

Daniel is referred to in the OT in one other book. In Ezekiel 14(Ezekiel is rebuking the wickedness of his contemporaries), and in v. 14 he says, "Though these three men Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver only their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God." In v. 20 we find the same statement. The end of the verse is slightly different but the same idea is there in v.20. Noah and Job were great ancient figures but in the time of Ezekiel when Ezekiel was living in the land of Israel, Daniel was a prisoner over in Babylonia. We don't know just exactly when this was written by Ezekiel. Probably Daniel had already been there c. 20 years so may have been very prompt in its recording. And his reputation for wisdom we see was known even way across the desert in Israel by this reference to it. This is the only reference to Daniel in the OT outside of the book of Daniel.

In the NT we find him referred to in Matthew 24:15 and in Mark 13:14. Both of these are references to the abominations of desolations spoken of by Daniel the Prophet. I have placed in parenthesis other references in Matthew, Mark, and Luke in which the name of Daniel is not used but in which Jesus says to the High Priest, "Hereafter you shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." Everyone agrees that that is a reference to the seventh chapter of Daniel. We will look at that when we get to that chapter. But everyone agrees that that is what is referred to there in the Gospels. The term "Son of Man" originally meant just a man. It means an individual of the class of man. In the book of Ezekiel the phrase "son of man" is used maybe 70 or 80 times to refer to Ezekiel. In the book of Daniel there is one place where the Lord addresses him as the son of man. But in this one case it says there will come one like the son of man coming on the clouds of heaven. It was recognized very early that that was a prediction of the coming of the Messiah upon the clouds of heaven. Jesus Christ called himself the Son of Man very clearly referring back to this statement in Daniel.

What is most familiar to most Christians in Daniel is the great accounts in this book of fidelity to God. Many people think the Bible is composed of just one miracle after another. Those who have this idea have not read the Bible very much. You can read long sections without finding any reference to what we would call a supernatural act, something that is ordinarily called a miracle. Of course the word miracle actually means a sign. It does not have to mean a supernatural act. But we do have great supernatural acts in the Bible. But they are found only in a few great crucial periods, and one of these periods was at the time at the beginning of the Exile, when you have this accumulation of miracles described in the book of Daniel.

These accounts in the first -- five of the first six chs., perhaps you might say in all six of the first chs. of Dan. are probably among the best-known parts of the Bible, because S.S. Lessons as they go through the OT practically always give these stories. They are very interesting stories and they are wonderful illustrations of the way God has blessed those who are true to Him. There is great value in studying these accounts in Daniel. But that is not our purpose in this course. In this course we are confining ourselves almost exclusively to the prophecies. So the book of Daniel is characterized by these two things: great accounts

and great prophecies. The last six chs. of Daniel are made up almost entirely of prophecies, of predictions of the future. One might suggest dividing the book of Daniel into two parts: the first half history, the last ~~half~~ half prophecy. Roughly such a division can be made. But it is not altogether true because one of the greatest prophecies in the book of Daniel occurs right in the 2nd ch. And one of the chs. of the last six is composed almost entirely of a prayer that Daniel gave.

But the last six are composed almost entirely of prophecies. Those prophecies are very little known to the average Christian. They contain some marvelous illustrations, evidences of God's power, and knowledge of the future. There is much of tremendous value, and they are not easy to interpret. So I'm glad that in this course we have only about six chs. to cover instead of being like last year in our course in Ezekiel where we had nearly 50 chs. to cover. We are able to go into detail more on particular points of interest and of difficulty.

But another reason why you cannot strictly divide Daniel into two parts is the fact of the language. Daniel begins in Hebrew and ends in Hebrew. But from Dan. 2:4 to the end of ch. 7, it is in a different language-- in the Aramaic language. We try to give training in the languages of the Bible here. I am anxious that every one of you get a thorough training in Greek because the great central teachings of our Christian faith are brought out in that very complex and precise language in the NT. The OT is not nearly as precise. Its statements are often much more general in nature and possibly we cannot be as precise often in our conclusions in regard to many things in the OT as in the NT. So I feel it is of outstanding importance that you get a solid foundation in the Greek language.

If you are going to read the Bible in the original it is also important that you know the Hebrew. I only wish that we had Bibles, commentaries, grammars, dictionaries in which the Hebrew was written in the Latin letters--like the letters we use for our English language. If somebody wants to donate a million dollars for the purpose I will be glad to direct people in translating the Hebrew Bible into Latin letters. It would require a little revision of the alphabet, but not much and it would make ~~it~~ a good representation, but I'm sure you would learn as ~~many~~ much Hebrew in one year that way as you learn in two or three now! Because a tremendous amount of what is involved in learning Hebrew is simply a matter of getting your ~~y~~ eyes used to those letters. You've all had 20-25 years of getting your eyes used to Latin letters, and you can't make up for that with an entirely different sort of letter in a year or two. That is a great part of the effort in learning Hebrew.

That is as far as is usually gone in most seminary courses in learning the languages of OT. But there is a portion of the OT written in Aramaic. That includes these chs. I mentioned in the book of Daniel. It includes certain sections--about a half-- of the book of Ezra, and portions of the book of Jeremiah. These are in Aramaic. Since it is a comparatively small part, we don't think in a seminary course we can expect most students to learn Aramaic.

In this course I'm not requiring work in the languages. We are doing this on the basis of the English, and I am discussing the original languages where they apply because we have many students who are only now beginning Hebrew. But you should know that there is that difference so that so that in chs. 2-7 we have the identical reference, in the same kind of letters, in fact these letters are written in Aramaic letters.

The Hebrew before the exile was written in a different kind of letter but they changed the type of letter during the exile and adopted the Aramaic letters but still wrote Hebrew. So we have this section of Daniel which is in Aramaic which includes about a third of the prophecies. And the prophecies from ch. 8 on are in the Hebrew language. Ch. 7 and most of ch. 2 are in Aramaic.

Now I want to mention a great attack that has been made on the book of Daniel by a neo-platonist philosopher named ~~REXBNXY~~ Porphyry who lived from A.D. 233-304. Porphyry said the book of Daniel claims to tell about great future events. He said, You look at the history of the time after the time of Nebuchadnezzar when Daniel was said to have lived, and you find the book traces events very, very accurately during the period of more than the fourth century(?) (unclear)

He said this is extremely unlikely that anyone would have been able to do. But he said, if somebody in a time of a great crisis in the history of Israel were to write a book to encourage their people to stand valiantly for their faith, he might imagine that someone four centuries earlier wrote a book which predicted events up to that time. And then which predicted a great attack made upon the religion of Israel by a king named Antiochus Epiphanes who ruled in Syria from 175-163 B.C. And he said, Many of the acts of Antiochus Epiphanes are very precisely (though in somewhat general terms) described in the book of Daniel just as somebody living at that time would have described them but after that, he said, it tells simply what the writer hoped would happen. So it is history up to a certain point, claims to be prophecy given four centuries earlier and then all the sudden it begins to make wonderful promises about someone coming from heaven in clouds and remedying everything, delivering them, and that's all imaginary and did not happen.

So, he said, we can see when it was written. It describes the history through that long period, accurately up to that point, and then it just imagines a lot of things that might have happened afterward. So he said, that is when the book of Daniel was written. Many today, in the last century, have followed Porphyry in this view, even some earnest Christians. Men like F.W. Farrar whose book on the life of Christ is highly regarded, but in writing on Daniel he followed Porphyry's ideas.

We think that would make the book a fraud. A book by somebody 4 centuries later claiming it was written it was written earlier, claiming it was giving history, claiming it was prophecy in advance. That would make the book a fraud. But most important we know it was accepted by the Jews at the time of Christ as being

a divinely inspired book, accepted by the Jews at the time of Christ as being a divinely inspired book. And Jesus set His seal of approval on the books that were accepted by the Jews at that time as being God's Holy Word.

So on the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ we believe Daniel actually lived in the time of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, and that Daniel was able to predict these historical events during four centuries after his time with remarkable accuracy. Where it goes beyond what happened then, we believe it is looking forward far further into the future much beyond the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. We take that attitude because we believe Jesus Christ gave His authority to the OT as God's Word and as entirely true, and dependable.

In this course we are not interested in studying the criticism. We do have to do a good bit of that in our classes. It is vital that you be prepared to meet the higher critical views that are so widely taught as established fact in seminaries and universities around the world today. But that is not the purpose of this particular course.

Yet we find it necessary in this course to deal with this particular theory to some extent, because it makes a difference in the interpretation at a good many points. So I will refer to the critical theory a good many times. You simply do not want to take anything that the critics who think it was written later say as being necessarily false, because they are certainly right in saying the book of Daniel contains a remarkable picture of the history of those four centuries. But the interesting thing is that in order to hold their theory they have to at a number of points say, he was quite mistaken about the history! And that is quite interesting, and I think a rather weak point in their whole theory. We will notice certain points of that type as we come to them.

I want to say a few words specifically about the purpose of this Course. The purpose of this course is definitely not to find proof texts for views already adopted. There is great value in someone who has a complete idea of what he believes the Bible teaches about the future writing on the book of Daniel to show how it fits in with those ideas. And in order to give evidence from the book of Daniel of particular points of his viewpoint. But the unfortunate thing is that most Christian teachers are equally dogmatic about those matters that are absolutely clear and definite in Scripture and about those matters that are highly speculative, as to interpretation. That is one thing we particularly try to do here at Biblical is to inculcate an attitude of saying, This is clear in Scripture, we stand upon it. But here is something which may be interpreted in two different ways. We think this is the more likely but we do not stand on it as positively as we do on those things that are absolutely clear and definite in the meaning of Scripture. So our purpose in this particular course is not to come to the book of Daniel with an already adopted idea of the future. We are coming to it simply to find what is there, and to see what is taught in this particular book without importing into it any more than we can possibly help of ideas from other sources.

Secondly, it is not our purpose to determine the detailed course of events still future. In order to know what the Bible teaches about events that have not yet occurred in our day and ~~are~~ are still future, it is necessary to compare all those parts of Scripture that deal with this matter. That is a big study. There are certain things that stand out absolutely clearly in it. There are other matters on which equally intelligent Christians can differ. That is not our purpose in this course. We are anxious to find how much there is in the book of Daniel that predicts things that have not yet happened. We are anxious to see what there is that we can say definitely has not yet occurred. Since Daniel is part of God's Word it definitely will occur. ~~But we can say from absolute positiveness from Daniel alone~~ and what we can say with absolute positiveness from Daniel alone as to how it will occur. So you see we have a rather restricted purpose in this particular course.

Our purpose is not so much specific results (though we will get a good many of them) as sound methods of Bible study. I am anxious that you get the definite ideas that are clearly taught in the prophecies of the book of Daniel. But I am even more interested that you get a correct understanding of correct methods of approaching these prophecies in order that you see what is definite and clear and that you see what there is on which differences of opinion can be had. It is so common in study the Bible to take a passage and to say, Well now this could be this way, it could be that way, it looks to me it is a little more probable that it is this way. And then a little further on we say, We have already proved that this is taught there! And we find a verse that seems to contradict it and we say, It could not contradict it so we have to interpret it in such a way as to fit it in. I believe it is important that we find what is clear in any part of Scripture. Then to explain the matters that are less clear in relation to the clear. Instead of taking certain conclusions on perhaps fair, but not absolute evidence and then twisting other things in line with it.

So method is my greatest purpose in this course, but I am sure we will get a good many results that are very much worth while.

Fourth, in this course I desire to look at the book by itself bringing in elsewhere from Scripture only what is absolutely clear. That statement is not strong enough. I don't mean that anything you find elsewhere in Scripture that is absolutely clear we are ready to bring in to this particular course. I mean that there are a few great definite Scriptural truths of which any Christian must agree that they are taught in the Bible. Aside from those we are going to simply look at Daniel and see what we find there. There are just a few points by which we will bring matters that are clearly taught elsewhere in the Scripture.

C. The Importance of the historical background (which I barely mention at this point). You cannot interpret Daniel in any proper way without bringing in the facts of ancient history. Of course, some of those facts are not well-known. As a matter of fact, in any history many of the facts are not wellknown. If you were to write a history of everything that will happen in the world between now and 10:30 in these next 5 minutes, if you were to write such a history, the books that it would take would more than fill this room. Because every

every individual in the world for these five minutes, has certain ideas, certain thoughts, certain relations to other individuals. There probably are people being born in some countries of the world today that nobody knows anything about except their own families and who will, 40 yrs. from now if the Lord tarries, will be known throughout the world as important historical figures. But most of the people in the world pay no attention to them until the time when they become prominent. Yet with a true understanding of history their early life is tremendously important.

History probably would include everything that ~~happens~~ happens and what we know of history includes only what people thought was important enough to write down. Of course in these days we write down an awful lot more than they used to. But even so there are a great many things of importance that are not written down today. When it comes to ancient history, a great deal of what is known rests upon what has happened to be preserved. A great deal that is of tremendous importance has not been preserved. There are certain facts in history that are pretty well established and there are a great many matters about which comparatively little is known. But the principal facts of the political history of the Near East in ancient times enter very definitely into the prophecies of Daniel. I'm not going to try to take 2 or 3 days to go over these events and to have you have a clear understanding of them. I am going to touch upon them as we come to them, and anything I say in relation to them if you have questions, you can look them up in any good encyclopedia or any good ancient history. I believe that most of what we will ~~not~~ deal with in the historical background you will find in almost any book on the subject-- matters that are obscure or uncertain.

Yet the strange thing is that practically every commentary I have seen on the book of Daniel makes statements that are contrary to all that is known on the particular points of ancient history. It just looks to me as if the writers of these commentaries simply have taken the statement that Daniel must mean so and so and then said that's the way the history was without looking into what has been preserved in history to see what actually did happen. There are 2 or 3 cases where I was tremendously surprised to find that is a fact and we will look at that (those) as we go on.

D. I see we have already covered the attitude toward the critical views. We are not here trying to answer the critical views. We are not going into those details. But it is important we know its central features which I have already mentioned to you. It will enter into our interpretation at a number of points to see how the critics have interpreted it. There are some places where their interpretation is absolutely right. We can agree with it thoroughly. There are other points at which their interpretation is absolutely wrong. We will look into those but that is not our main feature.

I have reminded myself at this point to make a remark about questions. In a class of this size, general discussion would be quite

impossible. We cannot have general discussion of matters that come before us in this subject. But anyone who speaks makes little slips of the tongue occasionally. I have found on many occasions when I was speaking about something in the book of Micah I said Amos. I don't know why I do, but that particular, rather foolish error, I have made repeatedly. There are little slips like that that any speaker is bound to make. So if I make a statement that is palpably absurd --usually I catch it and correct it-- but if I don't, please raise your hand so that I will not mislead anybody, by such a statement.

