but is it contained in the particular passage you are looking at? It is all too easy to read our preconceived ideas into a passage! So I'm interested in Daniel-- in fact in all my study of Scripture--I am greatly interested in seeing just what is there, and not to read into it something that isn't there but to get out of it as much as is there as I possible can.

So in this second ch. we have a view of God's plan for the world looking ahead for a thousand years. We have a tremendous view of the future. Naturally you can't tell everything about it in one ch. So it's very easy to read into it things that are not there, but there is a great deal there that is not always seen. I think it's important to get a clear understanding of this ch. which is sort of the basis of the sixth ch. of the prophecy that we have in the latter part of the book.

This ch. begins with Nebuchadnezzar having a dream. His mind was troubled, and he summoned his magicians and astronomers to tell him what he had dreamed. When they came in the king said, I have a dream that trouble me and I want to know what it means. The astrologers answered the king in Aramaic (v.4). KJV says in Syriac. But the Heb. word used there is Aramaic. Syriac is not usually used any more to mean Aramaic because a particular dialect of the Aramaic language was Syriac but that's not the dialect that is used here. So the word Aramaic is more correct. I believe all your recent translations used the word Aramaic.

The strange thing is that the astrologers answered the king in Aramaic, and it gives the words they said in Aramaic and it continues using Aramaic all through the rest of the ch., and in fact clear to the end of ch. 7. Thus we have Daniel divided in one way into the first half--six chapters in narrative, and the last half six chs. of prophecy. But in another way it's divided into the first ch. and the first three vv. of the second in Heb. and chs. 8-12 are Hebrew, but the second in between (which is just about half the book) is in Aramaic.

Attempts have been made to explain it (saying) that certain parts of it were meant to deal more with the Gentile nations and a certain amount with the Jews and that's why part is in Aramaic and part is in Hebrew. Various theories are made and I don't think any of them can be proven to be true.

I think it's just a fact of the particular way God gave the books to us. I studied with a great OT ~~scholar~~ scholar a great ideal--Robert Dick Wilson, a great defender of the faith and one who has done as much as many men in history to show the intent(?) of this particular book. One time I was going over some letters that had passed between Dr. Wilson and the Professor under whom he had studied in Germany, as a young man. They two became very attached to each other, and they kept up a long correspondence.

Of course in classes in Germany they had all talked German. This professor under whom he studied there and whom I had also visited once when I studied there --naturally his native language was German. But he was a man of very great knowledge and well acquainted with English. So either one of them would start writing in either English or German--say in English, and after about a page he would switch to German, and he'd go on in German for a ways and then he'd go to English. He went back and forth.

I used to notice when I was in the university in Germany how I was trying to take notes as fast as I could. To take down the whole sentence the professor gave in German, especially when I was in my first year and did not know the language quite as well as I did later, was very difficult. So I'd write down the gist of it in English very fast. But when I'd come to a particular word in German that I knew exactly what it meant but could not think quickly of an equivalent for it in English, I'd just write down the German word! So my notes were a mixture of English and German. All mixed together.

The way that Dr. Wilson and Dr. Stackhouse's letters switched from one language to another is what I think happened in the book of Daniel. Daniel was thoroughly familiar with the Hebrew lang. and also with the Aramaic and when he said what they said in Aramaic he simply went into Aramaic, and it was Aramaic from there on to the end of ch. 7. Then it comes back to Heb. again.

The Aramaic lang. is a lang. that is closely related to Heb. perhaps about as closely related as Spanish and Portugees are to each other. Much more closely related than for instance English and German. Yet there are some very vital differences. between them. I doubt if any of you will be able to follow the Aramaic though there is enough similarity that you may be able to recognize them at various points. Many of the words are the same.

Here it switches to Aramaic and tells what the astrologers answered the King of Babylon. Incidentally the Babylonians wrote all their inscriptions, their historical documents, their great literary works, in a language I like to call the Babylonian because people know what I'm talking about. Most scholars of that particular subject now prefer to call it Akkadian because it was spoken in a city called Akkad before(?) B. ylon was founded. But nobody outside of that particular field of studies ever hears of Akkadian while Babylon is known to everybody, and this was the language that the Babylonians used.

It is interesting that they spoke in Aramaic. We now have many thousands of clay tablets from ancient Babylon and in these clay tablets which are written in cuneiform writing--cuneiform means wedge-shaped. They are made with marks that are made by pressing a stylus in and making this wedge shaped figure. There are 300 characters that are commonly used in the Babylonian system of writings. The language has quite a bit of similarity to Hebrew though much more difficult than Aramaic.

From the time of Nebuchadnezzar it's interesting that we have these important contracts, and business documents written in the Babylonian language and you'll often have writings next to it or along with it you will have a title written in Aramaic which shows us that while Babylonian continues to be the formal language, it had largely in Nebuchadnezzar's court been displaced by the Aramaic language.

It's sort of like if you went into a class in theology 150 years ago anywhere in the U.S. and almost anywhere in the world all your textbooks would be in Latin, because Latin was the language used for most scholarship at that time. But the people of course spoke their own modern language whatever they were, and just used Latin for study purposes. That is the way it had come to be to quite an extent by the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

I don't know whether anybody would know this fact 400 yrs. after the time of Daniel. The higher critics hold unanimously that Daniel didn't write the book of Daniel, and that it wasn't written until 400 years later. I would question very seriously whether the people 400 years later would have realized that as Nebuchadnezzar and his court would speak Aramaic rather than the actual Babylonian language(? not clear?)

It goes into the Aramaic and tells how the king asked them to tell what his dream was. They said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will interpret it. The king answered and (I'd like to read that next v. from the KJV) verse 8 of ch. 2 there is a statement that could easily be misunderstood. "The king answered and said I know of a certainty that you would gain the time because you see that the thing is gone from me." It sounds as if the king had forgotten his dream and he wants them to tell him what the dream is, and then give the interpretation.

I think that gives us an entirely false idea of what happened. The NIV says, "I am certain you are trying to gain time because you realize that I have firmly decided." That last part of the v. I'd call a paraphrase rather than a translation. It's almost necessary to use a paraphrase to get the idea across. The KJV's "the thing is gone from me" what does that mean? I know when I was a boy and read it I thought it meant, "I've forgotten the dream." and now you tell me what the dream is and interpret it. You could interpret it "the thing is gone from me" as meaning the "order (that you must tell me the dream) has gone from me--tell me the dream as well as the interpretation. We now know that is what the Aramaic actually means. "The thing is firm from me." The word means "firm." It's a rare word. We have further evidence of this meaning.

It means "this is my decision" not that I have forgotten the dream. Why did the king ask them to tell him what his dream was? Isn't that an absurd thing to do? Why ask to tell you the dream you had? It seems absurd but I think with a little thought we can understand what it really meant.

People in those days had great faith in dreams. They often thought a dream told them of something that would happen. There are many in our day who have that idea. I will not say it's impossible that some evil spirit, or perhaps even a good spirit, might give you a dream that will tell you about the future. It is said that Abraham Lincoln before ~~hearing the news~~ hearing the news of each of the great decisive battles of the Civil War had a certain dream. His dream was that a ship was going along in the water. He told how he dreamed. One morning he said, Last night I had that same dream again, and I saw that ship but this time it came into harbor. It went up to the dock. He said, I wonder if that means we'll get word from Sherman that actually the war is over.

That didn't happen for some six weeks later. But what happened then was that Lincoln was shot that night so it was not quite the end of the war but it was the end of his life! I don't know whether that story is true or not. But I've read it. But belief that dreams could give you some important ideas of the future was very common. We know that in the Bible that the Lord constantly spoke to the people in dreams. We know that God has done that at various times. Yet the Bible has warnings against putting too much faith in dreams.

I think when one of us has a dream it is more likely the result of something we ate than anything prophetic. But the Babylonians were very much attached to thinking they could find the means of learning something about the future. One of their customs was to kill an animal and examine its liver. They would see what the condition of the animal's liver was and then they would see what happened--whether they won or lost a battle, and they would keep record of these things. When they would ask the priest to kill an animal, compare the liver with other previous livers and tell us what it says about the future.

Well, Nebuchadnezzar I can well imagine had often had dreams about which he asked these astrologers to explain to him what they meant. The astrologers pretty soon got the habit of making up something they thought would please the king. If they happened to hit upon something that actually happened eventually they'd get a reward. When it didn't happen Nebuchadnezzar began to catch on they were just making up these dreams (interpretations). So in this case Nebuchadnezzar decided, If these astrologers really know what they claim to know, they will be able to tell me what the dream means after I tell them what the dream was, but actually to tell me the dream. So Nebuchadnezzar asked them to ~~interpret~~ interpret his dream, but the astrologers said, Nobody can do that. That's impossible. The king said, I'm certain you're just trying to gain time. You've conspired to tell me wicked, misleading things hoping the situation will change. Tell me the dream and I'll know you can interpret it for me. He must have been pretty ~~disgusted~~ disgusted with the previous times when they had misled him

So he said he was going to kill all these astrologers, these so-called wise men. And of course Daniel was considered one of the wise men now in the land. The order was given to kill all of them. That included Daniel too. So Daniel (v.12) asked his friends to pray that God would reveal it to him, and in the last part of the ch. we have how Daniel told the king what his dream was and Daniel explained to him what it meant.

The dream was the picture of a large statue. This statue which Nebuchadnezzar saw in front of him would not tell you anything. Without the interpretation Daniel gave you would have no idea of what the statue might mean. Some elements of this prophecy and also of some later ones in the book, fit so exactly with the history of the next few centuries after Daniel wrote, that the critics unanimously say the whole thing must have been written after these events happened.

Dr. Wilson used to say the book of Daniel is perhaps the hardest in the Bible to defend against the attack of the critics. Because, he said, it's the hardest from the viewpoint of philology, and from the viewpoint of history, and from the viewpoint of prophecy. He spent a great part of his life studying into it. But this theory which is unanimously held by destructive critics today was advanced as early as the 2nd cent. A.D. St. Jerome in his commentary on Daniel has as his specific purpose to refute this idea that Porphyry, a great enemy of Christianity, was advancing, that the book of Daniel was written 400 years after Daniel's time. Because the book describes so exactly many things that happened during those 400 years. Therefore it must have been written after that time, said he said.

The trouble is then these things that they tell us are going to happen at the end of the age, they said those did not fit with the history at the end of the 400 years, so they said, those were just the guesses of the writer, the man who wrote the book 400 yrs. after the time of Nebuchadnezzar! There ore it was not any genuine prophecy from God. Jerome answered that and Porphyry's views were pretty well forgotten until within the last 200 years. But now there have been many very learned books written holding that view, and even some fine Christian expositors have adopted that view of the book of Daniel.

We could take months going into the evidence back and forth on this. I think Daniel will stand every test that is given it. There is much detail. But that's not our purpose in this course. We will look at certain points where the critics say it fits the history of the 400 years, and yet certain things they say refer to that time just don't fit with it. They say then, the author just didn't know those particular facts! But we see in those particular places he was looking beyond that time and it can fit with things that happened later than that.

The great prophecy of this second ch. is probably well known to most who have been to Sunday School. The thing Daniel saw. The statue Nebuchadnezzar saw told certain things that are repeated

and amplified later in the book. In order to understand the latter remarks, one really needs to have this second ch. well in mind. You cannot say the book is half history and half prophecy because one of its greatest prophetic sections is right here in the first half, in ch. 2. But the last 6 chs. are mostly about Daniel's ~~own~~ own vision. This is a vision by King Nebuchadnezzar that Daniel explains.

Daniel told him how he saw a great statue, and the statue stood in front of him, and (v.32) "the head of the statue was made of pure gold, its chest and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron and its feet partly of iron and partly of baked clay." "While you were watching a rock was cut out but not by human hands. It struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed it." Then they were all broken up and the wind blew it away. When he finished that Daniel interpreted it (v.37) and said to Nebuchadnezzar, "You Oh King are the king of kings, the God of heaven has given you dominion, and power and might . . . in your hands has he placed mankind and the beasts of the fields and the birds of the air. . . You are the head of gold." Nebuchadnezzar must have felt pretty good! He must have thought there's a real interpreter!

But he goes on and says, "After you another kingdom will arise inferior to yours, next . . . one of bronze . . . Finally there will be a fourth kingdom strong as iron . . . and as iron breaks things to pieces so it will crush and break all the others." So here was a dream that Nebuchadnezzar saw. Now if you just had the account of the dream what could you learn about the future from it? You would have no reason to say, "These 4 parts represent 4 kingdoms, one after the other." You would have no reason to say that except that God enabled Daniel to interpret it.

Daniel said, "It stands for 4 kingdoms. You're the head of gold, and after you come these other three. If Daniel hadn't explained that, for all we know it might have started at the bottom and gone up. Nebuchadnezzar might have represented the feet and the others subsequent things. But Daniel explained that it represents four separate kingdoms that were going to come. In history we have the Babylonian kingdom, then they were conquered by the Persian kingdom who for 200 years had one of the strongest regimes in all the world's history. Then Alexander the Great conquered the Persian empire, and established a situation in which the Greeks were in control which lasted for about 300 years. Then at the end of that time the Romans took over. They exactly fitted the description of the fourth kingdom--strong as iron, for iron breaks and smashes everything. We find that no nation at that time was able to stand before Rome. They took over a much larger area than any of the ones before it had."

Now you look at this and you wonder what in this image has a meaning? He said, "You're this head of gold. Does that mean that Nebuchadnezzar had better eyes than anybody else? That he could see better than others? That he was a better speaker than others? What do the ears mean? What does the neck mean? What do the different parts of it mean? They don't have any meaning. It's just the picture of a man. The thing in it that means something is the four

types of metal. There is a break there -- four different kingdoms represented by the four kinds of metal. If we did not have the interpretation it would be easy to ~~begin~~ begin to let our imagination go as to what the ears represented, or the nose, or the teeth, etc. That would be very easy to do and you could get into all sorts of vague areas that has no correspondence with anything that has actually happened.

You have often seen pictures of this statue in some books on prophecy in which they will say as the two legs ~~for~~ stand for the Roman Empire they represent the eastern and western portions of the Roman Empire. The fact that the Roman Empire was the tightly united organization for 400 years, and it was only toward the end of the period that it was divided into two parts. So to say that the two legs stand for something in the history of the Roman empires is simply reading into it something we have no right to do. Daniel simply says the 4 parts of it represent a succession. Four different kingdoms were to come.

You notice he said, You are the head of gold, and after you there will come another kingdom. And then a third one that will have rule over all the world. Then a fourth one that will be strong as iron. He said to Nebuchadnezzar, You are this head of gold. Did he mean that Nebuchadnezzar himself was the head of gold? Or did he mean Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom was the head of gold? The fact of the matter is that Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by his ~~son~~ son who reigned only 3 mo. and then was killed. Then an old general took over; he was a very man but he was quite elderly, and he only lived a few years and he was succeeded by his son, ~~son~~ who was so inferior that he was killed 3 mo. after he took office and then another man Nabonidus took over and he ruled for about 15 yrs.

So we have a period of about 50 yrs. after the death of Nebuchadnezzar before another kingdom succeeded him. So there are two ways we might explain this: 1) Nebuchadnezzar is the head of gold. After Nebuchadnezzar there is going to come another kingdom, but there is a gap between them. There are three or four inferior rulers of the Babylonian empire who succeed Nebuchadnezzar before the Persians take over. That's one possibility but in this case I don't think it's the right one. 2) I think that what he means "you are the head of gold" is "your kingdom is the head of gold." Nebuchadnezzar was the greatest of these rulers of so called Neo-Babylonian kingdom. But I believe he was referring to the full history of the Babylonian empire. And the closely related Assyrian empire, which had preceded it.

Closely related in language, culture, and in many regards. So he is referring to this first of the great empires. The Assyro-Babylonian empire which had continued for many centuries, by this time even though Nebuchadnezzar's particular branch of it had begun with himself. But that he's referring to that as the first great kingdom that was represented by the head of gold, and then the others that followed did not== they came of course, the Persians conquered immediately after the Babylonians came but not immediately after Nebuchadnezzar.

So when he says, "You are this head of gold," I don't think he means Nebuchadnezzar personally. But Nebuchadnezzar as representative of his great people. This corresponds with history as we know it because the Babylonian empire seemed to be standing in all its glory and then the Persians attacked, and overcame it and annexed it to their empire, and for 200 years the Persian empire continued as a very powerful machine over a much wider territory than the Babylonians had controlled.

Then when the Persian empire was at the very height of its power and perhaps got overconfident --they were so strong at that time--but at the very height of its power, after 200 yrs., Alexander the Great came with his army--the excellent army his father Philip of Macedonia had developed--and attacked him, and after a dozen years of fighting he overcame him completely and annexed him and became a much greater empire than the Persian.

Then Alexander's empire was divided into sections. But these various sections continued about 200 yrs. and they were then taken over one by one by the Romans. So we can't say just when it ends and the next one begins. But it is a marvellous similarity to the history of those next few centuries after the time of Daniel.

I think particularly in preparation for later prophecies its good for us to know what has a meaning and what doesn't have a meaning in symbols.

Now the assignment as it has been posted. You notice that the first ch. tells about Daniel's experience of King Nebuchadnezzar's favor, and it ends "and Daniel continued even to the first year of king Cyrus." Then in the second year of king Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams. That is certainly the proper place for a ch. division. Before it was all connected. After it it is a different story, and that is true of most of these first six chs. Is it true of the rest of the book? That's the assignment for next time. Please get them in on Friday. It should not take you more than a hour, I would think at the most to glance over the material. We'll continue here next time.

I hope you will all sit in your assigned seats because otherwise I will have to mark you absent. If you miss one or two classes it won't make much difference. If you miss more I doubt if you can get credit for the course. I like to know who is here. And about the papers you turned in they do not count much as to how you do them, but the fact that you turn them in is quite important to our work.

Now today I will look at different chapters and hastily glance at them now. The first ch. starts with a date: "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim" something happened. It tells how Daniel was taken off and tells about his first appearance.

The second ch. begins, "In the second year of his reign Nebuchadnezzar had a dream." Here is a clear definite reference and you are certain you have a definite division between the first and second ch. When you come to the third ch.-- it is all about the men who were put into the fiery furnace, and ends with their being given particular positions at the court. Then the third ch. begins with another incident, and we have no way of knowing whether this came soon after Nebuchadnezzar's dream or a long time after. It does not tell us the time, but it's clearly a different incident altogether. The incident of the fiery furnace.

Then the fourth ch. It is very obvious the 3rd ends with the promotion of these men, and the 4th ch. begins a new subject. The 4th ch. is a unified account of this experience.

The 5th ch. starts with king Belshazzar, not previously mentioned and tells an incident in connection with Belshazzar. Clearly a chapter division was well made there.

The 6th ch. is quite alright the way the division is made but there would be nothing wrong in making it a verse earlier because it is all about Belshazzar up to the last verse. Then it says Darius the Mede took over the kingdom and it pleased Darius to appoint 120 satraps. Probably the best place is where it is but it wouldn't matter. Certainly it should be in one of those two places.

Those six chs. form a unit. They are all narrative; one has a good bit of prophecy, but they are narratives. Then the remaining chs. are mainly revelations, visions, prophecy. So there certainly is a definite break ~~between~~ between the first six and the last six.

The 7th --it is very obvious it is a new start. "In the first year of Belshazzar, the king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream." Then ch. 8, "In the third year of king Belshazzar, a vision appeared to me." Then the 9th ch.--"In the first year of Darius, son of Xerxes". Then the 10th ch., "In the third year of Cyrus King of Persia . . ." "There's no question these are separate units.

Then the 11th ch. begins, "In the first year of Darius . . ." I'm sure the Archbishop must have been looking at his Latin Bible rather hastily and his horse must have stumbled when he got to this point, because it looks a little bit like the beginning of the previous chs. but it's altogether different. It is actually conclusion of what was told before. There is absolutely no excuse to begin a ch. with 11:1. I'm glad to see that most of you saw that. It's not a sensible place for a ch. division. That's an important thing for us to have in mind. Namely, the ch. divisions are very valuable in order that we can find places easily so we are grateful for their having been put in and giving us this excellent system to enable us to find a ch. and verse at once.

We are grateful for them, and I would not want change and confusion brought in. But it's important to remember that they are useful only to find places. Here in our first 9 chs. they are well made, but that doesn't necessarily mean they are well made in the first 9 chs. of any other book! Sometimes they are not. Sometimes it's a division of a ch. and a half. Sometimes it's half a ch.

I always like when I read to start a couple of vv. before the end of the ch. and run a couple of vv. after the end of the next ch. so I won't miss the connection that is there or be in a place that interrupts the thought. In the book of Hebrews it is my impression that just about every ch. is summarized by a verse which is actually made the first v. of the next chapter! There might be an argument: should we have the summary and stop there? Or should we go on and put the summary at the beginning? There might be an argument. But it is good to not be confused by the ch. divisions. It is too bad the Archbishop was confused by this v. superficially looking like the start of some many previous chapters when actually it is very different.

But something more important than that is involved. Suppose you start your ch. at v. 2. "And Now I tell you the truth." Who tells you the truth? How does it start? It is closely bound, not just at the v. before--the v. before says "I took my stand" and that isn't Daniel! Who is it? You have to look back to see. So actually there should be no ch. division between ch. 10 and ch. 11. There should be no division. Ch. 10 is simply preparation for the giving of a message from God to Daniel. The two are bound together. There is a paragraph division after v. 1 because it now gives the message that he gives.

But before that it is all leading up to this message. It greatly stresses the importance of the message that it has a whole ch. of narrative to leadup to it. Then you have ch. 11 and when you get to the end of ch. 11, you start ch. 12 and you don't say in the such and such year of such a king, but you say "At that time Micahel will arise" What time? The time just discussed before. So the beginning of ch. 12 certainly should not be a ch. division. Many students suggested there should be a ch. division at v. 5. An argument could be made for that. It starts, "Then I Daniel looked and there before me stood two others" and this seems to imply it's closely tied with what is before. So we can say the first 9 chs. of the book of Daniel are 9 separate sections. And 10 to 12 is one section which you can divide into subsections if you want to.

I always like to give this assignment just to notice how carefully you will notice them because it is good in all our study to get the habit of seeing what are the natural divisions. A text without a context is only a pretext. But what is the context? When you take a verse it's always good to see if it's at the beginning of a new section--not closely related to what preceded, or the end of one, or is it united to both? It's very important to find the sections. So I thought this would alert you a bit to that very important matter.

Now, we've looked at the fact ch. 2 tells about the dream. Daniel gave Nebuchadnezzar the interpretation of the dream by reminding him exactly of what the dream had been. We have in vv. 20-23 of Dan. 2 a very wonderful prayer of Daniel to God. He praises God for giving him what he could not have possibly have gotten out his head. For giving him this revelation of exactly what was it that Nebuchadnezzar had dreamed and also what it meant.

Then we have Nebuchadnezzar's dream and then the interpretation of the dream. I trust you all have in mind the details of the dream. I think most people have who have attended Sunday School. This is a ch. that is often referred to. The dream starts with a static portion. He simply sees a statue. He sees it before him. If that was all you'd have no reason to say this shows a series of events. It could show a lot of things existing at once. (?) Just like you could have a map showing you a map of a country, or you could have a chart showing you what happens in various centuries.

You could have the writing to explain what it was. Here, without the interpretation you have no reason to know this shows a series of events rather than things that would happen at one time. You have a static portion. That static portion I would like to divide into two parts.

I would like to note first he sees the statue made up of 4 different metals. Then we notice that there is a special emphasis given on the second phase of the fourth kingdom. In the fourth there is a second phase. Some might say we have five different sections. But the feet and the legs together constitute the fourth kingdom, so it's much better to say four, but we have a change in the course of this fourth kingdom. So I think that's an important 2nd part of the dream.

Then the 3rd part of the dream ceases to be static and becomes dynamic. As Nebuchadnezzar watches he sees a stone cut without hands and he sees that stone come rolling down the mountain and hit the statue and ~~it~~ destroys it and then the stone begins to grow ~~and~~ until it ~~fill~~ fills the whole earth. It must have been a very very vivid dream. This third part of it is a dynamic series of events which takes place at the end of the account of the 4th kingdom.

Daniel said to the king, You are the head of gold. A^m
As we noted. Does the "You are the head of gold" mean you,

Nebuchadnezzar, or does it mean the kingdom you are ruler of over. This history of this succession. This long period. Well, Nebuchadnezzar reigned for about 45 years. Actually from 605 to 562 he reigned. But the second of these kingdoms lasted for 200 years. The third for about 300 years. The fourth the longer still. It hardly seems that the head of gold would be just 40 years.

Also, as I mentioned last time, Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by three very inferior kings who reigned a very brief time each. Then the fourth one only reigned about 10 or 12 years. So that to say these are the 3 kingdoms would just be nonsense. So if this is the head of gold, there is a big gap--or interval-- between that and the second kingdom. Now there could be such an interval. We have many such intervals in the book of Daniel and elsewhere. But I don't believe there's one in this place. I think that paralleling the others following that it is reasonable to say that the head of gold represents the Assyro-Babylonian empire.

In Scripture they call them a kingdom. What is a kingdom? When I was a boy I learned there are three kingdoms. There's the animal kingdom, the vegetable kingdom, and the mineral kingdom. I heard a story once about King Frederick the Great of Prussia. He was visiting somewhere and there was a child there. He asked the child, How many kingdoms are there? The child said three; the animal, vegetable, and mineral. The king said, And to which kingdom do I belong? The poor child was in a bad position, because if he said, You belong to the animal kingdom it might be a bad affront to the king. Strangely the child had sense enough to realize his danger, and he answered, The kingdom of heaven.

There we have an illustration of how differently the word kingdom is used. I think most of us would think a kingdom was something a king reigns over. Certainly the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms are not something that a king reigns over. In Scripture the word kingdom is used for these, but I believe the word empire would be a better word to use today. Because as human history began and as groups began to amalgamate together who spoke the same language and had the same customs and formed national groups, this seemed very natural that they should be together in national groups.

But then the time came when the Assyrians began trying to conquer other language groups and other customs and they extended their power over a very large area with diverse groups. We today have come to speak of that as an empire. Usually we speak of a nation, but we speak ---we would not call something an empire unless we thought of it as ruling over other groups unrelated to it. Etymology does not help us with either of these words. It's usage that determines the meaning of any word. I believe we should say that these four so-called kingdoms are what we today would call four empires. So that's why I think it's quite reasonable that it starts with the Assyria-Babylonian empire which continues for several centuries, rather than to start with the Egyptians.

The Egyptians had a great power but they were pretty much one nation with one language and one culture, and there was a comparatively brief period during which they held other regions around them. The Assyro-Babylonian power was the first of the great empires. Nebuchadnezzar consolidated his empire and he said, You are the head of gold! He wasn't talking specifically of Nebuchadnezzar, but he was talking of the empire over which Nebuchadnezzar was one of the very greatest rulers.

This empire continued after Nebuchadnezzar's death only a few years because there was a region east of Babylonia, a region where a people called the Medes lived. The Medes were a large group of tribes that were related one to the other, and someone had succeeded in amalgamating them. But you would not call that an empire. They were related together, one language, one group of customs. But the Medes had helped Nebuchadnezzar in destroying the Assyrian empire.

In this region of the Medes there was a small section known as Anshan. The king of Anshan had a son named Cyrus, and the people of his small section were called Persians. He succeeded in overcoming the leader of the Medes and getting control of the whole group of Medes and his people in Persia who were very closely related to the Medes, assumed supremacy over them and it was now a Persian kingdom. But then Cyrus proceeded to conquer other nations and he came west and went north of Babylonia and conquered the region there, in what is now Turkey there.

Then we went further north into Asia Minor. There he came to the kingdom of Lydia which was a Greek kingdom. Croesus was the king. When I was a boy we used to hear a great deal about Croesus. He was supposed to be the richest man who had ever lived. I don't know whether he's much known any more. But Croesus had a large kingdom and Cyrus overcame Croesus and now he had an empire. Because he not only had people related to him, but he had these other people who were under his control. Then in a few years he turned south again from there and he attacked Babylonia and defeated its armies and captured Babylon. The story of his conquest of Babylon is of course familiar to us all from the story of Belshazzar.

Cyrus then had established quite a large empire but he was not satisfied. After he took over Babylon, we don't know whether this Darius the Mede who is mentioned in the Bible in the story of Daniel in the lions den was a man he made king over the Babylonian part of his empire, or whether that incident happened when Cyrus was still there and he had Darius as another name. Rulers had several names. Scholars differ as to which of the two it is. The modernists say there was no such person and it simply shows the book of Daniel is unhistorical! But at any rate Cyrus was not satisfied. He now went east again. He conquered almost as big an area to the east as he had to the west. He even conquered the northern section of India, which then belonged to the Persian empire for the next 200 years.

This Persian empire then was a much larger empire than the Babylonian empire. A large and very strong empire which lasted for about 200 years. I should mention perhaps that after ~~Alexander's~~ Cyrus's death, his son Caybyses, went on down to Egypt and conquered Egypt and made it part of his empire. Assyrian and Babylonian kings had occasionally attacked Egypt and held it for a brief time, but had never really held Egypt as part of their empire. But Cyrus' successor also held Egypt for about 100 years. Then Egypt revolted and for 90 years it was independent again, and then the Persian empire attacked Egypt again.

So you see the Persian empire continued very strong for its for 200 years. Then after they had held Egypt again for 10 years Alexander the Great attacked the Persian empire and the Persian empire was at the very height of its strength, as you can see from his re-conquest of Egypt. But Alexander had a very very well-trained army and was a very skillful military leader and in the course of about a dozen years he conquered the whole Persian empire, one of the fastest conquests in all the history of the world.

That put a sudden end to the Persian empire. Then Alexander the Great who in 331 conquered the Persian empire and he led his army clear across into India and back again through the desert and when they got to Babylon, Alexander was taken suddenly ill and after 10 days he died. Still a young man in his 30's.

The result was that a third empire was established which was as large as the Persian empire, larger than the Babylonian empire--much larger, maybe twice as large and which in addition to that included Asia Minor, Greece and Macedonia. It was a much larger empire than any of the previous ones. But Alexander the Great's death threw things into confusion. It would take some hours to describe events of the next 30 years. His generals began disputing as to who should have control and eventually there were three of them gained control over large sections of Alexander's empire. Then there were several small sections of it.

But these were united in the fact that Greek civilization, Greek language in the leadership at least, Greek culture was spread throughout all this area so it can properly be called another empire. Alexander established it even though it was divided into these many sections. Then the parts of this empire were conquered by a new power that rose over in Italy--the power of Rome. Rome gradually conquered Italy as long as it was still Italy you would call it only a kingdom. Then they came into conflict with the Carthaginians from Africa, and they conquered them. Then they proceeded eastward. One after another they conquered a sections of Alexander's empire.

We can say the exact day when the Babylonian empire came to an end, and the Persian empire began. Because Babylon was conquered on a certain day. That was the end of the Babylonian empire so we can consider the Persian empire started then. And we can say the exact year when Alexander conquered the Persians and we can say he established his great empire. But the Hellenistic or Greek empire (its called by both names)--we cannot say exactly

when it ended because it had three main sections and one of the areas from which Alexander came i.e. Macedonia, in ~~168~~ 168 about 150 years --a little more than that-- after Alexander had conquered the Persian empire, and Macedonia the area from which Alexander had come, that kingdom was conquered by the Romans in 168. Then another 90 years went by and then the second large section of it, which we call Syria, (though that is a rather rough term to describe it-- it's better perhaps to name it after the ruler, but we'll look at this one more in detail later) this section--for the present we'll call it Syria--included Asia Minor and what is now Syria and Palestine and theoretically all of Asia that had been in Alexander's empire. But the extreme eastern parts of it were soon lost.

Syria was conquered by Pompey in 72 B.C. See there ~~was~~ were 90 years after Macedonia was conquered before Syria was, and then it was 42 years later before Octavius Caesar conquered Anthony who was the paramour of Cleopatra, the last of the queens of Egypt. So the end of the third kingdom would come in 30 B.C. when Egypt became part of the Roman empire. So the end of the third empire and the beginning of the fourth spread over a century and a half. It wasn't a sudden, sharp division like the previous two.

Then the Roman empire began. Some historians now like to call the part of it after the conquest of Egypt for the next 300 years, they ~~are~~ like to call it the principate instead of an empire. Because it kept up all the forms of a republic, but actually the emperor was absolutely supreme and could do anything he wanted to, and most of them did. It certainly was an empire in the true sense of the word, and it was an empire in the sense that he held many lands (entirely different from the Romans) under his sway. Roman government, Roman laws, Roman customs were completely dominate in those areas. So the term empire in the sense we have been using it would certainly apply to the Roman empire and this == and it was far larger than any of the previous kingdoms. I could not say far larger because it did not include India and sections close to that.

But aside from that it did include a great deal in Europe that had not been in the previous ones. So you have a general idea of the four great empires that came and there has been nothing like it since. There has been nothing comparable to these. So== there have been what have been called empires, but they have not been comparable in power or the time they lasted to these four great empires.

So there is a remarkable similarity between the picture of the image he saw and the history going on for many centuries after that. Now he saw a statue, as we said. You look at the statue and you have no idea what the statue represents. But he gave him an interpretation that shows a series of events--you are the head of gold and after you will be another kingdom and another and after him another. I've had difficulty with all the translations because they all say "after you will come a kingdom inferior to you." The translations say "inferior", and it's pretty hard for me to see

how the Persian empire which covers three times as much territory as the Babylonian empire could be said to be "inferior."! Different people have tried various ways to make out it was inferior. But actually this aramaic word I have not been able to find anywhere that it's ever used to mean inferior. The word is simply the word land like the Hebrew word etets (land) with the locative in it. "Toward the ground." I think it simply means on the statue, lower down, toward the ground on the statue from you who are the head of gold there is a section that indicates another kingdom. that follows.

It doesn't make sense to say it means inferior. I don't believe the word means inferior. I wrote to the professor at the University of Chicago because I knew that for many years they had been collecting Aramaic inscriptions, and I thought he would know as much about the ancient Aramaic language as anyone I knew of. So I said, can you tell me of any case where this word is used of to mean inferior. It is used in the translation of the Aramaic of the OT --that translation we called the Targum. A translation that was used in the synagogue.

It is used of the lower part of the ark--the same word. It's lower down. But that doesn't necessarily mean inferior. It's only lower down on the statue. Because these kingdoms had been increasing in power, increasing in size rather than decreasing. He wrote back and said, I know of no case where it means anything except lower physically but of course, he said, in this case it must mean inferior. That's what you call conjectural saying what a word means. No evidence for it. But you feel it ought to mean that you ~~xxx~~ you will say that it does. Unfortunately there is no translation of the Bible which does not contain some conjectural translation. There is none.

Because when a person translates he's got to make sense for the people who read. And there are many cases where he's not sure exactly what it means and he says something he thinks fits the context. If you looked at it naturally you might say, Another kingdom inferior to you. But he's talking about the statue and its another kingdom lower than you and there is not place anywhere I've been able to find where the word means inferior.

If you have the word used many times to mean lower down physically why even if it did find it used once it would not mean that in this place. There were two people who had their hands up. Yes?

Student: There are some people who say it means inferior not in respect to size but in terms of its governmental structure. Would you comment on that?

Yes, some say in the first one the king was autocratic; in the next ~~king~~ one he did not have quite as much power, and less in the next, and the next less. That is absolutely contrary to facts. Because in the Babylonian empire they had very definite laws giving the rights of individuals, and while the kings did stride over the rights of many individuals and they had very great power, yet theoretically and often in reality they were very much bound to follow the laws as to how the people were to be treated.

We have thousands of clay tablets from ancient Babylonia of contracts that were made which show the legal structure that there was in which the king was very far from being absolute. He had great power but he was far from being absolute.

When you take the Persian empire, the Persian emperor had very great power, but you read the book of Ester and you find that when the Persian king had made a law giving people the right to kill the Jews, he had no power to change it! The only thing he could do was to say on a certain day he gave the Jews the right to defend themselves. He could not break the law that he had made. Now that's pretty far from having absolute power.

Then when you get to the Greeks, you find that some of these rulers had very great power. Others much less. But when you get to Rome, the Roman emperors, some of them, were mighty close to being absolute. So I've heard that. That is one of various attempts that have been made to show that they are inferior, but if you show what the word simply means you don't have to find a way to show their inferior. In many ways they were greater, stronger, more varied, but there is no progression there either toward greater strength or less strength. Mr. Buses?

Question: You said this word was used to describe the lower parts of the ark?

Yes, there were the upper stories and the lower stories of the ark. Or lower deck. The word is used there in the ark.

Incidentally, any time I mispeak myself or anything I do not make clear please don't hesitate to raise your hand. Or any question that I just answered rather quickly. If you have an extended question I'd rather you would write it out and I'll see how to fit it in.

Question: Can you comment on the value of the metals?

Yes. That is of course--the question is what is there in this that has meaning? What has a meaning? As far as their value is concerned there are many things you could do with iron you could not do with gold. If you wanted to have a strong military power, iron is much more valuable for that purpose than gold. A little gold--people will give you as much for as for a lot of iron. If you are trying to build the strength of an empire I think you'd find iron more valuable.

That all brings us to the very vital question: What is there in a symbol that we can take as being part of the meaning, and what is there that is simply part of the symbol. Now I mentioned last time on "You Nebuchadnezzar are the head of gold." Well the head has eyes. Does that mean Nebuchadnezzar had better sight than others? Do the ears tell something about him? Does the neck have a meaning? These are different features. It's simply a man standing there. Which of the features have meaning; which don't?