The material that I present, I want to make clear enough so that everyone understands what I am giving. If a point I make is not clear, if you don't understand what I am trying to say, then raise your hand, because I want to be sure that what I said is clear

If you have questions as to the validity of points I make, if you have an idea that another interpretation is better, if you have certain matters you would like to have gone into more thoroughly than I do, I think it would be well in a class of this size for you to write out such a question and give it to me. I will be happy to have such questions. If the question is one of general interest, or if I have not made the evidence clear enough on some point, or if I have spoken more positively than the evidence warranted, I will mention it at the next meeting of class. On the other hand if it is a point which does not seem to me to be of general interest to the class I will try to see you personally or write you a note.

So I would encourage you to give me questions in written form about any difference of opinion, any other view, any matter you think would be worth going into further. Anything I don't make clear I wish you would immediately ask me about it. Because I want to be sure everything is made clear.

Another point: there will be assignments. These will be written. Since the class is only one hour credit course, I do not expect anyone who is taking this as an undergraduate course to spend more than 2 hours on any assignment I would say an hour and a half would be quite ample. If you find it taking more than that you may have misunderstood the assignment. I do not expect you to spend more than 1½ hours, that is aside from graduates, and I would be pleased if you would take 20 min. or ½ hr. reviewing what we have had in class so you have it well in mind. That would leave only an hour or a little more to handle the assignment. It is a little hard to plan just how long an assignment should take. Every now and then I find someone spends 6 hours on an assignment! If you are interested enough in the subject to do that, fine. But don't think that is what I am expecting or asking you to do. But except when we have tests-- we'll have a test, a half-hour test in the middle of the semester and then a final exam at the end. Except for the days when we have a test I'll I will always give you an assignment. But I don't always know just how much ground we are going to get over, though sometimes--- The assignments vary a little depending on how far we are and then I'm apt to forget giving one. It is my intention always to stop at 10 min. of the next hour. If we reach say 12 min & I give no indication of stopping I wish you would raise your hand because I want to give the assignment for the next time. The assignment should be written out and turned

in to Mrs. Rebecca at the office for me by Friday noon, so that I will have a chance to look them over prior to our class. So I would appreciate it if you would get your assignments always by the next Friday noon. That is partly because of the nature of the assignments. The assignments I will give will not be assignments to test what you know or to find out how well you can do something. They will be assignments in order to prepare you for our discussion in class. It will be an assignment for you to look into the book of Daniel yourself and to make certain observations or reach certain conclusions.

There may be occasions when the assignment will involve examination of commentaries. There are quite a number of them on reserve in the library. But in most cases they will not. I prefer you not look at a commentary or even at the notes in any particular Bible as you begin an assignment. I want them to show what you yourself get from a particular section of the book assigned. Please at 12 men. of the hour if I have not given an assignment raise your hand otherwise I shall have to put in on the board. Even then I want it in for sure by the next Friday.

II Predictions in Daniel 2 (the first great assignment in the book of Daniel). I mentioned that the predictions in Daniel after the first six chapters are comparatively little known in Christian world. That is unfortunate because there are some very wonderful predictions there and marvellous evidences of the truth of God's Word. Very important but comparatively little known.

Dan. 2 is probably one of the 12 or 20 best known chs. in the OT. S.S. lessons nearly always in the course of teaching the OT include Dan. 2. In Dan. 2 the setting of the prophecy is not our present interest but there are one or two points I would like to have clear. Most of you are familiar with events in ch. 2. It starts just like ch. 1, in the third year in the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon (it starts with a date like ch. 1 ones.) Then ch. 2 starts And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreamsand his sleep brake from him.

It is very evident that that is a point at which a ch. division should be made. We know that the ch. divisions are not in the original. They were put in c. the 13th century A.D. According to the general idea they were put in by an English Archbishop in his Latin Bible. It is generally thought he put many of them in as he rode on horseback making his pastoral calls. Some people say when the horse stumbled he may have mistaken the place where he put in a chapter division. I remember Cambel Morgan the famous English expositor say that in 9 cases out of 10 the ch. divisions are in the wrong place. I believe that is quite extreme. I would say it is the other way around. There are a great many places where if you are going to have a ch. division it is in the right place. There are many cases where there is just no division in thought at all.. I do not recommend a new revision of the ch. divisions, because they are very convenient in order to find the place. So even tho they are erroneous I would stick to them, just as the electricity, in it we still call positive what is really negative and we call negative what is really positive because when the

when the names were given we did not know what the facts were about the direction in which the electrons moved, and therefore the names were wrong. It could -- would cause tremendous confusion to change them today so we just stick to the old names. The same is true here. These divisions were taken from the Latin Bible and put into the Heb. Bible. When they were put into it there are a few cases (maybe one in twenty) where they preferred to make a change and make it at a different place. So occasionally the Hebrew Bible has a different ch. division than the English Bible. Not more than about one in twenty. We follow the divisions from the Latin which were put in there in the 13th century, A.D.

The verse divisions are much older than the ch. divisions. But they also were put in quite a time after the Bible was originally written, and in some cases they are very strange. We have cases where two or three long sentences were included in one verse, and we have cases where one sentence is divided into two or three verses. They are strange but very convenient for finding places.

The setting here is that Nebuchadnezzar called in his wise men, v.2. He called in the magicians, the astronomers, the sorcerers and the Chaldeans to shew the king's dreams. And they came. "Then spoke the Chaldeans to the king in Syriac." It could have said Aramaic which is the word we use today for the language in which they spoke. And from there on it simply changes to Aramaic from that point on.

They said, Tell thy servants the dream and we will show the interpretation. The king said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me. If you will not make known to me the dream with the interpretation you shall be cut in pieces. They said, Nobody can do such a thing; you tell us the dream and we'll tell you what it means.

The impression that that makes is that this man was a very arbitrary tyrant who asked people to do a ridiculous thing to tell him what his dream was! How could you expect wise men to tell you which dream? But I believe that is a misinterpretation. I believe it because where it says "the thing is gone from me" the word translated "thing" there can be a thing, a word, an idea; it can mean a decree. It does not have to mean dream. A decree. And when it says "it is gone" it can mean "the command went out from him." "I've given this command; that's definite." This is possible. We find it again in v. 8--"The king answered and said, I know of a certain that you would gain time because you see the thing is gone from me."

In v. 8, the phrase "is gone" is a word that occurs nowhere else in the Bible. In recent yrs. scholars have come to the conclusion this is a Persian word meaning "it is firm, positive." That's the way it's taken in most recent translations. The decree is firm, is fixed; this is the regulation I've given. Now it's up to you to do it! It does not mean he has forgotten his dream. After all if he'd forgotten his dream they could make up anything they wanted to and tell him that was his dream. I believe that what happened was that Nebuchadnezzar was in the habit of calling upon

these so-called wise men and saying, I dreamt last night that a big horse came in riding through the main square and there was a man on it who called out certain words, and certain things happened. Now tell me what it means. And anybody could make up some idea as to what it meant and sometimes what they said would work out, it would happen that way. Other times it didn't. The king decided they were just pulling the wool over his eyes so he decided, If they really can tell what the dream means they can tell me what the dream was. I think he certainly still knew what the dream was but he was wanting real proof that these men could tell him what it meant, and they were not just making something up.

So he gave this command: You tell me, and he had decided from past experience with their imaginings and pretending to know more than they did that he wanted to be thorough with the whole bunch of them. So he gave command for all of them to be killed.

Daniel was considered a wise man and the command went out to get Daniel and Daniel asked him to give him time to pray. He prayed and God gave him the answer. Then we read how Daniel ~~gave~~ told the king what his dream was. The king of course knew that what he told was correct therefore he was ready to believe what he said it meant.

B. Nebuchadnezzar's Vision, vv.31-35.

We all have dreams. The person who does not dream will not live. Dreaming is natural but for most of us it is a very good thing to forget what we dreamed. Usually it's a combination of experiences we had before it combined in a somewhat unusual way. It may have something to do with what we ate for supper last night! Most dreams have no meaning. But God can reveal something by a dream if he chooses. In this case God gave the king a specific dream in order to show his people something of what was going to happen in the future. So in this case this dream represents true events of the future. The dream is divided into two parts.

1. We have a static picture first. The king saw a statue made up of five parts: a head which was gold, breast and arms of silver. How many arms did the statue have? We're safe in saying there were two arms. And the breast (the upper half of the trunk). It's belly and thighs were of bronze. Thighs is usually interpreted as meaning from the hips to the knees. I've seen pictures that have shown the whole _____ as being the third part, but that's not what this says. The third part includes the abdomen and down to the knees. The belly and thighs were made of bronze. Then the legs (which would be from the knees down) were of iron. The feet were partly iron and partly clay. So the dream begins with a static picture.

2. It continues with a dynamic series of events. This series of events has three parts:

- a. Origin of the stone. There is the stone cut without hands.
- b. Effect on the statue. This stone hurls through the air and hits the statue. The statue is entirely demolished.
- c. Enlargement of stone. Then the stone grows until it fills the whole world. Those are the parts of the vision.

There were three last time not on the list the office had originally given me. I had them sit way in the back last time, but I thought I could give them better seats. Mr. Koontz takes the roll from the back according to the seats . . . Please take the seats listed in the back (on the bulletin board). . . .

I got papers from most of you . . . The papers that are turned in I do not ordinarily turn back, but anyone who at the end of the semester would like to have your paper back please give me a note to that effect and I will see to it that they get back to you.

We were speaking last time about ch. 2 -- the Vision in ch. 2. There we noticed the setting of the prophecy, and we noticed there is no reason to think it had been just an arbitrary action on Nebuchadnezzar's part. I think we are quite justified in thinking he had been fooled by these so-called wise men, and therefore he said this decision is firm from me. Now the word only occurs in this ch. So the way it is guessed at--"the word is gone out from me" could just as well mean exactly the same thing: this is the word that I have given. In fact that word "word" often is used for a command. But the way it is stated in KJV in two different vv. it could suggest that he meant he had forgotten it. I don't believe there is any necessity for taking that he forgot it even if the word meant it is gone out from me, the command. But it is quite generally recognized that in at least one of these verses, the word is a word which means "firm".

Now I just received a question whether that is so in both the cases but unfortunately I did not bring my Aramaic with me this morning. I'll look that up later, but it is my impression it is in both of them.

We also began to look at Nebuchadnezzar's dream. We noticed Nebuchadnezzar was king from 605-562. His vision had two parts. First there was a static picture: a standing image with three parts. Then we noted it had a dynamic series of events. I asked you to look at those events for the assignment for today. We will not immediately get to a discussion of them, but I hope I can get to that before the end of the ~~hour~~ hour.

C. The Interpretation vv. 37-45

. The Meaning of the Statue. There it is important to have in mind that if God gave a person a dream, and the dream showed a statue in front of him which was made up of 5 different kinds of material that you would have no basis whatever to make any guess as to what this meant. Some people have suggested that this statue was the basis for the statue described in the next ch. that Nebuchadnezzar put up in the plain of Dura and told everyone to worship. That is purely a guess. We have no reason to say it relates to it. But you would have no basis to have any idea what this statue meant. That it meant a progression of events from the head down to the feet, it might just as well mean a progression of events from the feet up to the head! Or it might mean a situation that was present at that time, it might represent various

of that time of various particular types of people, various languages. It might represent something about planning or general plans for the advancement of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. There would be absolutely no way for knowing what the statue meant, except as you have the interpretation given. When you have the interpretation given to us, we can immediately begin, after we know it represents a series of events, starting with the head and moving down to the foot--then we could if we were inclined to make guesses as to what each part meant. For instance, he said of Nebuchadnezzar: You are this head of gold.

Does that mean that Nebuchadnezzar being the head has better eyesight? than anybody else in his kingdom because the statue had eyes of gold? Does it mean he had better experience than anybody else in the kingdom? Does it mean he had a better mind than any ruler who would ever come? Does it mean he could hear better? There are all kinds of guesses you could make about the parts of the statue. But that would be purely guess work. We have no reason to say it is divine teaching.

We move down a little further in the statue and we find the breast and arms are made of bronze. The Old English says "brass" and that was unfortunate; it simply stands for copper or any alloy of copper. It could mean brass which we think of as rather shiny -- a not particularly strong thing, but the common alloy of copper in ancient times was bronze which was very strong, was widely used for weapons (Question?)

Student: breast and arms of silver?

Yes, we are not to the bronze, that will apply to the next part. But the breast and arms were of silver. As you look at the breast and arms you have three parts. You have two arms and I suppose the hands would be included. We can't say whether the hands were included or whether the hands belong to the next part down. What do the fingers mean? What does it mean that there is a central body and two arms. Are there going to be three parts to the next kingdom? There are all kinds of guesses we could make but we have no basis for them unless we are specifically told something about them in Scripture.

Then the third part which is of bronze (that you for calling my attention to that) for bronze is a better translation unless you want to say copper -- brass is stronger than silver. Perhaps silver is a little better conductor of electricity than bronze. I don't think any of those facts tell us about the meaning of the statue.

We notice the third part includes the belly and thighs. That would mean it would reach from about the middle of the trunk down about ~~xxx~~ to the knees. Does that mean that the third kingdom ~~xx~~ is going to be originally one and then divided into two parts? We have no basis in the account to lead us to think so.

Then we have the legs which are of iron. It is quite generally thought the legs stand for the Roman Empire. Some say the fact there are two legs indicates the eastern and western

parts of the Roman Empire. I don't think we have any warrant for that --any more than for the precious statements. Particularly when we realize the Roman empire lasted for four centuries, and was almost ready for its downfall before its division into two parts occurred. So I want to warn against that sort of reading into it additional meanings above what is suggested in the text.

Now we may as we find other parallels somewhere have a right to look back and say, Here is something that fits with something in history or that fits with something in a ~~ax~~ later tradition. But I'm particularly anxious that we look at it from the viewpoint, "What do we have in this chapter? We think of Nebuchadnezzar and of Daniel, and what would they find there? We may find points suggested that are clarified later on in Daniel. In such a case if you note a particular thing like that you may make a note of them and bring them to my attention later. Make a note of anything that occurs to you where you think of something later in the Bible throws light on something here. But at this point we are interested in seeing what we have here and what can be legitimately drawn from this without looking further forward in the Scripture. We are justified, I think, at this point in looking at the future history to see how it fits with it.

~~ax~~ The Five parts of the statue. What has specific meaning and what is only a part of the picture. That I was just speaking of.

What do the metals signify? We are told, You are this head of gold. Beyond that that the head of gold stands for Nebuchadnezzar, I don't think we have a right to say that the Babylonians kingdom from this had more gold than any of the other kingdoms, or that it was a more powerful kingdom. It is simply the first of the metals. It does not say anything about a difference in meaning between the gold and the silver.

Silver next, then bronze, then the iron. Of the iron we do have evidence it has a specific meaning. It says iron is ~~z~~ strong and breaks in pieces. Similarly this kingdom will be strong. So we have four kingdoms here mentioned, of which the fourth one is to be very strong. Of course the art of warfare was gradually improved in those years.

The Persians, for instance, were able to make tremendous conquests because of their ability in shooting arrows. They would shoot great clouds of arrows and nothing could stand before them. But then the Greeks came under Alexander the Great and they were encased in heavy armour standing close together with the strong armour that could hold back the arrows and keep them from injuring them, and they had a step forward. The art of warfare stepped forward, so we might say the iron represents a stronger force than the previous ones. Beyond that we don't know, but we do know that the iron stands for strength.

Then there is clay mixed with iron in the feet and toes and the clay we are told more about. We'll look at that later.

D. The Five Parts of the Statue

I just referred to four kingdoms, As it is stated here you could not tell whether there were 4 kingdoms or 5 kingdoms.

I have not noticed here anything that would indicate which. There are five parts. The fourth and fifth have a similarity in that one is entirely ~~xx~~ iron, the other is partly iron. Are they the same kingdom, or are they two distinct kingdoms? I don't think you can decide that from ch. 2, unless somebody calls my attention to some point I have not noticed yet. But I do think this point can be definitely decided when we get to ch. 7. So for the present I think we should say we do not know whether there are four kgdms. or five. There are definitely five parts.

1. The starting point - Nebuchadnezzar, v. 36-39. We have a remarkable series of statements that Daniel makes to Nebuchadnezzar in vv. 36-37. Daniel says, This is the interpretation: Thou O king art a king of kings. The God of heaven has given thee a kingdom or power strength and glory. And wherever the children of men dwell. The beasts of the field and fowls of the heaven has he given into thine hand and has made thee ruler over them all." Does that mean Nebuchadnezzar had a power none of us have to order the birds of heaven in which direction they are to fly? To change their migratory progress as we may choose? It sounds to me like flattery! God has given the fowls of heaven into his hands and made him ruler over them all. I sure the birds that fly over Babylon, that there was very little Nebuchadnezzar could do about them unless they flew rather low. The beasts of the field he could not possibly control.

"Thou art the head of gold." Are Daniel's words to Nebuchadnezzar inerrant? I believe very definitely in the inerrancy of Scripture that whatever God has given us in Scripture about any subject we can stand upon and accept and believe it is true. But I think you have to be very careful. When Daniel gives Nebuchadnezzar the interpretation God has given Daniel we can accept everything he says as being absolutely true. But when he flatters Nebuchadnezzar a little bit and begins to tell him what this means, I question how far we should go in saying that is a true description of Nebuchadnezzar's power. "Wherever the children of men dwell." Were there no Indians in the U.S. at that time? Were there no civilizations in Mexico or in Peru at that time? Were there no peoples in China at that time? We have evidence there were great many people in these areas, some of them living in rather high civilizations and some of them never having heard of Nebuchadnezzar. Probably. I say probably because there was commercial traffic between Babylon and Egypt and China at this time.

But these introductory words, the statement that is part of this interpretation is "thou art this head of gold." The head of gold stands for you, but the flattering words he gives to Nebuchadnezzar, it is absolutely true that is what Daniel said to him. But whether Daniel's words represent exact truth would be carrying inerrancy beyond what it means.

2. What is meant by this head of gold? Is this Nebuchadnezzar? Is he this head of gold? You can turn to these pieces of paper I have given you here and you have a few facts here. I am not given you these to memorize. There may be some of it you will think important to remember. There are facts in it that are useful in connection with today's lecture and with many subsequent lectures during the course. Keep it and have it with you when you want to refer to it.

I mentioned the Neo-Babylonian empire. There had been a great power from Babylon many centuries before Nebuchadnezzar which had wielded control over a very large area. Then that had been overcome by the Assyrians who followed the Babylonian culture very closely, so closely that we can think of them as one civilization--the Assyrians and the Babylonians. For some centuries Babylon was subject to Assyria with its capitols first at Ashur and then at Ninevah. During those centuries Babylon was constantly trying to get its independence. But there was a close similarity of culture -- a tight(?) and language between the two. Eventually the Babylonians ~~gained~~ gained their independence and overthrew the Assyrian Empire by forces of Nebuchadnezzar and of the Medes, 614. Now whether I should have said of Nebuchadnezzar, I'm not quite sure because in 604 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar was a great force. In 614 (the other date I've given here) it was probably his father.

His Father had been governor of Babylon and Babylonia under the Assyrians and he had revolted. Then a group of people came to the east of them who were called the Medes who had a rather loose confederacy of these different tribes, joined together with the father of Nebuchadnezzar and in 614 they destroyed the old capitol of Assyria at Asshur. Two years later they were able to conquer Ninevah which had been its capitol for some centuries and to destroy it in 612. They destroyed it so completely that until 150 years ago no one knew where Ninevah had been. One of the great cities of ancient times.

A large group of the Assyrians fought on after that, and it was not until 604 when Nabopolassar's son, Nebuchadnezzar, was leading the army-- in fact a year after Nabopolassar died, that Nebuchadnezzar and the Medes together put a complete end to the Assyrian force. Some of the Assyrian territory was taken over by the Medes. But the greater part was taken over by Nebuchadnezzar.

Nebuchadnezzar reigned from 605-562 B.C. He was unquestionably one of the great fighters of ancient times, one of the great rulers. He deserves all the prominence he is given. "Thou O Nebuchadnezzar art this head of gold.!"

But then it says (v.39), "After thee shall arise another kingdom, and another third kingdom of bronze which shall bear rule over all the earth. The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron. When Nebuchadnezzar died in 562 he was succeeded by his son, Amel-Marduk who reigned two years, but proved not to be a very satisfactory ruler; he was assassinated and a general who had married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, Nergal-Sharazer succeeded him. He is sometimes shortened to Neriglissar. He rules four years and is succeeded by his son who was very unsatisfactory and was soon removed. Then Nabonidus became king. Does this mean the breast and arms represent Amel-Marduk who reigned two years? And that the belly and thighs represent Nergal-Sharazer? Certainly neither Labashi-Marduk nor Nabonidus would be worthy to represent as the great force of iron.

So when it says, You Nebuchadnezzar are the head of gold, and after you shall arise another kingdom, we must say this is either jumping ahead--there is a gap there between Nebuchadnezzar

and the coming of this other kingdom some years later in 536, about 23 years later, or else when you say "thou art this head of gold" it represents not simply Nebuchadnezzar but the empire of which he is the temporary head. So as between those two, I incline to think that the second is more likely ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ interpretation. That this does not represent Nebuchadnezzar alone, but represents the Neo-Babylonian empire.

But then again we get a question. The Neo-Babylonian empire altogether only lasted from 605 to 539. The Persian empire lasted two centuries. The Hellenistic empire lasted about two centuries. The Roman empire last somewhere between four and six centuries. When he says, "thou art this head of gold", does it mean just the Neo-Babylonian kingdom, or is the entire period perhaps of this Neo-Babylonian imperial power? A period of perhaps nearly 1000 years in which great power was wielded by the Babylonians and Assyrians and in the end by the Babylonians which were a closely related people using the same language, the same type of writing, a closely related culture?

Those are three possibilities, and at this ~~point~~ point we cannot speak dogmatically. Personally I incline very much to the third. Now this word Kingdom is a word that is not used very much today. Sixty years ago we would speak of the kingdom of Spain, the kingdom of Portugal, the kingdom of Greece, kingdom of Italy. We had many kingdoms in the world. Today the word kingdom is little used. By the word kingdom are we referring specifically to the rule of one man, or do we simply mean a nation's power? A strongpower? The word kingdom is used in the passage at this point in a way that what it ~~really~~ really means is not what we meant by kingdom even 100 years ago! What it means is more like what we meant by empire then. The word empire never occurs in the Bible but I think it comes closer to representing what is meant by these kingdoms.

This word empire originally meant a military command. The Roman troops after a great battle would sometimes hail their commander as Emperor. The Commander, the man who gave the command! From this word Emperor we derive our word Emperor. So it developed from the great power of the Roman rulers and it has been carried on since that time usually to mean someone who rules much more than one nation. Thus the king of Germany during the Middle Ages, if he had sufficient power, would go to Rome and be crowned Emperor by the pope and then he would ~~call~~ call himself Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire which was ~~supposed~~ supposed to embrace ~~Germany~~ Germany, Italy and all the regions in between them. If he was a ~~very~~ very powerful man he could come down several times and keep Italy under his control. It was a difficult thing to do and most of them did not succeed very well. But the Emperor was considered a higher type of a king.

In modern times, I believe the term empire refers, like the term kingdom, not so much to a particular ruler as to a power. When we speak of an empire we are apt to mean that more than one nation is involved. That one nation exercises control over another nation, or that one man exercises control over several nations. That, I feel is what most interpreters would feel is meant by these various kingdoms, in Daniel. That it is not used in the sense that we speak of the kingdom of Portugal and kingdom of Spain, of Greece, of Italy.

But it means an empire. It means a power like Nebuchadnezzar had where a group of different nations were all under his control and direction, and that it could be extended to that ~~x~~ even if your rule is not a one-man rule. You could have a senate ~~of~~ or a group of leaders who controlled rather than an individual.

3. Is there a progression in the metals? Verse 39 says, After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to you, and another third kingdom of bronze that shall bear rule over all the earth and another kingdom, a fourth strong as iron." This suggests the fourth kingdom is going to be the strongest of all! So if there is a progression, you'd think it would be a progression of strength, rather than of weakness. That would fit with history because Nebuchadnezzar ruled over an area (see map). He conquered Jerusalem about half way through his reign. Once he made a campaign down into Egypt, but he Palestine and Syria. He held Mesopotamia. The Medes were not under his control, nor the Persians south of the Medes. He did not control Asia Minor. There was much territory there he did not control.

The Persians that followed him-- Cyrus first got control over all the Medes, then he conquered Asia Minor, then he came back and conquered Babylon taking over the region Nebuchadnezzar had. Eventually his armies went clear to India conquering part of India. So the empire that followed was three times as large an area as Nebuchadnezzar's and at least twice as large in population.

Then when Alexander the Great came from Greece, this area here had not been under the Persians at all. They conquered the whole Persian empire so their area was much larger. But the area of Europe here the Romans had added still more territory to it! So if you are speaking of areas, these empires increase in size rather than diminish in size!

If you speak of population, they increase in size rather than diminish in size. So some have said there is a decrease. The second kingdom is inferior to you and there is another third kingdom which shall bear rule over all the earth, and the fourth kingdom. There must be a decrease! But there is no decrease in area, or in population. The decrease must be that Nebuchadnezzar was an absolute despot, and the next gets ~~xx~~ weaker, and the next gets weaker, etc. That idea has been advanced in recent years but there is no basis for that because Nebuchadnezzar was ~~not~~ an absolute despot even if it sounds so in his relations with them in this chapter. Nebuchadnezzar was very much bound by the laws of Babylon. In fact there has been found in Babylon a great monument put up in the central square by Hammurabi, more than 1000 years before Nebuchadnezzar, in which he shows a picture of the Sun-god giving him the laws at the top and it tells all about the Sun-god giving these laws and ordering him to put them up in the main square so that any citizen can come and read them and know exactly what his rights are.

Now today if you want to know what your rights are you pay 100 dollars to your lawyer and try to find out, and your lawyer may differ from you. But in Babylon individuals had definite rights--not ~~x~~ near as much as individuals have in this country

but they had definite rights. The power of the king, though very great was not absolute. In these various kingdoms there was sometimes more autocracy, sometimes less. You cannot show a progression in that regard.

So I was puzzled by that statement "after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee", so I asked the question, Is this "inferior" a correct translation? I went to the Aramaic and I found there the word was arcah (?) which is Aramaic corresponding to Hebrew eret meaning earth. It has an ending which means "toward." The word occurs only in this place in the Aramaic Bible. Literally it means "toward the earth." I was told 30 years ago, by the man who was then professor of Aramaic studies in Chicago, that he was making up a complete list of all the words in all the Aramaic inscriptions that have been found, and in all the Aramaic literature that has been preserved.

present

So I wrote to the Professor of Aramaic there and I asked him, Could you tell me from this list whether there is any other case you could call my attention to where this word means "inferior" and he said, I know of no case where in context the word means "inferior". He said as far as a list of all the Aramaic words is concerned, I don't know of any such thing here. So it may be the former professor took it with him when he retired, I don't know. However, he said, it is perfectly obvious here in Daniel that it means "inferior."

I don't think we can decide what a word means by saying it is perfectly obvious! The word means "toward the earth." The Persian empire was not inferior to the Babylonian kingdom; it was superior in many regards. If this means "toward the earth", I think he is simply speaking of the place on the statue. "You are the head of gold; and after you will be another kingdom which is lower down on the statue." And after it will be another kingdom of bronze. The third kingdom wasn't specifically of bronze. In fact, they were using mostly iron weapons at that time, but it was represented by bronze on the statue.

So to take it that there is a progression or they are getting weaker in some regards, is reading into Scripture on the basis of the translation of one word, and the translation is not warranted. It means lower down on the statue. There are four kingdoms which actually increase in strength and in size, rather than decrease.

4. The Second, Third and Fourth Kingdoms.

I have already mentioned the fact of what they would seem to be, because in the sheet I gave you out, it explains Cyrus the Persian conquered the Medes. When he became king over the Persians they were subject to some extent to this loose confederation of Medes, and he married the daughter of the Median king, and eventually he declared his independence of them. He then fought them; overcame them and put them under his control and led them to conquer other nations around and they came to the west-north of Babylon and went up and conquered the whole of Asia Minor. After they had conquered all that territory, a territory much larger than the area Nebuchadnezzar had, then he turned southward and went against Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom, and in 539, twenty-three years

after Nebuchadnezzar's death, he conquered Babylon. So we have this second kingdom--Cyrus, the Persian. In 559 he became king. In 546 he conquered Asia Minor. In 539 he conquered Babylon. In 529 he died.

There's quite a bit on this chart that relates to later chs., not just to this ch. After him came the Hellenistic (or Greek) empire, and then the Roman Republic or empire.

The critical theory. I've referred to it before. We are not in this course trying to prove the authenticity of Daniel. We accept it as part of the Bible, as part of that upon which our Lord Jesus put His seal as being authentic and genuine. But, as I mentioned last time, Porphyry in the 3rd century A.D. advanced the theory that the book of Daniel was not written in the time of Nebuchadnezzar but written in the time of the Hellenistic empire, at a time of great crisis, of the Jews. We'll look at this later on.

At that time somebody wrote this and described past history as if it were predicted. You notice the difficulty immediately they have. The Hellenistic empire is the third of these empires. So the critics all say, The man who wrote the book of Daniel thought there was first the Babylonian empire, then the Median empire, then the Persian, and now the Greek empire in his own day. Actually, as we mentioned, Cyrus had the Medes entirely under his control and they formed part of his army before he destroyed the Babylonian empire. So the critics say the writer was mistaken in his idea of the history but on most things it is so accurate that it must be it was written later rather than earlier.