As far as the metals are concerned, I would say there are four different metals. There == They are different. It makes a distinction between the parts. The fact that what is paid for them--the gold is more valuable than the iron, the iron we are told has a meaning. It means the Roman empire was stronger than any of the others. That we are told. But we are not told anything in the interpretation as to a meaning for the other metals.

What then will tell us what has a meaning? The first thing is, Is the interpretation--does it specifically say something has a meaning? It tells us it goes from top to bottom. It tells us there is a succession of events. It tells us that the iron shows us the strength of this fourth kingdom which breaks in pieces everything just as iron does. The other powers were very destructive too, but the Romans perhaps were stronger. than the rest. But that's all the interpretation gives about that. But if you have a specific interpretation given, that of course gives you something to tell you it has a meaning.

Now as to the second thing that it can tell you: Is it something quite out of the ordinary? If it said it is a statue and the head has three eyes in it. That would be very unusual. Or ten horns on it. That would be very unusual. It would be unusual for a man to have any horns. If it was a beast, a beast might have two or even three horns perhaps. But if a beast had ten horns you would think that was an unusual feature. Something that is quite out of the ordinary is quite apt to have a meaning and not part of the picture.

Now there is a third thing that may be suggested: Are there similarities to the thing symbolized? You will find many books that will tell you the fact there are two legs indicates the eastern and western parts of the Roman empire. Well, if it had three legs that would be something out of the ordinary. Or if it said the last kingdom will be divided, that would be something in the interpretation. But, a statue (or a man) is pretty sure to have two legs. Does it exactly correspond to the history? No. The third kingdom includes the thighs. So the upper part of the legs, perhaps as far as the knees is included in the third kingdom. And the fourth kingdom does thus begin in two parts and actually the Roman empire was united for its first 400 years; it was one great unity for that time. It was only after 400 years that they established two emperors, who were not separate from each other--they were supposed to work together, and in fact did--but found the area too large for one to control.

Of course the western empire lost its power before the east did. It is methodologically wrong to say that it represents eastern and western empire because it doesn't correspond to what actually happened. And there's nothing in the interpretation to suggest that this points to a division in the empire. If you had the belly and thighs as ~~the~~ the third empire, that would suggest that the third empire was united for a long time and then

divided into two parts and actually it was united for less than 20 years. Then for 200 or 300 it was divided! So these do not correspond to the history of the empire. They are just part of the picture.

Now a fourth way of seeing that something is symbolized, and might be suggested, though caution should be taken on both the 3rd and 4th is compare it with some other vision. And you find something in another vision that is comparable to it, and you say this gives us a suggestion of that. So there are many who say the 4th beast in ch. 7 has 10 horns. And the feet of this which represents the 4th kingdom has 10 toes. Well, the account does not say I saw an image and it had ten toes. There is no mention it had ten toes. It was 45 years at least before Daniel had the other vision. If we read that back and say that is involved here, I would say it is methodologically wrong.

Now knowing the vision of Nebuchadnezzar and you have a new vision that seems to be parallel 40 years later, you might say, Oh this in here fits with that. But to read back something that way, I do not think is justifiable. So I do not think it is proper to say the toes mean specifically anything distinctive. Thus the 3rd and 4th must be used with great caution. The first is the one to depend on. The second is pretty apt to be accurate.

The vision, the statue has three(?) parts. The first part is the four kingdoms. The second part is the second phase of the fourth kingdom which we are told here the iron has clay mixed with it. It becomes weakened by having potter's clay mixed in. So this kingdom was partly strong and partly brittle.

Turn to Dan. 7 and you have another vision which has remarkable parallel with ch. 2. Ch. 2 is very well known among Christians; ch. 7 is much less. But in ch. 7 there are four beasts appear, not a bit like the statue with 4 different parts, but when you get to the interpretation, he says the four beasts represent 4 kingdoms. Then you have a second phase of the fourth kingdom when it has clay mixed with iron, and you have in ch. 7 comparatively little told about the first three, though more than is told in ch. 2. Then you have an account of some things that happened during the history of the fourth beast. So you have a second phase of that also.

For next time I would like you to look at ch. 2 and ch. 7. Glance through these chs. I'm not asking you to study them in detail, indicate which vv. refer to anyone of the four kingdoms. If the v. speaks of 4 kingdoms, put it under all four. List 1,2,3,4, and give that v. under all four. But if the v. is dealing with only one kingdom, give it under that kingdom, in ch. 2 and ch. 7. I would like you to note which vv. in ch. 2 and 7, refer either part of the vision or part of the interpretation, refer to the 2nd phase of the fourth kingdom. I'm not asking you to do anything about the 3rd part--the dynamic, when the stone comes and hits it. I'm not asking you to study these, you are welcome to do so as much as you feel inclined, but it's not part of what is required for the course.

I'd like you to give me a paper by next Friday noon on which simply mention each of the four kingdoms and then under the second phase of the fourth, just list the vv. in ch. 2, whether it's the vision, whether it's the interpretation, and the vv. in ch. 7 whether it be vision or interpretation. So you can see how they compare.

Now in ch. 7 some might say ch. 7 is not a parallel to ch. 2. The similarities are too marked. There's a similarity to the four kingdoms, There's a similarity to each having a second phase of the fourth kingdom. There is a similarity to the great changes which are to take place represented by the Stone hitting the statue and completely destroying it and then growing to fill the whole earth.

So we have this remarkable similarity between the two. There are therefore many things on which they will throw light on each other. But methodologically I think we ought to get all we can out of the 2nd ch. before we throw light upon it from the 7th. But it is quite right to throw light on the 7th from 2nd because it was given first.

That's the assignment for next time, and we'll continue there.

In the assignment for today you looked at the passages in ch. 2 and the passages in ch. 7 that relate to the predictions about the four kingdoms. You noticed in ch. 2:32-33 speaks of the four kingdoms. You read there, "The head of the statue was pure gold, the chest and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of clay." In the interpretation there was nothing specifically said about the kingdoms further than that.

About the first kingdom you had in the interpretation in v.37-38, "You O king are the king of kings. You are that head of gold." So the first kingdom is definitely designated in this point. You had that kingdom referred to again in ch. 7:5, "The first was like a lion and it had the wings of an eagle. I watched until its wings were torn off and it was lifted from the ground so that it stood on two feet like a man and the heart of a man was given to it." Quite a different picture you get from what you got in the other. The head of gold. But if the two chs. are parallel there are enough points of similarity to lead us to feel that they are, this must be speaking about the same kingdom.

As you look at these you did not notice about any of the first three any statement about it being destroyed. At the end of the fourth kingdom you have the destruction of the image, and you have all four mentioned at the end, in the destruction in ch. 2. But you do not have in either ch. any mention of a specific ending of any of these kingdoms unless this statement: "I watched until its wings were torn off, and it was lifted from the ground and it stood on two feet like a man and the heart of a man was given to it." Is that an account or a prediction of the destruction of the first kingdom?

If it is what is it? I wonder how many of you have just that question. I think the immediate reaction any of us would get is that this tells us how the first kingdom is destroyed! It's wings are torn off and it's lifted from the ground so it stands on two feet like a man." Well, didn't the kingdom always stand on two feet like a man? It's not destruction, is it? And the heart of a man was given to it. Did the kingdom ever not have the heart of a man? That's certainly not a statement about destruction. Mr. Buses, did you indicate you had a suggestion?

Buses: Well, the thing that struck me as I read this was the parallel with the person of Nebuchadnezzar and the imposition(?) of humility involved. The Heb. word "be humble" means like an eagle folding its wings. Having the wings plucked off it stood up and heart of man spoke to me of (?)

Which ch. was that? Chapter 4. I think that is a very excellent suggestion. Now we look back at ch. 4 we find that there the wings were torn off ~~(XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX)~~. A figurative expression. He loses his power and ability. In ch. ~~(XXXXX)~~ 4 Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar that he would be driven out into the field. He would be drenched with the dew of heaven and live with the animals among the plants of the earth until his ~~heart~~ heart was changed into that of a man

and that his heart be changed from that of a man and that he be given the heart of an animal, till seven times passed by. If you have the NIV it says, Until his mind be changed and he be given the mind of an animal. KJV says "heart." But ~~max~~ both of them in ch. 4 say the "heart." The word is the same in both cases.

The heart. Naturally they don't mean his physical heart is going to be changed. It is a symbol for something, and it's a good guess it's a symbol for mind. We're apt to use the term heart for affection but they would be much more ~~ab~~ apt in biblical writings to use some other word for affections, and feelings, and they are more apt to use the "heart" for mind. So that is a very good interpretation to translate it mind in the previous case. But the important thing is that it is the same word in both cases.

What happened to Nebuchadnezzar was that his power was taken away and that could be represented by the wings being plucked and his mind or heart was changed from that of a man and he was given the mind of an animal until seven times passed by for him. Here we read he will be lifted up from the ground after the wings have been torn off, later he'll be lifted from the ground and will stand on two feet like a man and the heart of a man is given it. So I believe when Daniel heard this would immediately say, The one who was previously called the head of gold, we are here reminded how that at one time his wings were plucked from him, his power was taken away. He was == lost the mind or heart of a human being and seemed like an animal grovelling on the ground, but again he was given the heart of a man, and he stood up on his two feet and lived(?) again.

So Daniel would immediately have said, This shows that the first kingdom referred to in the 7th ch. is the same one who is called the head of gold earlier, that is the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar! I think that's quite clear, quite definite. I don't think there is any question that's the correct interpretation, but I doubt that's the interpretation many would get upon the first reading.

I know when I first read it I thought, There is going to be a first kingdom and then it's going to be destroyed. But you don't destroy something by giving it the heart of a man! And causing it to stand upright on two feet. That is a picture of Nebuchadnezzar's relief from the previous situation describe as the wings being torn from him. It ties together and says to Daniel: This first beast is one with which you are already familiar. This is the very kingdom in which you're now living.

That is the first kingdom; the comparison of the two chs. Now the second kingdom we're told in 2 2:39, "After you another kingdom will arise below you." That is to say lower down on the statue. The translation Inferior to you-- there is no evidence for it anywhere even though most say it must mean this so let's translate it that way. The word, however, is never used elsewhere that I've ever found to mean inferior. It means lower down.

Lower down could mean inferior but in this case there is no reason to think that it is.

The second kingdom is described in ch. 7:5 "There before me was a second beast which looked like a bear. It was raised up on one of its sides. It has three ribs in its mouth between its teeth. It was told get up and eat flesh." Many books will tell you what these three ribs stand for. But Cyrus conquered many kingdoms and I don't see any reason to pick three particular ones out of all that he conquered. I believe it is a general term to show he has conquered -- his conquering this kingdom begins by conquering many other kingdoms.

So it has three ribs in its mouth between its teeth. It was told, Get up and eat your fill of flesh. It was raised up on one of its sides. This was written in the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon. At that time Cyrus had already obtained control over all the realm of the Medes. Now it was the laws of the Medes and Persians, a phrase we find repeatedly in the book of Esther and other parts of the OT. Here a group of Medes and Persians and the Persians were supreme. It was raised up on one of its sides. I think that was very natural way to take it, and doubtless what it impressed Daniel as meaning.

Even though there are those who do not wish this to refer to the Medo Persian empire and they say, Well that's just the description of a bear. It's natural for it to rise up on one of its sides. I don't think we can be dogmatic about that. I've never lived with bears or observed them at length. I'm not in a position to say whether this would characterize a bear or any other kind of animal. I don't know.

But it is a theory of the interpretation of Daniel taught in all the universities that know anything about Daniel today and written in most of the commentaries on the subject which takes what I call the Maccabean view. According to this view the book of Daniel was not written by Daniel but 400 years later. It was written by somebody in the time of the Maccabees trying to encourage the people today, and to tell them, Now you see this great terrible beast that is threatening you--this Hellenistic kingdom--and God is going to give you deliverance. That is what all the liberals accept and many that are generally conservative.

For instance Farrar's Life of Christ is very highly thought of --Farrar has written a commentary on Daniel in which he takes the Maccabean view. Not that it was written by Daniel but by some unknown writer in the time of the Maccabees. But the problem with doing that is that that is the third kingdom! when the Maccabees lived. So they get around it by saying there was a Babylonian kingdom, and then a Median kingdom, and then a Persian kingdom, and then there was the Hellenistic kingdom. So they get an extra kingdom in there. Naturally it doesn't please them to say that the bear raised up on one of its sides means the Medo Persian empire. Now we will look at this Maccabean view more some later. It doesn't particularly apply here except on this one point. But I believe God

put this in in the vision he gave Daniel in order that Daniel would say, Yes, I have seen the way this Persian army is conquering the countries round about. Well, he suggests he will even eventually conquer Babylon, and will be the second great empire. It was given, I believe, to tell Daniel that he could recognize it that it was now beginning to happen that which would end in the change from the first empire to the second empire.

So we have the second empire given, and I think this is a very important point in the prophecy. How often prophecy contains something like this in order to give people an assurance that it's true. It contains something that they can actually see happening so they can know or that they know has happened. It only affects us at this one point. Most evangelical scholars, but not all by any means, feel that the second kingdom is the kingdom of the Medo Persians.

This description I don't think would fit the Persian empire after its first 50 years. During its first 50 years it conquered all these nations round about, and made a tremendous effort to conquer Greece. One of the great things the ~~Greeks~~ Greeks in classical times always celebrated was the inability of the Persians to conquer them. The Persians failed in that conquest, but in the next 150 years the Persian empire was a well-run, relatively peaceful empire. It was very strong. But this picture of it--"eat much flesh"-- would not picture it after the first 50 years. So it was a picture to show while it was coming, and to assure Daniel that this is what is next.

We look at the third kingdom in 2:39, "Next a third kingdom one of bronze will rule over the whole world." That doesn't tell much about it, does it? Except that it's going to have a large area. The third kingdom is mentioned in 7:6, "After that I looked and . . . one that looked like a leopard." That doesn't tell us much--it looked like a leopard. A leopard is something that moves rapidly. I don't know. Alexander's conquests were tremendously rapid. "On its back it had four wings like those of a bird. This beast had 4 heads and was given authority to rule."

Alexander's empire was a united empire for less than 20 years. Then he died, and his generals fought for 40 years in order to get control over that empire. It ended up divided among 3 large important kingdoms and 6 or 7 small separately independent sections. All of them related to one another by having the Greek language, Greek culture, and Greek people or Macedonian people in control. So the emphasis you might say on diversity with the four wings and four heads can fit with that picture of the Hellenistic empire which came 200 years after the time of Daniel.

Then we find a fourth kingdom (as I believe you all noticed in your papers) in 2:14. It has more told about it than any previous kingdom. "Finally there will be a fourth kingdom, strong as iron, for iron breaks and smashes everything. As iron breaks

things to pieces, so it will crush all the others." That could be said about the second kingdom; it could be said about the third one. But the fourth kingdom was certainly the most lasting of them. It was a very strong group which was able to conquer very effectively. The Romans did not come like the Persians and in the brief period of a few years make a great conquest. It did not come like the Hellenistic empire, like Alexander the Great, in just a very short time conquering the Persian empire. But over a long period of years, a century and a half or so, the Republic --the Roman Republic succeeded in conquering one nation after another, until eventually it covered a tremendous part of Europe that had never been in the previous kingdoms, and also a substantial part of the previous kingdom. So it exactly fits.

Now in ch. 7 we find the parallel to it. "After that in my vision at night in my vision I looked and there before me was a fourth beast, terrifying and frightening, and very powerful. It had large iron teeth; it crushed and devoured its victims and trampled underfoot whatever was left. It was different from all the former beasts and it had 10 horns.

That of course is a similar picture, but more stress is its great power. The new feature of it is that it had ten horns, which is not explained. Were these ten horns successive? Were they all at once? Were they something that was in the beast at the very beginning? Were they something that came later? Nothing is told here about that. But this very strange thing that it had ten horns.

So we have these parallels. In the fourth beasts there is more told about it in ch. 7 in v. 7 and v. 19. "Then I wanted to know the true meaning of the fourth beast which was different from all the others and most terrifying, with its iron teeth, its bronze claws, teeth that crushed and devoured its victims and trampled them under foot . . . I also wanted to know about the ten horns on its head." But he doesn't tell you anything about the ten horns. He wanted to know but he doesn't tell you.

Then you get the answer in v. 23. "The fourth beast is a fourth kingdom that will appear on earth. It will be different from all the other kingdoms. It will devour the whole earth, trampling it down and crushing it. The ten horns are ten kings that will come from this kingdom." It doesn't tell when they will come. Whether they are successive kings. Whether they are toward the start. Whether they are toward the end. It does not tell you. But we have this information about the four kingdoms.

You notice-- I wonder how many of you noticed a contradiction in ch. 7. In v. 2 he said, In my vision at night I looked and there before me were the four winds of heaven churning up the great sea. Four great beasts each different from the others came up out of the sea." Now these beasts came out of the sea! But what does this mean? The interpretation beginning in 7:17 says, "The four great beasts are four kingdoms that will arise from the earth." Did they rise from the sea, or did they rise from the earth? It's a contradiction isn't it? Well, it's perfectly obvious, one of them is a figure of speech. Naturally the

kingdoms, the earth, would show their perhaps their nature, and nothing heavenly about them. It's a figure. They come up out of the earth. It's a figure, and another figure about them is that they are coming out of the sea. Tempetuous constantly changing nature of the sea. Wars, conflicts, changes. Two different figures. The figures contradict each other, but the meaning does nota at all.

I asked you also to note what we are told about the second phase of the fourth kingdom. That we found in 2:32,33. "It's legs were of iron; its feet were partly of iron and partly of baked clay." That's not much information. But we find it referred to again further on in ~~2:2~~ ch. 2:41-43 and there greatly stressed. "Just as you saw the feet and toes were partly of clay and partly or iron, so this will be a divided kingdom, yet will have some of the strength of the iron in it just as you saw iron mixed with ~~clay~~ clay. As the toes were partly iron and partly clay, so this kingdom will be partly strong and partly prittle."

Some say the iron and clay shows an intermixture of the peoples. But you notice it says, "so this kingdom will be partly strong and partly brittle." It suggests that the iron and the clay show the weakening of the strong iron of the empire. I would not be dogmatic, but I certainly think that leans rather definitely in that direction.

Now the second phase of the fourth kingdom is also described in ch. 7:8, where we read: "As I was thinking about the horns before me was another horn, a little one, which came up among them, and three of the first horns were uprooted before it. This horn had eyes like eyes of a man, and a mouth that spoke boastfully." That shows a definite ddevelopment during the history of this fourth beast(kingdom). We find parallels to this second phase in 7: This was v.8 I just read, and further in the interpretation we find it referred to twice in ch. 7:20-21 where we read, "I also wanted to know what about the 10 horns on its head, and about the other horn that came up before which the kingdom fell, the horn that looked more imposing than the others that had eyes and a mouth and that ~~p~~ spoke boastfully." That reiterates what we've already ~~a~~ had.

The answer that is given him is in v.24-25: "The 10 horrs are 10 kingd that will come from this kingdom; after them another king will arise different from the earlier ~~was~~ ones. He will subdue three kings. He will speak against the Most High and oppress His saints, and try to change the times and the laws. The saints will be handed over to him for a time and times and a half." Thus we've seen that the four kingdoms are described under entirely different figures but it's quite easy to see how they fit together. But the ~~fourth~~ 2nd phase of the fourth kingdom we are told that it is two different metals, one of them a very weak metal, but still has some of the strength of the iron. And the other one we're told about the 10 horns and a horn coming up among them which has eyes like the eyes of a man, and speaks boastfully." Well, there's not much parallel between those two!

So the parallel between chs. 2 and 7 at this point all you can say is that there is a 2nd phase to the fourth kingdom in both

of them, and that this 2nd phase is described ~~fairly~~ very differently in the two. If it were not for the other parallels we would hesitate about saying the two visions were parallels. And there have been interpreters who say they don't.

But they both have four kingdoms. They both have a second phase of the fourth kingdom. They both have a dynamic phase at the end, in which the whole succession of earthly kingdoms is destroyed. So we have enough similarity and then we have enough the specific descriptions of individual kingdoms here that fits with ~~this~~ the history in such a way as to lead us to be quite sure ~~that~~ that the two chs. are parallel. I don't believe we should take anything from the fourth and take it back to weave into meanings of the second because the second was what was told to Nebuchadnezzar, and Daniel had 45 years to ponder over it before he had the new vision, in ch. 7.

But when he had the new vision he must have remembered the previous one, so I think we are justified in taking what we found in ch. 2 and looking at ch. # 7 to see what it adds to it.

At this point we can go on to look at the dynamic part of the vision in Daniel.

Question: into two phases of the fourth kingdom in ch. 2--the first phase is purely iron, and the second phase is iron and clay?

Yes, iron mixed with clay. So there is great weakening. That is not very similar to what you are told about the second phase in the fourth(?) seventh ch., but the first and the last part are similar and its reasonable, and there being a second phase to the fourth to parallels for us to think that they should be dealing with the same.

After this inch. 2 we have a dynamic phase following a static phase. There was a ~~statue~~ statue standing there. But we're told the statue represented four successive phases. We'd never know that unless we were told it in the interpretation. In ch. 2 there is a great dynamic phase which occurs. The dynamic phase has three events in it. These three are: 1. The origin of the stone. That is in 2:34 --"While you were watching a stone was cut out but not by human hands." The origin of the stone was the first part, in the dynamic event.

The second part in the dynamic event is that " it struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed them, ---there is a dynamic event. Here's a straight statue standing there in its glory with all these metals ~~and~~ in it. And a stone hits it on its feet of iron and clay, and it has disastrous results for the statue. It smashed it. "Then the iron and clay, the bronze and silver and ~~gold~~ gold were broken to pieces at the same time "All the parts were broken to pieces at the same time. And became like chaff on the threshing floor in the summer." Evidently they were broken into little tiny bits.

How could a stone striking a statue on its feet break all the other parts of it into little bits? You can see that the figure cannot be taken too literally. Because it breaks them ALL into little bits. "They were broken to bits like chaff on a threshing floor, and the wind swept them away without leaving a trace. That was a tremendous thing to happen--the destruction of the statue. You get the impression of a sudden destruction that completely eradicates it. It was swept away without leaving a trace.

But the rock that struck the statue became a huge mountain and filled the whole earth. That's the third. The rock that strikes it is large and fills the whole earth. These are three sets and its very important to have them in mind.

In ch. 2 we have the interpretation of these three steps. In v. 44, the first part of the verse, and v. 45, the last part of the verse, we have reference to the origin of the stone. Or the middle part of v. 45. "In the time of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed." That's the the origin of the stone. It's the God of heaven who does it. It's of supernatural origin. And in v. 45, "This is the meaning of the vision of the rock cut out of the mountain but not by human hands." It is a supernatural beginning of this ~~whizzzzz~~ which destroys the statue. That is the first part of the dynamic movement.

The second part of it--the destruction of the image--we find in v. 35; the interpretation, in v. 44, 45. The latter part of v. 44 "it will crush all those people and bring them to an end, but it will itself endure for ever. This is the meaning of the vision of the rock cut out of the mountain but not by human hands. A rock that broke the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver and the gold to pieces. The complete destruction of all the parts of the image is brought to pass by something that is supernatural, in its origin.

Then the growth of the stone which we had brought out in v. 35-- it fills the whole earth. It is discussed in the interpretation simply in the words "but it will itself endure forever." It doesn't say anything about its growth--that it will fill the whole earth, but it does say in contrast to these kingdoms which are completely destroyed, it will endure forever.

We have there a picture of human history. When we try to see what it means, what does this second phase mean? The clay and the iron intermixed; well, it is very definitely explained in v. 43--"You saw the iron ~~mess~~ mixed with baked clay, so the people will be a mixture and will not remain united any more than iron mixed with clay." And the previous verse, "And this kingdom will be partly strong and partly brittle." That is the latter phase of this kingdom.

Now when did that occur, or will it occur? The Roman empire in the years between 200 B.C. and the time of Christ (just a few years before the birth of Christ)--during that

period it conquered the divisions of Alexander's empire one after the other. I gave you the dates on that last time. So the Roman Empire may be thought of as starting sometime between 200 B.C. and the time of Christ. The history books is apt to say the Roman Empire started--and they give you a date when Augustus became emperor shortly before Christ. Because before that it was a Republic. But it was a Republic which conquered other nations and held them subject so could probably be called an Empire!

And many recent history books won't begin the Roman Empire until 284 ~~xxxxxxbefore~~ A.D. because the emperor during those nearly three centuries called himself an Emperor. Of course the word Emperor originally was just the word for commander of an army--emperor. But he didn't use the word, but he pretended to be the chief magistrate in the republic. And there were consuls appointed every year, until 284. Consuls appointed and tribunes appointed and all these officers who supposedly ran the government but they all had to do what the princeps told them to. So I think it's silly to say the Roman empire didn't begin until 284 A.D. -- it was certainly an empire all these years.

In 284 Diocletian saw the empire was getting weak in many places, and he thought he could strengthen it by taking on all the trappings of an emperor--making the people all bow before him and making the people go through all this as though he were tremendously important more than the rest of them. But his power was no greater than those who were before. Actually less, I think, in some regards.

The Roman empire continued about as long as the previous three put together. It continued all those years, and it was not until about 380 that the Barbarians broke through across the Danube and began marching back and forth across the empire. So at about 400 A.D. you'd find that about 9 out of 10 people in the Roman Empire could read and write; you had a high standard of literacy, and by 600 with these armies marching back and forth pillaging and destroying, setting up temporary regimes which were destroyed by someone else, after all that, about by 600 I doubt if there was one person in 10 in the Roman empire who could read and write. It was a time of tremendous turmoil.

And it was quite natural to say: This must be the time of the mixture of the iron and the clay. I believe the greatest objection to that is it says there will be in it the strength of the iron, and there wasn't much strength in the Roman Empire during those years! There was perhaps up until about 350, but but between 400 and 600 there was very little strength. The emperor was just supposed to ~~He~~ He didn't have much power. These Germanic tribes marching forth and forth, pillaging and destroying, settling in one place a while and then moving on to another, settling there and taking over more power.

So St Jerome who lived in Bethlehem about 400 A.D. made the great translation of the Bible into Latin which was so popular that the Roman Catholic church came to take it as the inspired Scripture rather than the Greek. They wouldn't say anything, but actually it had tremendous importance here and rightly so because it was an excellent translation which St. Jerome made into the

language of the common people. So they called it the Vulgate. In other words the Bible of the vulgar people, ordinary people. When the people ceased to know the Latin language and got all these other various languages, the R.C. church kept insisting the Bible is the Vulgate! When the very name said this is the Bible of the language of the people! It's an ironic thing.

But St. Jerome as he saw this Rome itself attack and loot by these tribes marching back and forth, it looked as if the very end of the world was coming. And St. Jerome must have said, We must be in the time of the iron and the clay. If that was the time of the iron and clay, then what is the stone? What is the new kingdom that came? Someone in succeeding centuries might have made a reason to any one of two very reasonable suggestions. The first would be it is the Mohammedan kingdom. Because at 600 A.D. in Arabia, there suddenly arose up among those roving Arabic tribes a movement when a man, a caravan driver, began preaching and gathered people around him and said, There is no god but Allah and Mohammed is his prophet.

Soon, after many years of preaching when nobody hardly listened to him--he had about 15 followers and finally in fear of his life he fled from Mecca to Medina. There the people gathered around him. He organized armies. They attacked caravans from Mecca, and within his lifetime he conquered all of the Arabian peninsula, and in the next 100 years the armies of the Mohammedans conquered the great Medo-Persian empire to the east and they conquered to the West most of the old Roman empire. Their armies came clear across N. Africa and clear up into Spain, and it looked as if they were going to take all of Europe.

And it would have been very easy for someone to say Mohammed (reading the book of Daniel) would say, We've got the four kingdoms described. Then you have the time when it became weakened. Then the period between 400 and 600 and then you have the stone coming. They claim a supernatural origin. Mohammed claimed that. It certainly looked like that, when from nothing there arose this tremendous force that conquered this region and that region and the other region. And it looked as if they were going to take over all of Europe.

So the was demolished practically, and this new great power arose. It seemed to fit the picture very well. But unfortunately for this being the true interpretation, they did not succeed in getting all of Europe. They were stopped by the French in the North of Spain. They helped Spain for several centuries but eventually they lost it, and in time their empire broke into pieces and different groups. So today it is not a great force. That is not the true interpretation tho it certainly would have looked like it-- at least to a Mohammedan.

Now most of the early fathers said the stone cut without hands must be a description of the virgin birth. Certainly the figure sounds like it, doesn't it? So they said the stone cut without hands means the virgin birth, so the stone is Christ. They said Christ came and he established the force that would

destroy all these great kingdoms, and eventually ~~xxxx~~ when the Roman Empire practically disappeared by 600 A.D., the vice-regent on earth of the Bishop of Rome began to take over and all the kingdoms of this world became the kingdoms of our Lord. And by the 12th century you have popes putting down kings and raising up kings and declaring complete control over all of Europe. You might say, Here is the new kingdom; the stone that has filled the whole earth and that has destroyed all these different kingdoms!

But the papal power began to decline and it is today a comparatively secondary force in the power of the world. There is no nation today that would like the nations in the 13th century say, Whatever Rome says is what we have to say. So neither of these explanations work out- But as far as the Roman empire is concerned at least we can say this: the Roman empire is not just the power -- is not just a matter of a power ruling and exerting control, but there was a ~~xxxxxx~~ cultural situation, a language situation, and influence, and ~~xxxx~~ just as you had the Babylonian influence continuing unto the Persian empire, and you had the Persian influence continuing unto the Hellenistic empire, and then the Greek language and culture was very influential unto the Roman empire, yet eventually, in fact in the Christian church in Rome for the first 3 centuries, they used Greek almost exclusively, in their services. But then Latin took over. And the culture of Rome became pervasive throughout Europe, and the influences of the Latin culture, the very name of the first man who could deserve the title of the emperor Caesar, all the early emperors were called Caesar after him.

Way up in Russia they called their leader the Czar. An abbreviation for the word Caesar. In Germany they called him the Kaiser, which is the very German word Caesar. If you had 100 years ago gone to seminary, all your textbooks would have been in Latin. Even to this day Latin terms are used in our law course constantly. The Latin culture and civilization permeated most of Europe; and permeated to a great extent N. America, and was very influential all throughout S. America even more than in N. America. So as you think of Daniel looking forward through the years and seeing the Babylonian kingdom which didn't last very long after ~~xxx~~ his vision, and then seeing the Persian empire lasted 200 years, and then the Greek about 200 years, and then beyond that seeing this Roman, you might think of that culture, of that general attitude as persisting to a very great extent, being very influential at least up to 1900, and to quite an extent to ~~xxxxxx~~ this day over most of Europe, certainly over S. America and even to a very great extent in N. America here. A great part of our legal system is derived directly from the Romans. Also the great part of our language, and so on.

So you might say that there would be the possibility of saying that the coming of the Sea Stone was still future, rather than in the sense --- and that in a sense the Roman empire was still continuing. That would be certainly a possibility, of interpretation.

The great problem with that of course that the stone is still future is the fact of the supernatural coming of Christ, and the fact that he said, My kingdom is not of this world. His people went out and preached. So a great many of the commentators say: The Stone is the first coming of Christ; it struck the kingdoms of man on the feet, and it is growing and permeating the world, and eventually it will pull the whole world to itself.

The vision sounds as if it's sudden. The stone hitting it and it being shattered and a new kingdom rising in its place. But the figure of the stone falling and hitting it, and growing could conceivably be thought of as the slow steady growth that is gradually overcoming the earth and eventually taking control of the whole earth and so the stone fills the whole earth.

So there are two different views, each of which is held by a good many commentators. As between them I do not believe that ch. 2 gives us an answer, as to which of those two is the correct view. I think we have to look into ch. 7 before we can give a satisfactory answer to that problem. Now there are other problems that come into the interpretation of ch. 2, but I don't think any of them are as important as this one question.

Between these two views--- you might say there are three views: There is the Maccabean view that all this was written to encourage the Maccabees and that this represents a hope they had which didn't work out. Of course I don't see how work out view, but there are some who have.

- 1) Then there are the other two views--the stone hits when Christ was born. The stone has been growing and filling the earth and gradually destroying the image. And that the coming of the stone
- 2) is still future, is going to be sudden, and all that the statement "made without hands" indicates is that it has a supernatural origin.

These are the 3 parts of the vision: The origin of the stone, the destruction of the image and the growth of the stone. I hope I have made clear exactly what those are, and how they are clearly presented in ch. 2.

I would like you for the next time to look at ch. 7 and see what vv. in ch. 7 could come under any one of those 3 headings. Just indicate those vv. in ch. 7 that represent, that are parallel to the origin of the stone, to the destruction of the image, or to the growth of the stone. Is that clear to everybody? If you would see which vv. in ch. 7 come under each of those headings; indicate them and get that into me by next Friday.

The assignment for today related to finding sections in ch. 7 that are related to sections in ch. 2. So I will briefly remind you again of those sections in ch. 2. In ch. 2 we have 3 parts: first the four kingdoms, then the second phase of the fourth kingdom, and then third the dynamic events that followed the static picture of the image.

In ch. 7 we again have four kingdoms represented entirely differently by 4 animals. Then we have a second phase of the fourth kingdom when certain events happened in connection with the fourth beast, and one of them very evidently represents a great force in human affairs. Then we have the dynamic portion which again is like the dynamic portion of ch. 2. In other words it shows an interposition from outside that makes a big difference in world conditions and ends in a complete destruction of all that the animals represent, and is replaced with something entirely different.

So that is what is given in the two chs. We have a remarkable similarity. The second phase of of the fourth kingdom is so different you would'nt necessarily ~~they~~ think they were necessarily related at all if it were not for the fact that the four kingdoms are very definitely related, and that the dynamic portion is very similar even though it is an entirely different figure. So I asked you to see what in ch. 7 represents the different parts of the dynamic events ~~described~~ that we found in ch.2.

I will very very briefly look at them now. In ch. 2 we had the origin of the stone in v.34a: "While you were watching a rock was cut out but not by human hands." It is perfectly obvious to us that this rock that was not cut out by human hands does not represent an actual rock, but it represent something that causes what happens later on. It relates to the cause of the great change. When you say the rock was cut out not by human hands, it is quite evident that what it means is that there is a supernatural origin with a tremendous change that makes a complete destruction of the fourth empire, and the substitution of something entirely different. We have that in ch. 2:34a.

Then in ch.44:a?? ch.2:44a we have the verb(?) In the time of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom. So again the rock cut without human hands. The God of heaven sets up a kingdom. It is of supernatural origin.

Then in ch. =v.45, "This is the meaning of the vision of the rock cut out of the mountain but not by human hands." So 3 times in the ch.2 it is stressed that it is a supernatural origin of that which makes a tremendous change. Mr. Buses?

Buses: You said ch.44 a?

No ch. 2 I was speaking of. If I misspoke myself, thank you for correcting me. It's all ch. 2.

Then I asked you for today to note the parallels to these in ch. 7. So we not in ch. 7, you have in v.11 a suggestion of supernatural origin, because you have a picture of the divine power

in vv.9-10, then you read: Then I continued to watch because. . . I kept looking until the beast was slain and its body was thrown into the balzing fire." There you have an emphasis . . . a scene where God is in heaven and is related to what happens before and after. So it's of supernatural origin, vv.9-10.

Then vv.13,14 "In my vision at night I looked and there before me was one like a Son of Man coming with clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence." What all this tells you of the destruction and of the new kingdom so it's evident that this latest emphasis is upon the supernatural origin of what happened. It parallels the statement that it was cut without hands.

You have the same note touched again in v.22: "Until the Ancient of Days came and pronounced judgment in favor of the saints of the Most High, and the time came when they possessed the kingdom."

A new kingdom caused by the coming of a supernatural One. It's brought out again in v. 26, "But the judgment will stand . . ." So the cut without hands is divine power not human power that's stressed in these three places.

The second thing was the destruction, the complete destruction. We had that brought out in 2:34 "It struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed them. Then the iron the clay, the bronze, silver and gold were broken to pieces at the same time and became like chaff upon the threshingflood in summer. The wind swept them away without leaving a trace. This is a dream. It's something which he saw. It's not literal; it's a figure. But what it stands for is very obviously the complete destruction of the statue. It's completely destroyed. That's brought out in those verses.

In the interpretation in vv. 35, 36 " --no vv.45 "This is the meaning of the rock cut out of the mountain but not by hands. A rock that broke the iron, the bronze, the clay the silver and the gold . . ." So we have these stresses in ch. 2 on the complete destruction of what the four great kingdoms represent.

Then you turn to ch. 7:11 "Then I continued to watch because of the boastful words of the horn was speaking. I kept looking (not till the horn was destroyed) but until the beast was destroyed. The beast of which the horn is only one of many horns. "The beast was destroyed. It's body destroyed and thrown into the flaming fire. . . ." So the final beast is destroyed, and it is assumed the others all came to an end, that they have no further existence after that. That is not specifically mentioned here but it's brought out very clearly in ch. 2.

In the interpretation of it we find in v. . . He says I'd like to know more about it, so he asked further questions and in his questions he repeats this about the destruction. He says, (v.26) in answer to his further question: "But the court will sit, and the judgment will stand, and his power will be taken away and

completely destroyed forever." So the second aspect of the dynamic aspect is the destruction of the image is in the two different words but the same idea very clearly.

Then the third of them was the growth of the stone until it fills the whole earth. This is found in 2:37, --no v.35, "But the rock that struck the statue became a high mountain and filled the whole earth." Is that a picture of the Christian church? Certainly not today! when the number of professing Christians is not over a fourth at the very most of all the people in the world, and a great many who profess the Name of Christ certainly do not know the Lord. This is not a picture of the church today! If this is a picture of the church it must be a picture of the church as at some time in the distant future. It cannot represent the church today unless it represents it as in the process of growing until it reaches this point! Because it says the rock became a high mountain.