Incidentally you remember the phrase occurs in the book of Esther: "the law of the Medes and Persians." It combines the two as one power. In Daniel 5 where it tells of the conquest of Babylon it says, it shall be given to the Medes and Persians. So to say Daniel believed in a separate Median empire is contrary to the facts.

(Question: I misunderstood something. You said the man who wrote Daniel had a wrong view of history, and he saw the kingdoms differently?)

That was the view of the critics . . . Babylon, then the kingdom of the Medes, then the Persians, and then the Greeks. But the Medes and the Persians are historically one empire.

E. The Fifth part of the Statue. ~~xxxxxx~~

1. Are there four kingdoms or five? I don't think you could tell from the book of Daniel. He says the fourth kingdom will be strong as iron. Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." Does he mean by that the next kingdom, or the same kingdom? I don't think you could prove it from this chapter, but I think you find conclusive evidence about it when you get on a little further, in the book of Daniel.

2. The symbolic meaning of the Potter's Clay (which, of course means, weak or brittle). We think of clay as being

something like mud, something which could not possibly stand up. The statue could not possibly stand up if it just had some mud in the feet. It is quite obvious what he means is potter's clay: in other words, it is clay which is dried in the sun or else baked in a furnace and therefore becomes what we now call china, or pottery. It is something which could stand up by itself and you could put a fair amount of weight on it, but nothing like what you could ~~put~~ put on iron.

So it means the feet had interspersed between ~~this~~ them this material which is brittle and easily broken; it is not ~~strong~~ strong like the iron in this part.

3. Does the statement in v. 43 simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people? What is the character of this last part? The kingdom shall be divided, there is in it the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou the iron mixed with mirey clay, and the toes were part of iron and part of clay so the kingdoms shall be partly strong and partly broken. Whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miery clay they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men but they shall not cleave one to another even as iron is not mixed with clay.

Does that simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people, something like the present nation of Israel where you have a large part of the area with mostly Jews speaking Hebrew and then you have another large section of people who are ~~under~~ under their control of people who are mostly Arabs, a very different culture? Is that the sort of picture that is described here?

It is like Switzerland today where you have about 60% speaking German, and maybe 25% speaking French. One day I walked from the German section five miles across through the woods into the French section and I could not find a person in the first town I came to who could even talk German! So distinct is the line, yet they are one nation. Does this mean an unintegrated mixture of people? Does it mean something more than that? If that's all it means it would fit the whole history of each of these empires. The Babylonians had various peoples mixed together. They transported people away from their homes to another section of the land, carried some ~~of~~ of the people from that to another section, so they had these peoples together and all looked to the Babylonian king for protection from the other groups.

Does it simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people? If so, it could fit the Babylonian empire; it could fit the Persian empire which had so many different peoples in it that when Xerxes sent his tremendous armies to conquer Greece they had maybe 40 different languages spoken by the soldiers. It was ~~very~~ very difficult to organize them, to communicate. The Greeks with extra good weather and various unusual circumstances were able to prevent them from conquering. The Persian empire ~~was~~ was, the Hellenistic had many different troops in it. It is not very well ~~mixed~~ mixed together, and certain not the Roman ~~empire~~ empire (?) assimilated

So the possibility remains that v. 43 describes something that is not obvious. Exactly what does v. 43 mean?

We have noticed in this ch. we have a symbol. We have the statue, and we have three dynamic occurrences: the stone that breaks away from the mountain without human hands and hits the statue utterly destroying it and the stone grows and becomes a whole nation. All of that is symbolic and strictly figurative.

But the interpretation is nearly all literal, in plain language. You are the head of gold. After you will come another kingdom further down on the ~~xxx~~ statue, a kingdom which will rule over the whole earth. Then a third kingdom and then a fourth kingdom. This symbol meant this fact.

For next time look at ch. 7. ~~There~~ In ch. 7 you have a vision and an interpretation. Note whether like ch. 2 it is a vision given entirely in symbolic language, and then an interpretation in literal language. Is it like that or are they mixed together? Look at the vision in ch. 7 and I would think if you would put down ~~a~~ a reference to each verse that is describing the vision or the interpretation. After it say whether it is symbolic(figurative) or literal. Indicate which is the vision, which the interpretation and what are figures of speech and what are literal statements. Go through and indicate that for ch. 7.

To study ch. 7 thoroughly will be a long job. We'll have to go into it as thoroughly as we can, but for this I just want you to get a good general idea of this fact about ch. 7.

The assignment had two parts: look at Daniel 7 and see which vv. are part of the vision, and which are part of the interpretation. Also, which are figurative and which literal. Most of you did very well. There were two or three from whom I expected good papers who I came to the conclusion they either weren't listening at the end of the hour or that they were much more exegesis than they thought they were, because they simply gave me a comparrison of ch. 2 and ch. 7 as to the general course of events. Not the assignment at all. That would not detract from the mark but did not add anything to it because they did not deal with the two things that I asked for: which parts of the vision are figurative and which are literal.

I got the impression that one or two did not clearly understand what we mean by figurative (or symbolic). In Dan. 2 we had a vision Nebuchadnezzar had. Daniel describes the vision. In vv. 31-35, and every single thing in that vision was figurative. A symbol. If you heard that vision you could not have known what much of it meant. They are symbols. Unless you had seen the same figures used some other time, you have no way to approach it. Or unless you have an idea what it is supposed to describe and then you can make a comparrison. It is strictly figurative. Perhaps "strictly" is a little bit too strong, but mighty little. The only thing I noticed that is at all literal is the statement at the ~~xx~~ end "and fill the whole earth." Whatever it was filled the whole earth. That, of course, is a rather literal statement. But it could be part of the dream which he had.

Up to that there is a statue. As we noticed there are many things in the statue. We don't just know how many there were. We don't know how many fingers were visible. We have no reason to think the two arms and chest had a specific reference to a second kingdom or anything of the ~~king~~ kind. We have no definite evidence as to specific meaning of the first three metals. We are told the fourth one indicates strength. There are many things which are just figures and maybe just part of the general picture.

As to which parts have a meaning and what they mean, we have no basis whatever to go on unless we had the interpretation.

(Question: . . . Is it the whole earth that we know, or the whole earth that they know?)

Of course this was just a dream. In the dream did he see a ~~globe~~ globe? Did he see the stone flowing around and covering the whole globe? Or did he see the stone enlarge so as to cover everything he could see? We don't know. When we get to the interpretation we have a literal interpretation, and there we have to ask the question you just raised. What does the interpretation mean in that regard? That is a question I don't want to take time with here now. It's the sort of question I'd rather have you give me in writing and I'll see whether it fits in with the course of our discussion or whether I should discuss it with you personally. I wish you would give it to me in writing.

That is all figurative, all symbol. The interpretation is all

separate by a ~~xxxxx~~ verse from the vision. The two are completely separate and distinct, in Daniel 2. When you come to the interpretation in Daniel 2, the interpretation is all, I believe, literal. It contains an occasional repetition. Whereas you saw this, this means this. The full meaning may not be expressed (explained) -- you can infer somethings sometimes. Except for repetition it is entirely literal.

When you come to ch. 7 the situation is very different. So different that I have made a list I think it would be interesting for you to look at. (Pass these out please). This is on the lower part of the page. I have mentioned that in ch. 7 the vision ~~x~~ runs from vv. 2-14. That vision is figurative except for ~~x~~ the last verse of it which would seem to be definitely literal. The rest is clearly figurative. I said with the possible exception of ~~xxx~~ much of vv. 9, 10 and 13. There are certain questions in those three vv. as to what is literal and what figurative.

As I say there the vision in ch. 7 runs from vv. 2-14. That is quite obvious. It is all figurative except the last verse (v. 14) "There was given him dominion, and glory and a kingdom that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away" That is a pretty literal statement.

How did he see that in the vision? Perhaps a voice said it, and he heard it. It is a quite literal statement. But the rest of the vision is figurative, except that in vv. 9, 10, and 13 there are certain statements on which we might have a question. We will look at them later in detail.

In ch. 7 the interpretation that is given is a part of the vision. Notice I said, Interpretation still in vision. The whole thing was a vision, but in the vision we read that Daniel came near to one of those who stood by and asked him the truth of all this and he told me making known the interpretation. Then we have an interpretation given which is only three vv. These three vv. are literal, with the possible exception of the phrase at the end of v. 17. Then the strange thing is that after he's been given this very brief interpretation which quickly summarizes the whole thing, then in v. 19 we find Daniel expresses his desire for more information and he repeats part of the vision. As he ~~repeats part of the vision~~ repeats part of the vision he gives a little more detail than before.

So we have a further description of a part of the vision in vv. 19-22. Vv. 19-20 are clearly figurative. Vv. 21-22 are mostly literal. Then in answer to this further question which gave us further repetition in part of what he's seen already, then we have interpretation from vv. 23-28. It's interesting to see how different it is from the very simple interpretation we have in ch. 2.

That would be the assignment for today. We go back now to ch. 2. We were looking at

E. The Fifth Part of the Statue. I think I gave you # 2 under E. Note the symbolic meaning of potter's clay (weak or brittle).

3. Does the Statement in v. 43 simply mean an unintegrated mixture of peoples?

a. If so, it will fit the whole history of each of these empires. The Babylonians not only conquered many nations but they mixed them together and carried people out from one section to another and from that to a third, etc. So they were all mixed. The statement of v. 43 about the feet being mixed with iron and clay . . . they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men but they shall not cleave one to another. The mixture of iron and clay is clearly a statement it is brittle. But this verse seems to go beyond that.

The most simple suggestion is that it is an unintegrated mixture of peoples. But if ~~it~~ so it would fit the Babylonian empire; it would fit the Persian empire which conquered many kingdoms and mixed them together to some extent. It would fit the Hellenistic empire which conquered the whole Persian empire and made a great conglomeration of people instead of a small group of Greeks or Macedonians controlling the whole.

It would certainly fit the Roman empire. So it does not seem to be anything distinctive. All it means is an unintegrated mixture of peoples, except that perhaps the mixture became greater between 400 and 600 A.D. than before. At that time Germanic tribes were marching back and forth across the Roman empire totally destroying and settling down here and there. But ~~there had been~~ there had been Germanic peoples entering the ~~Roman empire~~ Roman empire in the previous six centuries -- entering in small groups and being assimilated. So it might fit that period a little better but it might fit any period.

b. The possibility remains that v. 43 points to something that is not obvious. (Reading KJV of v. 43). Some have tried to make out that it shows inter-marriage in ruling families. Well, there was that in all the kingdoms. So that would not be a distinctive feature. There was that in just about every period. It's a peculiar statement. It may simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people that became more pronounced between 400 and 600 than ever before.

Or it may include some element that is not clear. If any of you have any good suggestions as to what it might be I wish you would write them out and give them to me. I confess that at present I'm not sure that it does represent something more than that, but the peculiar language suggests that to me very strongly. What it is I do not know.

4. The ~~xx~~ Marked Similarity of this (the 5th part) of the feet and toes ~~with~~ to the condition of the Roman empire between A.D. 400 and 600 should be noted. At that time you had the western half of the Roman empire being crossed by various barbarian tribes, conquering, pillaging, destroying, settling down for a period at one time and moving to another. You have a condition of intermixture of peoples far greater than ever before. You have weakness along with strength. You have the violence of the conquering tribes. You have a certain amount of strength remaining in the Roman empire, but not much.

What you did have came from some of these Germanic tribes who

gave what real strength there was to the Roman empire during this time, but its name and its reputation carried a great deal of weight. It's a period of great intermingling of people. There is a marked similarity of those two centuries to that description.

5. Verse 34 says the stone strikes the statue upon its feet of iron and clay.

In a symbolic picture there are apt to be many elements that are just part of the picture and do not convey a meaning, like the two arms and possibly the ten fingers. We don't know whether the fingers were shown or not or whether Nebuchadnezzar noticed them or not. We don't know whether the arms were longer than usual or shorter than usual. There were the normal features that a statue would have so that to know which have a meaning you need an interpretation. Unless you have something pictured that is very unusual. Like you have here different metals. The metals themselves may not have had a specific meaning, but the fact that you have a different metal certainly is an unusual thing which has meaning. There is a change from one empire to another.

The stone strikes the statue and it specifically says upon its feet of iron and clay. Since the statue represents a progression of events, when it specifically says the stone strikes the statue on the feet of iron and clay that suggests very strongly that the event described by the hitting of the statue by the stone and demolishes it, is something that would take place in the fifth period of the statue, rather than in one of the first four. That would seem to me to be quite obvious.

But there are those who do not like that idea at all. I noticed in one commentary the statement is made: The striking of the feet is symbolical and does not necessarily have any particular reference to the fourth kingdom. The image is struck on the feet because such a blow will cause it to totter and fall. Where else would one strike a blow that would cause the entire image to fall?"

That is a case where a man has a certain interpretation that he wants to stand for and so he tries to twist everything in line with it or explain away anything that does not fit with it. This particular commentary I am not criticizing it greatly on this account. It is a little worse than a good many commentaries in this direction but not a great deal. Most people approach it with a definite idea in mind and they try to fit everything in with their idea or explain away what does not seem to fit. It is specifically said the stone strikes the image upon its feet that are of iron and clay. Why bother to tell where it struck? Why not just say it struck the image and destroyed it? There would seem likely to be some reason for saying where it struck, but more than that hitting it on the feet is a very unusual and strange thing! If one of you were standing here and if for some reason I wanted to demolish you, I can't imagine I'd pick up a stone and try to hit you upon the feet! I think that would be the last place I would think of aiming it. If there was a statue here I wanted to knock over, I might hit it in the head, in the chest, perhaps even in the legs but I can't imagine I would try to hit it in the feet to try to knock it over!

It is so obviously something that is unusual, something that is strange-- it is so specifically named here-- that it is ludicrous when a commentator tries to get rid of it by a statement like this! An absurd statement! Where else would you hit it? Well anywhere except there, if you would hit it.

So we've noted that as a specific fact about the fifth part of the statue. Verse 34 says that was where the stone strikes the statue on its feet.

F. The Dynamic Series of events.

We have been looking at the parts of the statue. Now things began to move. Let's look at the Biblical statements about these events. Here I have reference to the sheet that I gave out. This was the assignment for last week. You were to look at them and see how the statements made relate to each of these three events we have noted here.

The three events are the 1) origin of the stone 2) the effect of the stone upon the statue, and 3) the enlargement, or growth of the stone. I have taken the verses ~~x 24x42x44~~ vv.34-35 and vv. 44-45 and taken the KJV of those verses and I have arranged them to indicate which relate ~~to~~ to those three events.

In the account of the events, you'll notice there is first an introduction: "thou sawest unti." That connects it with what precedes. Looking at the image then he sees the events as they happen.

The first of these is the origin: a stone was cut without hands. Then we have its effect upon the stone: it strikes the image, and completely demolishes it. It uses very strong language to show how every part of the image gets all mixed together and it is all carried off so that there is nothing left of it. Then the growth of the stone.

In the interpretation, it begins with an introduction: "In the days of these kings." Then, the origin is rather summarized: "the ~~g~~ God of heaven will set up a kingdom." It's not merely the origin; it summarizes the whole thing. But it specifically deals with the first and last parts. The God of heaven sets up the kingdom, and the stone fills the whole earth is paralleled by the fact that the kingdom he sets up will never be destroyed and that kingdom will not be left to other people.

Then he goes on in v.44 to tell about the demolition of the statue. "He shall break to pieces and consume all these kingdoms." We do not take that altogether literally. It does not mean that the people of those kingdoms are all broken to pieces; it does not mean the land is all broken to pieces, or the buildings are all broken to pieces! It means that the characteristic features of these kingdoms are all demolished. Everything represented by the gold, the silver, the bronze, the iron and clay is demolished. Everything that is typified by Nebuchadnezzar's empire and by these other empires which rule over the earth, most of them in defiance of God, most of them in utter disregard of his righteous

laws. They were broken in pieces and consumed. And then we have a reiteration of the fact "and it shall stand forever." Again part of the last part.

Then we go back to origin again by simply repeating the statements in the vision: "Forasmuch as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hand . . ." And then a repetition of the destruction of the statue. And that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver and the gold. Then there is the final conclusion.

I have ~~a~~ to say a word about the first phrase in the interpretation. "In the days of these kings." You ask immediately, What kings? You will find many commentators who tell you that they are kings who are described in ch. 7. Well, it is quite unbelievable that Daniel in the time of Nebuchadnezzar speaking of him would use a phrase that was referring to something that was not revealed to him (Daniel) until 45 years later. We can use a later revelation to throw further light on an earlier revelation, but we cannot read it back into the earlier revelation.

My purpose in this course is not to find what Scripture teaches about the future. My purpose is certainly not to give you my interpretation of all these passages. My purpose is to go through it with you, carefully seeing what is clear and definite, and what there is on which perhaps we would not know the answer and would have to wait for further revelation from God.

Here he says "in the days of these kings" the only reasonable interpretation would be he means the kings already mentioned. It has mentioned, Nebuchadnezzar. It has mentioned the kingdoms that followed. The terms king and kingdom are sometimes interchanged. They are used rather loosely. Instead of referring to the man or referring to the whole kingdom over which he rules. In this case ~~xxxxx~~ the whole context would seem to require that when he says "in the days of these kings" he means that within the time represented by these four nations and the fifth, whether it be a part of the fourth, or whether it be a separate kingdom. That's not made clear in this ch., but it is made clear in ch. 7. In either case it is in the days of the kings we are talking about. There are commentaries which say, Of course this is referring to the ten toes." They represent 10 kings and in the days of the 10 kings represented by the 10 toes this is going to happen.

Methodologically that is reading too much into this statement. It is only 45 years later that anything is revealed about the number 10 in connection with the fifth part of the vision. So we are not warranted in reading that back. Now if the statement were made there were 10 toes, something to call attention specifically to the toes that perhaps might give a little ground for such an interpretation that the 10 toes represent 10 kings. Unless you have the statement here, it is very hazzardous to read something like that into a _____. You may find that taught in ch. 7 but I don't believe we can read it back at this point.

So here we must see == be wary of taking a view that has been adopted and reading it into what ~~it~~ is there, either by saying the 10 toes, the number of which is not mentioned here --there is nothing said about the toes having a specific meaning anymore than the fingers, the eyes, the noes, or any other part of the image, and to say that now has meaning. Or on the other hand when it specifically says something unusual such as it struck the image upon its feet and to say, Where else could it strike and knock it over. They are both reading into it a previously established system. Now we want not to read in anything, but to read out what we find there.

2. The Origin of the stone. As to the origin, all that is said is on the sheet that I just gave you. We are told the stone was cut without hands in Daniel's account of the vision. But in his interpretation he says, Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands." It does not say the stone was a new creation. It does not say something came into existence that did not exist before. It does say "it was cut out." There is a new phase. There is a new form, a new representation in some way.

A stone was cut out of the mountain without hands. We can very clearly draw from this the teaching that the origin of the stone is entirely supernatural. It is not something that any human being or human force produced.

The early church fathers felt that in this passage there was a definite reference to the Virgin Birth. I'm not sure we can be quite as certain as that. We must state it as a possibility that the being cut out without hands refers to the supernatural birth of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is certainly a possibility but one on which we should not speak dogmatically. At least not at this point.

The second of the dynamic events is the effect on the statue. The effect is rather fully described in the picture in vv. 34-35, and also in the end of the interpretation, v. 45. It breaks in pieces all the different parts of the statue. It breaks it into tiny pieces so that the wind carries it away and there is nothing left of it. The completeness of the destruction is surely emphasized here.

This certainly does not represent something that is going to take place in certain sections of the world scattered here and there. It is something that completely eradicates the previous situation. The completeness of the destruction is stressed just about as completely as anything can be stressed. There is in this an end to all that the statue symbolizes. All of human glory. All of clever human organization. All of human violence. All of human autocracy. All the things that are represented by the different parts of the statue. It is not merely the fifth part of the statue that is destroyed; they all are destroyed.

How could they all be destroyed when the Babylonian empire can to an end many many centuries before this stone strikes the image? Because the qualities of them are much the same throughout.

There is a different nation, a different language, a different culture, but that which is symbolized by Nebuchadnezzar's control and the activities of his government, is found in the Persian government also, and is found in the Hellenistic government and the Roman government. Different forms, varying amounts of freedom on the part of individuals, varying at different times within these governments but there is always that big government autocracy control over the lives of people mixed with graft and corruption and violence and clever human organizations and clever human plans which is characteristic of these empires. And we are told that is all completely demolished, completely destroyed by the Stone.

So the completeness of the destruction is one thing that is very greatly stressed here.

4. The Growth of the Stone.

It is made definite that the stone which demolished the image completely, grows until it fills the whole earth. The picture seems to be the picture of a rapid change. But it does not say the stone grows at lightening speed until it fills the whole earth. It does not say even that the stone cut out of the mountain comes with lightening speed to hit the statue. Neither of those statements is made. So while it is absolutely clear that it fills all the earth and that the statue and all it stands for is completely demolished we have a question: Is the growth gradual or rapid? A question which we cannot say is dogmatically answered in the picture.

Then there is another question. When does the growth of the stone begin? Does the stone begin to enlarge and to fill the whole earth only after the entire statue is demolished? Or is the growth of the stone a thing that begins at an earlier time? That we cannot be dogmatic about either from the picture or from the interpretation.

→ G. Various Attempts at relating these dynamic events to history. I have said that relate these dynamic events to history. I have not said relating the whole prophecy to history, because the four kingdoms are pretty clear. We have a long history about which we know many facts. We have many remarkable points fitting together between the picture as shown here and the events during a thousand years after the time of Daniel.

So we are particularly interested now in attempts to relate dynamic events with history. First we notice the view of the critics ~~Christians~~. This is the view which was published in the 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D. by Porphyry. A view which was attacked by Christian writers in the next few centuries and which in the last two or three centuries has been adopted by most of the so-called higher critics and by men who would not wish to be called higher critics. There are many commentaries on Daniel which adopt this view of the critics.

According to this view the book of Daniel was not written at the time of Nebuchadnezzar. It was written about 400 yrs. later.

According to this view it was written at the time when the ~~Assyrians~~ Syrian kings, from this Hellenistic empire, tried to put a complete end to the Jewish religion. A great persecution was involved in this and a group of Jews fled into the wilderness. There was gathered together a band which attacked these various parts of the Syrian control and eventually won complete freedom for Judea, a freedom which lasted for about a century.

These leaders came to be called the Maccabees. This period we can speak of as the time of the Maccabees and according to this view which is held by all the critics and by some who would not call themselves critics, the book of Daniel was written by someone of that period who made out to be ~~by~~ prophecy what was really his knowledge of history. And thus he showed as if it was predicted 400 years earlier the course of events up to his time. Then when it gets to his time it goes on with prophecy and what it contains is only wishful hopes. He believes-- or at least he ~~tries~~ tries to get the people to believe that they were to be delivered from their difficulties by God intervening and completely destroying this wicked power that was trying to destroy them.

That is a view which it is surprising you will find some men who are usually thought of as very earnest Christians presenting this view in their commentaries. For instance, F. W. Farrar, the author of the Life of Christ, which is highly regarded ~~as~~ he has a commentary on Daniel in which he takes this view. The same is true of Moses Stuart of Andover. Both of them have written some fine Christian material but have taken this view regarding Daniel. I personally don't see how they can because the NT -- Christ definitely takes the attitude that the OT is entirely true and reliable.

When you look at history that is a great difficulty with this view. According to this view the time of the Maccabees has to be the fourth kingdom. And according to history it is only the third kingdom. As you have in on your sheet of the history I have you all last week, Nebuchadnezzar's empire was succeeded by the Persian empire which lasted for two centuries and that by the Hellenistic empire. So we have three empires. The Romans came later--the fourth, and there are four empires in this picture. Either ~~there is~~ a fifth nor a second part of the fourth

So that is a very great difficulty with a view that imagines a Median empire between the Babylonian and the Persian. The book of Daniel specifically tells us that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar was given to the Medes and Persians putting them together as one empire. That is one view, the view of the critics.

A second view which you will not find in any commentary as far as I know is the obvious view as it might be seen at A.D. 750 if the NT were left out of consideration. In A.D. 750 a person who knew nothing about the NT could look at this picture in Daniel and say, There's the Babylonian empire conquered by the Persian empire, conquered by the Hellenistic empire, and then conquered by the Roman empire. The Roman empire stood there for as long as the two ~~preceding~~ preceding ones put together. In fact, longer than the two preceding ones--maybe as long as the other three. It was a great, powerful

empire until c. 400 A.D.: Between 400 and 600 A.D. you have a period when the Roman empire was largely broken into pieces. And when these German tribes were going through and seizing this part and that part and the other part, and at 400 A.D. let us say the probability is that 3/4 of the people of the Roman empire could read and write.

And by 500 A.D. in the western empire at least, I doubt if one person in thirty could read and write. There was -- There was a tremendous decline in every aspect of civilization during those years between 400 and 600 A.D. Then at 600 there came a new force into ~~the~~ the world. A force which its followers believed was a supernatural force! Mohammed declared God had sent him. He declared there is one God and Mohammed is his prophet. He declared that all people should turn and believe in one God and ~~after~~ after preaching this for a number of years and getting perhaps 8 or 10 and being in danger for his life in Mecca. Finally he fled from Mecca and went to Medina and there he started a new system, starting to force people to adopt his view. And building Arab tribes into enthusiasm for his teachings and also for the plunder they were getting. The armies marched out shortly after 600 A.D. and in a very few years most of the eastern empire had been conquered. The new Persian force that had developed had been completely overcome. All of N. Africa had been overrun. Spain had been taken and it look as if the whole world was going to fall into their hands.

So here is what == something which its believers felt was a supernatural thing, something which seemed about to completely destroy the empires which preceded and which seemed about to grow so as to fill the whole earth.

So you have the obvious view as it would appear to somebody living at c. 750 A.D. if the NT is left out of consideration. But you have here a great difficulty, just as you had with the critic's view. The difficulty is that what appeared to be the case in 750 A.D., no longer appears to be the case today. There was this tremendous spread of Mohammedanism which held the land of Israel for c. 800 years, Jerusalem was in Moslem hands. It spread over a large part of the world and looked as if ~~the~~ it was going to conquer the world, but eventually it became weak and today it would have little hold on the world if it were not for the money it receives from the oil. Today it is a comparatively weak force in the world.

So here is something which might have appeared to be precisely the fulfillment, but which did not work out. There are other interpretations I was hoping to get over today. We will not try to get the conclusion as to the correct ~~interpretation~~ interpretation in ch. 2 but will look forward to further evidence from other sections.

I will post the notices of the next assignment.

When you are speaking ordinarily you will try to give people the truth as you find it. Give Scriptural evidence of what you believe is true. Only occasionally will you try to teach people to study the Bible for themselves. I wish that was done more often than it is. But a greater part of a Christian worker's task is passing on to others what he personally believes. However, in his own words there are two equally important tasks. One is passing on to others the truth you have found in Scripture, but equally important is that you be constantly handling the Scripture right so that you are learning more of what God wants you to know from the Scripture. In this course our purpose is related to that part of your work.

I think it is not the one that will take the greatest part of your time, but I think it is really the most important. Because it is very easy for us to jump to conclusions on things that may not seem to make any difference at present, but as new situations arise, we don't know what may come where our hasty interpretation of Scripture can lead people astray.

So in Dan. 2 my purpose has not been to get all the truth I can~~xx~~ for me from Dan. 2, but my purpose has been to find what is clearly taught in Dan. 2, and to see what the points are at which we cannot gather answers without looking elsewhere for further evidence. That is not ordinarily part of our present task. Our present task is to see what Dan. 2 has.

In Dan. 2 we find there is a statue which has four principal metals in it. The argument has been made that there are four kingdoms here. But then we find that the feet and toes -- in the feet and toes the iron is mixed with clay. So the question comes: Is this a fifth kingdom or is this another stage of the fourth kingdom? From Dan. 2 you cannot decide that question. From Dan. 2 either answer would be possible. And so the answer as to whether there are four kingdoms or five kingdoms that are typified by the statue, is one at which we have to look at evidence further, and I believe we find evidence answering that question later.

So for the present I am speaking of the statue as five parts. We notice it speaks of "after you there will arise another kingdom" and another third kingdom which shall bear rule over all the earth, and the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.

Then it says in v. 41, "Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of clay and part of iron, these kingdoms shall be divided. Does this mean the fifth kingdom, or does it mean a further stage in the fourth kingdom? It perhaps sounds a little bit more like the latter than like the former. But we should not come to conclusions on it in ch. 2. We should see whether Daniel is given further light later on. You probably all noticed that in connection with your assignment for today. So that's the answer to that question whether there are 4 kingdoms or 5.

As far as Dan. 2 is concerned, we cannot be dogmatic. But when we come to Dan. 7 we may find evidence that will give a definite answer.

The other question related to symbols and this is very important. Nebuchadnezzar had a dream which was a symbol. We could not understand what it symbolized except as it was explained to us. It might describe things from the bottom up, it might describe them from the top down! Or it might describe things that will all happen at once in different parts of the world. The statue had many parts to it. If every one of those parts had a meaning it would have a tremendous amount of information contained in that statue. If you don't have anything in the statue but what has a meaning, it would be hard to recognize it at all as a statue.