It would not see the rock the stone and then the rock disappear and a great mountain. There must have been a growth which must have been very very fast but very slow as far as the picture is concerned.

The interpretation of the growth of the stone is brought out in ch. 2 twice in v.37 he says now I will interpret. No, in v.44 he says the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed. The other said it will fill the whole earth. Here it expresses -- its stress is not its size but its durability--it will never be destroyed nor left to another people.

In v. It will crush all those kingdoms and bring them to an end but it will itself endure forever. It's stress is upon its lasting quality in ch. 2.

In ch. 7 you have this same feature given again. In ch. 7 the assignment for today was the matter of the stone becoming so big that it fills the whole earth. Four times. In v.14 latter part, "He was given authority, glory and sovereignty. . . that all men of every language should worship him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, that will not pass away, and his kingdom one that will never be destroyed.

When the atom bomb first came out somebody made a cartoon which showed some monkeys on a tree, and a land that was utterly devastated. One monkey said to the other, Now we have to start all over again. A picture of the complete destruction of humanity by the atomic force, and who knows what will happen after that. This passage is very clear that when the human empire, ungodly powers that control the world come to an end, it is not a condition of utter desolation but is replaced by another kingdom, a kingdom which will not pass away and can never be destroyed.

That is brought out in v.14, and again in v.18 where it says the saints of the Most high will possess it forever. Forever and ever. In v.22 it is brought out again-- "a time came when they possessed the kingdom." In v. 27 where it says, "the people of the Most High and his kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom and all people will worship Him and obey him." When Daniel spoke to Nebuchadnezzar he did

not say much about this new kingdom that is going to completely replace the four kingdoms, the four wicked human kingdoms. He touched upon it but mostly on the figure of the stone becoming a mountain and filling the whole earth.

But in ch. 7 in the vision God gave to him it is four times touched upon that there is a new kingdom when the old kingdom disappears. There is not an end to human existence. There is not time will be at an end--that's all! No! The kingdoms of this world are destroyed and in its place there is the kingdom that is established by the coming of the Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven, but it is a kingdom (we are three times told here) that is given to the saints of the Most High, and they will possess the kingdom, and it will be an everlasting kingdom.

So we have these parallels between ch. 4(?) 2 and ch. 7. Very interesting parallels and justify us in figuring that we learn more about what is meant by comparing the two together than when we just have the one alone.

We noticed last time that the second phase of the two is quite different. All we are told of the second phase in ch. 2 is that its feet are of iron mixed with mirey clay. And we are told in ch. 2 that the kingdom is to be partly weak and partly strong. So we have a picture of disintegration, a picture of weakness. As you look at Roman history and as you find that the Roman Empire began you might say when Egypt was conquered in 26 B.C. and thereafter how -- from thereafter how Octavius took the title of Augustus and became the absolute ruler of the Roman Empire. That empire was a very strong empire and continued longer perhaps than any other regime in all history. It continued in great strength until about 400 A.D.--for 4 centuries.

Shortly before 400 A.D. a group of German barbarians forced their way across the Danube. Before that time the Germans had been entering the empire during its whole history, in fact even before it became an empire the Romans had occasionally fought back the Germanic tribes, but they had constantly constantly received individuals from them into the Roman army, until in the latter years before this the Roman army was very largely made up of Germans, who were brought into the empire and became soldiers in the army, and eventually were given pieces of land, were made Roman citizens in the empire. So the population of the Roman empire was to a very large extent people of Germanic background.

But they were people who had completely adopted Roman customs, Latin language, and they were certainly were Romans in every sense of the word tho their background was Germanic. But shortly before 400 A.D. there was a large group of these Germans who were pressed from behind by the Huns and tried to force their way across the Danube and succeeded in doing so despite the efforts of the Roman emperor who fought them and was killed. Then they went marching across the empire looking for places where they could settle down and live, and another tribe followed them, and another ~~tribe~~ tribe, and another tribe, and during the years from 400 to 600 A.D. the Germanic tribes were moving across the empire and eventually settled down--some in Spain,

and some in France, some in eastern Europe, many of them in Italy. The whole character of these countries was changed. The Schaff Church History, Vol I deals with the Apostolic Period up to 100 A.D. We usually don't pay a lot of attention to that mainly because we have better materials on that. But the second volume of Schaff which runs from 100 to 325 A.D. has a great deal of very valuable information about that important period in the history of the church. Then the third volume of Schaff's Church History is called 325 - 600 A.D. It has a lot of interesting material in it.

But once I went through it noting how much of it definitely from 125 to 325 == how much of it dealt with the 125 years from 325-450, and how much of it dealt with the 150 years from 450-600. At least 3/4 of it, probably more than that, deals with the period from 325-450. The amount that deals with the period from 450-600 is very little. The reason is this includes the 200 year period when these Germanic tribes were moving across the country, and it was all they could do to keep alive, and to keep body and soul together. At the beginning of that period probably 90% of the people were literate, and at the end I doubt if 10% were literate! So it was the beginning of the dark ages, a period we know little about.

It immediately seems this is the natural thing to say--this is what is represented by the feet of the image. That period of 200 years in which the Roman power had become so very very weak. But the trouble is that the interpretation says in ch. 2, "there will be ~~the~~ weakness. . . partly potter's clay, and there will also be the strength of the iron." During those 200 years it's mighty hard to find any strength in the Roman empire. So we can hesitate about believing that this is what was represented by that section of it.

the suggestion occurred to me that maybe there was an unmentioned interval. There are many unmentioned intervals in Scripture, particularly in the book of Daniel. It may be that there was an unmentioned interval here and the statue represented the history from the time of Daniel on up until 400 A.D.--that would be all of the statue except the ~~the~~ feet. Then there was an unmentioned interval and the feet represent something that has not yet occurred.

That occurred to me as a possibility and it doesn't seem to me to be the best interpretation. It is not a very reasonable place to put such a division. It seems to me more reasonable that since the Roman civilization, tho the Roman power was crushed, starting in 400 A.D. and became in the west at least only a figure, yet it was a figure that affected people's minds, and hearts, and habits, and as the German tribes settled down, each of them tried to find == to claim that its leader was at least a representative of the nominal Roman emperor out of Constantinople. They tried to claim that, to pretend that tho actually they had all the power in their own hands, and as the institution, most of them lost their former Germanic languages, and ~~the~~ through Spain and France and Italy and much of Switzerland and Scandinavia--thru all this large area that had been in the Roman empire--the languages of these peoples was lost (these new people) and they adopted Latin as their common language and out of Latin there developed the modern

language of Spanish, Portuguese and French, Italian and Rumanian, --differing greatly from Latin yet similar enough that it's easy to trace how each of them developed out of Latin.

They adopted the Roman customs, the Roman names. You notice how that in Russia the leader took the name of Ceasar, of course they abbreviated it to Czar. The names of Ceasar, the names of Roman customs, the features of Roman law, the very organization of the Roman empire--its dioceses was taken over by the RC church, and extended through that whole section of Europe on to Latin America. So it seems to me that we can easily think from the prophet's vision as he looks forward and seeing this Roman empire extending all on for limitless centuries, beyond that.

Thus hearing it represented by the combination of the iron and of the clay, it might be something that is still future. That is a difficult point of interpretation. It seems thought it has one of the two ideas.

There are those who insist that the stone striking the image immediately the stone began to grow and was gradually replacing all the kingdom. In this case the stone would have had to strike them at the very beginning of the Roman empire. The coming of Christ in 4 B.C. (is said to) represent the virgin birth! That means you would have the stone gradually growing, gradually pushing against the kingdoms and eventually destroying them.

It seems to me that interpretation is twisting the meaning of --the apparent picture of the statue a great deal. I find it difficult to accept that interpretation. Now I find a good many commentators that either express that idea or assume it. I think that one interesting example is the commentary by E. J. Young on Daniel in which he said: The stone is definitely the first coming of Christ. It grows and the church is growing. The new kingdom is being fulfilled at the present time.

One very interesting thing struck me that in the picture, the stone strikes the image on its feet which were of iron and clay. That would seem naturally to mean that the stone struck the image not in the head--representing the time of the Babylonian empire, not in the shoulders and breast representing the Medo-Persian empire, not in the thighs representing the Greek empire, not in the legs representing the Roman empire, but in the feet representing the second phase of the Roman empire. Consequently it would not at all fit with the first coming of Christ for he came at the very beginning of the Roman empire.

Of course the question is, What features of the symbol have a meaning? Which of them are simply incidental to the picture? If it simply said the stone struck the image, and demolished it, it could give you nothing to draw from it when it was going to happen. But when it says that the stone struck the image upon its feet which were of iron and clay, --when it puts it in those words, I think a strong argument can be made that this represents the coming toward the end of the long period of the Roman empire and not right at its beginning.

Now Young is aware of that possibility, so Young says: If you want to make the image topple, where else could you strike it except on its feet? That sounds like a conclusive answer, doesn't it? Where else could you strike it? Of course if it doesn't have any meaning, that's naturally where you are going to strike it! Personally if I wanted to knock one of you over, I don't think I'd hit ~~you~~ you on the feet. So it seems to me it is a figure that is unusual, rather than usual. It is stated so specifically that it ought to convey a meaning--meaning it comes at the end of the Roman empire rather than at its beginning.

I can imagine knocking a statue, or person, over by hitting them on the head and shoulders. Perhaps on the thighs, though I think that's unlikely. I think there would be a lot more power by hitting it higher up. To hit it hard enough on the feet to make it fall over, impresses me as unnatural. I would not want to build an argument on that, but it does seem to me that his statement, where else would you strike it but on the feet, seems rather silly! Contrary to fact.

We saw last time that if you take the time of the iron mixed with clay as the last 200 years of the Roman empire, from 400 to 600, why shortly after 600 a force came out of the desert-- people that just seemed to have no power, nobody paid much attention to these ~~g~~ ~~o~~ ~~m~~ ~~i~~ ~~n~~ ~~g~~ in the desert, they had been there for thousands of years. People mentioned them, but they didn't pay much attention to them. Then all the sudden a man claimed to be a representative of God and he filled people with enthusiasm. They went out and conquered all of Arabia, all of the great Medo-Persian empire to the east. They conquered a great deal of the area of the Roman empire. They came right to the gates of Constantinople within a few years, and if it were not for the invention of Greek fire, they would have taken it too. But it repulsed them.

Constantinople continued calling itself the Roman empire, and head of the eastern Roman empire, but actually having only a little territory around Constantinople. For the next 1000 ~~know~~ years (nearly 800 to 1453 A.D.) when the Mohammedans took Constantinople. Question?

invention

Was it ~~xxxx~~ through the intervention of what they were given ? taken? ? ?

Yes. There had just been invented a new technology, which they called Greek fire. It was a precursor of modern weapons. Projectiles that shot fire. If it wasn't for that they would have taken Constantinople and come right across Europe. After they conquered Constantinople in '53 (1453)? They came right across and conquered all the Balkans. They conquered Hungary. It looked as if they were going to take ~~of~~ all of Europe then. Before then, around 700 they had conquered all of South Africa, and had gone up and conquered all of Spain. They were stopped about 700 from entering France. Or they would have taken all of Europe, it looked like.

A Mohammedan might have said, Here's the fulfillment. The last 200 years of the Roman empire, right after it comes this great supernatural force, that strikes the image, destroys the Roman empire, takes the whole world and establishes an entire new regime. It might have looked that way then, but of course they were stopped after 100 years. They held the rest of that territory with great power for over 1000 years, but they did not fulfill that promise of becoming a world power and today they are a comparatively weak power altho they have a great many people?

So that interpretation does not work out. Another interpretation would be the stone--the Latin for stone is *petra*. Jesus said to a man named Peter, I will make your name *Cephas* which is the Aramaic for stone and which they later translated into Latin as *Petros*, so he became known as Peter and the bishops of Rome claim to be the successors of Peter. They established a power over Europe. They claimed control of all the people of Europe. In 1214 the Pope declared that King John of England must submit to him completely. He proclaimed an interdict over England and gave the French monarch his blessing to conquer England, and the result was that John would have lost England entire to the French, if he had not completely surrendered and gave the Pope a paper in which he said he turned over England to the Pope to be controlled by the Pope; it was a part of the Pope's temporal power!

Of course it was so far away that the Popes never exercised such power, and 200 years later the Pope tried to and the English Parliament refused to admit it. By 1200 the Papacy had established a power which looked as if it might be the new regime that would rule the whole world, but it didn't work out. Today the papacy as far as actual land rule is concerned has maybe half of ~~1~~ a square mile in the center of Rome, which is the Pope's own country. It is a separate country. Ambassadors are sent to it by the nations as a great power, but the power of the papacy is through the church rather than through their land and their power is only a fraction of what it was. So it did not work out that way.

So the establishment of the new kingdom, unless it is the church, and it's hard to think of that as really fulfilling the picture? and yet unless there should be some tremendous advance in the church in the next few years, it would look otherwise and as if the coming of this stone represents something that is still future. It would look as if it's a great fut. development.

It's amazing the number of commentators that talk about how the church is the kingdom that is here today. Yet everyone of them would say the church has not yet occupied the whole world, and so the picture is not complete. The great stress is put upon the church being the fulfillment and you wouldn't notice that part. For a decision between these two it seems to me you'd have to look to ch. 7. On ch. 7 the commentators are much more agreed as to what it means than they are on ch. 2 tho there are still many differences between them.

Ch. 7 parallels ch. 2 starting with its picture of 4 kings. It tells us more about them. Then it has this stage where there are

the 10 horns. It does not say --- it says the beast has 10 horns. Some have said those were 10 successive rulers. You can't tell when it says the beast has 10 horns whether it represents 10 successive rulers. It might be the 10 hills of ancient Rome. Rome spoke of itself as a city -- no they speak of seven hills, so it would not represent them. It might conceivably represent 10 rulers that succeeded one another, until you read that among them there came up a little horn before which 3 of the 10 disappeared, so 10 must be to some extent at the same time.

Then this little horn comes up among them which has the eyes of a man and which boasts great things. You might think this represented Napoleon or Hitler or one of the Popes. You might make various guesses like that but I don't think any of them would work out very close. It would seem that it must represent something that is still future.

But then we have a scene ~~at~~ in heaven. The mouth of the horn was speaking boastfully. Then as he looked he saw a heavenly scene (vv.9-10). You can think of that as he sees the picture he sees these beasts with the horns and all that, and the little one coming up and it has the eyes of a man, and a mouth that speaks boastfully. Just how you see that in a dream? But as he looked he sees a heavenly scene. You could think of it as a ~~z~~ scene in which he sees changes. Another way you could think of it was he was looking at the earth and then he realized there was a heavenly scene above. His eyes look up and he sees the heavenly scene.

The heavenly scene is described in vv.9-10. Verse 11: "Then I continued to watch because the horn was speaking and I kept looking until the beast was slain. That suggests he sees the heavenly scene and then it disappears and he sees an earthly scene with the beasts slain. To me it seems more likely that he thinks of himself as looking at the heavenly scene and as he ~~st~~ looks he hears the horns boastful words. Or perhaps he remembers them. In any case he wonders. Here's this wonderful heavenly scene, but here's this horn that is boasting so and attacking heaven and persecuting the saints; what's going to happen to him?

Then he looks down from the heavenly scene, and he kept looking until the beast was slain and his body destroyed and thrown into the place of fire. So you see the vision of the destruction of the horn. Not of the horn but of the beast, but that would imply that the horn was included with the beast.

Then v. 10. I read you from the NIV. If you read v.10 in KJV you get a different idea of it. Not v. 10, but v.12. "I beheld even until the beast was slain and its body destroyed and given to the burning of flame and concerning the rest of the beasts they had their doming taken away, yet their lives were ~~proxx~~ prolonged for a season and ~~a~~ a time. If you read that in KJV, the natural interpretation would be, He looked and saw the beasts slain and its body given to the flames. Then he looks at the other 3 and they are continuing to live for a time. They are no longer ruling, their dominion is gone, but their lives are prolonged for a season (a time).

That of course does not fit the picture at all. Because when the horn is slain, when the 4th kingdom is slain, certainly the other 3 ~~must~~ must == did not continue to exist. So I believe that NIV of v. 12 is correctly put in parenthesis and they say the other== when they say the other beasts had been stripped of their authority, While KJV says, As concerning the rest of the beasts they had their ~~dominion~~ dominion taken away. In other words it's taken as a past, as a pluperfect. "As concerning the rest of the beasts they had had their dominion taken away." That is absolutely possible according to the interpretation because in English we have all kinds of verb forms: He went, he had gone, he would have gone, he goes, he is going, he will go, he would go. We have many different verb forms.

But in Hebrew you do not have all those forms. The two tenses are the perf. and imperf. The perf. quite regularly can be something that has happened, in the past. But the imperf. in Heb. ordinarily indicates something that will happen, or something that would happen after something that has just been described. So we find in Gen. 2 how there was found no man to till the ground, but a mist would come up to water the garden. It says-- the form there is imperfect: a mist will come up, but it meant just after what had been described. To take that as a pluperfect --e- that a perfect can represent something that happens before a previous perfect, just as the imperf. represents something that happens after a ~~perfect~~ previous perfect as the NIV ~~does~~ does is perfectly proper. It's the only way it can make sense. I believe all the modern translations take it that way.

That suggests the possibility that Heb. is a much less precise lang. than Greek. Greek has all kinds of forms, of tenses. Are always arguing about the precise meaning of something. In Heb. we only have these two tenses so there is a very wide range of meaning in connection with them

For next time I would like you to look at 5 vv. in ch. 7-- v. 9, 10, 21, 22, 28. Look at these in the KJV. . . Surely can get access to one in the library . . . then look at some modern version. I don't care what version it is but I want you to state on your paper what version it is. Look at that translation of these 5 vv. and see what important differences they have. (Not any real difference between meaning of a rock and a stone. Pay no attention to a change like that.) Any difference of tense, of word, anything that seems to make a real difference in meaning. I take these 5 vv. because there is such a difference in every one of them. A difference in meaning between what you find in KJV and in some modern version. Tell what are the important differences.

For a moment I thought of saying if you've had Heb. look at the Heb. . . but I can't say that because it's in ~~Heb.~~ Aramaic rather than Hebrew. I don't think any of you know Aramaic tho Aramaic is quite similar to Heb. in many ways. See what the differences are and what they make in your understanding of those verses. What important differences in each of these 5 vv. Don't bother with little trivial things. Is at least one important difference in each one.

The assignment for next time will be posted before the end of the hour. . . .

Today I'd like to look again at ch. 7 which has a great many interesting things in it. It starts with a dream Daniel had in the 1st yr. of Belshazzar, king of Babylon. We don't know when that was. Belshazzar is not mentioned in the list of the kings of Babylon. The last king of Babylon, according to the records is Nabonidus. So it used to be said this was entirely fictitious. There was no such king as Belshazzar. But it now has been proven that Nabonidus made his son Belshazzar co-king with him. During the last years of Nabonidus' reign he was off in Arabia studying archaeology, and his son Belshazzar was doing the actual reigning!

But we don't know how long Belshazzar did that. So when it says the first year of Belshazzar we know it was a little time before the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. We don't know just how many years before. In that year Daniel had a dream. In that dream he saw the four winds of heaven churning up the great sea and four beasts came up out of the sea, yet they weren't fish! They were beasts. Such beasts don't ordinarily come out of the sea.

When you read the interpretation further on you find they represent four kingdoms that come out of the earth. Of course both earth and sea here are figures of speech. There's no contradiction. Many people say the Bible is full of contradictions. It is true that any book has many--any book of any length has many seeming contradictions. That is where you find the words that sound like the opposite of the same thing said. But often its two sides of the same truth. That's what it is here.

The sea speaks of the changing conditions of human life. The earth represents a natural coming out of a human development--these four kings, they were earthly beings but they came out of the shifting changing currents which can be well represented by the sea. So we have these four kingdoms. You remember it was mentioned that the first was like a lion and had the wings of an eagle. That was the Babylonian kingdom. Better say the Assyro-Babylonian because it doesn't just represent the one kingdom. It represents the succession of empires--one great empire which had its ups and its downs for several centuries. The first of the great empires. I mentioned to you why he did not take Egypt as the first great empire earlier.

This was the Assyro-Babylonian empire. The rest of the v. explains. I hope you remember what we said about it. Then the second beast looked like a bear. It raised up on one side, and we saw that was the Medo-Persian empire which conquered the Babylonian empire. Belshazzar was king, when they conquered. He was killed in connection with the conquering as we read earlier in the book of Daniel.

Then there was the third empire which was like a leopard. On its back it had four wings and four heads, . . . we have this stress on different divisions--four heads, four wings. It is the third great empire--the empire of Alexander the Great, the empire which within a very few years after its conquest was divided into parts--three great parts and many small parts. That lasted for about 200 yrs. We call it one empire because altho there was not a single unified control there was a single culture spread over this wide area with people of Greek or Macedonian background in control and trying to carry on the Greek language and culture all through this big empire that had been conquered by Alexander the Great. So we have this stress on the division in the mention of the four heads and four wings. That wouldn't tell you. But when you find what happened you know it fits. Yes?

Student: My question is in reference to the four wings and the emphasis on the number four if it was divided into three.

There can always be when you have a figure like that, there is always the question: Is this a general figure? Is it a specific figure? Those who say this must be a specific figure, it was divided into four parts. And I have a friend, a very fine scholar who is strongly convinced it was divided into four parts, and that's it! But in the history you find there were three large parts and several small parts. He wants to ignore the small parts and to imagine the fourth large part. It's possible he's right. Because there's a good deal we don't know about the history. But I've been unable to find more than three. So I feel we are justified in saying here the four is a general number: three main parts and the fourth one covers a lot of smaller sections. It's not an extremely important question but it is an interesting question for interpretation. I don't think we should try to twist history to fit the prophecy. But see what history is and see the prophecy and I think you'll find that the correct interpretation. Yes?

Student: Is that the Roman empire(? ? ?)

Yes, the very latest Roman empire. That is after several centuries. There was a brief time when Diocletian divided the empire into four parts, but that lasted for only 2 or 3 decades. Very brief thing. He wanted it to be one empire divided into two parts either of which had an emperor over it, and each of them divided into two parts with a man over it called Caesar, ~~and~~ who would have half of it and he would succeed the Emperor and appoint a new Caesar, and the two would work together. But it doesn't work out. Out of centuries of Roman history there is only that 20 or 30 years that could possibly ---

Student: I was under the impression that the empire was divided by four generals (?)

Yes, that is a very widespread impression. But it doesn't fit the history.

Student question: (indistinct)

Well, there are three divisions. There was Egypt where the Ptolemies reigned. There was Macedonia, and Thrace which the _____ family ruled for a couple of centuries. Then there is Syria. Those were the 3 large divisions. I know of no other large division. There are about 8 small divisions. There were generals that succeeded him--maybe a dozen of them. Fought back and forth. . . A period when there were 5, a period when there were 3, a period when there were 4. They varied.

Many writers have picked four of these arbitrarily. They seldom pick the same four. They say, these are the four! We have so many important things I don't want to spend much time on this particular point. I'll be glad to discuss it individually with anybody . . .

The main thing is that this empire was divided and yet it was one empire because it wanted to have Greek culture, the Greek attitude, even the Greek language supreme in all of these. Although there was quite a little fighting between them from time to time. That was the third empire.

Then the fourth empire-- a beast terrifying, frightening and very powerful with large iron teeth. It crushed and devoured its victims and trampled under foot whatever was left. It was different from all the former beasts and had 10 horns. Daniel would have no way to know what this meant: it had ten horns. Except that it must be something very unusual. Would the ten horns represent 10 successive kings? Ten kings that rule at the same time? Do they represent something else? He could not know at this point.

He says, While I was thinking about the horns, there before me was another ~~horn~~ horn, a little one which came up among them and 3 of the first horns were uprooted before it. This horn had eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth that spoke boastfully. How could a horn do that? It's evidently a very grotesque thing, but it in a dream things that are very strange can seem real. It was to represent something that was going to come that would seem to be a man. It had eyes like a man and a mouth that spoke boastfully.

You have a condition where it looks forward to probably there is a man, probably a powerful ruler. It says later on that these represent 10 kings. So there is a king who speaks boastfully. We read later on in the ch. that he oppressed the saints. It did ~~not~~ look as though he was going to utterly destroy them. But now (v. 22) (v. 9) as I looked (the KJV says in v. 9) I beheld two of the thrones were cast down. This phrase I beheld till-- is used in this chapter. It means as I looked a certain change took place. So NIV has "As I looked thrones were set in place." There is a striking difference in this v. 9 as must-of you noticed. KJV: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down." All modern VS say something like: "As I looked thrones were set in place!"

One modern version (NASB) says "thrones were set up." This seems to be the opposite of "thrones were cast down." Actually all the Aramaic word means is "were placed." He looked and he saw thrones there. Did he see the thrones put into place, or did he see a scene in which the thrones were already there? in place? You cannot tell from the original, but most of the modern translations seem to think it means "they were put in place." At any rate he turns his eyes away from this earthly scene and sees a heavenly scene.

In this heavenly scene he sees the throne, and the Ancient of Days did sit (KJV says). What does it mean? "He did sit." Does that mean he sat down? Or does it mean as he looked he saw the Ancient of Days sitting? There is quite a difference isn't there? Did he see a scene in which there He did sit? Or did he see a scene in which He came in and took His seat? It makes quite a difference, though it's not the most important difference here.

a scene

At any rate he saw/in which there was somebody called the Ancient of Days who sat. What do we mean by Ancient of days. Some translate it an oldman. Well it's == it does mean someone who had been in existence a very long time. The Ancient of days sounds certainly a lot nicer than an oldman. But as you read the context it's very clear that this represents God. This represents ==does it represent God the Father? Does it represent God the Son? Does it represent the Holy Spirit? I think we can all agree this represents the triune God. The Ancient of God here is God as He existed from all eternity--the Ancient of Days is the triune God.

God does not have a body as a man does. He didn't see one person of the trinity. He saw a representation there of the great God whom we know is triune. Three persons in one God. He saw the Ancient of Days sitting. His garment was white as snow. The ahhair of his head was like pure wool. His throne was like a fiery flame and his wheels a burning fire. A tremendous scene of the magnitude and great power of God. His majesty. A fiery stream issued forth from before him, thousands thousands ministered unto him . . . and judgement was set and the books were opened.

What does it mean "the judgment was set?" Practically all recent translations render it as NIV does "the court was seated and the books were opened." It makes a difference. There is a possibility between two pictures. I think we get one picture from KJV. We get a different picture from all the modern versions. Personally in this case I think KJV is correct. But it does not make a tremendous difference. The difference is this: As it stands in KJV you get a picture of the tremendous power and majesty of God. Here are thrones. Here is the great triune God sitting there. Here are the flames shooting forth. Here are 10,000 of thousands of thousands to do his will. The books are opened, The books which show the decisions He has made from all eternity. The decisions that the wickedness reigns in this earth the four great empires succeed one another, and it ends with this terrible horn which speaks blasphemy, yet God from all eternity has determined what is going to be the fate of them, and He is going to bring wickedness to an end and set up His glorious kingdom.

He will set up his glorious kingdom of righteousness which can never be destroyed. But the impression which I get from the KJV here--an impression which is at least possible from the Aramaic and which I think is required by the Aramaic, but I would not make a big point of it particularly since all the modern versions take it differently.

They take it that as Daniel looks he sees a place there and in that place he sees the Ancient of days come in; he sees thrones there. (I don't know whether you can draw from it that the thrones were already there or whether the thrones were put there as he saw. He saw thrones that were placed there or he saw thrones being put there.) Then he saw the Ancient of days come in and take his seat, and then he saw other beings around him. Then the court was set, the books were opened and under the leadership of the Ancient of days the court decided what are we going to do about this terrible horn here that is being blasphemous. You see the difference.

Was it a decision being made then as you would get from all the modern versions or was it a picture of the greatness of God as He had this tremendous power to carry out the decision which he has made from all eternity? I think we could spend quite a bit of time looking at the evidence on it, and I don't think the difference is important enough to take the time at this point. The main thing is he sees there the great power of God. As he looks, is he simply looking at the upper scene and there below is the scene on earth? Or as he looks up there and the scene on earth disappears but he still can hear it ringing in his ears, the boastful words of the little horn?

At any rate he either turns his eyes down from the heavenly scene to the earthly scene, or the scene in front of him changes from the heavenly scene to the earthly scene. Because as he saw this happen then he says, I saw this happen and because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake, or "Then I continued to watch because of the boastful words the horn was speaking." He turns his attention to the earthly scene. "I kept looking until the beast was slain and its body destroyed and ~~the beast~~ thrown into the blazing fire. A tremendous destruction of what? He doesn't mention the horn! He mentions the beast. The horn is part of the beast, so we can assume that the horn was destroyed but the emphasis here is on the whole thing. This dread kingdom is destroyed and its body is slain and thrown into the blazing fire.

He sees the heavenly scene. He sees the earthly scene. He sees the great power of God. He sees the end of the anti-god power on earth here as it is completely destroyed. Whether he sees the carrying out of the decision that God had just made or that the court had made over which He presided as you could get the impression from the modern translations, or whether he sees the great power of God that is so great in comparison with this earthly thing the when you look at the earthly thing it seems tremendous, that you know there's plenty of power there to carry out God's decree from all eternity to bring an end to it.

Certainly God didn't just make a decree then, or the ~~world~~ court just didn't, because we're told ahead of time about it. So we know from His prediction what was going to happen.

At any rate we go on to the next v. which in KJV can be quite puzzling. I wished later I'd asked you to include that v. in the ones I'd asked you to compare. Verse 12, "As concerning the rest of the beasts they had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time." As that stands you'd get the impression the great beast was destroyed --the fourth kingdom was destroyed, but the first three kingdoms they still live on. If you got that impression of course it would be absurd because ~~the~~ it parallels the whole image being destroyed and broken into little pieces. To say the first three still continue after the fourth was destroyed is of course nonsense, and the modern versions translated it I believe correctly when they say that (NIV puts it in parenthesis) "the other beasts had been stripped of their authority but were allowed to live for a period of time."

In other words as these beasts succeeded one after another they lost their power. The first lost it when the second came; the second lost it when the third came. The fourth is destroyed. The previous three had each been conquered by the succeeding one, but they took over many of its qualities. They were allowed to continue to live in that sense. But they all are destroyed (you might say) all the remnants of all of them when the fourth was destroyed. Question?

Student: The little horn, is that Rome?

No. (What is it?) Well I'd rather not go into that here. I'm just trying to draw from it what we can get from it for sure and I don't want to go beyond that. That's not my purpose in this course. You can draw what you think it should be, but it says later on in the interpretation that the 10 horns are 10 kingdoms and the little horn is another kingdom. So the little horn could hardly be Rome coming up after 10 previous kingdoms. The little horn is something that comes out of the fourth kingdom. But it's not Rome, certainly.

Then, we were looking at v.12. The Babylonian kingdom when it was taken by the Persians, the Persians continued to use the Babylonian language in their inscriptions in Babylon. They took over much of the Babylonian culture and civilization though the Persian superceeded it. Then when the Persian empire was taken over by Alexander the Great, he kept the divisions of the Persian empire, as administrative divisions. He married ~~the~~ a Persian prince. He encouraged his people to marry Persians, he wanted to mix the two together. The Persian culture continued even tho it lost its dominion.

Then when Rome took over, Alexander's empire section by section Greek culture continued in the Roman empire. In fact in the Church in Rome for its first three centuries you could read Latin entirely. It didn't use the Latin language at all. Some would even say the Roman empire was conquered by the people it conquered! Greek culture ~~was~~

So each of these, many of its qualities continued into the other. But in the end the beast is destroyed, it's the end of all of them, all of the earthly human aspects.

Then we have in v.13, "In my vision at night, I looked and there before me was one like a Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven." That's a very interesting statement. When you look on in the ch. you find there are three places where it says, --v.18 for instance, "The saints of the most high will receive the kingdom and possess it forever." In v.28 "the sovereignty greatness and power under the whole heavens will be handed over to the saints of the most high. . ." There are two or three times when the saints are said to receive the kingdom, afterwards.

So there are these who say, When he saw the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven and receiving authority . . . that is referring to the saints. Some take it that way-- this is a figure --the Son of man-- for the saints, who receive the kingdom. There's not reference or mention later specifically of the son of man coming. So one might consider the possibility of that interpretation i.e. the Son of man represents the saints. But I don't think it's the correct interpretation. I think the Son of man here stands for an individual.

I looked and there before me was a Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. The phrase a Son of man in Heb. and in Aramaic is a common way of saying "a man." In Ezekiel the phrase son of man occurs dozens of times. Whenever God speaks to Ezekiel he says, Son of man do this, Son of man do that, I'll tell you about this Son of man. So Son of man is a common way of describing an individual man. When you turn to ch. 8:17 as ~~xxx~~ Gabriel came near the place where I was standing I was terrified and fell prostrate. Son of man he said, Understand the vision concerns the time of the end.

So Daniel is called Son of man in the next ch. Son of man can just mean a man. It is a rather common way to say that. It occurs dozens of times that way in Ezekiel i.e. Son of man, for one man. You read of Abraham being visited by God when the ~~xxxx~~ three men visited him and he ran out to his flock and he took a son of the herd. That means an individual calf or cow and he killed it and made lunch for the company.

Questions In the first reference you gave was the son of man definite or indefinite? A son of man, or the son of man?

I don't think it would make a great difference, which was used. The word in its general sense meant just a man. I saw one like a man. I saw someone like a man who was coming in the clouds of heaven and he approached the Ancient of days and was led into his presence. He was given authority, glory and sovereign power. KJV says: He was given authority, glory and sovereign power that all people. . . nations and languages should worship him." NIV: "all peoples nations and men of every language worshipped him." It makes it in the past. I believe the other is the better interpretation, but ~~xx~~ both are possible. "He was given power that they should." It does not say it was done immediately. He gave them power and they all did, sounds as if this was something that happened right then.

This term Son of man originally just means a man, but this is a very remarkable statement: the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven and one who has great authority, he approached the ancient of days and was led into his presence and given this tremendous authority. It would seem that God in his providence caused that the Jews thru the years when they read this would say This points to a marvellous, supernatural individual who comes upon the clouds of heaven! They might assume that was what it meant. That would not prove whether it was or not.

But we do have a most remarkable proof that that interpretation was the correct one. We find that proof in Matthew, a statement that shows two things: what the Jews thought, and what Christ definitely taught. That we find in Mat. 26(it's also in Mark and in Luke). The high priest said to Him, I charge you under oath by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ the son of God. . . Yes it is as you say, Jesus replied. But I say to all of you, in the future you will see the son of man sitting at the right hand of the mighty one and coming on the clouds of heaven. What did that mean to the high priest? The high priest tore his clothes and said, You have spoken blasphemy . . .

This shows immediately the way the high priest took it-- that he understood, that the Jews understood that the Son of man that Daniel said is going to sit at the right hand of God the Father and is going to come on the clouds of heaven, is what I am. Jesus was understood by the high priest to mean that. So that is proof that this idea had developed among the Jews, though it is not specifically stated in Daniel, and the fact that Jesus took it over and said this is what is going to happen and used the term from Daniel, shows that Jesus was saying . . . He said, Are you the Christ, and he said, Yes, and you will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven . . .

It is an exact parallel. We could not draw that from Daniel alone. We could take it as a possibility. But Jesus three times is told in all three Gospels that this is the meaning . . .

Question: The Jews then interpreted Messiah then to be deity rather than just a human deliverer? Their messianic hope was to have God come physically and deliver them. Is that correct?

No, I don't think you can draw that conclusion.

Student: No I don't mean from this verse. I mean is that why they interpret that when Jesus said, Yes I am the Son of man that Daniel spoke of, their view of messiah, their view of deity delivering them rather than just a person sent by God.

We have no contemporary evidence except what we find in the Gospels. We have later statements by the Jews when they were oppping Christianity, and we have Jewish commentaries on the OT but it's pretty hard to prove one way or the other on that. In fact as they insisted later on God being one and the Messiah as separate from God, not being deity, it's pretty hard to say what they would have believed at this time. But they did believe this was a picture of one coming, and what he said to Jesus was, Are you the Christ the Son of God?

That doesn't say he thought he was God. Of course we know that he was. But that gives us then the evidence---yes,

Question: Inv.9 you refer to the Ancient of days being the triune God; in v. 13 the one whom we refer to as Christ is presented to the Ancient of days, doesn't that preclude the Ancient of days from being the triune God?

No. I don't think so. It will show the term is used in two different ways. It would show the term was used in that case to mean the triune God. When we say God, do we mean God the Father? We mean the triune God? We say Jesus is God. It is a mystery that nobody can understand, how there is only one God and yet three persons. Jesus who was God prayed to his heavenly Father who was God yet there is only one God. It is the great central mystery of the Christian religion which we cannot understand, but we have to accept what the Scripture teaches.

So when it shows God ruling over all the world, ruling over all he has created--that is very clearly I would say the triune God. But when you see one like the Son of man brought before the Ancient of days and being given all this authority, Jesus said the Son of man does what he sees his Father doing. He does what his Father wishes, etc. You have the Ancient of days used in one case to mean the triune God, and used a few vv. later to mean God the Father. Of course we have the word God used the same way. Sometimes for God the Father, sometimes for God the Son.

So we have this picture of one like the Son of man coming and there's an interesting thing that the gospels never call Jesus the Son of man. They never do. The Gospels do not anywhere say that anybody called him the Son of man. You notice in this case the high priest said, Are you the Christ the Son of God? Jesus said, You will see the Son of man coming . . . The Gospels never call Jesus the Son of man. The Gospels never call him that. No person is represented in the Gospels as calling him the Son of man. But in the Gospels there are nearly 80 cases where he calls himself the Son of man.

That's a very interesting fact. Jesus took the term and applied it to himself. Before I studied the book of Daniel I thought the term Son of God represented Jesus as being divine, and the term Son of man represented him as being truly man as we are. But that is not the case. The term of Son of man means that the one Daniel saw coming on the clouds of heaven, the one sitting on the right hand of God the Father, that is the one who Jesus when he used the term Son of man was saying I am the one that Daniel talked about. He is not specifically say it in so many words; he is implying it.

It's very interesting in the gospels to note that fact. 80 t. approximately Jesus refers to himself as the Son of man. No Gospel writer ever calls him the Son of man. Jesus said, The Son of man came . . . But the Gospel writer doesn't say The Son of man went to this place . . .

But he does 80 times. He ~~xxxx~~ thereby takes this term to himself from the book of Daniel, a term which is used dozens of times in the book of Ezekiel to mean Ezekiel. A term which is used in the very next ch. in Daniel to mean Daniel. But in this case it used one coming in the clouds of heaven and Jesus takes it and applies it to himself.

We have these two elements in Daniel? he sees the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven; he sees him brought before the Ancient of days and given all authority and power that all should worship him. I take that as Jesus at his resurrection being there as we read in Ps. 2, "Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee." That at his resurrection God(the Father) gave him his place at God's right hand to wait until all his enemies shall be made his and shall be given to him. We have these two elements in what Jesus quoted to the high priest, and we have those two elements in those two verses in Daniel.

So we have this tremendous picture of what is going to happen and strangely we have it given in this statement in a way which we could not take so definitely if we did not have Jesus' statement that he himself made which is repeated in all 3 gospels(synoptic). If it was not for that we could not be dogmatic on that. But with that we can certainly be dogmatic. We are given this tremendous picture of Jesus who was brought before the Ancient of days, Jesus who went before His Father and was given all power and authority and told to "sit at my right hand until I make thine ~~xxxxxx~~ enemies the footstool of thy feet." We have this picture given to Daniel and then to Peter in all the gospels.

This dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away; his kingdom is one that shall never be destroyed. Then v.15, "I Daniel was troubled in my spirit . . . I approached one of those standing near and asked him the true meaning of all this." So they gave him the interpretation. What was it? He said, The four great beasts are four kingdoms that shall rise from the earth but the saints of the most high shall receive the kingdom and possess it forever and ever," and that's all he says. A very brief summary of just the main things. (Hardly an interpretation). But Daniel wasn't satisfied with that. He asked him further questions which give us more detail about what he'd already seen ~~before~~. than what he'd given before.

"Then I wanted to know the true meaning of the fourth beast which was more terrible than all the others . . . the beast that . . . trampled under foot whatever was left. I also wanted to know about the 10 horns on its head and about the other horn which came up before which three of them fell. The horn that looked more imposing than the others and that had eyes and a mouth that spoke boastfully . . .

He's not seeing this now; he's repeating here what he'd seen in the vision earlier. But he had not told us in the vision earlier that this horn was fighting against the saints.

He was fighting against the saints and defeating them. He had not told us that before, so he's going back and reversing us part of the vision and giving us more understanding of what he's already seen.

He said, As I watched this horn was waging war against the saints and did ~~not~~ until the Ancient of days came. The KJV says: "and judgment was given in favor of the saints of the most high." NIV ~~says~~ says, "pronounced judgment in favor of the saints of the most high." The word "pronounced" is not in the original. It's just "judgment was given." And the time came when the saints possessed the kingdom. This word "judgment" here is the same identical word as was translated "court" earlier. I think its ~~its~~ KJV to be translated "judgment" in both cases. And also in the later case.

That was the big difference in the assignment I gave you whether they say "the court will sit," or whether they say, "the judgment is set." The judgment is the decision isn't it? for the case that you bring. It is the matter under investigation or the decision made on it. It's not the court. You don't call a ~~sawxax~~ court a judgment. But the word occurs 3 times in this ch., and everybody translates it "judgment" in v. 22.

In the other two cases where the word occurs, all the modern translations I've seen translate it "court." There's a difference between a judgment and a court. The Aramaic din is similar to the Hebrew word din. Many of the words are very closely related between the Hebrew and the Aramaic. In the Middle ages in the Jewish writings it refers to a house of din, which means a court. A house of judgment was a court. But to say a judgment alone means a court . . .

Probably the reason your modern translations want to make it court is because it says "will sit." But it could just as well be translated (like the KJV does) "it was set." I'd rather render it "the judgment stood." The judgment stands. That is, God has determined from all eternity that is what is definitely set. I don't know as it makes a great deal of difference, but when you take it God saw the terrible things taking place on earth and he says, Let's get a court together and make a decision and decide what we're going to do about it, or whether it shows God's tremendous power and there is to be carried out the decision he has made, from all eternity.

I think it's more natural to render the word the same way in all three cases where it occurs, here. I think he is contrasting the tremendous power of God ~~is~~ against the seemingly great power of these human forces but their power in relation to God's power is insignificant, and the power which God is going to destroy.

Then he gives the explanation: the fourth kingdom is a kingdom . . . different from all the other kingdoms, it will devour the whole earth trampling it down and crushing it. The 10 horns are 10 kings who will come from this kingdom. After them another king will arise different from the earlier ones. He will subdue three kings.

If he subdues three kings that would seem to suggest the ten kings are at the same time rather than one after the other ~~xxxx~~ although it could possibly be there were seven of them one after the other and then three came at once. I mean we can't be dogmatic on that. But I do not know of anything that has yet happened that would seem to be what is here predicted. So it would seem to me that it would have to be something that is still future.

This one subdues three. He speaks against the Most High and . . . will try to change the set times and the laws." Some interpreters say that must be Julius Caesar because Caesar was a Roman ruler ~~xxxx~~ who changed the calendar, made a much better calendar than they had before--a calendar which the whole western world followed for 1700 years after Julius Caesar, then a slight change was made 300 years ago.

Julius Caesar changed the set times, he changed the set times, he changed the laws, he improved many things but I don't think this is referring to Julius Caesar. I think it is referring to something still future because it seems to occur just before the kingdom of the saints is set up. The kingdom that is to be established by this Son of man.

Verse 26, "but the judgment will stand" is practically the way KJV says it, "but the judgment is set." NIV: "but the court will sit and his power will be taken away." Though it doesn't make a tremendous difference which way you take it I think in this case the KJV is right. "Then the sovereign power and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heavens will be turned over to the saints . . ." You'd think it would be turned over to the Son of man. But I think it means the Son of man takes it and he rules through the saints. He uses the saints for the purpose as His representatives. It will be an everlasting kingdom and all rulers will worship him. This is the end of the matter.

Now the previous--in ch. 2 we noticed it seems to say, Here comes the stone. It hits the statue and completely demolishes it, and it itself grows up to fill the whole earth and replaces it. ~~But~~ But there are others who say, No, here comes the virgin birth; here comes the beginning of the Christian church. It gradually grows; it takes over and takes over more and eventually it's got everything (of the world) and the old statue has disappeared. But everybody seems to feel that ch. 7 is parallel to ch. 2 and represents a tremendous change taking place after the end of the fourth kingdom. One could make a strong argument for the two being parallel. It would show then the end of the fourth kingdom which I incline to think is the Roman empire being thought of as a kingdom until ~~this time~~ this time as so many elements of Roman culture, Roman government, etc. are important in so many parts of the world. We even name our days of the week--some of them after Roman Gods. We do name many of our months after Roman gods. We use the calendar Julius Caesar invented.

We think of that as continuing through, but it is going to be destroyed by the sudden coming of the Son of man. That seems to me to be the most natural interpretation.

It's time to close. Let me say again, anytime I misspeak myself or don't make myself clear in what I'm trying to say I wish you would interrupt me. If you have another point you want to bring, or you wish to ask questions on anything further I wish you'd write it out and give it to me.

(Handout papers for review for mid-semester quiz . . . Two weeks from today we'll have the mid-semester test. Most if not all the questions on the test will be taken from this sheet . . . Giving them out two weeks ahead so that if you have questions you want further help on I'd appreciate it if you'd give me a note before the beginning of the next class. If two or more ask about the same question I would take time next week to briefly summarize it . . .)

Home work papers on the whole were very well done. The first question asked you was "Compare in Dan. 8 the two kingdoms there mentioned with the kingdoms in chs. 2 and 7." Practically everyone had it correct that the first kingdom in ch.8 is the same as the second in chs. 2 and 4; and that the 2nd kingdom in ch. 8 is the same as the third one in ch. 2 and 4. Most everyone had that correct.

Not so many had the other part correct. I asked you to look at the mention of horn, of one horn in ch. 8 and one in ch. 7 and tell whether they were the same or different. About 2/3 of you said they were different; a few said they were the same. I believe we have to agree they are different because the horn that is described in ch. 7 that speaks boastfully against the Lord, and that leads to the destruction of the fourth beast, that horn came out of the fourth kingdom. The horn in ch. 8 says it specifically came out of the Greek ~~in~~ kingdom which according to our understanding is the third kingdom. So you can't have the same horn coming out of two different kingdoms. Both the third and the fourth. That reason was given on most papers. Some gave an additional reason: that in ch. 7 you have 10 horns, and then one comes up from among them before which three of the others are destroyed. So it comes out of a group of 10 horns, while in ch. 8, the Grecian kingdom is divided into four horns, and from one of them comes a little horn. So the description of the ~~is~~ is very different. Just as it comes from a different kingdom.

Now we were looking at 7:9-10 and we noticed that the interpretation of this picture is the KJV and the one in the most recent versions is quite different. The differences is partly ~~xxxxxxx~~ in minor things like "thrones were put in place and the Ancient of days ~~the~~ took his seat." KJV says "did sit." When you saw the scene ~~xx~~ there he was sitting. Or it can mean he came in and sat down. That's a minor difference, because the original could be translated either way.

But the major difference between the two is that in the end of v. 10 in the recent translations it says "the court was seated and the books= were opened." While KJV says, "The judgment was set and the books were opened." That is an entirely different picture of what happened, because according to the picture you get from KJV in looking at these things from earth he either looks up to heaven and sees them or the heavenly scene replaces the earthly before him. ~~E~~ In either case he sees a picture of the tremendous power and majesty of God who from all eternity has

determined what's going to happen to this blasphemous little horn and in fact to the whole beast, to the whole four beasts. He sees the tremendous power of God. 10,000 waiting to go out and fulfill his bidding. He wonders what's going to happen to the beast. He looks back to the earth and sees the beast destroyed. That's the picture you get from KJV.

From most of the recent translations you get the picture of the opening of a court. In comes the judge and takes his seat. The others are seated around him and they--the court sits, they open their books and decide what they are going to do. God says, This thing is terrible. What shall we do about it? So you take a vote and they decide to destroy the beast. That's the picture you get from all the modern translations.

That is not a major thing in the interpretation of the passage. Because in either case what you have here is the stress on the great power of God which solves the problem. The only question is whether God is the judge presiding over the court which is deciding now what they are going to do, or whether the judgment was set already and he sees the great power of God that's going to carry out his judgment and they proceed to carry it out.

You have similarly in v. 26, "but the court will sit." KJV says "the judgment is set and its power is taken away." There's a big difference between those two. But as to the importance of which interpretation (is right) it is not a major point. I don't want to take much time on it expect to say I see no warrant whatever to translate these words --the Aramaic word din there as "court." "The house of judgment"-- that would be a court. If you had a group to make judgment, something like that.

But the word is judgment. It is translated judgment --it's an Aramaic word translated judgment a good many times exactly the same as the related Hebrew word which is translated judgment many many times in the OT. I know of no warrant for taking the word "judgment" and making it mean "court." The reason they do that may be because the judgment was set, the actual word in the Hebrew is, will sit. Will sit. How will the judgment sit? How was the judgment set? You think it must be a court in which he sat. But the actual Aramaic word used there which is closely related to a very common Hebrew word is a word which means, which is translated "sit" ordinarily in our beginning Hebrew classes but which actually as used in Scripture it is translated in KJV "to dwell" 434 times; it is translated "sit down" 25 times; "sit still" 4 times; and "sit up" once. It is translated "remain" 23 times; "abide" 60 times. So you see the meaning of the word is to be in a position of continuing, sitting, or dwelling. It is only translated "sit down" 25 times, while it is translated "dwell" 434 times! So the judgment will sit... it would be just as accurate to the original, probably more so to say "the judgment will abide" or remain. I would say "the judgment will stand" in our modern English idiom. It's set, fixed.

That's not a major point. Between these two. The major point here is that you have the picture of God's tremendous power. Then he looks at the earthly scene (v.11) the beast is slain, its body destroyed and thrown into the blazing fire. That's a pretty strong statement of destruction of the beast. It's just like what we have in ch. 2 when the great statue is broken down and pulverized into tiny bits and the wind blows it all away. It's a complete end of wicked human government. A complete end of the power of wickedness upon this earth.

He sees this happen, tho here the stress is upon the fourth beast so the next v. mentions the ~~a~~ fact, and here I think the new versions are more clear to us than KJV. The parenthesis--the other beasts had been stripped of their authority--were allowed to live for a period of time. The 2nd ch. makes it clear that all four parts of the statue were destroyed. Here the emphasis is upon the fourth beast. The parenthesis indicates that all the qualities of the first, second, and third which I think continued into the fourth all are brought to an end when it is destroyed.

Then we have that great picture in vv. 13ff. In my vision at night I looked and here before me was one like the Son of man." As I mentioned last time this word Son of man occurse dozens of times in the book of Ezekiel. The Lord said to Ezekiel, Son of man do this, Son of man do that. It's just the same as a man. That's what the word originally means--a man, an individual man. Just like I mentioned where Abraham went to his ~~herd~~ herd and he got a son of the herd, means one of the cows and killed and prepared it (Gen 18). That is a common usage. We find it even here in Daniel 8:17.

"He came near where I was standing, Son of man he said to me." (8:17) So Daniel is called son of man. And here in ch. 7 you might think: I looked and there before me was a man coming with the clouds of heaven and he approached the Ancient of days and was led into his presence." There was a man--that's all the impression one might necessarily get. But we have ~~xxxxxxx~~ good reason to believe that as the Jews read Daniel in subsequent years, they became more and more convinced that this Son of Man who comes on the clouds of heaven and is led before the Ancient of days and given power that all peoples of every language and nations should worship Him, that this ~~is~~ coming great one who could be called the Son of God is now going to coming to earth. We have reason to believe on the basis of the Gospels that that is what the Jews came to believe that this passage teaches.

Of course what they came to believe doesn't prove anything to us except for the fact that Jesus put His seal of approval on that interpretation. In Mat. when Jesus was before the Sanhedrin (26:63), The high priest said to him, I charge you under oath by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ the Son of God." That was the high priest asking him this question. Then Jesus gives an answer: Yes it is as you say. But I say to all of you, In the future you will see the ~~son of man~~ ^{of the Mighty one and coming on the clouds of heaven.} sitting on the right hand of the Mighty one a

If the high priest and others with him never read the book of Daniel, they might say, What on earth is he talking about? Who is this Son of man? But we find when Jesus said that, the high priest tore his clothes and said, He has spoken blasphemy; what more do we need? That gives absolutely proof that the high priest and others there understood that this one use of Son of man out of dozens usages of it, is a specific prediction of one who was actually the Son of God. So this interpretation then, Jesus set his approval upon it as the true interpretation by quoting the words of Himself.

You ~~may~~ notice Jesus said two things about the Son of man:
 1) you'll see him sitting on the right hand of the mighty one; and
 2) you'll see him coming on the clouds of heaven. That is exactly what we find in Daniel here, those two things. Except that here you have them in the opposite order. "I saw one coming on the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of days and was led into his presence and was given authority and glory . . . all people . . . worshipped him." KJV has "that they should worship him." Those are two equally two possible translations in the Aramaic because in the Aramaic as in the Hebrew, the imperfect usually indicates some future-- something future, but it can be future ~~to~~ to what immediately precedes it. It doesn't have to be future from our time. So it is future to what immediately precedes it.

You get the NIV translation: They worshipped him. But the more common translation is like the KJV: "That they might worship him" or "they will worship him." Of course what we find in the gospels is that Jesus was at his death and resurrection set down at the right hand of God. There he ever lives to make intercession for us. The second Psalm describes his sitting there and waiting until his enemies are made the footstool of his feet. So we have the two passages fitted together exactly. There will be two elements that he is (1) given this power by God ~~and~~ at his resurrection. He is there at the right hand of God, the right hand of power and all are to worship (or the worship may just as well be translated "serve") him. (2) And That he is to come on the clouds of heaven. Mr. Buses was there something. . . ?

If it were not for this NT interpretation we might ask: I saw one like the son of man coming. Does this mean a man, or is this a figure for something. After all this is a vision in which there is much that is symbolic or figurative. We have had the figure for instance of these great kingdoms represented as beasts, and a man represented as a horn. So is the Son of man ~~the~~ here a figure for a group? Does it represent a Saviour? Does it represent the church? Does it represent a great group of God's people? or does it represent an individual? In favor of its representing a great group of God's people, we find that there are several cases later in the ch. e.g. v. 22 (NIV) "until the Ancient of days came and pronounced judgment in favor of the saints of the most high . . . and they possessed the kingdom." We find it again (v.27) that "the sovereignty, power and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heavens will be handed over to the saints of the people of the most high. We have a number of statements that the saints are going to rule. They will take over control of this earth.

They will take over the control of this earth which the wicked kingdoms have held through the ages.

However when you look at the end of v. 27 you find that after the greatness of the kingdom was turned over to the saints then you read "his kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom and all rulers will worship and obey him." Kingdom could be a figure for the church but it would be very strange right in the same verse where we've used the plural for them to use the singular pronoun. So the use of the singular pronoun there is used to mean the Jews--his kingdom, and they all worship and obey him which suggests very strongly that it is pointing to an individual and not a figure for his people, for the saints.

This word "saints" is a word which occurs a good many times in the book of Daniel than you would think from looking in an English concordance. Because the English word "saints" occurs only in this chapter. It occurs in this ch. 6 times. We do not have it anywhere else in the book of Daniel. But in the original in the Aramaic, the very same word translated "saints" is translated as "holy ones," in ch. 4 in 3 places. It is there translated "holy gods," "holy ones," Holy gods 3 t., holy ones 2 t. So this word is a word that is used for those who are devoted either to the true God, or to false gods. Of course in our usage the word "saints" means only those devoted to the true God, while saints in ch. 4 it is Nebuchadnezzar who speaks and calling it holy ones rather than saints leaves it open. Whereas saints would make it clear it refers to the true God.

We have this picture of the one coming on the clouds of heaven. This Son of man, and we have the NT evidence that it was something that was still future when Christ was crucified, when he stood before the Sanhedrin. It is not a picture of something that happened prior to that time. From Daniel alone we would not know that. But we find Jesus said to the high priest, "You will see" he did not necessarily mean the high priest would see him. The disciples saw him ascend into heaven, but no one saw him coming down from heaven at that time. I think he is taking the high priest there as symbolic of humanity in general when he said "Hereafter you will see. . ." He meant all people including the ungodly will see the Son of man coming, so he points to this as something that will be still future.

There are those who interpret it as being the church gradually taking over control of the world. A gradual taking over of something like that. But when Jesus specifically said, You will see the Son of man coming it would seem pretty strongly to suggest that it is an individual actually coming on the clouds, and then when you get the statement that the two men made to the disciples in Acts 1, that "this same Jesus shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven" and just before that it stated he was taken up from them and a cloud received him out of their sight. That makes it clear he was going to come back with clouds and that that is what is pointed to here in Daniel.

The commentaries that try to make ch. 2 a picture of the gradual destruction of the beast, as a good many do, and say it represents a gradual progress, these commentaries when they speak of Dan. 7 (everyone of them does) make it clear they believe this represents a sudden conclusion of events at the end of the world. One that tries very hard to make ch. 2 refer only to things most of which are already fulfilled, when it comes to ch. 7 says, Thus we see in one great picture the complete history of the world from the time of Nebuchadnezzar right up to the end of the age.

So it seems to me we are justified in the fact that we are required to interpret ch. 2 parallel to ch. 7 as both of them pointing to the stone or to the coming of the Son of man on the clouds as one great cataclysmic event that is going to take place at the very end of the age.

We've look at v.22. There it says in NIV, Till the Ancient of days came and pronounced judgment in favor of the saints of the most high. That is a possible translation. The word judgment there is exactly the same word as they translate court in two other places. Here they translate it judgment the common meaning. This is a word which is used in reference to a court in Jewish writings in the Middle Ages. But they always put the word house before it. They used the "house of judgment" for a court. They never use the word "judgment" alone for a court. But it is a pretty good presentation of the general area of what the verse means to say as NIV does "until the Ancient of days came and pronounced judgment."

But it gives you a little bit of the idea as if he just made up his mind, and pronounced judgment. In reality all that the original says ~~that~~ is that judgment was given. He came and judgment was given. That does not necessarily mean he pronounced it then. But it does mean he put it into effect. He may have-- it leaves it open that the decision was made long before he carried it into effect in judgment at that time.

This term Ancient of days occurs three times in the ch. It is very interesting that the first time you have it is in v.9 where it says of the Ancient of days . . . showing him as having this tremendous power. This is certainly a picture of the triune God. There is no question of that. This is certainly not a picture just of Christ. It's not a picture only of the Holy Spirit. It is a picture of the triune God. God is one. That is the great point of Judaism and it is the great point on which we are just as firm as they are that there is only one God. This one God who is triune is one God who is three persons. We cannot fathom it, we can only accept it as what is taught in the Scripture.

In the early days of the Christian church they moved in the direction of emphasizing the oneness of God, in the direction of emphasizing the distinction of the persons, and there were big

controversies over it until 400 years after the time of Christ the Council of Chalcedon adopted the statement in which they simply restated what is clear in the NT teaching that there is one God but that there are three persons in the Godhead and that these three persons cannot be confused, cannot be separated. It's a concept which we can't understand, but both aspects of it are true.

So in ch. 8 we have the Ancient of Days meaning the triune God. But when we come to v. 13 we find the Son of man is led into the presence of the Ancient of days and given power, authority, and glory. That's exactly what happened to Christ at his resurrection. The Lord said, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." So here it is the Lord Jesus Christ who is in the presence of the Ancient of days, and given this authority. So it is quite clear it is here God the Father. So it means the triune God (v.9), and it can be applied equally to any person of the Godhead. Because God is from all eternity. He is certainly the Ancient of Days.

So here Jesus Christ is to be seated at the right hand of God the Father, and God the Father is here called the Ancient of days. When we get on to v22 verse 22, we find the horn of war waged against the saints, and defeating them until the Ancient of days came and judgment was given in favor of the saints of the most high and the time came when they possessed the kingdom. This must mean until Christ returns and the Son of man comes on the clouds of heaven. Of course he is from all eternity, so he is just as truly the Ancient of days as is the Father. So the term Ancient of days--the eternal one you might say--is used once of the triune God in this ch., once of God the Father, and once of God the Son.

Question: What is the justification on v.9 for saying it refers to the triune God?

Simply that the picture here is certainly a picture of the one God. There's no reason to find any distinction there. Certainly it is not the Holy Spirit alone. It certainly is not Christ alone, in that picture. It would seem to me quite definite there it must mean the triune God.

We have this picture in Dan. 8 which like the picture in ch. 2 leads us to the == reaches to the very end of this age in the establishment of a kingdom which can never be destroyed; it is an everlasting kingdom and all rulers will worship Him. Yes?

Question: In regard to this kingdom, in the vision in ch.7 in v. 11 where Daniel sees the judgment pronounced by the Ancient of Days in the previous vv., he says the beast was destroyed and his body thrown into the fire. Then after that he says the Son of man was presented to the Ancient of days. Now if this presentation was Christ being presented to God the Father after his resurrection, how did the destruction from the fourth beast come after this event?

It seems like Daniel is saying there is the destruction of the beast and then there's the presentation of Christ to God the Father. But it seems from what is happening _____ is coming and the beast is destroyed and _____ the kingdom of the saints. How is that reconciled?

The question there is one very important for general interpretation. That is when we have two events described, if it says after this happened then this happened then you know a certain order is given. You have in the NT the account of the temptation of Christ. The temptations are given in different order. Some have said it must be that Jesus was tempted by the devil on different occasions so that the same temptation occurred in different orders. But I don't think anybody believes that is actually what happened. They are simply told in different order, but in one case the order may be a chronological order; in another case it may be a logical order. This is a picture of the order in which Daniel saw these _____. And in his vision he looked. He saw the enemies. Then he saw the earthly scene reaching a conclusion so far as the beast was concerned with its utter destruction.

is

Then the next scene he sees/the is this destruction is brought about. He sees the Son of man coming who had been brought into the presence of the Lord. So the order in which Daniel saw it is not specified here.

Question: So then from vv. 13ff, it is more or less a detailed explanation of how the beast was destroyed in v. 11.

Yes. He looked at what happened in connection with the destruction of the beast, how the beast was destroyed and then he looks at how this one had received the authority. He looks at the different stages of it rather than as strictly chronological. Yes. That is a principle that's very important in Scripture study in general. We must take whatever Scripture but we must be careful about what implications we draw from the order in which things are given and particularly in Hebrew where the tenses are not nearly as specific as they are in English.

The other beasts had been stripped of their authority but were allowed to live for a period of time-- you'd think that the fourth beast was destroyed and the others kept living after it. Of course that doesn't make sense. It's clearly a pluperfect and all recent ~~translators~~ translators take it that way.

Question: I'm still a little confused on the Ancient of days description in v. 9 . . . as having white garments and hair as wool is similar to the description in Rev. 1:14 of Christ having the same type of appearance. Wouldn't that indicate they are of Christ?

Certainly Christ was involved, yes. But was it Christ alone that he saw there with the river of fire ~~flowing~~ flowing forth . . . and thousands . . . ministering unto him, etc. Later on also we read how he was given authority and power-- I don't think people would think that was Christ. I can't rule it out as a possibility but I think most would agree with the other being the better interpretation.

I want to get into ch. 8 a bit. Ch. 8 we start in with an interesting picture of future events. "In the third year of king Belshazzar's ~~xxx~~ reign . . ." So it's two years after the vision in ch. 7. Daniel ~~xx~~ saw myself in the citadel of Suza, in the province of Elam. In my vision I was beside the Ulai canal." Why did Daniel say that? What did Daniel know about Suza. Suza was the capital of the Persian empire. It had several capital cities and that became one of those.

By this time--the third year of Belshazzar--we don't know yet whether that part there had been taken over by him or not, most likely it had. And I would think that Daniel had in his life gone on diplomatic missions for Nebuchadnezzar and his successor and therefore he was familiar with this ~~xxxxxxx~~ scene. So in his vision he sees a scene that was familiar to him. The fact that the vision was over in another in another country brings vividly to his mind that he is now looking at things that are going to happen that are going to relate to these great changes that are going to take place through the coming of the Persian empire.

He looks up and there he sees this ram with its two horns. Of course the fact it had two horns would not necessarily mean anything. You'd expect a ram to have two horns. So it is -- I gave you four characteristics, four features by which we can try to find what features of a symbol have significance. In connection with that we noted that a valid oracle picture, a symbolical picture, whether in the OT or the NT may have just one central thought it's presenting and that's all. Or it may have several features in the picture that symbolize what's going to happen or some situation. It may be either way.

How are you going to determine what features of it have a meaning and what features of it simply ~~xxxxx~~ part of the picture as he looks at it. So the first,=== the only way to be absolutely clear that some particular feature in a picture has a significance is that it is so stated in the interpretation given. Here we have it specifically stated in the interpretation further along that the two horned ram he saw represents the kings of Media and Persia. So that is specifically state.

The second feature is something quite out of the ordinary. If he saw a ram with three horns, that would certainly mean something. But if the ram had two horns we would not know the ram had a definite meaning. But when we look at the next part of the v. it says "one of the horns was longer than the other but grew up later." That's not just an ordinary thing. So that would strongly suggest it has a meaning. Of course the fact was the Median power was great and then the Persian, which was part of the Median, assumes control of the whole thing. So it fits again with the picture in ch 7 of the second beast which was like a bear that was lifted up on its side.

So we have the ram representing the coming of Cyrus the Persian. No animal could stand before him; none could rescue from his power. He did as he pleased and became great. That is a very clear picture of the Persian empire, the Persian conqueror which overcame the Babylonian empire and it is specifically explained in the interpretation.

But then, he said, as I looked(as I was thinking about this) suddenly a goat with a prominent horn between his eyes came from the west ~~knocking~~ touching the whole without the ground. Crossing the whole earth without touching the ground. That is a vivid picture of what Alexander the Great did in 12 years conquering the mighty Persian empire. The tremendous speed of his conquest. The Persian empire was at the very height of its power when Alexander attacked it and completely overran it and overcame it.

It was a goat with a prominent horn. That was a rather unusual feature. It is explained in the interpretation which you looked at for today that it represents the first king i.e. Alexander the Great. He crossed the whole earth without touching the ground and came toward the two-horned ram that was standing beside the canal and charged at it with great rage and attacked the ram furiously and shattered its two horns." A picture of something that would happen 200 years after the time of Daniel, and it was literally fulfilled.

The ram was powerless to stand against him and the goat knocked him to the ground and trampled on him and none could rescue the ram from his power. The goat became very great but at the height of his power his large horn was broken off. Alexander the Great died as a young man just in his early 30's, having made his tremendous conquest. He was taken sick and in about 10 days died. The empire was left with no leader. The empire was left with no power to control it. They had 20 years of fighting back and forth until it finally broke into three large sections and a number of small sections, but all preserving the Greek culture, the Greek type of government, the Greek control, so it can be represented as one empire even though it was divided into these many portions though these principal ones and then I believe one represents the others. One of the four pictures.

There are those who say the four horns must be taken literally. A very fine man insists on that. He insists there was a fourth great kingdom but what he says it was I've been unable to find any historical evidence for whatever. I don't think it's a thing worth making a big issue over, but my personal opinion is that the fourth represents a number of smaller kingdoms. one of them even as far as Afganistan. Where the Greek culture reigned for 200 years. With Greek rulers over it even though it was separate in its government from the rest.

Then we have this vision given showing these things were to happen. Then the interpretation of it a little later. Then out of one of them came another horn which started small but grew in power. This which started small is an interpretation which I believe is entirely justified. As we look at these two in the KJV we might assume that the little horn here and the little horn in the other ch. were identical, but the words in the Aramaic are quite different. In ch. 7 it is "another horn, a little" whereas the horn here is described as "a horn from littleness." "A horn from littleness" the LXX translates as "a strong horn" instead of a "little horn" because it is a horn from littleness. I think a better interpretation of it is the one the NIV gives: "A horn which began small but became strong."

It's a little horn in both but the phraseology is quite different. It comes out of the third kingdom, not out of the fourth like the one in ch. 7. In ch. 7 it comes out of 10 horns, in ch. 8 it comes out of four horns. So it is quite different.

Then this little horn grew and reached the host of heaven and drew some-- threw some of the stary host down to the earth and trampled on them. It set himself up to be the prince of the host. --as great as the prince of the host. Just how could the horn do that in his dream? It's pretty hard to imagine just what it was in the vision. Of course the meaning is clear. He took away the daily sacrifice, and the place of his sanctuary was brought low. That is hard to imagine just how he saw that in his dream.

Of course that is exactly what took place 400 years after the time of Daniel when out of one of these four kingdoms came a man called Antiochus. This was the fourth king of that name. So he's often called Antiochus IV, but actually those numbers are a modern term. They didn't use numbers in those days. He was called Antiochus Epiphanes. The word Epiphanes means the manifest god. Antiochus claimed to be a god. On the coins he had made he wrote his name as Antiochus Epiphanes--Antiochus the manifest god. That fits exactly with what Daniel saw in his vision, i.e. he set himself up to be as great as the Prince of the host.

Also he took away the daily sacrifice from him. Antiochus persecuted the Jews trying to make them give up their religion, ordering that anyone who would be circumcized would be killed, ordering that all must worship Jupiter and put up the statue of Jupiter in the temple in Jerusalem and for a period of years the place was=== seemed utterly desecrated. No pious Jew could go in it. A few Jews fled into the wilderness and then under the leadership of a man called Maccabees they began to have a operation against Antiochus and his successor and eventually won their freedom. Judah became an independdent state with a treaty of alliance with Rome. It stayed that way until Rome took it over about a century later.

So this was one of the great crises in the history of Judaism and is described in the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees, books which are designated in most editions of the Bible (and they still are in the German Bible to this day) as books not inspired but worthy of being read. This is one of those books which we call apocryphal. The RC's don't call it Apocryphal, they use that term only for false or pernicious books and they consider it a part of the OT. 2 Macc. is considered as a good historical document. It tells of this terrible crisis which is described in ch.8.

We'll continue there next time. Don't forget to get copies of the (question) paper here.

Our mid-semester test comes next Monday. I gave out this sheet last week . . . the questions in the test will probably all be taken from this . . . Bible open before you The last four questions we haven't yet discussed . . . I'll be glad to take questions if they are of general interest to the class . . .

Question: On no.8 You said the word "holy" there . . . ?

We said quite a bit about it. As much as you can remember of what we covered in class.

I tried to put two together sometimes . . . Like I said "Discuss each of the following vv. and give 3 vv., and then I said to briefly discuss a number of others.

Question: No.3 Have you ever heard an interpretation of that ch. where it has nothing to do with ch. 2 because in 7:17 it says these four beasts are four kings that will arise from the earth. . . . (?) already there, so how can it be still future yet?(?)

The "will arise" that's a matter of the English. It's "which arise." That would be an argument based only on English, not on the actual words I don't say it's an impossibility. . . . I'm interested here in what evidences there are for . . . If you would look at the second phase of the fourth kingdom, and only at that you'd say they aren't parallel because those are very different, but there are so many things that are similar that I'd be interested in having a presentation of that.

Question: No.#5 You say discuss contemporary views of the statue. Most contemporary views of the books I read say the statue represents the fourth country. I didn't understand what it means b contemporary views.

No.5 I said fulfillment of the dynamic portion. I'm not interested in the four kingdoms in that particular question. When did the stone hit the statue? Did it hit it at the coming of Christ 2000 years ago and is it now gradually destroying the statue, or is it a future thing? I'm interested just in the dynamic portion there.

Question: By contemporary views would that include the view about the Mohammedans?

No. I'd put them under false views. Those two are clearly false. The idea that it is the Mohanmedan kingdom--there is much to be said for that, but history proves it wrong. There is also much to be said for the papacy but history proves it wrong. So under false views they should both be presented, but under contemporary views, the question is Does this point to something that comes at the end of the age? or does it point to something that is gradually happening that began long ago and is still in progress. We have people on both sides.

One other thing. I asked for the approximate dates when the vision was seen. Of course in ch. 2 we know exactly, because it was the second year of Nebuchadnezzar. Perhaps I should not say exactly--we know within one year. It depends when it started, what month, etc. It was shortly before 600 B.C. It was in the previous 3 or 4 yrs. before 600 B.C. for ch. 2, but ch. 7 and 8 are dated in the reign of Belshazzar. We know Belshazzar was killed in 539 B.C. But we don't know when he started. So it was somewhere between 567 and 568. I said approx. I did not expect the exact date on either of those two. But know the relation between them, i.e. ch. 7 is at least 45 years, at least 40 years after ch. 2.

We'll turn to ch. 8. The matter that is very important to notice is that the little horn comes out of the third kingdom. Not the fourth kingdom. It comes out of the third kingdom. That is very clear. It comes out of the Grecian kingdom, or the Hellenistic. There are those who try to make it come out of the fourth kingdom, by taking Greece as being the fourth kingdom, but to do that they have to make the Medes and the Persians two different kingdoms.

When the writing was on the wall before Belshazzar, Dan told them your kingdom is to be given to the Medes and Persians. Thought ought to be clear enough. The Persians and Medes are one kingdom, not two. Many try to make it two. But they still would make it the Grecian kingdom, the one which we believe to be the third kingdom definitely.

The little horn in ch. 7 comes out of the fourth kingdom. That would seem to me to be conclusive kingdom that they are two different kingdoms. One comes up from among ten horns, three of them are destroyed in front of him. The other comes from among four horns, and one of them three horns are destroyed before him, the other the four kingdoms continue, the four branches of Alexander's kingdom. It's quite a different situation.

Someone could say, But look how similar they are. They are both little horns. It sounds like that in KJV. But in the exact translation one is another horn, a little one; the other is a horn from littleness. The NIV has done a good job translating: a horn that started small but became great.

You could take it like the ancient Greek VSS did i.e. a strong horn. But either way you take it it certainly is not the same as another horn, a little one which is described in the other ch. The word horn is in both of them, and there is something about littleness. But there is no reason to say they are the same. There is much reason to say they are different. I think that's very important to have in mind.

Some say, Yes it is a horn; it comes out from other horns; it has a throne that speaks blasphemy, a tongue that attacks God, one that persecutes God's people; there are many similarities between them, therefore they must be both be the same one (some affirm)!

About 1800 there was a man who coming from various backgrounds gained control over his nation; then he led his armies and conquered most of Europe. Eventually the English fought against him, and finally he was destroyed, by forces in which the English, Germans, and Russians cooperated against Napoleon this great emperor. He tried to change times and seasons. In fact he changed the whole system. He introduced the metric system.