So there have to be features in any symbol which are not necessarily part of the meaning. If you say of a man, He was a lion in the fight, you don't mean that he went out and chewed up the enemy or he scratched him to pieces with his fingernails! You are taking the idea of a lion as being brave, powerful, and fearless, and that is all you are taking from the symbol. Many other things in the symbol of the lion would have little relevance.

So in any symbol there are quite sure to be elements present that are just part of the picture, and that do not necessarily have a meaning. We do not find in this statue any particular meaning for the eyes, the nose, the ears. The second kingdom is represented by the breast and arms. We do not have any reason to think that the Persian empire had one center and two other important but subsidiary elements. It is just a part of the picture.

Now when we get to the feet and the toes we are told how many toes there are. Now if we were told that on the right foot it had three toes and on the left foot it had four toes, we could say, Why on earth do they mention such a peculiar thing? Surely there must be a reason for it. But if it said that it had five toes on each foot, you'd ~~say~~ say that was just a natural part of the picture. In order to decide whether a part of the symbol has meaning, the most important thing is, Is it explained in the Scripture? Scripture says, Thou art this head of gold. Now we know the head stands either for Nebuchadnezzar himself or for something of which Nebuchadnezzar was an important part. We know that because we are definitely told that the head has a meaning. We are not told that the eyes or ears or the nose (have meaning) or anything like that. We are told the feet and toes represent the fifth part of the picture of the future that is given in the statue.

The most important way to tell if a thing has meaning is if it is explicitly stated. There is nothing explicitly said about the toes having meaning separate from the meaning of the feet, any more than there is about the fingers having a separate meaning & distinct from the hands.

Another way to tell is if there is something, unusual, something very strange, something that is not normally to be expected in the statue. Then we can say probably this has a specific meaning. Well now, ten & toes does not have a specific meaning. Three on one foot and four on the other would!

So unless we have a Scriptural statement, we have no basis on which to say the toes have a specific meaning. It may be that later on we will find a parallel somewhere which will say that the number 10 is important at this time. If we do, that is fine to get that information, if that is additional information, not information we can get from Daniel 2.

But there are some who carry that to an extent which in my opinion is utterly indefensible when they say that in the days of these kings God will set up a kingdom-- that the phrase "these kings" refers to the 10 toes, which refer they say to 10 kings. You may find later on there are 10 kings at this time. But if such a fact was revealed ~~44~~ 45 years later, it is not sensible to think that 45 years earlier he would say "in the days of these kings" refers to kings whose existence was not even known until later! So that particular phrase "in the days of these kings" must mean in the time covered by the whole statue, in the time covered by all the kings represented by the statue. Somewhere in that time, and not refer to the toes.

This is not near so important for the question as to the toes, as it is to the whole question on the method of interpretation. That is why I felt it was wise to take the time on it. I appreciate very much having the question given to me.

Let me repeat again, If I make a mistake-- likewhen I typed out the assignment for next time, I said examine carefully Isaiah 7:13. Mr. Koontz pointed out to me that I said Isaiah and he thought surely I meant Daniel, and I did. So when I make a slip like that as everyone makes a mistake when they speak -- some few more than I do, and many less than I do, but everyone makes some foolish mistakes, so please call my attention to something I say that is confusing and that does not make clear what I am trying to say, please call my attention to it. But if you have a question like these two excellent questions I have given the answer to that might be worth a little time, I wish you would write it out so that I might consider how much time I should give it in class or whether I should speak to you personally about it, or whether I know it might be something I know will be covered within the next two lectures and therefore we would not need to go into it right at the present.

At our last time together we began speaking about

G. Various attempts at relating these dynamic events to history.

1. View of the critics -- which you will find in many books written on Daniel, even by very godly Christians. We noticed that this view considered the prophecies in the book of Daniel after the time of the Maccabees are only wishful hopes. There may be wishful hopes in Scripture. If there are we believe they will be identified as such. We don't believe we can take a verse of Scripture and merely say, This is the hope of the writer, unless the context makes it quite clear that that is true.

2. The most obvious view as seen at A.D. & 750 -- how very very similar the condition of the Roman empire from 400-600 is to the description of the fifth part of the statue. Very similar. The other four kingdoms coming one right after the other with no

break between them, it is quite natural to think this is still continuing right after that. Then it is very striking that right at 600 A.D., right at that period which so exactly fits this-- except for the one phrase that I really don't know what it means -- "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men"-- I really don't know what that means. Certainly it does not mean intermarriage because we had that in all periods.

But right at that time there arose a movement which seemed to its followers to be a supernatural movement, thus corresponding to the stone cut without hands. It came suddenly, quickly. People never dreamed that the Eastern Roman Empire and the new Persian Empire were fighting back and forth, each of them trying to overcome the other, never dreaming that a little group of bedouins in the desert would ever be a problem to them. Then all of the sudden out of the desert came this great horde of Arabs following Mohammed and declaring that everyone on earth must accept their teachings or be killed. The one exception was those who believed in one God. They were not killed. They were given extra taxation; they were treated as second class citizens but were allowed to live.

But all pagans, all heathens, all except Jews and Christians the Mohammedans killed, in their conquests unless they would accept the Koran(?) and it spread eastward over a great part of Asia, and it spread westward and took over the whole of the Near East. It took over Palestine and Syria and it went all the way across N. Africa. One of the most fertile and important parts of the Roman empire. It took over all of Spain. It looked as if all the world was to fall to the Mohammedans. It seemed to exactly to fit this prediction and came right at that time.

Those living in 750 A.D. would have found it very difficult to answer an assertion if such an assertion had been made, that here was a fulfillment of Daniel's prediction. It fit so exactly.

But of course today we don't have to argue about that, because though it spread over most of the parts of the world that had been covered by those three kingdoms, it was stopped, and while it held the Bible lands for more than 1000 years right up until 1917, yet during the last two centuries it has made comparatively little progress and I don't think anybody today-- at least no non-Mohammedan would think that it was the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy.

3. View of the early Christians.

Here, at the moment, I'm not so much trying to find an answer to their attitude toward Daniel 2, as to look a bit at what they expected in general. We find a first evidence of what they expected in Acts 1:6-8, "When they therefore were come together they asked of him saying, Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Here were these disciples who had been with Jesus for anywhere from 2 to 3 years, and had been constantly been hearing his teaching. He had been raised from the dead and they now say, Are you now going to restore the kingdom to Israel? Well now, if his intention had been to establish a kingdom solely in the hearts of

people, a kingdom which would not have an outward expression, a kingdom which would not destroy all that the old statue represented in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and they asked him a question like this after he was raised up from the dead, I'm afraid he would feel like I do after I had been teaching for sometime and a person would ask me a question about something I had been discussing for half an hour, and he would feel like saying, What's the use?

He did not say, You are entirely wrong; the kingdom is never going to be restored to Israel; it is not going to be anything like the OT kingdom; this is a new regime purely in the hearts of people and it will be spread through the word and until all recognize me as their leader and all human society is changed by the progress of the Gospel! But that's not what he said. He said, It is not for you to know the time or the season which the Father has put in His own power.

I think we ought to remember that that the Father has put it in his own power, and it is not for us to know it. He repeatedly said we should be ready in case He comes right soon. If He should come tomorrow we should be ready for Him. On the other hand, there are not too many people saying we know He is coming in this generation because he may come in this generation, but I am sure St. Augustine as he lay on his bed-- deathbed and all civilization seemed to be tottering around him, he would have been horror stricken if anyone had said, The Lord won't come back for another 1500 years! Augustine would have said, What ~~ax~~ on earth are you talking about; he certainly -- I don't think anybody can say he might delay his return another 1000 years; we hope that he does not.

He says, It is not for you to know the times or the season which the Father has put in His own power, but you shall receive power ~~x~~ after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you and you~~x~~ shall topple all the kingdoms of the world and establish a kingdom of the saints in which there will be righteousness and peace ~~xxxx~~ everywhere! But that's not what he said. He said, You shall receive power after the Holy Spirit is come upon you, and you shall be witnesses to me, both in Jerusalem and in Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. So the work given them was to be witnesses; not necessarily a work of conquest or of complete victory.

We find at the end of Matthew (24:14): This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations; then shall the end come. He does not say, This gospel of the kingdom is going to conquer all the world and establish the kingdom. He said it is going to be preached for a witness. And at the end of Matthew he gave that Great Commission: ~~Go~~ Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always even unto the end of the age. We are commanded to witness, to teach, to spread the knowledge of Christ, but we are not in these passages given any promise that the statue will be toppled and the whole world taken over by the word that we use (by the work that we do).

There are many references in the Gospels to the return of Christ as an event that might occur soon. Many such references. Particularly in Mat. 24 and 25 and parallel passages, there are many cases where He says be ready for you don't know when the Son of Man will come.

After Paul spent his whole life witnessing to Christ, spreading His word, when he came to the end of his life in the two last epistles he wrote, in Titus 2:11-13 he says (quoting text . . .) He shows that at the end of his life, Paul was looking for the return of Christ. There are many statements that he thought it might come then. He was looking for it, up to the end of his life. In 2 Tim. 4:8 (quoting text . . .) The Greek word "appearing" here is a word that was regularly used when a king made a visit to one of his dominions. It is looking for the coming of Christ very definitely.

Now many of the early Christian writers quote the statement about the stone cut without hands and say this is a prediction of the virgin birth. Certainly the virgin birth was a supernatural event, an event that was made without hands. It is a figurative expression, but the meaning would fit very appropriately with the virgin birth. They quoted that as being predicted here. There is a problem, however, in taking it as referring to the virgin birth. That is, that the virgin birth occurs very early in the fourth kingdom. The Roman empire did not begin its great period of decline until nearly 400 A.D. and this was 400 years before ~~that~~ that when Christ was born. That is a problem. The stone cut without hands ~~xxxxxx~~ struck the image. The stone might conceivably have been cut without hands and struck the image later on. But it does become a problem in considering that the virgin birth is specifically predicted in this passage.

The disciples went out and witnessed for many years and as they witnessed groups of Christians came together in every section, in every place. There was much persecution. There was difficulty from the very beginning, right at the beginning of the Christian church, Stephen was martyred and Paul was stoned. There were great problems, but the Gospel spread as they witnessed but in all these centuries that ~~xx~~ have passed, I doubt if there has ever been a city that could be said to be 100% Christian. I doubt if there has ever been a sizeable section of the world in which you could say that Christ's Word was entirely supreme there. There are certainly parts of the kingdom of Christ. We try to follow Him as King and Lord, but He certainly did not conquer any substantially large section of the world, or any small section completely.

However they had persecutions and God tempered these persecutions. I think that's one thing we should remember. Sometimes we get the impression that during the first 400 years there was just one terrible persecution after another and the gospel can withstand any persecution!

Now in Japan in the 17th century, a bishop of the RC's

went there and they established a very sizeable missionary work. They had a great many converts, and then one of the Spanish officers, if I am correctly informed, at a meeting of some of the Japanese leaders became rather I guess and he talked with them rather frankly, and he said, These friars are coming in here and they are getting people to turn from their Japanese religion and turn to Christianity and when we get the nation all softened up we will simply take it over. At any rate they got that impression. There was a tremendous persecution, and RC Christianity was pretty well wiped out.

Nestorian Christianity is much closer to our belief than RC Christianity, but the Nestorians did a tremendous work in the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries in which they spread the Gospel through Asia Minor eastward across India, and there were great Christian churches in China-- hundreds of them-- a tremendous Christian population all through that part of Asia. The Mongul conquerers turned strongly against it and persecuted it and wiped it out so completely that the memory of it was completely forgotten in an area where there had been thousands of Christians.

So we cannot say that Christianity cannot be wiped out of an area by persecution. I understand that there are many secret believers in China today, but no public Christian propaganda or meeting can be held, in that country which holds nearly 1/4 of the world's population today.

But during the period of the Roman empire there were terrible persecutions, but in between there were long periods in which there was no persecution at all. Fifty years before the time of Constantine a Roman emperor made an edict of toleration. During those 50 years many church buildings were built-- fine buildings, and maybe 1/10, maybe as much as 1/4 of the people of the Roman empire became Christians. But then shortly before the Emperor Constantine died, Diocletian began a great persecution-- the greatest the church had ever gone through. Thousands were martyred. There was terrible persecution, but the persecution did not destroy the church. Constantine declared himself Christian. When he began-- became emperor, and put a complete end to the persecution and many of the Christians at this time-- 300 years after the time of Christ felt that now the time of universal rule of Christ had come. Constantine issued many very fine edicts and improved conditions throughout the Roman empire and gave tolerance to all religions but great favor to Christianity and many Christians even ceased to think of the possibility of the Lord coming back and thought now we have the kingdom of God on earth!

However, not very long afterward it became quite obvious that many of the Christian rulers were not very different from pagan rulers. Many of those were nominal Christians. These changes occurred in the attitude of the early Christians. We will look at them further under other heads.

4. Suggested fulfillment in the Papacy.

On the sheet I have out with facts and dates, I mentioned the rise of the papacy and gave the dates. Canossa, 1077 A.D.

That's 1000 years after the time of ~~Christ~~. C rist. But by that time there were bishops in Rome who declared that God had established them to be supreme over all the earth, and that every monarch was bound to obey them. One thing that made people think that this claim was true was what happened at Canossa in N. Italy when the German Emperor had been excommunicated by the pope and all his people ~~xxx~~ turned against him. As a result he walked barefoot in penitent garb down through Germany in winter, across the mountains into Italy and the Pope came North to meet him.

At Northern Italy at the castle of Canossa he got there when the Pope was there and the Pope made him stand shivering and barefoot with comparatively little on, all day in the courtyard waiting to see him. Then they led him inside the castle where he spent the night and they put him out in the courtyard again and kept him out that way for 3 days before the Pope let him come to him. Then he came, knelt ~~2~~ before the Pope and promised to do everything he wanted.

The Pope then raised him up and promised to support him as emperor and that is often referred to as evidence that the Pope had gotten supreme control over the world ~~the~~ the new kingdom, the kingdom of God!

But people forget that when Henry IV went back to Germany he reniged on everything he had promised and he now gathered an army and opposed the forces of the Pope and that Pope actually had to flee and died in exile.

Pope Innocent III one hundred years later was able to carry out over a longer period his power in various kingdoms and ordered the kings in Europe to do this and that and to stop doing this and that. He was the most powerful of all the popes in his power over the various forces of Europe. But no Pope since has anything like the political power that Innocent III had 700 -- 750 years ago.

The power of the papacy was never complete. It, like the power of Islam to a large extent disappeared.