About 100 years later, there was a man who came out of a country in Europe. He came from very obscure beginnings. He managed to get control of his nation. He led the armies of his nation against the surrounding countries. For a time he had most of the nations of Europe in his hands. Eventually he was destroyed largely by the force of people from Anglo-Saxon countries (England or America). Russia in this case as in the other case opposing him. Eventually he was destroyed!

How parallel they are! Therefore Napoleon and Hitler must be the same person! Mustn't they? Either they were the same person, or one was a type and symbol of the other! Once you go that way you can make Lincoln the war president similar to W. Wilson the war president! You can find similarities all over. But here we have 2 different horns, which are similar, but which have a different origin. The origin is so different that they are clearly different.

Rapidly looking at the first part of ch.8. "In the third year of King Belshazzar's reign, (that would be two yrs. after the previous ~~was~~ one), Daniel saw a vision. He saw a ram with two horns, one horn longer than the other that grew up later. Of course this represents the Medo Persian empire with the Persian coming up later, but becoming stronger than the other.

"I watched the ram as he charged toward the west, toward the north and toward the south." I could show you at least 5 good commentaries on Daniel which say, This does not mention the east because Cyrus made no conquest in the east. The trouble is the authors of those commentaries have not bothered to investigate ancient history. Because Cyrus made a conquest in the ~~east~~ East perhaps as big or bigger than any he made in the west or north and south. But this describes the progress of Cyrus, as he led his armies west of Persia, north of Babylon, and then from there he led them north into Asia Minor and destroyed the great empire of Koressus. Then he came back south again and destroyed Babylon.

He conquered Babylon, and that was the end of the first empire and the beginning of the second. So that is all we're interested in now. So he gives us the three and its a picture of Cyrus/~~and~~ marches. Actually when he conquered the Babylonian empire he went further east and conquered many regions to the east. Eventually his son-- and I don't know if we know for sure which-- actually conquered the northern part of India --a larger territory to the east than elsewhere. So it-- some commentaries make a lot of no mention of east which is unfortunate here.

and the Verse 4. I watched the ram. It describes how he charged

and no one could stand against him. It stopped with that because that's the end of the first empire and beginning of the second.

Then, as he was thinking about this(v.5) suddenly a goat with a prominent horn between his eyes came from the west. We're told later this was the Greek, and the prominent horn was the first king i.e. Alexander the Great. He covered the whole earth without touching the ground. Cyrus's conquests were very rapid; Alexander's were even more so! It exactly fits what happened 2 or 3 hundred years after Daniel wrote.

"I saw it attacking the ram, furiously striking the ram and shattering it's two horns . . . at the height of its power its large horn was broken and four prominent horns grew up toward the four winds of heaven." Notice there were three important kingdoms that came out of Alexander's empire, and a number of small ones--Afganistan being one of them. They called it Bactria in those days, but it was ruled by Greek kings for some centuries and was one of the several important sections that came out of Alexander's empire.

Question: You have Ptolomies, Seleucids, and what's the third one?

The kingdom(Greek) from which Alexander came--Macedonia. The kingdoms of Macedonia and Greece would of course be very important in it. That was where Alexander came from. Then the Ptolomies had Egypt; the Seleucids had most of the Asian part of Alexander's empire.

Question: In ch. 7 you made a point of the something strikes that four heads and four wings. It seems in ch. 8:22 when it interprets four horns, ? ?

Yes, that was a parallel to this v. I was just looking at. That is it was divided into four parts. When we look at the history we can definitely say there were 3 major parts and then a number of smaller ones which he lumps together. This is a picture of what happened 200 years after Daniel wrote-- more than 200 years.

In v. 9 . . . out of it came another horn which started small but grew in power to the south and the east and toward the beautiful land, which refers to its power over the land of Palestine. It grew until it reached the hosts of heaven and it threw some of the host down to the ground and tramped on them. That must have been quite a vision to have looked like that. It set itself up to the great, the prince of the host. It took away the daily sacrifice and the of his sanctuary was brought low. It's hard to see just how this would be represented in a vision, but it certainly fits something that happened c. 300 yrs. after the time of Daniel.

Because of rebellion the host of saints of the daily sacrifice were given over to him. It prospered and every good and truth was thrown to the ground.

This is recognized I think by all interpreters as a picture of Antiochus IV who is discussed in our 10th question. I want to say a word about him because here is a ch. devoted mostly to this man who was not previously mentioned in our class. Of the divisions of Alexander's empire, the one that covered the largest area was Seleucid's empire. You don't need to bother much about the name Seleucid at this point. We'll say much more about it later on.

One of the generals named Seleucid seized most of the Asiatic dominion that Alexander had conquered. His descendants ruled in this area with Greek culture, Greek language. It was a part of what you consider as one empire, because it was ~~was~~ the same culture, the same language, etc. throughout. In v. 23 it says in the latter part of their reign when rebels have become completely wicked, a stern faced king, a master of intrigue will arise.

This man was a master of intrigue, and it shows in many ways. One was in the way he became king. His father had been a great conqueror and a very powerful ruler (Antiochus III) until he came face to face with the rising power of Rome. He refused to keep from entering the territory where Rome wanted to be in control, and the result was that the Romans fought him and utterly defeated him. When they defeated him they demanded that he pay a tremendous indemnity and that he send his sons and other ~~sons~~ prominent power to Rome as hostages. So Antiochus IV was not the oldest son of his father Antiochus III. He was a hostage in Rome and lived there for a number of years.

Nobody ever thought he'd become king. When his father died his older brother succeeded him. When his older brother succeeded him they say, This man is no longer right in line for the throne so they let him go and made the older brother send his older son to Rome as a hostage. So Antiochus left Rome. He went to Athens and managed to get himself elected mayor of Athens. Then he learned his brother had been assassinated. When he learned that he managed by intrigue and various devious arrangements to get himself into the country and with a small army to seize control and become the ruler of the Seleucid kingdom which was most of the Asiatic part of Alexander's kingdom.

So you see him as the master of intrigue! Antiochus was very devoted to Greek culture. Devoted to the worship of the Greek god Jupiter. He tried throughout his empire to Hellenize it, to ~~try~~ try to make the people follow Greek customs. Most of the regions he controlled were very happy to fall in line. Many of the Jews were, and gave up their worship of God, and their Jewish customs and began following Greek customs. It says "because of rebellion" in this v. "When rebels have become completely wicked" == there were many Jews who aside. But there were others who refused to do so. Antiochus became so angry at them he sent troops into Jerusalem and seized the temple and put up the statue of Jupiter (or Zeus) in the temple, and made sacrifice of swine's flesh to it in the temple.

He made sacrifices of swine flesh, to it in the temple which made the altar in the temple seem so utterly corrupt that no Jew could use it. Then he sent troops throughout the country ordering everyone to make sacrifices to Jupiter. It looked as if he would completely destroy the Jewish religion and culture. But there were a number of people who refused to sacrifice, and one of them--a priest--killed the men who were trying to force him to sacrifice in the little town where he lived. He and his seven sons fled then into the wilderness, and other Jews fled into the wilderness.

After a year this priest died and his son was so successful as a leader that they called him the Hammer, from the Heb. word derived from that of Maccabees. So these sons were called the Maccabeas. Judas Maccabeas was successful in fighting for a time and then his brother Jonathan took over, and then his brother Simon, and they won freedom for their land from the Seleucids. It was a long struggle but they won complete freedom, and the land continued to be free for over a 100 years until the Romans took over.

When Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar the exile began. We sometimes say the exile; sometimes the captivity. But these two are quite different. The exile was when the Jews were driven out of their land. The captivity was when the Jews were subject to a foreign rule. When Cyrus let the Jews go back it was the end of the exile. We speak of the writers as post-exilic prophets i.e. after the exile. But it was not after the captivity because the land of Israel was still subject to the Persian ruler, then it was subject to Alexander, then it was subject for 100 years to the Ptolomies, then it became subject to the Seleucids. So the captivity still went on until the time of the Maccabees.

But that was the end of the captivity because these men who fled into the wilderness, eventually they gained sufficient force and sufficient strength to defeat the army that came from the Syrian ruler. Antiochus himself died of some bad disease. His successors continued the fight against the Jews but were eventually beaten and with ups and downs through the next 100 years the land of Israel was freed from outside control. They had a treaty with Rome for the mutual protection of one another, and eventually Rome simply seized it but that was over 100 yrs. later--nearer 150 years ~~later~~ later.

Sp Antiochus IV was one who almost destroyed Judaism, and it would be strange indeed if God in preparing the people for the times ahead did not prepare them for it by giving them a warning. So he gave Dan. this vision in ch. 8 about the events that would happen in that period. The history of that period is told in two books called 1 and 2 Maccabees. There is also 3rd and 4th Maccabeas which have nothing to do with the Maccabeas. But these two (1 and 2) tell about the Maccabeas. 1 Macc. tells about their fighting and gaining their freedom and is generally considered on the whole to be a reliable document. 2 Macc. tells about the persecution and difficulties of individual people and

in general it is considered as containing a good deal that is imaginary. The RC church considers both of these books as part of the OT. But some popes indicated they were not. St. Jerome, translator of the Vulgate said they were not. We Protestants call them Apocryphal. The Apocrypha are not bad books, but they are good books that are not inspired. The KJV originally included them in a separate section entitled "books not inspired but profitable for reading."

So we have this leader of the Maccabees who is not mentioned here but it mentions the great enemy, Antiochus IV, and we have the account of him in the first part of ch.8 and then in the last part we have the interpretation and it exactly fits with the history of Antiochus, but it ends in v. 25 . . . "yet he will be destroyed but not by human hand." Antiochus when he had gone further east was not at that moment concerning himself particularly the Jewish problems, but he was taken with a very bad nervous disease and died there. So he was destroyed but not by human power. It was an exact picture of what happened and it was to prepare the Jews for standing true at this difficult situation, 400 yrs. after the time when Daniel lived.

After the first part of the ch.(vv.1-14) we read(v.15), While I Daniel was watching the vision and trying to understand it, there appeared to me one that looked like a man, and I heard a man's voice from the Ulai saying, Gabriel, Tell this man the meaning of the vision." You read that, now do you think the rest of the ch. is going to talk about someone entirely different or is it going to talk about the same thing he saw in the vision i.e. the attack of Antiochus against the religion of Israel?

Well it seems the meaning of the vision all of which has been concerned with events up to the time of Antiochus and no further forward, preceded and he tells him the meaning of the vision it would surely seem that what will follow will be an account of Antiochus. Here the interpretation is given and everything in it fits with what Antiochus did or what happened in those days. But it begins with the words: "And I came near the place where I was standing and I was terrified and fell prostrate. Son of man he said to me understand the vision concerns the time of the end." So some people say, The vision is not about Antiochus, it must be about the very end of the age because it says it will be at the time of the end.

What is the end? The term end can be used== we can say, The end of the school year. We can say, the end of your course; the end of your life; the end of the century; the end of the world. What does the word "end" mean? There are about 8 words in the Hebrew that are translated "end" and ~~about~~ there is only one in the NT. But the one in the NT(that one Greek word) has as wide a meaning as the 8 or so words in the OT. Thus James says, You have seen the end of the Lord. Does that mean you have seen the Lord destroyed? The end of the Lord? Does it mean you have seen the very last days in which the Lord will live? Everybody knows it means "you have seen the end toward which the Lord is working" i.e. His purpose. So the word end is used particularly to mean purpose; the end toward which he goes. But it's often used many times in the OT and NT for the end of a particular era. Here it points to the end of the captivity. To

the time when the attempt will be made to destroy the religion of Israel but when they == it will notk succeed.

So a superficial reading of v.17, "Understand that the vision will be== concerns the time of the end," and also of v. 19, "I am going to tell you what will happen later in the time of wrath," because the vision concerns the appointed time of the end" has led some interpreters to say we agree that the vision is about Antiochus, but when he makes the interpretation he looks forward to Antichrist. He is not talking about Antiochus at all. Of course that makes nonsense of the chapter. He has a vision. He says, Tell me the meaning of the vision, and then he goes on and does not talk about anything he's seen in the vision, but talks about something that will be thousands of years later! That doesn't make sense.

So there are others who say, Yes, the first part talks about Antiochus. But, they say also, the latter part talks about Antiochus, but they say, Antiochus is a type of Antichrist! I think that is just as sensible as for somebody to predict Napoleon and for somebody to say Napoleon is a type of Hitler. Hitler comes after Napoleon and there are many similarities. The word type is usually used in the OT for things that point to Christ or something about Christ. I don't think we have any right to assume there are types of Antichrist, and when he looks forward to see Antiochus, he is seeing Antiochus as a type of something later.

They are similar. He talks about one, or he talks about the other. In this ch. he is talking about Antiochus Epiphanes. Everything in it fits him. It is the meaning of the vision which is directly connected with the third kingdom; it is not connected with the fourth kingdom. It is a picture of one of the greatest crises in the history of the Judea-Christian religion. The attempt of Antiochus IV to completely wipe it out. Yes?

Question: Would you say there is no typical significance to Antiochus prefiguring the antichrist?

I would say that there is a similarity, but a type is something that looks to Christ, not something that looks to antichrist. If you are going to say of two similar things that one is a type of the other, I would say that Napoleon is a type of Hitler. Maybe Abraham Lincoln was a type of Woodrow Wilson because Lincoln freed the slaves and W. Wilson tried to free the enslaved nations of Europe. I mean you can always find similarities between things that are somewhat alike. But I believe we should reserve the word type for that which looks to Christ, and that == Many Bible students say, We should not call something a type unless it is specifically designated in the Bible.

There is no such designation unless you take it as at the time of the end, as meaning at the very end. Of course there are many ends, and this is at the end of the captivity. A commentary by a very fine Christian writer and a good scholar has said that at this point it must refer to ~~Antiochus~~ Antichrist because it says "the time of the end" and nothing ending at Antiochus' time! I think he must have been a little drowsy when he wrote that because that's when the captivity ended!

Because that's when the captivity ended! That's when the attempt of Antiochus to destroy the worship of the Lord ended.

Question: Is there anyone else in history that you know of who would have done something similar to what Antiochus did where someone almost wiped out the Jewish race as antichrist will do. It seems like a very similar act. I just wonder if there was anybody else who was ever like that?

Hitler tried to wipe it out. Killed millions of Jews. Might have won the war if it were not for his determination to destroy them. In fact in the last 2 or 3 months of the war, when Hitler needed all the means of transportation he could get to continue the war, he kept trains working carrying Jews off to death camps. If that energy at that time and expense had been used to try to win the war, humanly speaking he might have won it. I would say Hitler was just as much an enemy of Jewry and Judaism as Antiochus was. I'm sure there have been others as well.

Now of course we have prophecies about antichrist very clearly in different parts of the Bible, but I think we only confuse ourselves by taking prophecies that speak of somebody being an enemy of Christ and saying this must be a type of antichrist. That's my feeling.

Question: Perhaps I missed this. Could you give a reference for the end of the captivity and the Maccabean revolt?

No you have to get that from history. There's no question about it. All students agree about the fact which is that the Jews were captive to other nations up to the Time of Antiochus. Any good history will mention the fact that they gained their freedom when they finally Antiochus. His successors weren't able to have any control over them because they were independent and they actually had a treaty as an independent nation with Rome during the next century. For over a century they were free. Then a new captivity came when the Romans took them over.

Most students overlook those facts and do not think of the fact that this is when the captivity ended. Like this very prominent man to whom I referred who said, Nothing ended at that time. I'm sure if you asked him, Were the Jews captive to other nations until the time of Antiochus he would say Yes, certainly. If you would say, After Antiochus; time were they captives? He would say, Yes, unto the Romans. But the Romans did not come for another century. And during that century they were independent. So it's a fact that is not ordinarily noticed, but it's a clear fact of history. So you can very properly call it the end of that, but of course the word end does not necessarily have to point to the end of a big era like that. It could point to the end of this particular vision. It doesn't say what it's the end of. It could point to the end of most anything.

Question: What were you referring to there in v. 19 as the final period of the nation?

Verse 19 has the phrase "what will happen later in the time of wrath." The wrath of God was hurled against the Jews in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. He turned Israel over to them, and Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem and carried the Jews into exile. The Jews still continued to be under the control of their enemies. So you could easily say perhaps the time of wrath here is the time in which God for their sins continued to leave them under the control of their enemies even though many of them were back in the land, until that time when they gained their freedom. It is the latter part.

The word there is translated. This is v. 19. The appointed time of the end of the wrath. Those are general terms and can fit this period, very well. It is the appointed time. The time of antichrist is the appointed time. The time of Christ was an appointed time. Any time when something happens that God predicts. is an appointed time. In Leviticus we're told that the Jews will be unfaithful to God; he will give them over to their enemies in captivity, and they will return to God as they did in the wilderness under the Maccabees truly did and God will free them from captivity and bring them back. They had a series of those in the book of Judges. Here you have the longest one but the same process as is described in Leviticus.

It is important to understanding of this ch. to see the application of this to this great enemy of God's people, Antiochus. There are many details of his life and activities which are important in connection with our study of ch. 11. This ch. 8 just gives us a brief picture of Antiochus. But in ch. 11 we have much more detail about Antiochus. Much more detail of him there which all interpreters agree is a picture of Antiochus.

Also in ch. 11 we have other persons, ~~also~~ after it talks about Antiochus, it talks about Antichrist. Two pictures are given one after the other, in ch. 11. We will not at this point go into much more detail about Antiochus because then we will look at some very interesting details about his life.

The way he is described in the Maccabees, the picture the Jews saw of him was indeed one side of his character in his scheming, vicious, the one who was determined to destroy God's people. That is entirely true, but that's not the whole of his character. In recent yrs. the attempt has been made by various historians to reestablish Antiochus and free him from all those statements against him, tho they cannot deny the facts. But he was a very peculiar character. He would go out attack and rob people and get a lot of money, and then he would walk down the street and just throw coins right and left. And laugh as he watched people scramble to get the coins. He was one who could be very mean and bitter; at the same time one who could be very generous, and friendly. He built a big temple to Jupiter in Athens which still remains to this day in Athens, tho most of the great things in Athens were built hundreds of years earlier, there is t

is still that great tremendous temple, on which he spent thousands of dollars way over in Athens. Antiochus built it. He was unable to complete it during his life, but it was completed by one of the Roman emperors later. He was a man of complex character. A man who was the devil's instrument in trying to destroy the knowledge of God completely.

So it is altogether proper that Daniel should look forward to that great crisis. There was an antichristian writer in the 2nd cent. A.D. who wrote a book against Christianity in which he said the Christians say the book of Daniel was written at the time of Nebuchadnezzar, and you read what it says about the history of Antiochus and you see that the man who wrote the book knew all about Antiochus so that must be when the book was written! He said, Everything in the book is leading up to Antiochus and the author of the book wanted to encourage the Jews to fight against Antiochus. So he wrote this book in which he gave supposed visions by Daniel 400 years earlier looking forward to that time, then when he got to his time he made guesses as to what would happen later. And his guesses didn't turn out!

So the history up to that time is accurate and beyond that it is just his guesses as to what was going to happen, and pretended to be written by Daniel. That theory of Porphyry, St. Jerome tried to answer. Today most commentaries (all the liberal and even some of the conservative) say that this book was not written by Daniel but by a man in the time of the Maccabees who claimed that everything in the book was looking forward to that. Now I don't believe you can possibly take the little horn of D n. 7 as referring to Antiochus. It doesn't fit. It comes out of the 4th beast. This horn comes out of the third kingdom.

The only way they can do it is by saying there was a mediate kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian kingdom, but there is no historic evidence of such a thing. It was Cyrus the Persian who conquered the Babylonian kingdom. But that theory which we have not said much about so far, that theory is based upon the fact that it gives such an accurate picture both in ch. 8 and in ch. 11 of Antiochus. In ch. 11 it traces the previous kingdoms right up to Antiochus and then tells us in considerable length about him. Then it goes on to give a picture of the antichrist. That is still about Antiochus, the liberals say, but it doesn't fit Antiochus, where he makes the jump from Antiochus forward to the Antichrist in ch. 11

We'll have the full hour for the text next Monday. I would appreciate it if at that time you would spread out through the room so nobody sits next to anyone else. We will have a test to take the roll from.

I mentioned the ~~saas~~ saints earlier but did not spend much time on it. The word is used in ch. 7. The same word is used earlier in Dan. simply to mean holy ones. When Neb. said the spirit of the holy gods is in Dan. he uses the same word. It occurs a number of times in this general sense. We infer when the k. was given to the s. it must be the people of G. and it is used several times with that meaning here. I'm glad you mentioned that.

The test papers have been marked . . . I'll give them back to you about a week from now.

We have covered as much ~~time~~ as we've had time for of the prophecies in chs. 2, 7, and 8. In ch. 2 it told about another horn, a little one before which three of the ten horns were removed, torn up. This horn proceeded to make war against the saints and to overcome them, but the coming of the Son of man put an end to that and he gave the kingdom to the saints.

Then in ch. 8 we had a horn that came out of the Greek kingdom. There were four ~~horns~~ horns and then this new one began small and became great. It was a great enemy of God's people but it ended simply with saying that he will come to his end and says nothing about the coming of the Son of man or of the saints being given the kingdom.

There are those who say the book of Daniel was not written by Daniel but that it was written ~~2~~ 400 years after Daniel's time. This argument was given began in the 2nd century A.D. There was a great anti-Christian writer who wrote a book attacking Christianity who said the book of Daniel was written 400 years after the alleged time of Daniel, and that everything in it that looks forward to the future, looks forward to a king who would persecute the Jews, Antiochus Epiphanes, and that is the little horn of ch. 8 and the little horn of ch. 7.

But as we saw the background of the little horn of ch. 8, and the background of the little horn of ch. 7 is different. The term used of them is not identical; the background is quite different. As we saw in ch. 2 and 7 there are four kingdoms and the only way we can figure it is that first there is the Babylonian, second the Persian empire. God said to Belshazzar thru Daniel, Your kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians. So this is the second kingdom, the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, in which the Persians were supreme at the time when they conquered the Babylonian empire. The third kingdom is the Greek kingdom, and the fourth kingdom is--would have to be the Roman kingdom.

Now these who say this book was not written at the time of Nebuchadnezzar but 400 years later, they say these two horns are identical. They ignore the fact that one comes 10 horns and the other from a situation of four horns. They don't bother a great deal about that. But the thing they had to deal with is that the Greek kingdom according to our figuring is the third kingdom., Sp it makes it come from a different kingdom than from the one which the little horn of ch. 7 comes.

So they get around that, or try to, by saying that in between the Babylonian empire and the Persian empire there was the Median empire. This Median empire is the second empire. The Persian, the third; the Greek, the fourth! ~~2~~ To say that means that it does not fit the ~~history~~ history! So they have to say, Well, the unknown writer of it got his history mixed. So we believing that this is God's Word, do not believe that that is possible. We believe that this is

true, that the author didn't get his history mixed and that he looked forward to two different persecutors of God's people, not to one.

Question: How does this solve the problem? If they made the fourth kingdom Greece? Since the little horn in ch. 7 could be Antiochus, in ch. 8 it says the horn was raised up out of the third kingdom which would be the Persian empire.

No. Ch. 8 says it is raised out of the Grecian kingdom. Ch. 7 says it was raised out of the fourth kingdom. So the question is, Which is the Grecian kingdom? Third or fourth? According to the actual development of events, it has to be the third.

Question: What do they do with the Roman empire? Where would they place it?

They would say the man who wrote this in the Antiochus Epiphanes knew nothing about the Roman empire. He describes history as he knew it, past history, and then he makes guesses, about what's going to happen in the future. That's their interpretation which you see makes the book of Daniel a fraud. It pretends to have been written by Daniel but was written 400 years later. It makes it have a pretty good picture of history before that time and some guesses that didn't work out after that time. So it's hard for me to see how any evangelical can hold that view. Yet there are some scholarly evangelicals who claim to be in the great Christian doctrines, who write commentaries in which they adopt this critical view. I don't see how they can do it logically.

This is not a course in criticism. We are not in this course trying to defend the Bible from attacks upon it, we are trying to interpret the prophecies of the book. But when we get to this ch., and of course as I've already mentioned in chs. 7 and 8, we have a situation where the critics interpret the statements quite differently than we do. We see the difference in the earlier chs. but in ch. 11 they will be more involved and that's why I bring in the references to criticism at this time. In this class we do not go into the criticism in any length or detail. That's not the purpose of this particular course.

To understand ch. 11 we will have to have in mind this difference of viewpoint. Mr. ?

Question: The man who advanced that view in the 2nd century, was that Porphyry?

Yes. Porphyry. A neo-platonist writer in the 2nd century. Jerome answered him in the 4th century.

We had looked at chs. 2, 7 and 8. There is a great prophecy in ch. 9. That prophecy I believe is not usually correctly interpreted. There have been many interpretations of it, but there is one interpretation which many in our day agree upon which I think does not follow it correctly. I will go into that, but I'm not going into that today. I'll skip that and go into ch. 11/

We will take it up later. The reason we do that is because ch. 2,7,8,11 are closely related. The prophecy in ch. 9 has little connection with these other chs. So I'd like while the others are fairly fresh in your minds to go on to ch. 11.

(By the way I will post the assignment by tomorrow . . .)

Chs. 10,11,12 we have already noticed are one unit. It begins in the third year of Cyrus king of Persia, a revelation was given to Daniel, ch. 10. But ch. 10 continues with telling about the angel coming to Daniel, and beginning to speak to him, etc. It does not get into the prophecy yet. Ch. 11:1 the angel still speaks: "In the first year of Darius the Mede I took my stand ~~xxxx~~ to support and protect him. When the English Archbishop in the 13th century was dividing the Bible into chs. he noticed this "in the first yr. of Darius the Mede" and so he said, There is a date given so that must be a new chapter." So he put the ch. division there.

But the previous ch. said "in the third yr. of Cyyus king of Persia a revelation was given to Daniel." It goes on to give us the revelation in the next 3 chs., but 11:1 is still the angel speaking referring back to something in the first yr. of Darius, the Mede.

So we begin with v.2 in which the angel begins to talk. and gives his marvellous prediction about the future. This 11th ch. of Daniel is absolutely without parallel in the Bible. It is without parallel in that it predicts a great number of historical events through a period of some centuries. We have nothing like it exactly anywhere.

There is one evangelical man I know of who has written on the book of Daniel who in his book claims Daniel wrote the book, it correctly predicts things in the future. But ch. 11, at least the first part of it, is an interpolation because he says there is nowhere else in the Bible where future events are described in so much detail, as here and over such a long period. Now we who believe that the Bible is inerrant do not accept that view. We believe Daniel was able to predict historical events in the future with a considerable amount of detail.

But this picture in ch. 11 would not enable you to write a history of those 400 years because the fut. events are predicted often in a rather vague way. They are predicted in such a way that when it happens you can see that prediction has been fulfilled. But not in such a way that you can say, This is what is going to happen. That is very interesting to trace through and see how that is. Unfortunately it deals with a period in history of which most people today know comparatively little. Therefore it is difficult for the average person to get a great deal of sense out of ch. 11 because they don't know anything much about the historic background.

So I have mimeographed(dittoed) a sheet in which I give a few dates and names. I am not asking you to memorize this by any means, but if you have it in front of you it will help you to follow the history as we look at it in the ch. Will ~~two~~ of you pass them out quickly. . . . I've condensed a good bit of the historical material on to this sheet. It may look confusing and needs a bit of explanation. . . .

As we look into this ch. we will see this ch. actually combines the insights of ch. 7 and ch. 8 and thus makes it easier for us to understand them in the order in which they came. I'm not sure we'll get to that feature of it today.

Looking at the ch. starting with v.2. "Now I tell you the truth three more kings will appear in Persia, and then a fourth who will be far richer than all the others." This statement is easy to understand historically. This was in the days of Cyrus. After Cyrus he was succeeded by his son, and then a usurper took the throne for a brief time. Then a nephew of Cyrus defeated the usurper and took the throne and became the third ruler after Cyrus. His name was Darius. The fourth one was Xerxes. They are familiar to anyone who has had ancient history.

As you read the verse it says "three more kings will appear in Persia and then a fourth who will be far richer than all the others." Thus you see the third one would be King Darius. The fourth who would be far richer than all the preceding ones would be Xerxes who organized an army to attack Greece, an army so large that they say it took a week for them to walk across the Hellespont. That is the short area near Constantinople, the shortest place between Europe and Asia where the water is at least under half a mile, quite a bit under half a mile I believe. They put boats across . . . and it took the army a whole week to get across there.

He had a tremendous territory which he possessed. Cyrus had conquered even part of India. His son had conquered Egypt. They had this tremendous area and they gathered troops from all the different nations subject to them. He was indeed the most powerful and richest of the kings of Persia up to that time.

The critics say this writer in the time 400 years after this was all mixed up because he thought there were only four more kings of Persia. He says, Three more kings will appear in Persia and then a fourth who will be far richer than all the other. So they say, ~~They~~ He thought there were only four more kings of Persia when actually there were ten more. So they say this history is wrong here. But if you look at it exactly, I think it does not say how many kings will be in Persia at all. It ~~says~~ says there will be three more, and then a fourth who will be far richer than all the others and it goes on to tell what this fourth will do.

That's what he is interested in--the fourth one. He's not interested in what follows. There is an interval in the prophecy which is not specifically mentioned. There are many such intervals, in the book of Daniel, which are passed over. We noticed one in ch. 2 where it says Nebuchadnezzar is the head of gold in the statue. Then the next one is the Persian empire and there was a period of about 50 years between Nebuchadnezzar's time and the coming of the Persian empire, in which there were three more rulers over his empire. A space is skipped over in the picture. That's very common in prophecy for that to happen.

He does this to call attention to the fourth one rather than saying that is all there are. It is a misreading of it to insist this proves the writer was mistaken about the number of the kings of Persia. But he points to the fourth king after Cyrus. "When he had gained power by his wealth he stirred up everyone against the kingdom of Greece." The fact is that the third king after Cyrus who possessed all that great territory conquered by Cyrus and his son Cambyses--Darius found he had all Asia Minor in his possession, but Asia Minor was just across the Egean Sea from Greece.

The people in Asia Minor, a great many of them were Greeks and closely related to the people in Greece, and they wanted their freedom! The Greeks were helping them when they would have revolts and attempts to gain freedom. So Darius said, In order to hold Asia Minor, I've got to get hold of Greece too. So Darius sent a great expedition in order to try to conquer Greece and his expedition failed. The weather turned bad; his ships were wrecked, and he came to make an attack against Athens. They had a battle in which a smaller number of well trained Greeks defeated a large Persian force.

The battle was at Marathon. A man ran 26 miles from there to Athens to tell them of the victory and dropped dead, from running so fast. From there we have our Marathon because of the running there to tell that the army of Darius had been defeated by the Athenian troops.

Darius was much upset about his failure to conquer Greece. He made two or three attempts. He began to gather equipment in order to gather all Greece under his control but when he had gathered a considerable amount of equipment he died. His successor, Xerxes proceeded to gather more equipment and troops from every portion of his empire and then this great attack upon Greece. Daniel predicts, it. He says that ~~after~~ this fourth king of Persia, after Cyrus, will stir up everyone against the kingdom of Greece. Then he looks forward to the reaction of this attack upon Greece. Because the attack was made by Xerxes' tremendous army and navy but the Greeks were able to hold them back after taking all the territory north of them conquering Macedonia and all the region north of them between them and Constantinople. They had come into Greece itself at Thermopylae. The Greeks held him back for a time. But they managed to get around them and through them. They conquered

m st

most of these but eventually they were defeated. The impression it made upon the Greeks was tremendous. So for the period of the next 80 yrs. the Greeks were constantly celebrating their victory over the Persians and many of the people were saying, We ~~were~~ would like to overcome the Persian empire which made such a tremendous effort to injure us. In addition there were many Greeks in Asia Minor who were under the Persian empire. They wanted their freedom and couldn't get it. They ~~were~~ tried to revolt but it didn't help them. X The Persians were strong enough to defeat such an effort.

So the next v. looks forward to something that was a reaction of the Greeks against this. "He will stir up everyone against the kingdom of Greece; then a mighty king will appear who will rule with great power and do as he pleases." All interpreters agree, whether they believe it is history intended to be prophecy, or whether as we believe it is the true prophecy God gave to Daniel, they agree this shows the reaction to Exerxes attempt to conquer Greece.

"A mighty king will appear who will rule with great power and do as he pleases." This is Alexander the Great about 80 yrs. later. We've already seen predictions of his conquest in earlier chs. Alexander the Great in the space of about a dozen years succeeded in conquering the great Persian empire and in reducing it all to subjection to himself.

Verse 4 says that after he appears his empire will be broken up and parcelled out toward the four winds of heaven. Alexander the Great in 330 B.C. put an end to the Persian empire and he wanted to unite it with his into one tremendous empire so he married a Persian princess and he encouraged his soldiers to marry Persians. He wanted to unite them all into one great nation that he would control. In 323 when he was in Babylon, he was taken ill and after 10 days there he died. He was still a young man. In his early 30's. He had made these tremendous conquests. Nobody had ever dreamed that their leader would be gone. "His empire will be broken up and parcelled out to the four winds of heaven."

So the third great empire (the Grecian) is different from the previous two. The Babylonian empire was a united, centralized control. The Persian empire was a centralized controlled empire. But the Greek was one empire in that one language (Greek), one set of customs was in control. Not only in control but the leaders of it were determined to Hellenize the whole area. So this next period is generally referred to by historians as the Hellenistic age. A period of 300 years in which there was Greek control of this area. There were 3 large kingdoms, and a number of smaller ones which held the area that had formerly been the Persian empire plus what Alexander had inherited from his father.

So it says, "It will be broken up and parcelled out among the four winds of heaven; it will not go to his descendants. Nor will it have the power he exercised because his empire will

be uprooted and given to others. This is a very good description of what happened. Whether it was written as we believe and given to Daniel in advance, or as the critics say someone who knew the history was pretending to give a good description of what occurred.

Because it did not go to his descendants, nor did any part of it have the power that he exercised. Alexander the Great was a very forceful character, had a tremendous army, and was able to hold all this territory during the short time that he lived. But when he died his people didn't know what to do. They were way over in Babylon there. So the generals got together and said let us arrange that each of us will rule over certain sections of this empire, and we will have one empire working together but each of us will have certain sections.

There were 20 who attempted to divide up the power over the empire in that way. But one man was supposed to have supervision over the entire empire. They said Alexander's wife, a Persian princess, was expecting a son in a few months. They said he will be the king but in the meantime we will carry on till he is born. But the soldiers, when they heard this, said, We don't want any half-Persian to be our king. Let's take Alexander's half-brother who was a man who did not have much brains. He was able to get around to some extent. But he was it was perfectly obvious.

So there was disagreement. For the next 40 years the armies marched and countermarches of these generals as one or the other of them tried to get control of the whole empire and would be defeated. They would try to rule it in the name of Alexander's brother, or in the name of his son who was born 6 mo. after his death, or they would get his mother for a time to rule. But in the course of that time all of Alexander's relatives were killed. So it didn't go to his descendants. Every relative of Alexander was killed. The various generals tried to control the whole thing. They did not succeed. One after the other was killed. It would take 2 or 3 hrs. to give the main details, but after 20 yrs. things were very well established and after 30-40 years they were quite definitely established.

In the paper I gave you I have the statement: After Alexander's early death the generals of his army desired to his vast empire together as a unit. About 20 of them assumed the rule of the various provinces. Ptolemy who became governor of Egypt realized the great potential as a base from which to try to gain control of the whole empire. This was Ptolemy. He became governor supposedly of Egypt. But he decided he was going to try from Egypt to get control of the rest. Other generals had similar ideas. For many years there were wars and alliances as the various == changing alliances as various rulers fought one another. After the strongest of them, Antigonus gained a great victory in 306 B.C. he decided that he and his son Demetrius would each assume the title of king. Thereupon Ptolemy and three other powerful leaders had the four of them each take the title of king, and together to overthrow Antigonus.

Antigonus was killed at the battle of Ipsus 301 B.C. You notice this is 20 years after Alexander's death. But his son Demetrius continued his effort to get control of the empire. In 294 B.C. he succeeded in establishing himself over Macedonia, the original domain of Alexander. After his death a series of others (and here I have a group you don't need to bother particularly about them, but I have put them in here in case someone is quite familiar with the history and raise a question at this point)--they became kings of Macedonia for brief periods, but Demetrius's son, Antigonus Donatus, eventually regained control of Macedonia and his descendants ruled it most of the time until its conquest by the Romans in 166 B.C.

The reason I mention that is because most commentaries today agree on listing four men who were the supposed men who took over Alexander's empire, and today they all leave Antigonus out of the four. After all Antigonus was the strongest of ~~the four~~ them all of the men who first took the name of king. That you don't need to worry about for this course. But I put these facts in there because there may be some who might raise a question about it as his being one of the alleged four. Actually there were five and then it became reduced to three.

Ptolemy and his descendants ruled in Egypt until the Romans defeated Cleopatra VI and annexed in 30 B.C. Palestine and southern Syria were part of the Egyptian empire for over 100 yrs.--until 100 B.C.(?)--A.D.(?)

Now look at the next verse, v.5. "The king of the south"--and which of these various sections would you logically think to be the king of the south? Well the northern part of Egypt is further south than most of the rest of the territory. It's very obvious that it refers to Ptolemy. "The king of the south will become strong but one of his commanders will become even stronger than him, and will rule his own kingdom with great power." This happened because Seleucus (who is named here on this sheet), another general, had taken over power in the area around Babylon. Seleucus had been driven from Babylon and went to Egypt and became one of Ptolemy's generals for a brief time.