5. Social gospel.

This was a viewpoint which was widely presented ~~in~~ just a few ~~xxxxx~~ years ago. In all our big churches that were hundreds of churches in the U.S. at which 100 years ago the gospel was presented with power and with absolute loyalty to the Word as the ministers understood it. But 50 - 60 years ago had ministers who felt that their work was to bring in the kingdom of God by introducing social reforms of various types in the world. One of their greatest enthusiasms was prohibition. When I was a boy there was hardly a church where you did not hear two or three sermons a year on prohibition, on how terrible liquor is, and the terrible results that have come from it. Certainly the results today are much worse than they were in those days because our cars go so much faster than they did then. But the movement of prohibition of alcoholic liquors, and of doing

away with corruption in government, and of getting universal peace was something that was going to bring in the kingdom of God. This was the great social gospel, preached then and advocated today by the NCC and WCC who give large sums of money to revolutionary movements in many parts of the world thinking that thereby they are going to bring in the kingdom of God. We will not need to linger over that in this class. It certainly does not fit the picture. It has no correspondence with the picture in Daniel of the stone cut without hands hitting the image and completely demolishing it and growing until it fills the whole earth.

6. A view today which is quite a widespread and widespread among many earnest Christians is a view which considers that the church is the stone. The church is actually the stone which is going to grow until it fills the whole earth. This does not exactly fit the picture. Yet we must not insist on the symbolism being absolutely exact.

For instance the stone is cut without hands. The picture naturally seems as if it is cut and strikes the image right away. But it might conceivably be cut out and then might hit 1000 years later. That would not be really stretching the symbolism too far.

As we look at the picture it seems as if the stone hits the statue on the feet and it immediately falls and breaks into pieces. Then that little stone grows to fill the whole earth. But it is not inconceivable that that might represent a situation in which the little stone grew to quite an extent before it actually knocked over the statue! That is to say, we must not insist on too rigid adherence to precise similarity to the picture. But the figure that through the preaching of the gospel people are going to be converted sufficiently to make this world truly a thoroughly Christian world in which most everybody is Christian and in which Christian principles will rule in the government of all our nations, is so far from the picture that it is pretty hard to fit it with this picture. So we can safely say it does not fit the picture.

I want to call your attention to four difficulties.

1. The time of origin. It is conceivable that the stone cut without hands represents the eternal pre-existence of Christ who existed from all eternity as the stone cut without hands. That's conceivable. It is also conceivable that a feature of Christ's power--the fact he was born of a virgin occurred quite a time before the actual smiting of the statue. But if it is the church that is going to destroy the statue then we certainly must say the church began in the very early days of the Roman empire and when it so explicitly says that it strikes the statue on its feet that were of iron and clay, this is a pretty big change from the picture Daniel describes. I think the time of origin is very much against this idea.

2. The NT commands and promises which we looked at in the views of early Christians. They were commanded to witness. They were told to look for the coming of Christ. They were not promised the victory. We used to have a great many hymns-- I have not heard them so much recently-- like Jesus shall reign where'er the sun

does his successive journeys run. It's kingdom spread from shore to shore till moon shall wax and wane no more." There were many hymns which expressed the confidence that the whole world was to be taken over by Christianity. We do not find the promise in Scripture that through the preaching of the Gospel the whole world will be converted. We have the promise that many will be won to Christ. It is the duty of true Christians to stand for what is good, to oppose what is evil, to give all the help you can in a material way to others, but the primary task is to witness to Christ.

So the commands and promises of Scripture do not fit with this idea which was once very widespread and is now again being pushed by some very earnest Christian people, is pushed very strongly by them.'

3. The Qualities of the Statue are still present.

One third of the world is held by regimes which absolutely control the lives and thoughts of the people who are subject to it. I've been reading an article which is in a magazine just recently that says how wonderful it is that there is no terrorism at all in three countries: China, Vietnam, and I forget what the other country was! No terrorism. In China you get a good snowstorm at 10:00 p.m., and immediately everyone gets out and cleans the streets. Immediately. In every block there is a man who has charge of watching every member of the block and noting exactly what their thoughts are, what their viewpoint is, what their deeds and actions are. You can walk anywhere in China any hour of the day or night with no danger of being violently attacked! That may be true, but when you have everything ordered and supervised by governmental power it is much more like the rule of Nebuchadnezzar than like the rule of the saints.

Nebuchadnezzar could not have the kind of autocracy which you can have today because they did not have the technological means to have it, but under these various rulers there was a totality an autocracy which you will find fully equaled in at least a third of the world, and to some extent in many many other parts of the world, today.

Certainly when you look at the number of our PA officials who have been convicted of corruption just within these last two years, we've gone very far from this establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth today. The qualities of the statue are still present.

4. Failure of hopes for the present establishment of the kingdom of God.

A book was published within the last 5 yrs. called the Puritan hope, in which the writer--a very earnest Christian-- tells about ~~the~~ the Puritans in England in 1600 A.D. disgusted with the rule of King James and his successors, how they were determined to establish a thoroughly Christian situation in England. Those Puritans had an uprising and got rid of the Stewarts, but after they did it they had all kinds of difficulties to face and soon they had all kinds of difficulties to face and they divided into groups among themselves with different ideas as to what they should do, and in 1660 the people voted the Stewarts back in and for the next 20 years they == it was impossible for a person, except for following

prescribed forms and ceremonies to preach in England. The theatre sunk to the lowest level of degeneracy it had ever seen in history and the king's court was really a house of prostitution during the next 30 years. England sunk to the lowest point in its history.

All those wonderful Puritan hopes of establishing the kingdom of God utterly failed. The book points out how at the beginning of that period some people who thought that could not be done in England moved over to the barren rocky cold shores of America up in New England. They established towns in which everyone was to follow the Bible. The Bible was the supreme in everything. Every Sunday they went to church and it was a two hour sermon in the morning and another two hour sermon in the evening. They did their best to have Christianity absolutely supreme in everything.

Some of their writings show how they said here is the country where Christianity is going to be absolutely supreme and they were going to bring in the kingdom of God. Many fine things were done by these Christian people, and we enjoy many of the benefits of the fine things they did, but today you go to most parts of New England and go to church after church and never find a mention of the Gospel. In fact, even within 150 years after the Puritans came their descendants had in the main departed so far from the Gospel that you would hardly recognize their teaching as Christian. Today it is far from one of the most Christian sections of the country.

great

There have been these ~~great~~ hopes of individuals, of groups, of colonies, of all sorts of organizations that are going to establish a present kingdom of God. But they never succeeded. There may be considerable extension, considerable growth of the kingdom of God, that is of the people who wish to follow Him and do His will before the statue is destroyed. We don't say that all the will necessarily come after the statue is destroyed. But certainly we have no reason to expect the establishment of the kingdom of Christ before He is here personally present, to establish it.

7. Second Advent of Christ is the Stone. Surely that seems to fit the picture better. Whether the cutting of the stone without hands refers to the originating of his having always been God, whether it involves in itself the virgin birth, whether it refers to the supernatural aspect of His coming to this earth, in either case it fits right in with this idea. The destruction of all the people in the world ~~at the return of Christ would~~ at the return of Christ would seem to fit it far better than any of these other suggestions and the stone will then arise and the kingdom of God will fill the whole earth after He comes. It surely fits the picture best, but there is one great difficulty. That is that the Roman empire disappeared. The Roman empire was very strong from c. 200 B.C. to c. 400 A.D.-- about as long as the first three put together. But the Roman empire after 600 A.D., in fact after 500 A.D., was practically nothing more than a name in the west. In the east a small remnant (?) around Constantinople continued to hold things until 1453 when it was taken by the Mohammedans. Nothing like this happened during those years of the decline of the Roman empire-- those years from 400 to 600 A.D.

So if this is what the picture means, we have the question: Does the picture of the image when the iron and the clay in some way covered the whole period since 400 A.D. is that possible? That long period. Or is it possible that there is an unmentioned ~~x~~ interval somewhere in the picture? Is an unmentioned interval a possibility? That is a question that cannot be answered from Daniel 2, and if we find no parallel to that thing we would certainly say it is not worthy of consideration.

So as we go on we will want to see whether there are parallels to this idea.

Now I'm just ready to start III Prophecy of Daniel 7. I had three pages already ~~written~~ written for it, but it is already 10 of.

Maybe I can barely refer to the assignment today which asks you to find parallels to the eight parts. You noticed in it the answer to the question whether there are 4 kingdoms or 5, I am sure. You noticed definite parallels to some of these parts and to others they were quite different. So we will look into those next time. The assignment is already posted.

Before we continue with our discussion of these sections of Daniel I want to look at the assignment for today. The assignment is important for itself, but I think more important for the principles of Bible interpretation that are invited in connection with it.

As you know in this class we are not trying to find out what does the Bible tell us about the future. We are trying to examine methods of looking at the book of Daniel to see what can we say with certainty about it; what are the points at which there are various possibilities of interpretation. And what are the widespread ideas about it that are false? We are trying to look at it very carefully from those viewpoints. On some matters we will not get dogmatic answers. I think we are better not to.

I find that where you take a verse or a passage of the Scripture and say, I've got to learn everything that this means is not the right approach. You do that and you get many things from it that are very valuable, and if you study Hebrew you get more. But there is a danger that you take certain things and you jump to conclusions. Then those conclusions that you jump to you later on think have been proven.

I think it is much better that you say, Here's something I don't know the answer to, here's something I don't know the answer to but you keep those things in mind. Then as you study some other part of Scripture, the answer to it is there and you would even have noticed it if you did not have the question in mind. So it is always helpful to get undertaintites in mind in order that they can be clarified from other passages rather than jumping to conclusions, where we are not sure we have sufficient evidence.

The assignment for today I want to look at before we go on. The first thing was the question as to what is literal and what is symbolic. We use figurative language in ordinary speech. A considerable amount. Most of it is quite clear to us whether it is figurative or not. Often there are cases where it may be uncertain whether it is a figure or not.

When you get a vision where Daniel saw a statue or Nebuchadnezzar saw a statue or Daniel saw four animals come up from the sea, you have absolutely no way to know what those symbols means. Unless it is explained to you. After you have the interpretation given you may have certain principles that may be helpful to you in looking at other passages. A figurative expression may be used as a figure and if it is used a great deal it can come in our minds to literally mean something different from what the words say. So it becomes literal language, but it is not accurately (?) actually what we say.

For instance I might have a discussion with someone and he didn't like what I said and got rather impassioned about it and I'd say, He tore into me. If you take that literally, he pulled off my arms and my legs! Perhaps he cut me. That's what the phrase actually says.

Yet, there are many statements which we use sufficiently that we no longer think of their literal meaning. They assume a different meaning to our minds.

Before looking at the assignment of Dan.7:13, I want to look at a verse in the OT which is perhaps quoted as often as any other OT verse in the NT. That is Ps. 110:1. The first verse of Ps. 110 is here quoted, of the words are used in such a way that it is clear the writer had this ~~is~~ in mind in at least 10 cases in the NT. The verse reads: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The phrase Lord, of course, here is another case where a somewhat more figurative use has come to be established so we could ~~call~~ call it ~~literal~~ literal. In England a Lord is anyone who has a particular title. We don't use it in America in that way. But when I was in Germany right after the war when people had to have all kinds of ration cards in order to get anything to eat, and they were under very strict regulations.

I think most of them hadn't seen a candy bar for years. You could go into the Post Exchange and buy all the candy you wanted cheaper than you could in this country. Any American who was there at the time would give out candy bars to the German people. You ought to have seen the look on their faces when you did so.

There was a German professor there -- very famous professor, who was having barely enough to eat -- I took him with me to be my guest at one of the best hotels that had been taken over by the Army. There for 256 apiece I got a big dinner both for him and for me. You looked at what the Americans were enjoying there in Germany during the period of occupation only three years after the war ended, he said to me, The American's are the Lords! That's a somewhat figurative expression, you might say.

We are -- were not appointed ~~lords~~ lords by a king or anything like that, but it was perfectly clear what he meant. Now this word "the Lord" we have come to use to represent the Biblical name of God. It is represented by the four Hebrew letters in the OT, the pronunciation of which is unknown. The ASV put it as Jehovah.

So when we read, The Lord said to my Lord, the Lord there is a somewhat figurative expression, yet it has come to be really a literal thing. We know exactly what is meant. It is the God of the OT. It is the great Lord of creation. "The Lord said to my Lord" - you remember Jesus said, Why did David call him Lord? Christ referred to it in such a way as to make it clear that this expression, My Lord refers to Messiah. It refers to Jesus Christ.

The great God who is a Spirit and they that worship Him must worship him in spirit and in truth, said to the Messiah Sit thou at my right hand. Where does God sit? God is Spirit. He is everywhere. Where does He sit?

How can you sit at his right hand? It's very obvious that this is a figurative expression. It is a figurative expression, the meaning of which is perfectly clear. It means: to take a place of glory and of power, a place of authority. I believe that most Christians feel that this was fulfilled at the resurrection. After the resurrection, at the end of Matthew, Jesus appeared to his disciples and said, All power in heaven and on earth is given to me.

In view of what He won by his atonement, where he destroyed the power of sin and overcame Satan, He has been given all power and authority. This was predicted by David when he said, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand. This is a figurative expression. I think it is quite clear to us what the figure means in this case. It might not if you did not have the NT to explain it. "Sit thou at my right hand." I think though that anyone regardless of knowing anything about the NT, would take this phrase Sit at my right hand to mean Take the place of prominence, take the place of glory. Receive glory.

Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool. Was he going to make them a wooden thing that he could rest His feet on? Here is a figurative expression. But the meaning of this figure is quite obvious to us. Until he gives Him complete victory over His enemies.

The verse we assigned: How much in it is literal and how much is figurative? in Dan. 7:13. "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man" -- there is no the in the Aramaic - "one like a Son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of days and they brought him near before him. That phrase "they brought him near" is an impersonal. It would really be better if they interpreted it in English by a passive: He was brought near before him, and there was given him dominion, glory, and a kingdom.

If this was only in the OT and we had no NT, there would be quite a variety of possible ways to interpret ~~xxx~~ what Daniel saw in his night vision as far as any meaning to it is concerned. Just as at the beginning of this ch. when he says he saw four animals come out of the sea. You would not know whether this means that his country was going to be attacked by the navies of four different countries all coming together and attacking them at once, or whether they were going to have lots of fish to eat, or any one of many interpretations which might be given. But of course in v. 17 we are told: These four beasts are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.

The symbol says they came out of the sea. Here he says they shall arise out of the earth. Nobody thinks there is any contradiction there because sea and earth are both figurative expressions, but it's quite clear to us there what they mean.

So here we do not have in the OT much of an interpretation of this. Just looking at it alone, you might say right away: He saw one like a son of man. What does it mean? Like a son of man? In the NT we find our Jesus Christ interpreted the term son of man.

In the NT we find how Jesus interpreted the term son of man. He uses it a great deal and it is very obvious he is referring to this passage when he does so. Because there is no other passage in the OT from which he could have derived that usage. You have this expression "son of man" used twice in the book of Daniel. The other case is in 8:17 where God sent the angel Gabriel to explain the vision to Daniel.