But then the situation became such it looked as if Seleucus could regain his power in Babylon. He with a small force rushed up to Babylon and established himself there. His descendants ruled in Babylon for the next nearly 300 yrs. We call them the ~~Seleucids~~ Seleucids after Seleucus' name, the rulers who succeeded him there in Babylon. But when he went back to Babylon and established his control there, that was marked as the beginning of an era. That was the first point in history that we know from which people ever proceeded to name years as year 1, 2, 3, etc. and that they kept it up. Previously a king would say that this happened in the 20th year of this king's reign. But then if he died in the 25th year, you'd start over again with his successor.

It never before, as far as we know, had ever been carried on for a long term of years naming years from a particular point. That date was still continued as a series of years even way up into the Middle ages. We find a Jewish writing which will say written in the year 793, and it will be 793 years after 312 B.C. when Seleucus went to Babylon. That shows you how strong Seleucus was. It says in the verse "He will become stronger than he and will rule his own kingdom with great power."

Seleucus controlled Asia Minor. He controlled northern Syria. He controlled all the rest of the area of the Persian empire to the east. All the rest of the Asiatic portions of the Persian empire. Antigonus' ~~maxwaxsaiwxenkrakix~~ descendants controlled Alexander's original kingdom, Macedonia and most of Greece. It varied off and on as to how much of Greece they could hold because they were always a little rebellious in different parts of Greece. Those are the three main sections of the empire. This is predicted. "The king of the South will become strong, but one of his commanders will become even stronger than he and will rule his own kingdom with great power."

On this sheet I have listed the Seleucid kings up until the time of Antiochus IV. I've listed the kings of Egypt up to that time. I'm not asking anyone to memorize these. I'm certainly not asking anyone to memorize the dates. You have it in front of you to show who lived at the same time as someone else. We have a running history in some of the events that follow. It is easier to follow with this sheet in front of you.

Verse 6, "After some years, they will become allies. The daughter of the king of the South will go to the king of the North to make an alliance . . ." I have indicated that on this sheet where you have at the left Seleucus I who reigned from 312 to 281. His son Antiochus I who ruled from 281-261. Then Antiochus II, you notice I have an = sign at one side of his name and the name Laodici there. Laodici was his wife. His son Seleucus II who reigned after him is next. But then over at the right I have another = sign, equals Bernice, who married him in 252 B.C. As you see from the list he had already been king 9 yrs, and this was only 5 yrs before his death. Bernice is the daughter of Ptolemy II.

So we read (v.6) "They will become allies. The daughter of the king of the South will go to the king of the North to make an alliance." So the daughter of Ptolemy II who is called Ptolemy Philadelphus married Antiochus II and he put away his wife, Laodice. So he lived in northern Syria with his headquarters at Antioch, named after his father, and Laodice went up into Asia Minor. His displaced wife and her son(s) went up to Asia Minor, part of his kingdom, and they continued to live there, at Sardis with plenty of money and everything she needed but he stayed down here with his new wife Bernice whom he married in order to make an alliance between these two kingdoms.

It didn't work out in the way they were hoping, so we read in v. 6 "But she will not retain her power, and he and his power will not last. In those days she will be handed over, together with her royal escort and her father and the one who supported her." That is a rather vague statement but it tells you she is going to have a great catastrophe. Her life is going to come to an end and so will those of most of those connected with her. That is what actually happened in the history. A very sordid history of what happened though perhaps in a way you can't blame Laodici as much as you might think.

Laodici was displaced and did not like it a bit. The thing she particularly didn't like was she was afraid that if Bernice had a son and Antiochus would make Bernice's son his successor instead of her son. Consequently Laodici got some spies working for her down there ~~there~~ seeing what was happening in Syria, and eventually after a few years Antiochus got tired of Bernice and he went up to Asia Minor and rejoined Laodici.

But Laodici was still worried as to whether her son would succeed and so she poisoned Antiochus. At least it is generally thought she poisoned him, and it is generally considered that she sent someone acting for her to kill Bernice and kill Bernice's infant son. So Antiochus died, Bernice died, and Bernice's infant son died, and just about that time Bernice's father Ptolemy II died. You notice he reigned until 247 B.C. In the next year Antiochus II died. This is giving you in brief language in this account ~~his~~ her power --"she will not retain her power", and he and his power will not last. She will be handed over to death together with her royal escort and her father will die about that time. So you have just a glimpse in rather vague language which when it happens if you had the book of Daniel before you you'd say how exactly it has been fulfilled.

Verse 7 "One from her family line will arise to take her place." We find that from her family line, she was the daughter of Ptolemy II, and Ptolemy III did not like the way his sister had been treated. He didn't like that a bit. So he arose to take her place. "He will attack the forces of the king of the North." He attacked with great success. He will enter his fortress; he will fight against them and be victorious. He will also seize their gods, their metal images and their valuable articles of silver and gold and carry them off to Egypt."

In the history we find that Ptolemy III was able to completely defeat the Seleucids, and it's easy to see how he would after half of them though Laodici was right, and half thought Bernice was right and they were in considerable confusion. Antiochus himself was dead and his son Seleucus II trying to get control of things, so he marched thru a lot of the territory of Seleucus and took a great amount of it in spoil and carried it down to Egypt. For some years he will leave the king of the North alone (v. 28). ~~sz~~ As a matter of fact,

Seleucus II, the king was not strong enough to get back at the Egyptian king Ptolemy but he was very unhappy about what had happened. It was in a manner minor way parallel to what happened earlier when the Greeks for 80 years nursed their irritation at the Persians who made such an effort to conquer them, and were so ready to join with Alexander in conquering the Persian empire.

So then the King of the North will invade the realm of the king of the South but will retreat to his own own country (v.9). So we have Seleucus II making an attempt to invade but not succeeding. He retreats to his own ~~country~~ country. He dies. But his sons You notice I have two sons listed under Seleucus II. "His sons will prepare for war and assemble a great army." They did that. But within 3 yrs. his oldest son died. So his youngest Son=== so his younger son, Antiochus III, the Great, succeeded. We say the Great after that because that's what he is called in history, Antiochus the Great. He was a very great conqueror.

He was one who defeated the Egyptians and took away Palestine and Syria from them and even tried to conquer Greece. For 30 years primarily Antiochus carried on a great succession of conquests. He was very successful until he came into conflict with the power of Rome. Verse 10 recognizes the fact that here we have two sons of Seleucus II who prepared for war. The older one died, and the younger one continued.

"He shall prepare for war and assemble a great army which will sweep on like an irresistible flood and carry the battle as far as his fortress." Verse 11, "Then the king of the South will march out in a rage and fight against the king of the North, who will raise a large army, but it will be defeated. When the army is carried off, the king of the South will be filled with pride and will slaughter many thousands, yet he will not remain triumphant. For the king of the North will muster another army, larger than the first; and after several years, he will advance with a huge army fully equipped. In those times many will rise against the king of the South. The violent men among your own people will rebel in fulfillment of the vision, but without success."

This statement here which NIV translates "in fulfillment of the vision" I believe KJV has "to fulfill the vision" which is an equally possible translation. It is quite generally agreed by interpreters that "the violent men among their own people" refers to the Jews, some of the Jews. It is an historic fact that when Antiochus the Great attacked Egypt, for the previous 100 years Palestine and Southern Syria had been in the control of the Egyptians. The Ptolemies as far as the history goes seem to have treated the Jews very decently. But there were some of them who were dissatisfied and did not feel == did not like to be conquered by the Egyptian power and said, If we could only

be under the Seleucids we'd be much better off instead of being under the Egyptians. They did not feel they had power to try to get their independence. They would rather be under the Seleucids. So they tried to help in getting away from the Egyptians.

It says the violent men among your own people will rebel in fulfillment of the vision, but without success. That "without success" came true very definitely because their ambition failed. In other words they succeeded in helping Antiochus to get the territory away from Egypt, that is Palestine and southern Syria, which had been under Egyptian control for 100 years. Now they became free from Egypt. They were under the Seleucids. Antiochus' son-
~~XXXXXX~~ Antiochus IV was one of the greatest persecutors the Jews ever had.

They tried to fulfill their vision of getting away from Ptolemy but without success.

Question: I got a little lost back in v. 14 Is that the rebellion of the Jews against Ptolemy which played into the hands of the Seleucids?

Yes. Right. Well, why does he give us all this detail? Why do we have this? It is universally agreed among interpreters of the book of Daniel that the reason for giving these glimpses of history is to point to Antiochus IV who was the great persecutor. He was the little horn of ch. 8. It is leading right up to him. We have a few more vv. here about Antiochus III and then there are interpreters who say after coming up to ~~at~~ this point now he tells us about antichrist, from here on. That would not be impossible. The prophet's vision could go up to a certain point and then jump over to another point. But you wonder why he gives all this detail.

Then ~~you~~ besides what he says after this just fits what Antiochus IV did. So the most of the interpreters agree that the history moves up to Antiochus IV and we have a picture of his persecution of the Jews here which is the little horn of ch. 8. Then evangelical interpreters say it jumps from him to Antichrist and we have a picture of antichrist. The two are separate the one right after the other.

Question: On what basis do they reject this as a picture of Antiochus IV?

Simply because they feel it must parallel ch. 7 or the picture of antichrist. But you see it can't parallel ch. 8 and as a matter of fact he gives the little horn of ch. 8 and then the little horn of ch. 7. The critical interpreters say, Everything here is about Antiochus IV; the whole book is written to protect the Jews against Antiochus IV's persecution. On the other hand those who believe (as we do) Daniel wrote it and find pictures of antichrist in the book, some of us come and say everything in it is about antichrist!

When as a matter of fact you have in ch. 7 definitely antichrist out of the fourth kingdom; in ch. 8 you have Antiochus out of the third kingdom; in ch. 11 you have both of them.

But I believe we have first one and then the other. Some have tried to merge them together and I think that is a mistake.

We'll continue there next time.

There were about 15 who did not turn in the assignment for today. I don't know whether that was because you were busy with the missionary conference and did not get to it or whether you did not understand something about it. I hardly think it was the latter because the papers that were turned in were pretty good. I expected six divisions, and five of those almost everyone had. There was one division which many did not notice. But it was tremendously important. The fact you got five of them pleased me very much . . .

(Instructions regarding the next assignment . . .)

The RSV is ordinarily a very fine translation in beautiful English so long as there's nothing important involved. But if it deals with a Messianic prophecy it usually twists it and tries to get rid of the Messianic prophecy. These assignments are not to determine how good you are. They are to prepare you for better understanding. Because if you have the questions in mind you notice the answer and understand it better than if you come to it with no knowledge of it at all. I am anxious you do these assignments and I keep careful track of how many each of you has done and whether it is clear that you have put some time on it.

We have noticed that in Dan. 7 there was a picture of a little horn that comes out of the fourth kingdom., from among 10 horns 3 are broken before it. In the 8th ch. there is a little horn that comes out of the Greek kingdom which is we believe is the third kingdom. All those except those who take the Maccabean view of the higher critics think that the Greek kingdom is the third kingdom. There it comes out from a group of four. These are quite different. We're not quite up to that in ch. 11, so I want to come back. I hope you have your sheet in front of you in which I made the rulers, because that will be helpful in following.

We noticed the account of the daughter of Ptolemy, one of the Ptolemies who came--who married the king who put aside his Laodice and how Laodice got this woman murdered and her son murdered. Laodice's own son eventually got the throne.

Then we saw how Laodice's grandson, Antiochus III who has been called Antiochus the Great, and he certainly was the greatest of all 13 men who bore the name Antiochus. I don't know how early(?) they started ~~saying~~ calling him the great. Incidentally these numbers are a modern thing. Antiochus III, IV, V, etc. They didn't use such numbers. They all had a name after it. The one we're most interested in is Antiochus IV who is called Antiochus Epiphanes. On the list I did not bother to give the title each one took. It's easier for us to remember them by number.

You notice there is quite an account of Antiochus III. We noticed in that account how Antiochus had a long war against the king of the south, and he eventually defeated him but we noticed that (v.14) "In those times many will rise against the king of the south and violent men from among your own people will rebel." The NIV says "in fulfillment of the vision." This of course is not exactly what it is. You can't exactly translate from one language to another. They will rebel in connection with the fulfillment of

the vision. The translators of NIV make it "they rebel in fulfillment". Rebel to fulfill is just as accurate and possible a translation. It's the way KJV ~~xxx~~ takes it. It also fits with the history. I was not present when the NIV considered this passage but I'm quite sure they would have seen the reasonableness of translate it "to fulfill." Because it exactly fits the history that in Palestine which had been under Egypt for 100 years, the people who were Jewish leaders there who were dissatisfied with being under Ptolemy, although the Ptolemy during those 100 years seem to have on the whole treated them very well, but there were some of them who thought, Oh if we could only get away from the Ptolemies and we had the Seleucids as our rulers we'd be better off!

So in order to fulfill their vision they turned against the Ptolemies and joined with the Seleucids. I don't know how much they contributed to the final result. Antiochus III was a very powerful man. In fact he reconquered most of the region to the east that had slipped away and eventually had practically all that had been in the old Persian empire except Egypt, under his control.

They did this to fulfill the vision but without success. In other words what he really means is that their hopes of bettering themselves in this way failed because they found that under the Seleucids they were far far worse off than they had been under the Ptolemies. That goes on to what happened after this.

"Then the king of the north will come and build up siege ramps and will capture their fortified city." That's the city of Gaza.(?)

Question: Going back to v.14 in the two versions, what would you say is the difference "in fulfillment" and "to fulfill." Would "in fulfillment" be more a passive thing where they had no choice in it whereas "to fulfill" would be ?

Very good question. Perhaps the way they translate it is just as good. "In fulfillment" meant they had a vision before now and they are fulfilling it (is what I thought it meant) but when it means--perhaps it could be interpreted that way that in the effort to fulfill a vision they had they turned against the ones who had been their rulers 100 years and tried to help the others. So "in fulfillment" might convey exactly the meaning but I would think "to fulfill" would come a little closer to the (meaning).

Question: Would the vision spoken of here be the vision Daniel had seen? Or the vision of the Jews?

No. The vision that they had of improved conditions under the other people. Thank you. Anywhere something I say isn't clear please interrupt me. If you have a big question, a different view, etc. or something that is quite aside, please write it out and give it to me. I'll either talk to you personally or touch on it in the next class.

"Then the king of the north built up siege ramps and captured Gaza and the horses of the south were powerless to resist even their best troops will not have the strength to stand. The invader will do as he pleases. No one will be able to stand against him.

He will establish himself in the beautiful as land and will have the power to destroy it." The beautiful land clearly here refers to the land of Judea, the land of Israel. This had been utterly under the Egyptians 100 years; now it comes under the Seleucids. Under Antiochus III and he would have power to destroy it, power he did not use at all. Antiochus III was too busy trying to conquer great areas to bother much with it. He got Palestine and Syria and was glad to have it. He had the power to destroy it, but didn't use it. His son, Antiochus IV tried to use it. We come to that a little later.

He will have the power to destroy it. He will determine to conquer the might of his entire kingdom and will make an alliance with the king of the south. Here the king of the south is to fight him (?) He is taking Palestine and Syria away from him. But he decided not to conquer all of Egypt. He thought instead he would annex Macedonia, and Greece. He would like to have all this territory in Asia. He would like instead of going further south and taking Palestine and Syria, to go north, get the sections of Asia Minor away from the Macedonians which they were holding and even get a good bit of Greece.

He decided then to change his attitude toward the king of the south. He had taken Palestine and Syria from him He'd been successful in the war. But instead of making a great effort to completely conquer Egypt he said, Let's make peace with Egypt and go ahead and conquer more in the north.

So we read, He will determine to come with the might of his entire kingdom and will make an alliance with the king of the south having just fought against him he now will make an alliance with him. He did. The present Ptolemy there was very glad to make an alliance with him rather than fight him. "He will give him his daughter in marriage in order to overthrow his kingdom. But his plan will not succeed or help him." KJV has "but she will not stand nor be on his part." Is it his plan or his daughter? The result is the same. (It doesn't help him.) His plan did not work out.

That is to say, he had a daughter named Cleopatra whom I mentioned on your sheet. I indicated she was married to Ptolemy V. Antiochus III said, Let's make peace and let's cement our relation by your marrying my daughter. You see this king Ptolemy V was much younger than he was. He said, You marry my daughter. Cleopatra will go down there; she will work with me; she will help me; I'll have big influence in Egypt from now on! But his plan didn't work out because his daughter gave her full allegiance to her husband instead of to her father. She was the first person of any great importance in Egypt to be called Cleopatra. The same you see came from the Seleucid.

So his daughter went there and married Ptolemy V but she did not support her father but when her husband died and her children were still very young--you notice Ptolemy V reigned from 205-181, and Ptolemy VI did not become king until 173! In other words there was a period of 8 yrs. there when the two sons were too small to be really rulers at all, and during that period

Cleopatra was a very excellent ruler of Egypt. Her whole loyalty was given to her adopted country. Daniel predicted this not in a way you could know what was going to happen, but in such a way that when it did happen you could see it exactly fit!

I think that is true of a great deal of prophecy. The Lord does not intend to satisfy our curiosity about the future. When we try to figure out all kinds of little details and even big details about the future, we may often be wrong. He gives us prophecies to prepare us for the future; to prepare us for situations we have to meet. He gives prophecy so we can see when they are fulfilled that He knew in advance what would happen and this strengthens our faith. But when we begin to try to tell exactly what's going to happen, we are more apt to be wrong than right.

Question: You gave us dates on the handout sheet on Cleopatra and Ptolemy V. Are those dates for both their reigns or one of the other?

They are for Ptolemy V?

Question: Do you have ?

She was Ptolemy's wife in I think it was about 198 she married him. She she had been married nearly 20 years when he died, and I suppose they may have considered her son the real monarch but they were little tiny infants so she really was ruler of Egypt. She was not officially installed as ruler but she exercised the power of --and was a very able ruler of Egypt. Not a person down there to help the Seleucids at all.

Question: Are you aware of any harmonies of the prophecies of Daniel that have been written along this line?

You mean dealing with this material? (Yes) Almost any extensive commentary on Daniel will give a good bit of the material I have been giving you. Of course any history will give it.

Question: Something that has been written in the form of a harmony, such as the harmony of the gospels?

No. I know of none like that. Well then, his plan won't succeed or help him. Then v.18, He will turn his attention to the coastland. KJV says islands. Neither of them is an exact translation. There is no exact translation. This Hebrew word here which is translated many times isles (KJV) and coastlands (NIV) is a name that is applied to the section, the lands and islands the Mediterranean Sea to the west. If you look from Palestine off to the north, the Mediterranean winds around there and across. Sometimes you can get a glimpse of Cyprus. It goes on and in fact ~~it~~ it covers everything to the west actually. It can be small or great--the amount of territory it covers. The isles, the coastlands.

So he turns his attention to the coastlands, and will take many of them. He now took his army and proceeded northward and seized all the territory in Asia Minor that -- I mean he held most of Asia Minor already, but there was some of it held by the king of Macedonia.

He seized those. He crossed the Hellespont. He seized Thrace just across the Hellespont and started to go down into Greece.

Far to the west of him there was a new rising nation, that is the Republic of Rome. Rome had-- I don't know how much you know about ancient history; when I was a boy everybody nearly everybody took ancient history. Now many don't even know who Julius Caesar was. The details of ancient history I refer to if you don't know anything about ancient history don't bother your head about them, except what specifically relates to Scripture here. If you do I think it's of interest to realize that the city of Carthage in N. Africa and Rome and come into collision in the Mediterranean. They had a series of wars. In one of them, their great general Hanibal led a great army with elephants from Africa north to Spain, across the alps, down into Italy, and even in Italy I guess for 20 years fighting there, and almost destroyed the Roman army.

They came very close to winning and it would have meant the destruction of Rome and its becoming subject to Carthage. But he did not quite succeed in that and had to go back to Carthage. Then the Romans won the war and they demanded that Carthage turn him over. But he escaped from Carthage, he escaped and took refuge with Antiochus III. Hanibal urged Antiochus to try to conquer territories to the west ~~but~~ of him, and Hanibal was with him for a time. Antiochus had conquered most of the territories that Alexander had conquered in Asia. He had an army there and had he stopped there he would have been a very great conqueror. But he now, as we noted, he took Hanibal's advice and went westward.

Then he got a message from Rome, and Rome in its battles against Hanibal and against Carthage had developed a very powerful army-- not a tremendously large army but extremely skilled and capable. He got a message from this little place way way off to the west. It would be as if we here got a message from someone in Singapore saying you do so and so! He thought, What's this little place at Rome going to tell me what I ought to do! They said to him, Get out of Europe; do not try to conquer any more in Europe. Go back to Asia. He sent them a note and said, I never interfered in Italy, what right have you to interfere in Asia, in these eastern areas. He got a pretty sharp note from them and he returned ~~ixit~~ in kind.

"But a commander will put an end to his insolence and will turn this [his] insolence back upon him." When he sent this word to the Romans telling they had no right to order him out of Greece, they sent an army which met him at Thermopylae in Greece and defeated him. So he had to leave Europe and return to Asia Minor and there in Asia Minor a larger Roman army came against him, utterly defeated him, made him turn over his entire fleet to Rome, made him pay a tremendous indemnity to them, made him promise to pay a large sum every year for the next 12 years, and made him take 20 of his legion people whom they would select to be taken to Rome as hostages that he would keep the peace.

So this says a commander will turn his insolence back upon him; after this he will turn back to the fortresses of his own country. He came back and he had all this he had to pay to Rome.

All this utter defeat. His great career of conquest shattered by this. He has gone into debt heavily with all these wars from which he expected to recoup by getting reparations from the places he conquered. Now he's lost them all so can't pay indemnity. So he goes back to the fortresses of his own country and says I've got to recoup myself financially.

So he appointed his oldest son, Seleucus IV as co-king with him, took a small force and went eastward into other parts of Asia that he held, and there he would go into the temples of the various deities of those areas and would take their temple treasures in order to recoup his own finances! He came into one of these little temples with only a handful of his men with him never thinking there was anything to worry about --He went in there, seized their treasury. The local people were incensed and rushed at him and killed him.

So after his tremendous career of conquest and grandeur he will stumble and fall and be seen no more. That covers a lot--his defeat by the Romans, his death in this ~~pk~~ petty little skirmish there. Question, Mr. Buses?

Question: Yes, NASB translates v. 20 the last part . . .

20? No we're in 19. He will stumble and fall to be seen no more. So that's the end of this great conqueror Antiochus III who would probably not be mentioned in the Bible if it were not for its leading up ~~to~~ step by step to his son, Antiochus IV. Otherwise why is there any purpose in it? There is a purpose in some predictions when people can see they are fulfilled that this is what God has predicted. But why do that about him any more than about Napoleon or Hitler, or Julius Caesar, except that it is leading up to something of tremendous importance. That is not nearly of the importance to the world that Antiochus III was, but of greater importance to the history of God's chosen people.

So after he stumbles and falls to be seen no more, then v. 20 says his successor will send out a tax collector to maintain the royal splendor. His successor was generally thought as not ruling very long. A few years it says and he will be destroyed. His successor is thought of as not ruling very long because the 11 years that he ruled seemed very small in comparison with the over 40 years, or nearly 40 years that Antiochus III had ruled. Antiochus III was so prominent. His son realized the best thing he could do was to try to reestablish fiscal responsibility in the land when they were in this situation.

So he was known as just the tax collector. People looked down on him in comparison with the great splendor of the conquests of his father. But this was the only thing he could do and sensible thing to do. He sent out a tax collector to maintain the royal splendor. But in a few yrs. he will be destroyed; not in anger nor in battle. His chief minister decided to seize the throne and ~~xxxxx~~ ~~reign~~ in the name of the infant son. So he killed him.

It was a conspiracy. Not an angry thing. Nobody got upset angry and suddenly killed him. It was not in a battle. It was not in anger nor in battle but he was destroyed. You couldn't predict exactly when it was going to happen but when it happened == you couldn't predict exactly what was going to happen but when it happened it exactly fulfilled it. What's it leading up to?

Now we find that the next person in line has a much longer account of his deeds because he is one of the most important characters in the book of Daniel. He is the one described at very considerable length in ch.8 where much detail was given about him. and the way that he tried to destroy the worship of God. So we read: He will be succeeded by a contemptible person who had not been given the honor of royalty. You see, Seleucus IV was the oldest son and he reigned for 11 years. When Seleucus IV became king he was required to send his own son to Rome as a hostage. So his oldest son was in Rome as a hostage and this minister who had killed him thought he could take over the power and rule in the name of an infant son.

But when Antiochus III had had to send to Rome some of his sons and other prominent people, one of them was a man named Antiochus. This man lived in Rome a number of years and became very friendly with a number of Romans and then he was released from Rome when his father died (his brother succeeded) he was released from Rome. He went to Athens, became a prominent citizen of Athens, he was actually elected to the highest elective office in Athens! But there in Athens no one ever thought of him ever becoming king over here, but when he heard how this man had assassinated his brother== assassinated his brother, instead of saying, Well now, let's try to get rid of the assassin and get the rightful heir viz, his brother's son who was now in Rome as a hostage installed as king, he immediately decided to make himself king.

So we read, "He was == will be succeeded by a contemptible person who had not been given the honor of royalty. He will invade the kingdom when his people feel secure and he will seize it through intrigue. An overwhelming army will be swept away even before him and the prince of the covenant will be destroyed.

He immediately got in touch with an area called Pergamum, which had been a very minor kingdom in Asia Minor, until a few years before that. When the Romans had overcome Antiochus III they had given territory in Asia Minor-- most of this territory in Asia Minor away from him--they gave it to this king of Pergamum, so it became quite important to them for just a few decades. But he got in touch with the leader there and made him promises of what he would do if he became king and got them to give him a force to go in and ~~declare~~ declare

he was the son of Antiochus III and establish himself as king. So he seized it through intrigue. When he got it he no longer helped Pergamum but he took the name Epiphanes which means the great god i.e. the god whose glory shines out.

Now many previous kings called themselves god. It was a rather common idea. It was a sort of fanciful thing to pretend they were gods. But he took it very seriously and on the coins he put his name with the title Epiphanes after it. Antiochus Epiphanes - now ~~xxxxx~~ we read in the next few verses we read about his accession and his character. "He invaded the kingdom when ~~his~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ == when its people felt secure. He seized it through intrigue. An overwhelming army was swept away before him. A prince of the covenant will be destroyed."

There was a high priest named Onias who was not the one that the previous king had wished to have whom he got rid of. He appointed another man high priest. Eventually this prince of the covenant was assassinated and where you read in ch. 9 that the Messiah (anointed one) will be cut off, the modern critics say that points to Onias this high priest. This describes how he became king.

"After coming to an agreement he will act deceitfully and with only a few people he will rise to power. When the richest provinces feel secure he will invade them, and will achieve what neither his father nor his forefathers did. He will distribute plunder and loot and wealth among his followers and will plot the overthrow the fortresses but only for a time." Up to here (v.24) we've had general descriptions of the things he did. Of how he by intrigue and plotting, etc. established himself here as king and he likes to call himself Epiphanes. He speaks boastfully, raises himself against God in this way.

Then from v. 25 on we read about specific details of his career. With a large army he will stir up his strength and courage against the king of the south. The king of the south will wage war with a very large and powerful army but he will not be able to stand because of the plots devised against him. Those who eat of the king's provisions will try to destroy him, his army will be swept away and many will fall in battle." So he succeeded in overcoming an army that was sent against him. Cleopatra was dead. Her two young sons were both called Ptolemy. Nearly everybody in that family was called Ptolemy. Both of them, quite young, perhaps in their early teens. He seized, managed to seize a considerable part of Egypt and he got the oldest son into his possession, whom we call Ptolemy VI. Then the Egyptian people got the next oldest son, Ptolemy VII. They said, This man is the rightful king; the other fellow has been taken prisoner. He has no right now to the throne. So we now have two men both called Ptolemy, both supposed to be the kings of Egypt, but Ptolemy VI is in the power of Antiochus who is an uncle because he was his mother's brother. Cleopatra's first brother.

In the next verse (v.27) we read: The two kings with their hearts bent on evil will sit at the same table and lie to each other but to no avail, because the end will still come at the appointed time." He gives Ptolemy to understand that he will help him and he's the right king of Egypt. Ptolemy VI. He's got most of these in his hands but not very strongly held. Ptolemy, his nephew is always planning, Once my uncle gives away (?) I'm going to throw off any allegiance to him. So he two are sitting at table lying to one another but to no avail for the end will come at the appointed time.

"The king of the north" (this is Antiochus IV) will return to his own country with great wealth, but his heart will be set against the holy covenant. He will take action against him and then return to his own country. On his way back he stops at his capital in Antioch and he stops at Judea and he seizes a lot of property there and he rather mistreated the Jews. He wanted to make all these people Greeks, in their culture, in their attitudes and the leaders-- many of the leaders in Jerusalem were not willing to go along that way.

So he returned to his own country. He began persecution of the Israelites. He took action against them but it was only the beginning. Then at the appointed time he will invade the south again. Ptolemy VI declared himself independent completely of his uncle and the leaders of Egypt had already made his brother king, so they say, Let the two of them rule together. Notice their reigns overlapped--173-145 and 169-116. They overlap. So they said, We'll have the two of them rule together. Eventually they put in a third: Cleopatra II who ruled along with them.

Antiochus soon finds that while he had taken a great deal of booty from Egypt and he'd left a garrison in one city, the rest of Egypt fell away from him completely. So he takes an army and goes to Egypt and he would have been able to conquer Egypt completely if something had not happened. "At the appointed time he will invade the south again, but this time the outcome will be different from what it was before. Ships from the western coastlands will oppose him and he will depart." You would not know what's going to happen here except there are two ships(?) going to come from the western coastlands.

What actually happened was he conquered nearly all of Egypt. Then he heard that a ship had come from Rome, and he goes out to the shore to meet the people from Rome. This delegation from Rome arrives, and there is a man named Pompillious Laenas. This man was one he'd been friendly with in Rome. So Antiochus greets him and says, Pompillius, I'm so glad to see you. Pompillius says, I have a message for you, from the Roman senate. He says, I'm glad to hear what the Senate has to say, but let's have dinner, remember old times

and then we'll look at the matter. Pompilius says, You must look at the message immediately! Oh well, he says, what is the message? He handed it to him. He read; The Roman senate requires you immediately to withdraw from Egypt and not to make any further attempts to conquer Egypt. He already had 2/3 of Egypt in his possession. He easily could have taken the rest with the force he had. Ordered by the Roman senate.

Well he didn't like that. He said, I'll have to consider that. Pompilius took his walking stick and he drew a circle in the sand around Antiochus. He said, You may consider it just as you stay standing within that circle. Well, Antiochus had lived in Rome. He knew the power of Rome. He knew how his father's whole career had been wrecked by Rome. He said, Oh well, if that's the way it is, Alright. He went and had dinner with him, withdrew his forces, went back from Egypt, feeling pretty disgusted and upset.

When he got back to Antioch he put on some great games and invited the people around him and did everything he could to renew his prestige and standing but he felt pretty sore about it. He knew what the power of Rome was. This dramatic way in which this man had shown the power of Rome against one of the powerful kings of the east who had practically conquered Egypt was something that Roman writers in later years liked to tell about and to remember how Rome had shown its power way off there in the east against this great force. Antiochus ~~then~~ then vented his feelings on the Jews. He couldn't do anything against Egypt any more.

So he said, Here's this group of Jews here that refuses to become Hellenized. Refuses to adopt all our customs. They won't dress the way we do. They ~~circumsize~~ circumsize their children which we don't do. They don't like to engage in the games-- they were nearly naked as they played these games, Hellenistic games. The Jews didn't like to do that. They believed in their one God who is the great power and they won't worship Zeus and Apollos, etc. and so he took out his anger on the Jews. He determined to compel the people to be uniform with the rest of the people.

So we read: And vent his fury against the holy covenant. He will return and show favor toward those who forsake the holy covenant. They had been making progress already, this man had in persuading the Jewish ~~men~~ leaders to give up their religion and to adopt Hellenistic customs, but they found throughout the land many who would not give in. There were many Jews, however, who were ready to abandon the religion of their fathers.

So, his armed forces will rise up and desecrate the temple fortress and will abolish the evening sacrifice. They will set up the abomination that causes desolation and put up a statue of Jppiter (whome the Greeks called Zeus) in the temple in Jerusalem. They offered swines flesh upon the altar and they ordered all the leading Jews to come and sacrifice to Zeus.

Some of them did. But many of them fled into the wilderness. Then he sent his soldiers all through the land of Judea and in every town they put up a little altar to Jupiter and told them to sacrifice. If they didn't they were killed. If a woman circumcised her child she was apt to be killed, or at least her child would be killed. So the soldiers there instituted a regime to completely destroy the ancient religion of Judaism.

They set up the abomination which causes desolation, and I guess you could say that most of what was said about his career at that point because then the next v. could be considered part of his career but could be considered part of the fate of the people of God. "With flattery he will corrupt those who have violated the covenant, but the people who know their God will firmly resist him. Those who are wise will instruct many though for a time they will fall by the sword . . . These are the people who fled into the wilderness and were gradually gathered together in bands under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus and attacked small detachments of Antiochus' troops and then larger and larger ones, and eventually regained their freedom. Eventually the whole land became free and they made a treaty of alliance with Rome.

When they fall they shall receive a little help and many who were not sincere will join them as they gain for power. Others Jews who had been ready to sacrifice. Perhaps they saw there was a chance to escape Antiochus' power and went out and joined with them. . . Some of the wise will stumble so that they may be refined, purified and made spotless until the time of the end. For it will still come at the appointed time.

What happened was Antiochus went east to do as his father did, tried to seize the treasures of different temples. He'd taken the treasure of the temple in Jerusalem. He went east to do this and met some resistance, but then he was taken with a nervous disease and he suffered greatly from this disease for a few weeks and then died. His successors tried to carry out his policies but little by little they were driven back and defeated. The next v. seems to describe the kings' character again. There is the view of the higher critics (the Maccabean view) that the whole book is to strengthen the Jews in their attempt to resist Antiochus; in his attempt to destroy the worship of God. Evangelical scholars believe that's one of the purposes of the book. That is the purpose of ch. 8 and of what we've just read. But at this point we believe it skips to tell about someone else similar but a different person. Not the little horn of ch. 8 or the little horn of ch. 7 which the critics say are the same. But we can't go into that today. We'll have to continue with this next time.

(Explanation of willingness to discussion of papers with students who may have questions)

We are still looking at ch. 11 and still have some very important things in chs. 11-12. I anticipate a little bit in looking ahead. Looking at the papers I realize this assignment is very important not just for ~~xxx~~ what's in those two vv., but for certain principles that come out that are vital in relation to our understanding of the Bible. The Bible in any translation that is honestly made, and in most that are dishonestly made, you can find the truth of salvation and the great outstanding truths about God sufficiently well that a person could be saved by them. A person does not have to know Greek or Hebrew in order to be saved, or in order to live a worthwhile life.

But if you're going to get into a precise understanding of difficult things, in the Bible, it is very vital that you have some understanding of the original. Whether you can figure out exactly from the original what it means isn't half as important in this regard as for you to be able to see what are the matters on which you cannot tell as between two possibilities in the original, and what are the possibilities in == the matters in which you can say it is this ~~xxxxxxx~~ and not that.

I do not suppose that any two languages have many words in them that are identical in meaning. Rarely is a word a point; a word is an area of meaning. These areas in different languages don't correspond very much. When I was in Germany the other American students used to laugh ~~xxxxx~~ when a Germany would describe me as a ~~groscher~~ schlanker herr, because the word because the word gross in English we would translate roughly as "big." The word schlank we would translate as "slender." You wouldn't call a man a big slender man! Actually the word gross which roughly means big is more apt to mean tall. The tall slender man, and it fit me much better then than it does now! The word gross also corresponds to our English word Great. I think few people in America would consider me as gross either in the sense of being big or in the sense of being great. But in the sense as used in German~~xx~~ of meaning "tall" you see the sense would exactly fit.

Yet you would not speak of Frederick the tall. You speak of Frederick the Great(~~der grosse~~). That's an illustration of how two words similar-- you say that word~~s~~ means this -- actually in some contexts it does and in others it doesn't because the areas are different that are covered by these particular words. These two vv. are an excellent illustration of that fact.

One thing that is very different in different languages and that is very hard to explain is the use of the article. There Latin has a great advantage. You ~~won't~~ have to worry about the

use of the article because they don't have any. But when you look at a Latin word whether it is the man, a man, or just man -- you can't tell. In English there's a difference between the two. There's quite a difference between the anointed one, and an anointed one. In Latin there would be absolutely no difference. The English indefinite article (a) is one that is not ~~used~~ usually found in other languages.

We had a student once who had lived in Spain most of his life. He was telling me of an experience he had and he said one girl was drowned. We immediately think, Isn't it good, only one was drowned. You say a girl was drowned. You'd never think of saying, Oh it is only one! Our English word (a) evidently has nothing exactly corresponding to it. In Spanish and in fact in most languages.

What does "the" mean? "The" points to it. That is the one isn't it? The horse, the dog. You say, I went for a walk in the ~~wood~~ woods. I went for a swim in the ocean? Which woods? Which ocean? You're not saying which. Just the one you happened to go swimming in. That's the one that is the ocean. So you see what a variety there is in the use of the article.

In Hebrew there is no indefinite article. The definite article in Hebrew does not correspond exactly to ours. Consequently when you look at these different versions, and you find that some say "the anointed one" and some say "that anointed one," ~~and~~ well, that may be a difference in the original, or it may be simply a matter of interpretation. But I would say that if you find two good versions and one say "the anointed one" and one says "an anointed one", you can be pretty sure the original Hebrew does not have a "the." Because if it did there would be an indication they would translate it "the." But when it does not have the article with it, they might do it either way.

So the NIV is very proper in ch. 9:25 where it speaks about "the anointed one." Incidentally it has it in capitals: capital A and Capital O. But we don't have capital letters in Hebrew! So whether it should be capital or small is purely a matter of interpretation. And when you find it speaks of "the anointed one" and you have a footnote under v. 25, "Or, an anointed one," and also in v.26, you know then there is no article in it in Hebrew. Well, if there is no article in Hebrew, how can they translate it "the anointed one.!? They may think of it as a proper name. That's what the KJV does. It says "the Messiah." Or does it say "the Messiah"? I forget. Anyway this word is used about 40 times in the OT, and there are two of those where the KJV translates it Messiah. These two are those two vv. Those are the only times it translates it Messiah. In every other case it translates it "an anointed one" or "the anointed one."

So when you translate it "the Messiah", you are making a determination as to what the v. means. Your determination may be right; it may be wrong. But it is your determination. It is not what the original necessarily says. So the difference between vv.

that say "the" and "a" (between this word) is simply a matter of your fitting it with the context and of your deciding which is the correct way to interpret this. This word Messiah in Heb. is used about half the time to refer to a king. David says, I will not lift my hand against the Lord's anointed. It doesn't say, The Lord's Messiah. We would be shocked if anyone said Saul was Messiah. But it's exactly the same word. It means the anointed one.

About half of its uses or a little more than that, it refers to a king. The Persian king even is called God's Messiah. God's anointed one is the book of Isaiah. The word is used a few times for a prince, and I believe twice for a prophet. So you see whether it points definitely to Christ or whether it means just some anointed one, that is a matter you must determine from context. Therefore the difference between the versions, that particular difference is not one of great importance. That is a matter of interpretation.

Here let me say this: The RSV and the NEB whenever they have a messianic statement in the OT, a specifically definite messianic statement quoted as such in the NT, in most such cases they twist it in some way. In such passages those two Versions are not at all dependable. Their prejudice enters in. In a trans. like the NIV and NASB, they will trans. such passages in the way the Scripture of the NT uses them. But there may be passages where those translators have a very definite idea. KJV in at least two instances translates this word "Messiah."

Evangelical translators are quite apt to think now this must refer to the Messiah. But if you translate it "an anointed one" which is more literal, that leaves it to the reader to determine. Is it talking about the Messiah or not. And if we are going to make careful investigation it is good as far as possible that we take a translation that does not choose between two different meanings. When it comes to the big Messianic prophecies of the OT, you can't trust the RSV or NEB. But when it comes to passages which are not in that category, you may find that the one that is made by strong evangelicals may reflect their particular interpretation of that passage. That made by modernists in such a case may not be a good translation. On the other hand it may give you just what the original says, instead of interpreting it to fit with their particular interpretation.

In these two vv., the most important difference on the one hand between the NIV and NASB on the one hand along with KJV and with these other versions, comes in v. 25 where it says in NIV, "Until the anointed one the ruler comes, there will be seven sevens, and sixty-two sevens." Now there is no period in the original. In Heb. most sentences start with an "and" . It is very common. So you can't say necessarily the two things are part of the same sentence, if you have "and." But these other versions, and the Jewish version say "there will be seven sevens." Or seven weeks (period). Then they say, "and 62 sevens it will be rebuilt." . . . This is a tremendously important difference, in translation.

I was particularly pleased with those of you who noticed that. I was disappointed in those who did not notice it, because it is a very great difference in meaning. But whether you call it the anointed one or the messiah--what it says is an anointed one. That's a matter of interpretation.

The other difference I was particularly interested in is where it says in KJV that messiah will be cut off but not for himself. If you did not use KJV you would not notice that because NIV says "and will have nothing." That is nearer to what these other versions say, since NIV is quite literal. And will have nothing, except it could just as well be "but will have nothing."

There is one other difference I would be happy if any of you noticed. That is, these translations speak of the commandment or decree, while some of the others simply speak of the word going forth to rebuild Jerusalem. What is the difference between command and word? If I send you word to come tomorrow, what's the difference between that and I send you a command to come tomorrow? It's identical. But if I send you word that I'm not going to see you tomorrow. That's quite different isn't it? In other words our word can include commandment. It does not have to. The Heb. word here is trans. "word" hundreds of times in OT. It's trans. "edict" or "command" quite a few times. Word is wide; command is narrow. There is another Heb. word for command that is used a great number of times in OT.

So edict or command is quite all right here, but it inserts an idea which is not in the original, here. This word is used 3 times earlier in the ch. to refer to God's message to ~~Isaiah~~ Daniel. The word that God sent to Daniel. Three times that way earlier in the ch. Now all the sudden if we are to render it decree, or commandment is interpretation.

The important reason for knowing the original is that you want it to understand a difficult passage like this. To know what the possibilities are & and to avoid ~~the translation~~ making a translation that is loaded in seizing one of two or more possibilities. We'll look at that more later. I want to continue with ch. 11 because we have some very important material yet to look at. in ch. 11.

We noticed in ch. 11 how it told about the career of Antiochus IV, and it describes a no. of specific instances in his life, like his eating with his nephew with each of them making good promises to each other but neither intending to carry them out. It told about the ships of the western coastlands that would oppose him and he would loose heart and he would turn back and vent his fury against the holy covenant. We noticed these matters which are described so specifically about specific details of his career. It exactly fits Antiochus' career. Now St. Jerome in 400 A.D. said: In ch. 11 you have a description of Alexander the Great and of Seleucus and his successors and how he points to one after the other and he gets to v. 20 and it tells how Seleucus IV who tried to recoup the shattered finances of the kingdom and who was destroyed not in anger nor in battle.

Then in v.21 we have a perfect description of Antiochus for a few vv. and then we have an exact description of his career. Jerome said with v.21 we jump forward from Seleucus IV clear to Antichrist, at the very end of the age. There is a big space. Well there may be a big space. There are many places in the Bible where there are small or big spaces between two vv. ~~There are~~ There are--any of us might tell -- I might tell you of something that happened 20 years ago. ~~Then~~ I might say I met so-and-so first 20 years ago. Then I might say, The next time I saw him he looked much older. I would not have to mention that it was last week--many years later than the other. But there's a space often in between the time.

But is it reasonable to think there is such a space after describing these kings we're not much interested in, and then you get right up to Antiochus IV who was the great persecutor of the Jews who tried to completely wipe out the Jewish religion. He made it a capital crime to circumsize their children. He tried to destroy the temple of Jerusalem as a place for the worship of God by putting up a statue of Jupiter and sacrificing swine's flesh on the altar! To jump from him to antichrist. It seems silly. Why tell all these things about the others? Why tell all this about Antiochus III? They are not of interest to us. They are of interest as leading up to Antiochus IV and pointing to

Jerome says, Here it jumps to antichrist. Then as he strikes some of these things that so exactly fit Antiochus IV, you say not of these fit Antiochus IV but its a type of Antichrist. To me that's as if you'd write a life of Napoleon and then you would tell of some terrible thing he did and then you'd say, Here it's talking about Napoleon as a type of Hitler. Though it ~~fits~~ fits Napoleon perfectly it's now a type of Nitler!

I believe it's a vital rule of interpretation that it's one or the other. It is Antiochus or Antichrist. It's not one as a type of the other. We have many types of Christ but whether we are justified in speaking of something as a type of something other than Christ or the work of Christ, I seriously question. And I certainly don't think we can pick out a v. or two in the middle of the description of Antiochus and say it is a type of Christ.

Question: So Jerome did not deny Antiochus was in view here but he wanted to make him a type of Christ xxxx of Antichrist?

Yes. Jerome was answering Porphyry who 5(?) years before had wirtten a great attack upon Christianity, and Propyry said the book of Daniel so exactly describes the career of Antiochus that it is clear it must have been wirtten at that time. He said, When it claims to tell you about past events thewriter is simply pre-tending he was writing at an earlier period and giving you pre-dictions which are really his knowledge of history. Then when he gets beyond Antiochus he simply says what he hopes will happen! His prediction up to Antiochus is true. Anything after that is his guess and his guess didn't work out, because the great end of the age he expected as shown in ch. 2 and in ch. 7 did not happen. They are describing Antiochus, (he would say).

In order to do that they run into certain historical difficulties. But Jerome was trying to answer it and he said No, this was written by Daniel. God enabled Daniel to predict Antiochus, but he also enabled him to predict the antichrist. I believe he is right in that but I believe he is wrong in making one verse as applying to both of them, or in thinking it is mixed up, that he talks about one and then ~~comes back to~~ the other and come back to the one. I believe you must find what in the book of Daniel is about Antiochus. All interpreters of Daniel find much in it about Antiochus.

In ch. 7 we have the picture of antichrist, the little horn that comes out from ten horns before which three horns are broken. In ch. 8 we have Antiochus pictured as a horn that comes out of the ~~four~~ four horns that are pictured in the third kingdom. But we must have I believe either Antiochus or antichrist in a particular verse. When you look at vv. 21ff you have a perfect description of Antiochus' character. Antichrist may be very similar, but here he's talking about Antiochus. Then we have a description of many details of Antiochus' career. We noticed some very unusual things described about Antiochus, like this meeting with the Romans there . . . These are things in Antiochus' career. God was preparing the people for one of the greatest crises because God called the Jewish people out ~~to~~ to be His instruments to keep the knowledge of God alive when the world had turned against Him.

The world wanted to forget God but He called the Jewish people to be His instrument to keep alive the knowledge of the true God, and to be His instrument for giving us the Bible, and His instrument through which he would bring Jesus Christ into the world. So Antiochus' efforts to change the Jews into hellenists, the followers of Greek culture and deniers of the Bible, was one of the greatest crises that the knowledge of God ever experienced.

Under the Babylonians they let them worship however they wanted to. They didn't care how they worshipped so long as they were subject to them. The same was true of the Persians. But Antiochus was the one real effort to destroy the worship of God.

So we have the description of Antiochus' character and then of his career. The description of his career runs on to the end of v. 32 or you could end it in the middle of that verse, because the next section talks about the people of God. The situation of the people of God at this time. There is a transition between these two because in v. 32 we read with flattery he will corrupt those who have violated the covenant." That of course is not a description of the people of God, but it is true that Antiochus' efforts had persuaded many of the Jews to forsake their religion and adopt the Greek customs where and in athletic competition naked, in the gymnasium and doing various things like that. These people who have violated the covenant -- he corrupted and led many astray with his flattery and his efforts. But then we read "the people who know their God will firmly resist him." There is the description of many who stood true and died for their faith and others fled into the wilderness.

Then those who are wise will instruct many, though for a time they will fall by the sword or be burned or be captured or plundered. When they fall they will receive a little help. Many who were not sincere will join them." That isn't a strong praise of the Maccabees is it? Many who are not sincere will join them. After they got going, and they began to show they could be successful in the wilderness, there were people who joined them who weren't so interested in standing true. Merely nationalists interested in maintaining their national identity and upset over the way Antiochus was treating them.

"Some of the wise will stumble so they may be purified, refined and made spotless until the time of the end . . . at the appointed time." In other words they end of the persecution will come. God knows what is going to happen. At the appointed time this persecution will come to an end. This little band did succeed in growing larger and larger and gaining its independence and they were independent for about a century after this time. till the Romans took them over.

So we have these three divisions: the character, the career, and then it tells about the people of God. Then we return in v.36 to the character of the king. Then a few vv. about the career, and a few vv. about the situation of the people of God. We have this repetition.

Question: Would you say the career of Antiochus stops with v. 21?

You could and include the next section under the careers. But in those vv. there are a number of things that tell about a number of things he does under one head. So I feel his character is certainly brought out though (indistinct)

Question: (indis inct)

I would consider that as accession to

Yes.

I have not noticed any commentary pointing out this: three sections following three sections. I have not noticed this in any commentary, but it seems to me the way the material is arranged. It does not prove we now are talking about a different person, but it certainly suggests it. You go back to the character and it tells about things in general that he will do, what his general attitude is, then it gives a description of his career. Then you talk again about the situation of the people of God.

The fact that it would say so little about these people who resisted under the Maccabees, it seems to me points rather strongly against the idea that the purpose of writing the book was simply to encourage the Maccabees. I think the purpose was to prepare people for this terrible crisis. That is one of the purposes of the book. I think another purpose is to prepare them for the Antichrist who would come at a much later time. At any rate conservative commentaries--that is commentaries written by those who believe that this is == that the ~~xxx~~ antichrist is in view and that it was actually written by Daniel, these commentaries --some follow Jerome in thinking it starts to speak about antichrist in v.21 but not many.

Most recognize that it is Antiochus and only Antiochus it is talking about in the vv. we have looked at up to this point. But there is a difference among them as to whether the next few vv., from v. 36-39 are continuing a description of Antiochus or whether it switches to Antichrist. I don't understand why there should be that difference of opinion, because it seems to me extremely difficult to interpret vv. 36-39 as describing Antiochus. It just doesn't fit. Those who insist that

The whole book was written at this time and that Antiochus only in view, they strive manfully to show how it fits Antiochus. But I don't think they succeed. "The king will do as he pleases." That's alright. It could be either one of those two. "He will exalt and magnify himself above every god," and will say unheard of things against the God of Gods." Antiochus did say unheard of things against the God of Gods, but that he magnified himself above every god when he built great temples to Zeus (the god of the Greeks) and he aligned himself right up with Greek paganism--to say that fits Antiochus is rather ridiculous.

The holders of the Maccabean view of the whole book have quite a struggle trying to show how it fits here. Some conservative writers kind of waver at this point. Then tend to say from v. 40 on is Antichrist. But it seems to me the change should be made at v. 36.

"He will be successful until the time of wrath is completed, for what has been determined must take place." That is God will do what he has determined to do. That is not a point of difference. But now, "He will show no regard for the gods of his fathers." But when he built temples to the Greek gods, how can you say he will show no regard for the gods of his fathers? Well, the followers of the Maccabean view say, His ancestral god was Apollo, and he built great temples to Zeus. So he didn't show regard for the gods of his fathers! They translate the god of the his fathers rather than the God. But he certainly -- there is no evidence he showed any disregard for Apollo at all. He simply magnified more than he did Apollo the one who is generally considered the head of the Greek pantheon--Zeus.

"Now for the one desired by women." What does that mean? Nobody knows what it means. Here is something said which we have nothing to show that anything that Antiochus did. When Antichrist comes we will see what it means. It takes a good deal of imagination to say this describes Antiochus. Some of the writers say there was a very licentious cult in Syria somewhere, and Antiochus opposed it. But there is no evidence for it whatever. It is purely imaginary.

"Now will he regard any god." Why then did he build temples to Zeus--even a very expensive one way over in Athens. He lavished a lot of money on it. Why did he constantly worship the Greek gods if he had not regarded any gods? Purely imaginary. "But will exalt himself above them all" That does not fit anything we know about Antiochus. It is purely imaginary to say it fits Antiochus. "Instead of it he will honor a god of fortresses." What does that mean? I know what I think it means. I think this word fortresses is like what someone said to Stalin: We should ask the Pope to enter into the peace conference. Stalin said: How many divisions of troops does he have?

In other words he had no interest in anything spiritual. Whether you think the pope is a good illustration of things spiritual or not, it shows the attitude of the communist leaders. That there is no such thing as a supernatural force. One of their astronauts said, I went up in the sky, looked all around and I didn't see any God! It is one of the prime claims of communism that there is no God. But not only communism, it is what is taught in most of our universities today that if you are so old fashioned you want to worship a god that's w up to you. But we can't mention it in the university. We are interested only in science and what is proven. So.

Some people may have felt the same way in ancient times, but they didn't express it if they did. Just about everyone in ancient times claimed to believe in supernatural forces. They might believe in different ones, but they believed in supernatural forces. But "he will show no regard for any of these god, but instead he will honor a god of forces or fortresses." It's hard to know exactly how to state it. It seems to me it's a description of a materialistic attitude. ~~Bss\$~~ A purely materialistic attitude that honors the god of fortresses rather than the gods of ancient Greece or Rome or worshipping the true God either.

A god unknown to his fathers he will honor with gold and silver and precious stones and costly gifts. There is no evidence of any kind Antiochus was like or attitudes he had. "He will attack the mightiest fortress with the help of a foreign god." There is nothing in Antiochus' career that we know of that would fit with this. "He will greatly honor those who acknowledge him He will make them rulers over many peoples and will distribute the land at a price." We do not know what some of these phrases mean. When the time comes we will see further. Jesus said to the apostles, when they were amazed at the stories that he was raised from the dead and when they had been terribly upset that he had been crucified, he did not say to them, Well I told you all about this; I told you it was coming.

He had on two or three occasions but they hadn't senses it. It seemed so contrary to anything they had in mind. He did not rebuke them for not remembering what he'd said. He said, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." It's in the prophets. They predicted the death and resurrection of Christ but people did not understand it. He said they should have studied it carefully and understood it. These things we may not know exactly how they are going to be fulfilled. I don't see any point in making a lot of guesses about things we don't know.

But I think we can say dogmatically they describe something that has not yet come to pass as far as we have any evidence. There has been no great enemy of God who has fulfilled all of these statements. Hitler came nearer than Antiochus did probably. Probably Napoleon came nearer than he did. I don't know. I don't know enough about Napoleon for that. But here we have the description of a character that does not fit Antiochus.

At this point everyone recognizes that there is a problem because it goes on to give his career and it does not fit Antiochus' career. So those who insist this book was written entirely at the time of the Maccabees have to do some strange juggling to try to make this fit Antiochus' career. "At the time of the end the king of the south will engage him in battle and the king of the north will storm out against him with chariots and cavalry and a great fleet of ships. He will invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood." Antiochus did not do that.

They say well he made a third campaign against Egypt. But after the second campaign when he was about to win and conquer all of Egypt, the Romans said, Give it up and go back. He did what they said. You'd think he would then have attempted a third campaign? One of which there is no evidence in history whatever? It's purely imaginary that he made a third campaign. This describes something clearly that does not fit Antiochus. Some try to get around it by saying this is summarizing his campaigns. But it just does not fit Antiochus.

"He will also invade the Beautiful Land. Many countries will fall, but Edom, Moab and the leaders of Ammon will be delivered from his hand." We know nothing in the history of Antiochus that would fit that statement. We don't know what it will mean. Will Edom, Moab and the leaders of Ammon again become vital forces in the world at time of Antichrist? Or are the figures here for some other great forces that will be at that time? We don't know. But it doesn't fit Antiochus.

They will be delivered from his hand. "He will extend his power over many countries; Egypt will not escape/" It did escape from Antiochus because the Romans interfered. This does not fit Antiochus. "He will gain control of the treasures of gold and silver and all of the riches of Egypt, with the Libyans and Nubians in submission. But reports from the east and the north will alarm him." Antiochus was alarmed and gave it up and went back because of reports from the west, not from the east or north. "He will set out in a great rage to destroy and annihilate many. He will pitch his royal tents between the seas at the beautiful holy mountain." What does that mean? We don't know.

I don't see any point in making a lot of guesses. But I think we can say positively it is something that is still future. It does not fit Antiochus. "Yet he will come to his end, and no one will help him." That could fit Antiochus --he came to an end. Nobody could help him because he had a terrible nervous ailment. There was nothing anybody could do for him. But that's not the impression you get from this statement. "He will come to his end, and no one will help him." Just what it means we don't know. But we can say, It is something that is future.

Then having thus had the character of another one who has later a big space coming not before v. 20 but before v. 35, then we have the third part: the faith of the true people of God. "At that time Michael, the great prince who protects your people, will arise. There will be a time of distress such as not happened from the beginning of nations until then. But at that time your people-- everyone whose name is found written in the book--will be delivered. Multitudes who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake: some to everlasting life, others to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever."

So here we have corresponding to the account of the *FAITH* faith of God's people in the time of Antiochus, we have him telling about the faith of God's people at the time of antichrist and leading up to the resurrection. So that we have a section about Antiochus and then a section about Antichrist.

Then after these two separate sections we have the conclusion of this section and of the book. "But you Daniel, close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end. Many will go here and there to increase knowledge? What's that mean? Many will go here and there. I believe it was Sir Isaac Newton who wrote a commentary on Daniel and said this predicts the time will come when people will travel back and forth over this world. They will even go as fast as 60 mph. Voltaire, the great French atheist, declared that this statement shows you how a great scientist like Newton when he starts studying the Bible can get into such nonsensical things as to say that people will ever travel as fast as 60 mph. He said they could not draw their breath if they went that fast. They would immediately die! Nonsense! Yet the greatest scientist who ever lived when he starts commenting on the Bible makes a foolish statement like that!

Unfortunately I don't think that's what the v. means at all. I think Newton was wrong in his interpretation of the v. "Many will go to and fro" is not the Hebrew word to go or to travel but it is the word to search. Many will search and knowledge will increase. I think it means, You Daniel close up and seal the words of the scroll till the time to which it is looking forward. Many will go through this and search it and come to understand it more, and as they see what happens to Seleucus and to his descendants and these different details here, they will see this is what was predicted there, and their knowledge will be increased and they will be prepared for the coming of Antiochus. And as people at a later time study it, they will see what has been fulfilled in Antiochus and what still awaits to be fulfilled in antichrist and will get new understanding as they search through it.

I believe it means to search back and forth in the Scripture rather than to search back and forth in the world(?) words(?) But that is a matter of interpretation. You can take it in either way in that regard. He says to Daniel, You've been given these things but the full understanding of them awaits a future time.

We are still in the vision. "Then I, Daniel looked, and there before me stood two others, one on this bank of the river and one on the opposite bank." It's still in this same vision. But it goes on to give us the end of the book of Daniel. "One of them said to the man clothed in linen, . . . How long will be before these astonishing things are fulfilled?" The man who was above the waters of the river, lifted his right hand and his left hand toward heaven, and I heard him swear by him who lives forever, saying, "It will be for a time, times and half a time. When the power of the holy people has been finally broken all these things will be completed."

Just what does that mean? I don't think we know because we haven't reached it yet, but I don't think anyone can say because it has not yet occurred. When the power of the holy people has been finally broken. Perhaps it points back to ch. 7 where it tells us about the little horn and says that he will fight against the saints and will subdue them and it will look as if they will be completely destroyed until the Son of Man comes, intervenes and puts an end to its cause.

When the power of the holy people has been finally broken. Then all these things will come to pass. It does not say, When the power of the wicked nations or of the Gentile kingdoms. It is looking to something else quite definitely. I believe that in these vv. here he is looking forward to the coming of anti-christ. To that situation shortly before the resurrection. He says, I heard but did not understand, so I asked, My lord, what will the outcome of all this be?" He replied, Go your way Daniel, because the words are closed up and sealed until the time of the end." That means the time to which they looked forward. The time of their fulfillment.

This word "end" has various meanings, both in the OT and in the NT. And in our usage today. We read in James: You have seen the end of the Lord. When is that? Obviously it means the purpose. You've seen God's purpose. Here it means the fulfillment of His purpose. His purpose about antichrist, his purpose about Antiochus. So he has spoken about antichrist and now I think he returns to Antiochus.

He says, Go your way Daniel because the words are closed up and sealed until the time of the end. Many will be purified, made spotless and refined, but the wicked will continue to be wicked. None of the wicked will understand, but the wise will understand. From the time that the daily sacrifice is abolished and the abomination that causes desolation is set up, there will be 1290 days." That is after the statue of Jupiter is put up in the temple, there will be 1290 days. "Blessed is the man who waits for and reaches the end of the 1335 days." Now if you lived in the time of the Maccabees I think you would have seen an exact fulfillment of it and seen how that exactly fit. Looking back. I don't think you could have looked forward to it, and seen exactly how it was going to be.

You would see how it exactly fit. As for you go your way to the end. You will rest, and then at the end of the days you will rise to receive your allotted inheritance."

So we have the account of Antiochus. Then we have the account of Antichrist. Then we have the statement that these things will be fulfilled with a statement of time relating to antichrist and then we go back to a statement about Antiochus. We don't have enough precise details to see exactly how it was fulfilled, but I think people of that day would have exactly seen it.

We'll look at ch. 9 next time.

(Assignment for next time . . . List vv. in Dan. that deal with Antiochus IV. Then, list the vv. that deal with anti-christ. If absolutely clear, underline. If questionable put ? after it)

Look at the assignment for today. First question: What is said about Cyrus in Is.44:24-45:1? We have him specifically named in v.28. "He will accomplish all that I please . . ." This does not say Cyrus is going to go and pick up stones with his own hands and lay them down and make a foundation for a temple or city. But it says Cyrus is going to give the order that will be carried out to build Jerusalem and the temple. "This is what the Lord says to his anointed, to Cyrus." Thus he calls Cyrus his Anointed. This is exactly the same word used in Isa.9 where it ~~xxx~~ speaks of Messiah the Prince, an anointed one. (Should be Dan.9)

So here we have Isaiah clearly predicting that Cyrus is going to send an order that will result in Jerusalem being rebuilt and in the foundation of the temple being laid. There are some who say Cyrus gave the order and as a result the foundations of the temple were laid, but the city was not built for 100 years after that. That's not what this says. This says, Cyrus will accomplish all that I please; he will say of Jerusalem, Let it be rebuilt." That's very specific and definite, isn't it? That is what it says Cyrus is going to do.

Then we find in 2 Chron. 36:22-23 that Cyrus--that 2 Chron ends with the statement that Cyrus when he conquered Babylon sent an order. He made a decree. A decree that God had appointed him to build a temple in Jerusalem for him in Judah. We find this repeated in Ez. 1:1-4. Very seldom in the Bible do you find a decree given once and repeated again. It goes to show the great importance that was attached to it. The ~~decree~~ decree was given and repeated in Ezra. When you turn to Ez.6 you find they had difficulty completing the rebuilding. It was stopped before it was finished. They sent and requested help from Darius. King D. gave an order and they searched in the archives and found C's decree, and we have the decree quoted again the third time.

Thus if you want to find the decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, here is one which is specifically quoted three times and which is predicted by Isa. Unless a person approaches this passage with an idea already secured from some other source, to lead them to look for some other answer to the question: Who said the decree that Jerusalem be rebuilt? I don't know how he can escape the fact it is stated and stressed that Cyrus is the one God appointed to cause Jerusalem to be rebuilt, and that Cyrus gave an edict commanding this be done.

Did Cyrus fulfill the prediction of Isaiah? If not was Isaiah a false prophet? Now Deut. does not say that a man is not to be accepted as a prophet unless he gives a prediction that is fulfilled. It even says in one place that if a prophet makes a prediction and it is fulfilled and then a man gives teaching that is contrary to what God has given, he is not a

true prophet. So the question of whether a man gives a true prophecy does not prove he was a true prophet. But if a man claimed to be a prophet of God and he gave a prophecy and the prophecy was not fulfilled, then he is definitely to be considered as a false prophet.

So I do not see how there is any way to get around it that if Isaiah predicted that Cyrus would send a decree to rebuild Jerusalem, that this == if there is later reference to the sending out of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem, it ~~is~~ must refer to the decree by Cyrus. That is to say you don't have a whole series of decrees like that. You might have a repetition of the decree by Darius. There is no other case in Scripture where a decree is quoted verbally, that this be done except this one which is quoted 3 times. This might not seem so important ~~but~~ at our present point in our examination but I think it will appear as we go further.

I want to look back for a quick review with what we did with Dan. 11. Dan. 11 began with a specific prediction of Xerxes who was to attack Greece. Then went on to the answer ~~is~~ to that attack (you might say) which came 80 yrs. later when Alexander the Great from Greece attacked Persia and conquered it, and it tells about the break-up of Alexander's empire. You have definite predictions given by Daniel and specifically and literally fulfilled in history.

Then we have the account of how Alexander's empire was divided and one portion of it had the ~~ps~~ description of the beginning of the section that included most of Alexander's Asiatic territory, and then we have specific details about a series of kings one after the other leading up to a rather long account of the activities of Antiochus III. Then this leads right into Antiochus IV, who was the great persecutor, perhaps the greatest persecutor of the Jewish religion before Hitler. This points so specifically to that it seems to me there is no question that the next vv. (a quite sizeable number as you notice) relate to Antiochus IV and they exactly fit with the events of his reign as they are known to us historically.

There are those who say the book of Dan. was not written in the time of Neb. but written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. I've called this the Maccabean interpretation and all liberals present this in their commentaries and a number that evangelical on NT teachings also present this in discussions of the Book of Daniel. According to this interpretation the writer told as if it was predicted events that he knew had already occurred. Then he went on to make guesses about the fut., what would happen after that. So according to that theory, most of Dan. is not prediction, but it claims to be describing things that are known to the writer.

We must not react against that by saying, This isn't talking about Antiochus IV. I don't believe we should follow Jermoe in say that all the sudden after leading up to Antiochus IV he ~~jumps~~ way forward to Antichrist and then he has many events that exactly fit with Antiochus and he's really talking about antichrist, or that he's talking about the two of them at once. I think that kind of double-talk gets you into a moras. I don't think it's a reasonable way to interpret anything. He's talking about one or the other.

There's no question in my mind the description of his career and the statement about the people of God that follows it are specifically dealing with Antiochus and with nothing else. But then we have again a description of the king's character, and this description of the king's character does not possibly fit the character of Antiochus. It's exactly opposite in many regards, to anything known of Antiochus IV and those who hold the Maccabean view do some strange twisting in trying to make this ~~xxxxxx~~ talk about Antiochus.

Sadly some even of evangelical interpreters who think that the account of the career that follows is the career of Antichrist, take the position that the account of the character is still talking about Antiochus. But it does not fit him at all. Imagine a lot of things for which we have no historical evidence and even beyond that that sharply contradict much that is known about him. But if it describes the character of Antichrist it then is still future. Between these two we have a big jump forward in time, with no statement that there is a space but we have quite a number of things in Daniel where there are intervals with no specific mention about them. So that is no great problem.

But it certainly is a much more reasonable approach to talk about one matter up to a certain point, then you make a jump then you talk about this other than to seemx them as intermixed. Then we have an account of events that do not fit Antiochus, or a career that does not fit Antiochus, and of the fate of the people of God which actually includes the resurrection of the dead which certainly has not occurred yet. So I would think there is absolutely no question that this is talking about Antichrist and what follows.

Then in ch. 12 we have Dan. twice told to close up the book because it is for the futre, for a time later on. Twice we are told that and by certain statements made about each of these situations. Up to ch. 11 I feel we can be absolutely what relates to Antichrist and what relates to Antiochus. In regard to ch. 12 I would insist that everything it it that deals with either one of them deals with one and not both! But I would not be dogmatic as to which is referred to in ch. 12. Comparing the sections in ch. 12 with what goes before in my mind it is most reasonable to say the first part of ch 12 is still dealing with antichrist, the subj. he's been talking about rather than going back he continues to talk about that. He is saying eventually people will study this through and search through and there will be new understanding as the time approaches just as there have been many predictions in the OT of the life of Christ it was very difficult to know in advance exactly what they meant, but when they occurred it was easy to see how Jesus had precisely fulfilled what had been predicted.

So this about antichrist I think most likely is the first half. Then we have again the command to close up the book. The vision is for a a later time. Then statements to be ready forit which seem to me most likely to refer to Antiochus. If we were to take 3 or 4 weeks to examine every verse and study it very carefully, I might possibly come to a different conviction on that. I don't think in a short time any of us would find any revision of that. I don't think it's anyway near as certain how you divide ch. 12 as how you divide ch. 11. On ch.11 I feel I can be dogmatic; on ch. 12 I express my opinion.

Anyone who puts as much time in it as I have and as a result comes to a different opinion on ch. 12 I will fully respect his right to give his opinion on it. Ch 12 is mostly exhortation. Many of the exhortations naturally would fit either one. It might be that is the way ch. 12 divides.

Most of your evangelical interpreters agree the last part of ch. 11 is about Antichrist. It is interesting that there are evangelical interpreters of Daniel who become very excited about the idea of finding anything about antichrist in certain other parts of the Bible, but who agree this much be antichrist. It seems to me the emphasis is very strong there and there is a very considerable consensus, except for those who take the Maccabean view.

These chs. we've looked at--ch. 2, the 4 kingdoms, and then the complete destruction of them. There's nothing about details of the destruction. Simply the stone comes. The whole thing is destroyed, and the stone fills the whole earth. An entirely new situation here on earth. That is certainly not a picture of heaven. That is certainly not a picture of what some might call the eternal state. That is a phrase that some book of prophecy use rather freely, for which I see no warrant whatever. I've looked in several books on Systematic Theology I looked up "eternal state" in the index, and found no reference to any such thing in most of them. God enables us to pierce the future to a certain extent, thru the Word of God. But what is beyond that He has not told us.

I've heard people say there will be one everlasting now: no motion, no thought, it's like a silent picture. That's not my picture of God. God we're told in Scripture feels, thinks, He has emotion. He is sad, he rejoices. He is a living person. Most remarkably he has planned all things from the beginning. He controls all things. Yet he is a person and there is such a thing as succession. As we look forward I believe the Scriptures clearly teach that there is coming a time when the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. When there will be no more violence and no one will say to his neighbor, Know the Lord for all will know the Lord. In my booklet A Glorious Future, I've gone into some of the leading OT passages giving evidence of this which I believe to be a fact, that is clearly taught in the OT.

The NT book of Revelation I don't think is the proof of it, but it takes the various OT and NT teachings and shows the order of them. I tell a little of that in that little pamphlet. But some people have the idea there will be no millennium. Christ will simply come back and that's the end. Some have the idea that Christ will come back and establish his reign of righteousness for 1000 years and have the judgment of the wicked dead and that's the end. I do not think there's any scriptural evidence for such an idea. Time continues, I believe. Events continue. God knows what will be. When God says, I will establish a kingdom that will never be destroyed --At the end of the millennium he makes certain changes, but that he destroys it, I think we have no evidence. It is an everlasting kingdom. One that cannot be destroyed. After 1000 yrs. certain events take place. God makes a certain change.

But that he destroys it. We have no evidence. It is an everlasting kingdom. A kingdom that cannot be destroyed. After 1000 years certain events take place. God makes certain changes.

But the way this phrase eternal state is flung around by some it seems to me unfortunate, because it seems to me purely imaginary. If God wishes he could cause in five minutes from now we all become frozen in our present condition with no further thought or movement, on and on that way forever. But I see no Scriptural evidence he will do that 5 min. from now or ever do it.

Ch. 2 gives us this wonderful picture of the course of events on this earth. Then it stops with the establishment of the universal kingdom when the stone fills the whole earth. We noticed in ch.7 what a remarkable parallel there is to ch. 2 in the four kingdoms again. We noticed in ch.7 the added little horn. The little horn speaks against God and is a part of the fourth beast. We are not told of his destruction. We're told of the destruction of the beast, which of course includes the little horn. Then in ch.8 we have the kingdoms specifically named. We talked about two kingdoms. Those who hold the Maccabean view say this must be the fourth kingdom because Antiochus is in ch.7. It doesn't work because this is the third kingdom, not the fourth. So to make it the fourth they put in a median kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian kingdoms.

But there is no historical evidence of such a thing. It was Cyrus the Persian who conquered Babylon. When Daniel gave the prophecy to Belshazzar he said, Your kingdom is taken and given to the Medes and Persians. So the empire of the Medes and Persians is one empire--the third empire.

the end of the age

Ch. 8 deals not with/antichrist, but deals with these two kingdoms and leads up to a rather lengthy description of many aspects of the life and deeds of Antiochus. We did not go into detail on that. I am not going to ask you to do it. I think we have all we can cover in one semester in what we have done. Sometime in the future if you would take the vision Dan. had in ch. 8 and list each phrase separately, one after the other. Then if you would take the interpretation he was given in ch.8 and list phrase after phrase putting them parallel to the phrases in the vision, you will find it quite an interesting study. It throws further light on the facts about Antiochus but we did not have time to go into that.

We skipped from ch. 8 to ch. 12 because ch. 12 deals so specifically with the second and third kingdom. Then jumps forward to antichrist. So we have these chs. all fitting together. It is remarkable the picture they give. But when you turn to ch.9 --the other prophetic portion--we find that it does not have a close parallel to anything. I think ~~one~~ one could break the continuity of examining these passages which so parallel one another by looking at it at this time.

In fact we will not go into ch. 9 with anything like the detail I would like to because it deals with ? and the others all paralleling one another and having so much relation to history there is a great deal which throws light on them that we do not have in relation to ch. 9. In fact in ch.9 there are only

four vv. that we can say are prophecy. These 4 vv. of prophecy are more or less isolated as least as far as they deal with events that have occurred up to this time. They have very little parallel with the other parts of Daniel.

Ch.9 begins with a reference to the book of Jeremiah. He says "In the first year of Darius, son of Xerxes . . . I Daniel understood from the Scripture given to Jeremiah the prophet that the desolation of Jerusalem was to last 70 years." There are two passages in Jer. that speak of 70 years. These passages do not speak specifically of the desolation of Jerusalem. They speak rather of the power of the Babylonian king over the nation. They say that for still another 70 yrs. this power will continue, and then it will come to an end. Those prophecies were given about 605 B.C. In 539 B.C., about 64 yrs. later--66 I guess-- Cyrus put an end to the Babylonian kgdm. Then it took a year or two before the people got back to Jerusalem. When this happened Daniel said, Jeremiah's prophecy is reaching the end of its time. Did he say, That's wonderful; God has promised this --the time has come for Jerusalem to be rebuilt. Let us rejoice and be glad!

He turned to the Lord in prayer of petition. He fasted in sack-cloth and ashes. He confessed the great sin of the nation. He prayed for the Lord to hear his prayer and to return his favor to Jerusalem and to Israel. After his wonderful prayer confessing his sins and praying that God will not delay, that God will speedily give them his blessing again, it must have been a terrible disappointment to Daniel to get the message he got.

Because he said, While I was speaking and praying and confessing my sins and the sin of my people, Gabriel came to me. He said, An answer was given as soon as you began to pray. A word was given -- the same word we have later on. It is translated, an answer, a prophecy, a word, etc. In v.25 it is translated decree, in NIV. It may be a decree, but it is more frequently used for a prophetic word, a prediction, something like that. A word was given. He says, Seventy sennens are decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish transgressions, to make an end of sin, to atone for wickedness, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the Most Holy. Those are all rather vague. All but one, are vague. There have been many interpretations suggested as to the meaning of those statements of purpose.

He continues with telling about the coming of misery, suffering, desolation. He ends with saying one who causes desolation will place abomination on the wing of the temple until the end that is decreed is poured out on him. So we have a statement to Daniel not your prayer is granted. Daniel is beloved of God. Daniel deserved to receive God's favor but his prayer for his people is simply given a picture of what follows. A sort of summary picture which introduces some things not mentioned anywhere else in the book. This makes it difficult and it is rather vague. The first v. of it (which I just read) is particularly vague. There was an article written by a very fine and godly evangelical scholar just before his death a few years ago, in which he tried to show how everyone of these purposes was fulfilled completely in the earthly ministry of Christ. For instances when it says he will put an end to sin, finish transgression, --that is Jesus going

into the temple and driving out the money changers. That way he makes this v. completely fulfilled in the first coming of Christ. I must confess that seems rather nonsensical, to me.

But as to what exactly what it does mean, these words are rather vague. That's not all. We have in the case of a couple of them keres. Now for you who have not yet had a full year of Heb. what we call a kere is a case where evidently the Massoretes who in the 10th cent. A.D. made up from the MSS they had a definite text of Scripture. They felt there were certain places where the MSS disagreed ~~xxxxxxxx~~ sufficiently that they felt they must keep the reading that was in the MS but they felt that a slightly different reading was the correct one. I do not think they based this purely upon their own interpretation. I think that as the Scripture ~~xx~~ was passed on in a text which had only consonants the vowels were put in at that time. But it was passed on by word of mouth. The Rabbis heard it read over and over and over and over in their youth. So the words were passed on.

You may say, How can you tell the meaning if there are no vowels? The fact is you could write a page in English and leave out the vowels and the probability is you could read it fairly well. It's not so difficult, to read. There are cases where you would not be sure, but even in cases where vowels are put in there may be difficulty. If you say = write read. What does that mean? I read the book, or I read the book? You have to guess by context. I read, you read, he read. If it has he before it you would say it must have an s on it. Must be he reads. Put the word will == will I read, will you read, will he read? Then it's alright. Often our vowels are not very clear, in writing in English. In Heb. the consonants carry a great part of the meaning anyway. These vowels were passed on by word of mouth, and probably accurately in at least 99% of the cases.

We don't have quite the certainty about them that we do about the consonants. But where the Massoretes found that most of the MSS they had contained one consonant and they felt a different consonant was what people were reading there, they kept the consonants they found in their ~~MAAxx~~ MSS and they put the ~~x~~ other in the footnote. They called it kere, because that in Aramaic means read. So when they would come to this they would read this, instead of that. In such cases I feel that instead of spending a lot of time ~~x~~ trying to decide which is what, I say let's take the two interpretations and see ~~whax~~ whether they fit in with what is elsewhere and let's not try to build on one or the other.

In this v. we have two cases of that. We have one or two cases where they ~~are~~ are used in a very unusual way ~~not~~ not used elsewhere. So this is a difficult phrase in v. 24. Personally I feel it points to the time when all wickedness is brought to an end. Not simply to the time when Jesus destroyed the power of wickedness by His death, a Calvary. I feel it is hard to escape that conclusion. The only one of these I feel is absolutely clear and certain is the one the KJV ~~kakax~~ mixed up. That I find very exasperating. I believe it is given here correctly in NIV as the third one: to atone for wickedness. The word trans. atone there is trans. atone many times ~~the~~ the OT. It is the word regularly used for the sacrifices as an

atonement. I believe it ~~is~~ points specifically to what Jesus did at Calvary. To atone for wickedness. I believe that's the clearest thing in the statement of purposes.

But in KJV unfortunately it translates that particular purpose "to make reconciliation for iniquity." There are only two ~~times~~ times when it translates this verb as "make reconciliation." There are dozens where it translates it "atone." I don't know why they translated it "make reconciliation." But I believe that is one of these purposes that is absolutely certain. Therefore I feel convinced that we must find in what follows a reference to the atonement of Christ. If I think we can get that definitely from v. 24. I don't think there is anything else ~~except~~ that 70 weeks are decreed for thy people and your holy city. I don't think there is anything else we can get with absolutely certainty from v. 24, tho we can naturally get quite a bit else.

That's the thing I believe we can get with certainty. Then in v. 25 he says, Know and understand this, from the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuilt Jerusalem . . . there will be seven sevens and sixty two sevens." ~~Wx~~ We've had 70 weeks. Then we've had seven sevens. We've had 62 sevens. It would seem when he speaks of seven and 62 there is another one to make up the 70. But what ~~about~~ are the seven? Or was it a week rather? Certain it was not a week of days. He's not telling what's going to happen in 490 days. We can be sure of that. So I believe we can say there are two possibilities: this may be weeks of years. If that fits we may be sure that is correct. If it fits clear through.

But if it doesn't fit I think we are justified in saying they are general periods. That these weeks are general periods rather than specific lengths of time. If they are general periods and not specific lengths of time, I believe they must be more or less proportionate. Whatever the seven weeks describe, the 62 weeks should be about 9 times as long! The one week about a seventh as long. I do not think you can rule out the possibility that they are general periods. But also I do not feel you can rule out as some very dogmatically do (evangelical scholars) the idea that they can be periods of seven years each.

The first week is from the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the anointed one the ruler comes there will be seven sevens. The issuing-- not the decree. The original is "the word", and there is another word for decree or command that doesn't look a bit like this word. This is dabar. The other is mitswah that is used dozens of times to mean decree or command. If he had used mitswah it would be clear it is a command. He uses dabar which means word, which it means as he used it three times earlier in the ch., it means ~~an~~ ordinarily a prophetic word, or information, ~~an~~ a message. But it can mean a command as our English word: I sent you word to come tomorrow. I sent you word that I would see you tomorrow. They are quite different. In ~~one~~ one case it is command, in the other it is information. In either case it speaks about the time from the issuing of the decree (or the coming forth of the word) to restore and rebuild Jerusalem till the anointed one, the ruler.

We saw that in Isaiah there is an anointed one. It is the only time in the Bible that any non-Israelite is called a Messiah, an anointed one. It is usually used of an Israelite king. But it is there used of the one who is God's anointed for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. So you might say these phrases belong together. It is the anointed one, the ruler, namely Cyrus who sends out the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem. But unfortunately it says there are seven weeks between these two things! So they can't both refer to Cyrus. But I believe we can dogmatically say at least one of them must refer to Cyrus. I do not see any possible way to get around that, unless you are going to get some ideas elsewhere either out of your head or out of some other part of Scripture and then forced them into the passage. There is a real temptation to everyone to do that, not only here but in many places where you interpret Scripture.

I think one of the most important things in interpreting the Bible is to get out ideas, not to bring our previous ideas from elsewhere into our interpretation of the passage. Bring in your idea as a possibility, yes, but think of other possibilities and see what the passage fits with.

When I was a student in seminary (on a subject entirely different from this) time after time I would hear the professor say, Here is our belief. This is what we hold. And I believe he was correctly stating what the Scripture holds on some point. Then he would say, But here is this v. which people say contradicts that. Then he would say, Look at the verse, and then he would proceed to twist the verse so that it would mean absolutely nothing. It might just as well not be in the Bible! I used to get very irritated. Because it seems to me that every v. in the Bible God put there for a purpose. It will not contradict what it clearly taught somewhere else in the Bible. But it may be that we are carrying too far something we get from somewhere else, or that there is some phase we have not properly understood.

Or it may be that this is dealing with some different matter altogether. So to go to Scripture without bringing into it ideas from elsewhere to see what it says, then bring in the ideas to see how they fit together, not in order to say this must mean that because I found that taught elsewhere. So we have this period of seven weeks which runs from the issuing of the word (whether it means decree or message) about the restoring of Jerusalem until the anointed one comes. Is it looking forward to the coming of the anointed one, Cyrus? Certainly it exactly fits him. Is it looking forward to that time, or is it starting with that time because he issued a decree that Jerusalem be rebuilt and then it looks forward from that time until a different anointed one who is to be a ruler comes? There are the two possibilities at this point.

I would say a word here about the LXX. The LXX is the Greek translation, the early Gk. trans. of the OT. According to tradition Ptolemy II asked the High Priest in Jerusalem to send him some

scholars to make a translation of the Pentateuch into Greek. According to this tradition there came 6 from each of the 12 tribes. So there were 72 people. These 72 were put into 72 different rooms and they worked for 72 days separately and when they had finished they all had written exactly the same thing as the Greek translation of the five Books of Moses! That is only a story. Very interesting but I believe an imaginary story.

There is an element of truth in it that at a very early time the 5 books of Moses were translated into Greek. It was an excellent translation. Which means the work of the 70, tho it is probably purely imaginary that there were 70 who did it, or that they all came out the same separately word for word! But then as different people trans. other books of the OT, eventually they were all translated and the whole thing we call the LXX. The early Greek Translation.

Jerome in his commentary on Daniel, c.400 A.D. says that all the copies of the LXX he was able to find did not have in them the LXX of Daniel, but instead had a different trans. of Daniel into Greek made by Theodotian, made after the time of Christ. And when you come to Daniel it is not the LXX, it is Theodotian's translation. There has been found one MSS which it is believed has the original LXX of Daniel. But it has been very much corrupted. It is not a very good MSS. Then another has been discovered that has only a few parts to it.

So scholars speak of the LXX of Daniel which they find in those one or two MSS and they speak of Theodotian generally when they refer to the Greek. People said in those early days, Look here it speaks about the anointed one coming. That must be Christ. Especially when it speaks before of atoning for wickedness. That must be Christ. There is an anointed one in the next verse. That in KJV is "the anointed one will be cut off but not for himself." If you take KJV of the second anointed one it must be Christ. And I believe it is Christ. But that does not prove the first use of the word here is Christ.

They thought here is the prediction of Christ. It is the only prediction of his first coming in Daniel. We've noted several predictions of his second coming. If it is Christ, then from when Cyrus issued the decree until Christ comes must be seven weeks. But if you take seven weeks that is only 49 years and from 538 B.C. to the time of Christ is a lot more than 49 years. In Theodotian's translation it says there will be seven sevens and 62 sevens and it will be rebuilt with streets and moats but in times of trouble. Thus they take the 62 weeks which should go with "72 weeks it will be rebuilt in times of trouble" and they put it on to the first one because seven weeks is too short! So Theodotian made it "it will be seven weeks and 62 weeks". There we have 69 weeks. And 69 weeks would be 483 years, but it's a lot more than 438 years from -- more than 434 years from the time Cyrus sent out his decree to the time of Christ! So it doesn't fit that way either. But it comes a lot nearer fitting than if you have only seven.

In Theodotians translation he says "and it will be built." Making a separation and putting that time "seven weeks and 62 weeks." But did you ever speak of a period of time == of any number as 7 and 62? You might say 7 and 60. You might say 9 and 60. But would you say 7 and 62? I never heard of such an expression in any language anywhere. I do not think we have a right to assume that the time that goes with the second period is part of the first if the second has no time connected with it!

Modern translations have followed Theodotian in putting a period after 62 weeks. That is the modern evangelical translations. So they make it 7 weeks and 62 weeks period. But then they ~~do~~ don't do like Theodotian did and put in an "and" because that's not in the Hebrew. They simply say, "it shall be rebuilt." As you know most sentences in Heb. begin with "and." Whole books begin with and in Hebrew. Just to say 62 weeks stop, and then say "it shall be rebuilt" is quite contrary to ordinary English usage and it is in line with Heb. usage to say the first period is seven weeks which will be from that to that, and the second period-- it doesn't say what it's from or what it's to-- but it says it is the time during which there will be a rebuilt city but a time of difficulty and trouble.

I believe we must stop here. We could easily take a month on ch. 9. It is much less clear than the other prophecies. The others all fit together so I think it is much wise to have a clear understanding of them. But I have stressed several rather important things, and we still have the question: Does this period begin when Cyyus issues his decree, and run to an anointed one, a ruler? Or does it run to the time of Cyrus who is called an anointed one ruler and start when God that Jerusalem was going to be rebuilt as one of the prophecies that was given to (Jeremiah?). We'll start there next time.

I fear this is the last time I will have the opportunity to address you about the prophecies of Daniel. There will be one more gathering. That is a week from Friday. . . .(exam)

In a school of lower standing(that is to say high school or college) in most classes you go and the professor tells you something. You ~~wxxx~~ write it down and memorize it. I have often thought in much of our American education, the professor's task is to take the big job, the memorizing of a big book by dividing it into sections and saying, This is the section for tomorrow you will study and this is the section for the next day. It seems to me his main task is just the subject for will power.

At this stage my idea of what we are trying to do is something entirely different. I'm not particularly interested in my telling you what I think the book of Daniel means. But I am very much interested in helping you to develop the method of going to the Bible and finding what it says. Finding out for yourself. The reason that is important is that any writing whatever--whether it is in prophecy, whether it is in ordinary Biblical writing, whether it is any other writing, there are certain things that are definite and there are many things that are not so certain. That's true in the nature of language.

I may say to you, Last summer I made a trip to California. Well, that is a definite statement but it leaves many many questions unanswered. Did I go to S. Calif. or N. Calif? How did I go? Did I fly? Did I take the train? Did I take a boat via the Panamax canal? Did I make a walking trip? How did I get there? Did I use the same method or did I use a different method for different parts of it? Did I stop over on the way? Did I go straight through? There are many many questions that are just unanswered. And the person ~~xxxx~~ has to combine the sentence with what he finds elsewhere and try to reach conclusions that certain things are definite. Some might say, I left here; I got there and you would say I came back. But that's all you could tell. I said, Last summer. I did not say what month. I did not say how long.

In the nature of language a word is not a point but an area. Consequently you have to use context to determine how big or how small the area is. Therefore from anything you have to gather from it what is definite and also try to become alert to possibilities on that which is not definite. I think it's important that we distinguish between our tasks. The expounder of God's Word has two distinct tasks; and I believe we should keep them separate. He has the task of determining for himself what the Bible says and what there is that perhaps it says--that goes further to be sure, and what we can definitely rule out as not being contained in it. And he has the task of conveying the ideas to people. When it comes to the two tasks there are very great differences between them. You get God's truth from the Word and you give it to people. You don't go to them necessarily. In most cases not at all to explain how you arrived at it, and what the things are that are certain, & what the things are that are questionable.

Emphasize the things that are certain. You try to avoid making statements that can be interpreted as conveying something that is not certain. They are two entirely different tasks, and we must keep them separate. If what we give is going to be dependable, it is important that we learn not only to get from the Scripture what we need to stand upon, and to find out the points are where this is probably what it is or perhaps it is, or if you combine this with other things it most likely means this, but let's avoid being dogmatic.

So my purpose has not been to tell you what Daniel means, but to try to develop in you methods of study. That's been the purpose of my assignments. They have been in no sense an attempt to judge you, but they have been an attempt to give you practice in this and then prepare you to get more value out of our discussion together. (Incidentally, any of you who would like to have your assignments back I've asked you to give me a note to that effect. If you haven't done so you can still do so . . . If you would like to have them before the exam, say that and we will get them to you before the exam . . . If you don't I will keep them a few weeks and then throw them away or use the backs for my own notes perhaps!)

I would wish almost that we could just skip Dan. 9. Because in Dan. 9 there have been 100 different interpretations of it. There have been many interpretations of it and most of these interpretations have been given very dogmatically. People declare this is what it means and they have tried to fit it into other things. There is no interpretation of it that I have found anywhere that does not have serious flaws. I have studied it carefully from the approach that I believe is the correct one, and I have reached a conclusion as to what I think is the correct interpretation. But I do not wish to be dogmatic on that because I have not found it presented anywhere else.

My purpose in this class is not to tell you what Daniel means but to develop methods of interpretation. So I'm more interested as far as Dan. 9 is concerned in your knowing what is positive and definite in it, and where the points are at which we must reserve judgment than I am in giving you a full interpretation of it. I am far more interested in the other chs. as far as this class is concerned than in Dan. 9 because there are certain things we have found absolutely clear in the other chs., and I think that they being so clear and definite are vital for our understanding of the Bible. Like in Dan. 2 we found definitely the 4 kingdoms that are fulfilled in history. That's a marvellous evidence for the truth of the Scripture, the way some of those details were fulfilled.

We don't want to imagine details fulfilled that aren't as many do. But there are details that are definitely fulfilled in history over a period of many centuries, and it points to a time when the entire image will be destroyed and the stone will grow to fill the whole earth. Some people talk about it as tho it had already occurred, which of course is nonsense. Almost anybody who does that that attitude, if you read their book as a whole you will find somewhere in it an admission that this means the time will come

all human government and everything that is imperfect will and Christ alone rules. You will find much talk as if it was already fulfilled. We might find some analogies to ~~present~~ present conditions and that is valuable, but that it is already fulfilled should not be assumed because it definitely does not fit the picture.

Then Dan. 7 again has the 4 kingdoms and it introduces a figure of a great anti-God figures who persecutes the saints and is about to overcome them, but the Son of man comes and puts an end to his power and completely destroys him and that kingdom and that certainly has not yet occurred. All interpreters (evangelical) agree that this represents something that has not yet happened. While those who hold the Maccabean view hold it is a picture of Antiochus IV, a picture of what the writer foolishly thought would happen. Of course the Christian rules out the Maccabean view because it infers the book was the outcome of somebody's imagination, rather than a true prophecy. The principal features of these are tremendously important and you should have them in mind.

In Can. 8, there is much clear. There are some things that are obscure. But this is certain that it is talking about a great anti-God figure that comes out of the third kingdom, not the fourth. It is definitely not the horn described in ch. 7. That is absolutely clear. Many writers will admit it, but some go on and talk as if they had not done so. Others say, This is a figure of antichrist, a type of picture of antichrist. It would be just as sensible to say that Napoleon was a type of Hitler. Then we might have a great arguments which is the better type of Hitler? Napoleon or Mousileni? You can find similarities in--between almost any two characters in ~~the~~ history. But in the Bible we have one meaning. It is either antichrist or it is Antiochus. Rarely do we find them blended.

There could be blending. Someone could say, There will come great conquerors who will try to destroy God's people and will cover great areas. Now that covers many. That's not saying one is the type of the other.

Then in Dan. 11 we found must that was very definite. A definite picture of history and of many details which are somewhat vague but which tell what was going to happen. If you saw it happen you could see it was being fulfilled. If you looked back you could see it definitely had been fulfilled, and it traces many details one after the other until it leads right up to the figure of Antiochus. That all the sudden there is a jump to antichrist is nonsense! Or to talk about Antiochus and to say this is a type of antichrist and some of it is Antiochus and some of it is antichrist, well that reduces it so that you can make most anything mean most anything. It is a definite picture of that great crisis that the Israelites met. A great crisis that threatened to destroy the Bible completely, and to destroy all belief in God. One of the greatest crises in the history of true religion. It is true in all of its details applying specifically to Antiochus, and most of it we can see exactly how it was fulfilled until we get u

Then all the sudden you have a few vv. that definitely don't fit Antiochus at all. Some interpreters try to make them fit and it is absolutely impossible. It clearly moves to another figure. And although the fact is not mentioned, it is obvious that one of two things is true: after giving as the Maccabean interpreters would say giving fact after fact that was true, then the writer let his imagination run and gave a lot of stuff that isn't true but thought might happen in the future, or else there is a big jump in time. He discussed this figure and then jumps forward to a different one.

Question: Does that change at v. 39 or v.36?

I did not write down the exact figure. It begins "but the king will rule"--v.36. From v.36-39 it describes the character and it does not fit Antiochus' character. Those who try to make it fit do an awful lot of imagining and twisting, nevertheless there are some good commentators who try to make that section on the character fit Antiochus and they have a struggle to do so. It doesn't fit.

But from v. 40 where it starts describing his career--from there on all evangelical interpreters agree it is talking about anti-christ. And all non-evangelical interpreters---no, I guess. . . because there are some evangelical interpreters who take the Maccabean view and say ~~it's~~ it's still Antiochus. But when it describes his career it definitely does not fit Antiochus' career.

We have the character of Antiochus, his accession and his character --we have his career and then we have the situation of the people of God described. Then again we have the character of a man, an account of his career neither of which fit ~~is~~ Antiochus at all. Then we have the situation of the people of God including the resurrection from the dead which clearly did not happen in the time of Antiochus. So we must have a break somewhere in time. It is best in my opinion to make it after the ~~of~~ of the people of God in Antiochus' time and before the character of the king. But if somebody wants to make it a few vv. later between his character and his career, I would not fight with him about it, I would just say it was rather illogical, to try to twist the vv. to make them fit. Yes?

Question: Something I've been concerned about. How do you the similarity in terminology ~~of~~ either Antiochus or Antichrist? (Indistinct)

But you do not have exactly those words used in four.(indistinct)

Question: What about the ~~of~~ king of the south?

Yes, the king of the south, and later on you have another reference to the king of the south. But I believe the logical structure ~~from~~ from this fact that you have the character, accession of character, then career, then the preservation of the people of God, it is very obvious, the fate of the people of God. Then again he talks about the character, again about the career, again about the fate of the people of God. I think that makes a logical structure. Then you ask the questions: Is it the same one or a different, and you find it doesn't fit the same one, you are justified in saying this whole section deals with a different one.

Now you can take the Maccabean approach and say the writer was mistaken. Or you can take the approach that those take who say this is antichrist, of saying there is the jump forward in time. Just as there was in ch. 2 where it says that Nebuchadnezzar is the head of gold and then it jumps to the Persian empire . . . There is a jump. There's no question about that.

The last time I taught this, the assignment I was to take each subject right straight through where it says "he" or the "king of the south" and it's my impression that just about everyone thought that made a definite break. Have three subjects and then the same three subjects again along with the fact that the three new ones just don't fit. (Thank you for the question . . .) What's on your mind?

Is it true that Antiochus but when you get to v. 36 and when you get to v. 40 both the king of the north and the king of the south so it's obviously a different person?

Yes, but there's a textual question there in that particular place. Whether it is the two together or whether it is the one against the other. Difficult.

I think we've noticed a good many things that are definite in this ch. Now I'd like to say a word about the Maccabean view. Not only do all modernists hold the Maccabean view, but there are some good conservatives interpreters who during the last century and a half, like take Canon Farrar, who wrote the Life of Christ-- a book that has been highly regarded--he wrote a book on Daniel in which he took the Maccabean view, and I don't see how it is possible how he could because Christ definitely referred to Himself as the Son of man, who is going to come from heaven. But he took it all as the imagination of a writer in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. That view makes Daniel a fraud. It claims to have been written by Daniel, but it was written by an unknown writer at a later time. He claims to be writing prophecy but instead is looking back and describes past history and looking forward with imagination describing what he thought would happen, but none of which did happen as he thought.

I don't see personally how any Christian can hold the Maccabean view, but there are some who have. I personally think they are illogical at that point. I think we should be aware of that fact. We have not gone into it a great deal.

For the critical point (of view) is the problem of Darius the Mede. We don't know exactly who is meant by Darius the Mede because we have Cyrus the Persian conquering the land. Some conservatives say Darius the Mede was an officer. Darius was under Cambyses, king over Babylon(?) Others say Darius the Mede is another name for Cyrus. It's a problem on which we're not sure of the answer. But I think we can be sure there is an answer that the facts. But that is one of the most difficult points for us. On the other hand, those who hold the Maccabean view, they have to hold that the Greek empire was the 4th empire

because the little horn comes out of the 4th empire. The only way they can do that is to say that there was an intermediate empire (Median) between the Babylonian and Persian empires. And when Belshazzar is told his empire is given to the Medes and Persians, it destroys that whole idea. It destroys that idea of a Median empire in between. They have to say that the writer was mistaken in his knowledge of the history at that point which he was presented as prophecy.

So I think simply on the grounds of the evidence that the Maccabean view does not stand up. From the view that it was written in the time of Daniel there have been minor problems that have been raised most of which have been answered by new evidences. But we have not gone into that in this class. In this class our interest is in interpretation of prophecy. We have to go into it a little bit because in interpreting it we have to see how those who hold the Maccabean view interpret it. But our purpose has been to find the meaning.

Now Dan. 9 again. I believe it is vital that we notice that in Dan. 9 there are certain things that are not definite. On these things we have to say it is open. We take the possibilities and see which fit. There are certain things which are definite. The one point which has been overlooked by Christians time after time is that there are three segments. From the going forth of the word to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the prince is seven weeks? It is not 69 weeks, it is seven(70)? It is definitely what the Hebrew says. If he meant to say 69 weeks he would have said 69 weeks. Some have said it is a period of seven weeks when the temple was being rebuilt, and this is separate from the 62 weeks which follow it. But that's not what the Scripture says.

Some try to put the 62 weeks first and then find the seven weeks afterwards somewhere. All kinds of but what it says is, Seven weeks and in the second segment is 62 weeks, in which the city will be rebuilt, but in troublous times. That to my mind is the most definite in the

Student: Can The NIV tries to make it

All the modern evangelical interpreters link them together. As I mentioned last time and it's well worth repeating, the LXX-- not the LXX because the LXX of this part is hopelessly confused-- but the trans. of Theodotian, put in the word "and." It says from the going forth of the word to Messiah the prince (and they make word decree, but what it says is to Messiah the prince will be seven weeks, and 62 weeks, and the city will be built in troublous times. That word "and" was put in the LXX. It is not in the Heb. and no modern translation inserts the word "and" but instead they use a semi-colon which does the same thing. It is seven weeks and 62 weeks and nobody ever anywhere that I ever heard of says 7 weeks and 62 weeks to mean 69. It is 7 weeks in the first section, and to imagine something that happened in the seven separate from the 62 weeks that puts the whole together into 69, I don't say that's impossible but it's purely imagination. But it's done by most evangelical interpreters today. I think it is best to lay this

aside and say we don't know what it means, or to recognize the fact that the first segment is seven and then 62 weeks.

Question: Will you answer the statement that the decree came not from Cyrus but from Artaxerxes and the temple was not but the whole city?

Temple not but the whole city? What's that about?

Question: About Cyrus being the anointed one, seems to have more to do with having the temple rebuilt rather than having the whole city rebuilt. Some hold the decree is for the city to be restored, and not just the temple, therefore they move to 445 B.C.

Yes. I think that is very important. I don't want to be dogmatic on what it means, but I want to be clear as to what it says. What it says is from the going forth of a word . . . It does not say a command, it does not say a decree. It says a word. The word may be a command, or a decree, or it may be a prophetic message. The word is used 3 times earlier in the ch. to mean a prophetic message. Same word. That doesn't prove it here means a prophetic message, but it proves it may be a prophetic message.

"The going forth of a word to build a city." From then, when God said it would be done? When God ordered it to be done? Or when some man ordered it to be done? Whichever, it is from then to the anointed one is seven weeks. There is a decree to allow the people to go back to rebuild the temple. If those people for the next 100 years lived in tents you might say it was a _____ for you have heard of tent cities often enough.

In fact long before the temple was rebuilt, Haggai rebuked the people for living in their fine houses and leaving the temple unfinished. So I don't see how you get around that there was a city there when the people went back, even though the great mention is made of the temple. There was a city from the time when the people went back. A city can be 100 people gathered around in one place living in little shacks, or a city can be a great metropolis with two or three million people living in fine brick houses.

To say there was no city for over 100 years is something which just isn't reasonable. If it refers to a decree, it is mentioned at the end of Chronicles that Cyrus gave a decree permitting the people to go back and build a temple, and they certainly would build a city around the temple. They would not build the temple and then go off and live somewhere else and come down to it is rather ridiculous. It would seem definitely that Cyrus gave a decree quoted in Chronicles, again quoted at length at the beginning of the book of Ezra, and again quoted at length when Darius gave it. So here is a decree given twice and quoted a third time. There is no quotation of any decree given by Artaxerxes. A man came to Artaxerxes whom Artaxerxes liked, and Artaxerxes said, Why are you so sad? He said, Because the tombs of my ancestors are in dissaray. Artaxerxes said, What

would you like? He said, I'd like to have permission to go back there and build them up and improve conditions there. He said, How long would it take? He replied, I'd like a letter to your officers there to give me some materials. Artaxerxes said, Fine but hurry back, I'd like to have you here.

There is no quotation of any decree. There is no order that Artaxerxes desired a city to be built. There is merely the statement that Artaxerxes gave permission to a favor to something he felt like doing. If that was the only mention of any permission of any king to go back, (I think) that would be one thing. But when you have a decree by Cyrus given three times, if this is a decree it seems to me it must be his decree.

Question: So you are faced with two possibilities; one is that God gave it, and the other is that Cyrus gave it and you are saying you cannot be certain which one is meant? Is that right?

I'd say, If it is a human decree it is Cyrus. If it is a word from God, that word could be a prediction, a promise, a decree, whatever, but those it seems to me are the only possibilities. Now there was an article written recently in a book of theological articles. A man wrote me and said, You gave a paper on this at the ETS, would you mind sending me a copy. I sent it to him. In his article he wrote he said, (something like this) The word "word" usually means a prophetic statement or declaration, and then he had a footnote where he refers to my paper to the very place where I said that is what the word usually means. Then he said: There are four possibilities: first, the decree of Cyrus; second, the decree of Cyrus in reaffirming his decree; third, a decree of Artaxerxes permitting Ezra to go back and asking him to offer for him at the temple, and fourth a decree of Artaxerxes permitting Nehemiah to go back.

After just saying what I said that it is and then saying there are four possibilities ~~with~~ and four decrees I thought it a bit illogical. But if it is a decree I think there is only one possibility--that is the decree of Cyrus. I do not see any evidence that Artaxerxes gave any decree to rebuild the temple. If, like Cyrus, Artaxerxes had given a decree, "You are to go back and build the city of Jerusalem and put walls around the city,"-- a city doesn't have to have walls, but it may have walls. Nehemiah wanted it to have walls and he went back and built walls. But if that contained a decree from him, you can be sure that with the complete Persian autocratic control of their territory, that Nehemiah would have gone back and gotten immediately in touch with their officers who represented Artaxerxes there and he would have said, "Here is the decree, sealed with Artaxerxes signature that Nehemiah is to build a walled city here for me. You are to give him the materials and help. They would have given help and it would have been done. But what happened?

Nehemiah got there and went out at night and made plans and started building furtively lest the local officers should know what he was doing. If he had a decree from Artaxerxes to build a city, he certainly would not have had to do anything secretly or privately.

They would not have dared lift a hand against him if he had an order from Artaxerxes to do this. He went because Artaxerxes permitted him to go and Artaxerxes was glad to help him, but that Artaxerxes gave a decree to build the city there is the context.

There are commentators who say this was Artaxerxes's second decree, the one he gave to Nehemiah. Others say, it came 10 years after the life of Christ(?) so it can't be that, so they say it must be the decree he gave in the eighth year of his reign, which is quoted in Scripture but go to the temple and offer something, on his behalf. But that's no decree to build a city! So I don't see how anyone can logically take it as a decree in the eighth year. As to the 20th year one might make an argument, but I do not think it is an argument that will not stand up.

When you consider the number of years it does not reach to the life of Christ. Dr. Newman has advanced a suggestion that like the 3 days in the tomb of Christ who was there the last two hours of the first day, and he was there the second day, and he was there the first twelve hours of the third day, so he was there parts of 3 days and that is what is meant by three days in the tomb. I think he is right in that, but that therefore that is a Hebrew way of saying and that therefore these seventy weeks can include the last week or two of the first week and the first week or two of the last week, making it a little over 68 weeks, and thus take it from Artaxerxes decree in his 20th year, and that it seems to me is by far the best way of figuring it if it were not for the fact that he also starts on the 20th year of Artaxerxes. There is absolutely no evidence for it. Because if it is a decree it has to start from Cyrus.

But I am far more interested in your seeing what is clear in the previous chs., than in your having a definite idea what these 4 vv. mean. But I do believe it is vital that we do not read into Scripture our own ideas. In Scripture there is no case I know of where it ever says 532 years after this that will happen. He says in 400 the children of Israel will come back. It is general. In the 4th generation. But a precise term for a long number of years like that in the future we have no other instance of it and no reason to think that God would want to do it here, and the dates don't fit here.

Question: Are we taking the position that the anointed one is certainly speaking of Christ?

No. I would say that definitely the anointed one here-- the second one is definitely Christ. I'm glad you asked that because there is a point I think is vital. I would say this is either from some going forth of a word that Jerusalem will be built to Cyrus, or that this is a human command from Cyrus to Christ. I would say it is one of the two, and you find that exactly 49 yrs. before this that God told Jeremiah to buy a field and to seal up the document because the time will come when again there will be in this place. In other words there will be a city again here.

We have that word from God to him. Ch. 9 begins with Daniel telling how he read Jeremiah's prophecy and how interested he was in what Jeremiah had said. He read the prophecy of Jeremiah and he says the power of Babylon will only last another 70 years.... Now we find that 49 years after this prophecy of Jeremiah that said it would be rebuilt, exactly that length of time Cyrus came. So my personal opinion is that when Daniel heard it he would say, Yes, the past history was exactly fulfilled and gives assurance that the future history will be fulfilled the way God says, but we don't know when the 62 weeks will start.

The first period is from this to that. Now it says that for 62 weeks it will be rebuilt. When it starts exactly is not told. You take a period of 62 weeks and there is an approximation of it.

Question: Do we have any justification though in thinking that the two anointed ones might be different people? So close together . . .

It would be most logical to say, There will come an anointed one and to say The Anointed one will be . . . but to say again the anointed one suggests but does not prove they were (two ?) I don't think there is any reason they have to be the same. The term could be used of different people or of the same. But there is one other thing I want to get in.

A space of time -- we don't know when the 62 weeks starts. (indistinct) But after the 62 weeks . . . Messiah will be cut off, and KJV says "but not for himself," and no other translation I know of at least into English, renders it "but not for himself." I think that is a marvellous phrase. It is a ~~fix~~ marvellous picture of what Christ did. He was cut off but not for himself. But NIV says, he will be cut off and will have nothing. That's altogether different! Is there any justification in the KJV rendering "but not for himself"? ^{wh} which would make it definitely apply to the atonement. Is there? I think there is.

It says, And will have nothing. As that stands in English it gives the idea that the result of his being cut off is that he will have nothing. I know of one interpretation (by a great evangelical scholar) which says that he will be cut off and have nothing means that ~~the~~ when antichrist comes the power of Christ in the world will be so cut off that he will have absolutely no power whatever on earth. "He will be cut off and will have nothing." That is a view that is presented by a very fine commentator.

That makes us today being in the 62 week period, which I think is ridiculous, because the city is not now in that condition--I mean it hasn't been in all these years till now. I don't think it fits. But that he would be cut off to that extent that would give antichrist power that would even exceed the power Satan ever had! I don't think that fits. He will be cut off and (lit) to him nothing. But "and to him nothing" does not necessarily mean that after his

being cut off he will have nothing. It may mean that when he is cut off he will have nothing. I think it that but he will have nothing is just as reasonable as (indistinct) This may be the condition of his being cut off, or it may be the result. Either is possible. If it means "he will have nothing" it leaves the question "he will have nothing of what?" Will he have nothing of success? Will he have nothing of power? Will he have nothing of what? He must have something. What does He have?

There is one ancient Greek rendering which says "but will have no judgment." It may be that he is cut off but there will be to him -- he will have no judgment. No reason that he should be cut off. So I feel personally that KJV "but not for himself" while it is not a literal rendering of the Heb., can be a presentation of the exact ~~presentation~~ something that the Heb. may properly mean. So I believe he will be cut off and have nothing-- is have no guilt of his own. Our guilt was laid upon him. So at that point I believe the KJV is the better translation. In any case I believe the "cut off" is a reference to the atonement. I believe that definitely. That the two have to be the same. I don't say they can't be the same but they may be-- but they don't have to be.

I personally think that the first refers to Cyrus . . . and the next is the atonement and then there is a space (indistinct). I have not spent a lot of time in this class on this ch. because I've been interested in our seeing what is definite. In the 9th ch. I would say that what is definite is that this is the word which may be command(not necessarily) but if it is the command of Cyrus; then I would say definitely there are three periods: seven weeks, and 62 weeks. And then it says seven weeks, and after 62 weeks he will be cut off. That could be (indistinct) but it could be (indistinct)

You could say there will be a conquerer. Somebody could say in the 1800's there will be a conqueror who will conquer Europe and there will be a space of a century and a quarter and there will be a conqueror who will conquer Europe. One could be and Napoleon(indistinct)

The thing I am interested in is what is positive, and where it is uncertain there are always in human language there are possibilities. Some things are certain; some things are possibilities.(indistinct) I'm anxious that we get the of not taking a theory; this must point to the exact number of years to Christ, and then try to fit it in. Well, the decree of doesn't fit, so let's look for some other decree. Well, he gave Nehemiah permission, so let's assume this was a decree. Well, Isaiah said, it was Cyrus who was going to give the decree to rebuilt the temple. Well, all we have is that Artaxerxes gave permission to a good friend to go. Nehemiah started at night. Evidently he didn't have the decree that would tell them you've got to (indistinct). But these other things in the previous chs. I believe you can be on, and I believe you can be dogmatic on them.

(Question about the final exam . . . Study the things I have stressed).