Gabriel came to him (v.17) and said unto me understand O son of man, for at the end of the time shall be the vision. Reading this in ch. 8 you might suggest in v. 13 of ch. 7 that "son of man" is Daniel, because he is called "Son of man," in ch. 8. But if you look at the book of Ezekiel that at least 50 times the Lord addresses Ezekiel as "son of man." There is a common usage in Biblical usage of using "son of" to mean one of a category, one of a class. So "son of man" is commonly used of an individual man. We have no reason to think that this term meant anything more than just someone who looked like a man, if it were not for the way people were led by the Holy Spirit and this verse and the evidence we get from the NT as to how Jesus interpreted it, and as to the interpretation which is contemporary of the phrase "the son of man."

Without that we could easily suggest the interpretation as some present scholars do. A professor in the University of Pennsylvania a few years ago wrote a commentary on Daniel which is perhaps the most scholarly commentary on Daniel written in this century. That is to say, he has examined a tremendous amount of evidence. He has looked at the translations in many different ancient languages. It is a very scholarly commentary, written from the liberal viewpoint that Daniel was a book written during the Maccabean period. So many of his conclusions we utterly disagree with. But he had a great mind and a tremendous amount of valuable history and valuable evidence to look to and compare when we make careful examination of various parts of Daniel.

He said, One like a son of man came in the clouds of heaven and received great authority. He says, Look on into v. 22:18 and you read, The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom. You look at v. 22, and you read, Till the Ancient of days came and judgment was given to the saints of the most high. You read in v. 27 that judgment shall be given to the people of the saints of the most high whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. So Prof. Montgomery says, One like a man is a figure for Israel. It is a figure for the saints, a figure for those who the writer of Daniel thought would come to possess all authority! That would be a possible interpretation of the phrase if we did not have evidence outside as to what the son of man is.

"He came with the clouds of heaven." What does that mean? Does that mean that he literally sat on the clouds? Does that mean as he came -- of course what Daniel saw was clouds around the man in his vision, no doubt. But as to what it symbolizes-- does it symbolize as many commentaries say: Glory and power is what is represented by clouds. Or mobility. All sorts of possible

interpretations. Sometimes you read in poetry that someone came trailing clouds of glory behind him or some such phrase. Is this to be taken as a symbol? literally as it happened? or as a symbol?

Then it says, They came to the Ancient of Days. The Ancient of days, the very old one, the venerable one. I believe all interpreters agree this represents God. A phrase used nowhere in the Bible, as I recall, except in this ch. where it is used three times. The Ancient of days, we read three vv. before, he sat in tremendous glory. A symbolic picture because God is a spirit, and you don't see Him in physical form.

But it is a term you could take in a literal term. It refers to the great God. No question of that. He came. But how would you come to one who is a spirit. Is it physical motion like I might come to one of you? He came to the Ancient of days and was brought near before him and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom. Certainly that is strange: He came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him and there was given him dominion and glory is a symbolic way of saying that God gave to him tremendous power and authority. It is symbolic. The meaning of that particular symbol is absolutely clear. It is identical with what we read in Ps. 110:1, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool."

Now I asked you to, as a second part of the assignment, to look at -- we've looked at various possibilities of interpretation thus far? what is literal and what is figurative? Now in the second part of it, I asked you to look at Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The references specifically I gave. The first two are clearly an illusion to this passage. The third may be.

We'll just look at the first two now. In Mat. 22:64, Jesus said to the high priest, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. There are two very great similarities between this statement and the statement in Mark 14:62 to the verse we just read. There is the obvious one that he, a Son of man will be coming in the clouds of heaven. That is obvious.

But what about the other part? Sitting on the right hand of power? That is used in both of these expressions. That, of course, uses the very same figure used in Ps. 110. But here He is referring to Daniel. Does it have any parallel? I submit it is an exact parallel. Here we read that this one came to the Ancient of days, was brought before him and given authority and power. He we read you will see him sitting on the right hand of power. It is an exact parallel. So Jesus in both cases referred to this verse. So the parallel is very close even though a slightly different figure is used for half of the parallel. In Daniel he speaks of being given the power; here he speaks of his already having it-- he is sitting at the right hand of power.

But what is the marked contrast between Mat. and Mk. and this passage in Daniel? The very marked difference is that in Mat. and Mk. Jesus says you will see Him with great power and

coming in the clouds of heaven. Whereas, here he says he saw one coming with the clouds of heaven and he was brought to the Ancient of days and then was given great power. There is a marked contrast that the order of the two statements is different. Which order is correct? Was he given power before he comes with clouds? Or does he come with clouds before he receives power?

I was looking at a book *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Jesus*, a book written by a very earnest Christian, a believer in the Bible. He is now deceased. It is a very scholarly book in which he says on one page that this is a prediction of the second coming of Christ, these words which Jesus in Matthew and Mark. On another page he refers to Daniel and he says he comes first on the clouds of heaven and he comes to the Ancient of days so that in Daniel it is obvious he is not describing the Second Coming of Christ, but he is there telling about his going in the clouds of heaven, ascending into heaven where he receives the power and authority from the Father.

Well now that gives quite a big difference in the interpretation! A big difference. Yet the parallel is so close between the two, are we justified in making that big difference. Well, I believe that we can safely say that in Daniel and in few other passages in the OT where we have a past statement followed by another past statement, the second one can be taken as a pluperfect. There is no pluperfect form in the Hebrew. And there are a few cases-- not many-- but a few cases where it's absolutely clear that the first statement -- he did this, and this happened -- means he did this in a situation where this other thing could happen. He gives the main thing and then he gives the clause describing its background.

So it is an altogether possible interpretation, and in view of the NT, I feel a correct interpretation to take Daniel as saying, "I saw in the night visions and one like a Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he had come to the Ancient of days and had been brought near to him and had been given dominion glory and a kingdom, that all people nations and languages should serve Him." In other words that Jesus Christ after His resurrection was given by the Lord authority -- he said all power, all authority in heaven and in earth is given unto me. And the Lord said, The Lord said to me sit thou on my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool, but that what Daniel saw in his vision was one like a Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, coming to earth, rather than one going in the clouds of heaven and going to God, who after all is everywhere.

We speak of the Holy Spirit coming into somebody. The Holy Spirit does not go into somebody. The Holy Spirit is everywhere. When we say that the Holy Spirit entered him, it is a figurative expression that the Holy Spirit exerted his authority in a particular way.

As between these two interpretations that one like a Son

of man want in the clouds to meet God who had given him authority and that the one who is sitting at the right hand has been given this authority and is going to come in clouds, between these two what basis do you have for deciding? I believe you have a clear basis in both NT passages where the High Priest said, Are you the Messiah the son of the holiest? Jesus said, Hereafter you will see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.

either

This is something which/the High Priest himself, or other human beings of whom the High Priest can be taken as representative, will see this actually happen. This is something which is still future and will be seen by human beings is what Jesus said -- this prediction Daniel made.

The second part of the question asks whether it proves anything about Jesus' interpretation. I think they very definitely do. But ~~do they~~ they prove anything about Jewish interpretation at the time of Christ? Well, when he said this the High Priest tore his clothes and said, What blasphemy; what need do we have of anything more? They knew He was calling himself the Son of man. Now he says they are going to see him with the divine power and glory coming in the clouds. So it is quite evident he is here pointing to the Second coming, as having been seen by Daniel even though in the rest of it we read about the saints receiving the kingdom.

It's interesting to note we never read about the saints conquering the kingdom. There is a phrase the saints take the kingdom, but the Hebrew word is not literally to seize, it is to receive! The saints are to have the kingdom, but it is Jesus Christ who takes the kingdom by virtue of the authority which He has, and appoints the saints as His representatives in it.

Perhaps that's all the time we should take on the second part of the assignment. But the third part was, What does the term Ancient of days mean in Dan. 7? What can you tell about the precise meaning in each case? The first time it's used is in v.9 -- "I beheld till the thrones were placed and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garments were white as snow, etc . . . " This is what Daniel saw in vision. This is symbolic. This is not literal because God is a spirit. It is a picture to impress certain ideas on his mind of God's power, glory, etc.

Some commentators say, This is God the Father. I think that is erroneous. We have very few passages in the OT where there is a distinction between the persons of the Godhead. Here I think it is very clear that what Daniel sees in v.9 is the triune God. It is the great glorious God, and one of the great biblical teachings is that there is one God. There are not three gods. There is one God. We thoroughly believe in that. But we also believe there is a distinction between God the Father, and God the Son. How ~~that~~ there is only one God and yet how we are to say there are three persons in the Godhead is a mystery that no human being can explain. But we can accept it as a fact because it is clearly taught in the Scripture.

So here we have the great God, the triune God, referred to here in his great glory in v. 9.

We look down a little further and read in v. 13 that He was brought to the Ancient of days and there was given to him dominion and glory and power and a kingdom. Knowing what we do from the NT about Jesus Christ, I think we are safe in saying in this case there is a distinction between the Son of man and the Ancient of days, so that in this case it is clearly referring to God the Father.

Then we look at v. 22. Verse 21 says I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came and judgment was given to the saints of the most High." Most interpreters before the spirit of truth about the trinity was revealed, would naturally think this == take this in exactly the same sense as v.9, and take it quite figuratively and symbolically, "until God exerted his power and gave judgment to the saints."

But in view now of our understanding of v. 13 we can say, it means, "Until the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven." So the Ancient of days here is Jesus Christ, the second person of the trinity. The term applies to God, the triune God, and it can be applied to any member of the trinity, naturally. I thought that was a very interesting fact of interpretation here.

Just one other point we should look at on this matter of clouds. Clouds can be figurative certainly. Clouds of glory. It can express power, it can express purity, it can express any one of a number of things. Is the word clouds in this (Daniel saw clouds) but is it to be taken as a literal thing? That actually it is pointing to one coming with clouds? Or is it a figure? Well, he said to the High Priest, Hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming with clouds of heaven. That could be figurative-- coming in great glory! It would not from that necessarily have anything to do with literal clouds.

But when you look at Acts, ch. 1, you read in v. 9, When he had spoken these things while he was speaking he was taken up and the clouds received him out of their sight; and great glory and great purity would not receive him out of their sight! It is quite obvious there in v.9 that it is used literally. That he went with clouds into heaven.

Then we read in v. 11, Why stand ye gazing into heaven? This same Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." If he went with literal clouds, and he is to so come in like manner as ye have seen him go, it would seem very definite to me that the Son of man coming in clouds, which Daniel saw, is a picture, but not a symbol of various things, but an actual picture of something that is going to happen.

We've spent a long time going over the assignment, but it

touches on many principles that are very important in all of our interpretation. And lest I forget at the end of the hour to give out the new assignment, I am going to request that you give a copy of each of these to everyone (distribution of assignments)

This is the assignment for next time. Mimeographed.

We were finishing up at the end of last period our discussion of ch. 2. We noted there two possible interpretations. We looked at a number of suggestions that we saw were not satisfactory. But we saw two that are widely held among evangelical Christians today.

The first of those was that the church is the ~~xxxx~~ stone, and we saw the difficulty of that. But at this point I do not wish to rule it out. There are many very fine Christians who interpret it in this way, that the church is going to so grow that it will take over the whole world. Certainly we must agree that if it was God's plan that everyone on earth at some time in the future were to be converted and to become ~~xxxxx~~ thoroughly Christian and become completely sanctified, it would be a complete end of all wickedness upon this earth. But that hardly fits the picture we find here in Dan. 2, or in Dan. 7. In both of which it seems to be a supernatural intervention, rather than simply a growth of the church.

Yet, though the picture in Dan. 2 shows the stone hitting the image and destroying it and then growing to fill the whole earth, and that would seem to fit the idea of supernatural intervention instead of a (gradual) growing of the church, we don't want to push the figure too far. We don't want simply on that basis to say that it could not mean that the church is going to grow until it covers the whole earth. This was a widely held view a couple of centuries ago. There were a great many fine hymns: Jesus shall reign where the sun . . . etc., which I believe are true, but I believe are true of what Jesus will do by His return, rather than by what the church will do.

I think the church is here for a witness to win souls to the Lord, rather than to change the whole earth. I think Christ will do that. I don't think that's a function he has given to the church. But since there are many very fine Christians who hold to this view,-- they say this view was in eclipse in the last half century but recently a number are coming back to it. Some books have been written recently strongly presenting it saying it is very pessimistic to think that the church is not going to succeed in converting the whole world.

But the question is not what's pessimistic or what is optimistic, but what has God given the church as its function and what is His will? I've even known some to say that a true Calvinist must think that God is going to convert the whole world. I think that's as great nonsense as anything I can imagine! Certainly God if he chose could have 9/10 of the world converted in only one generation, but only 1/10 in another generation.

That God has to gradually convert the world, is purely theoretical! But his view has been widely presented. I don't know if you can say widely, but it has been coming into greater prominence in these last few months than I have known at any ~~xxxxx~~ time in my life.

I do not wish at this point to rule it out. I want us to carefully consider the evidence and see whether it fits with it. But we notice the second possibility: that the second advent of Christ is the stone, which we saw seems to fit the picture best but the difficulty is the disappearance of the Roman Empire.

At the end of the hour I mentioned the question: Is an unmentioned interval a possibility? And at the end of the hour I was given a question which I appreciate being given to me. Any of you who have questions or suggestions, I would certainly appreciate your writing them out and giving them to me. We will consider them, and I will either speak to you personally about them, or they will be covered in the course of the lecture at a later time.

This very intelligent question said, Why could not the distinctive characteristic feature of the Roman Empire be seen in the Roman Catholic Church as a continuation of the Roman Empire, and have no ~~xxxxxxxx~~ unmentioned interval? That impressed me as a very interesting suggestion. I'm not sure I would say it exactly that way, but it does seem to me that we can recognize the perspective of prophecy. That as the prophet looks to the future-- you might say it's as if you were up on a high hill and you look out at the distant landscape. As you look you see a range of mountains. Then you see another range behind them. You can't see whether there is a valley between, a valley that is perhaps half a mile wide or perhaps 10 miles wide. Often you cannot tell.

So the possibility of an unmentioned interval is something that must be kept in mind as a possibility. But the other possibility which I appreciate having mentioned to me here is I think also a possibility worthy of consideration. That is when you look at these Kingdoms that Daniel tells us about, you have the Babylonian empire coming to a certain point and then being taken over by the Persian and that would be the end of the Babylonian empire. The Persians took it over and ~~h~~ they held it for 200 years and when they were in a very great strength, Alexander the great came from the west with his very skillful army and within a dozen years he conquered that tremendous empire, and the Persian empire came to an end and what we call the Hellenistic empire succeeded it.

Alexander's successors with their type of government, they were divided into several groups but with a distinctive type of government much different from the Persian, they continued until each of the parts was taken over by the Roman empire and put to an end as the Roman empire took it over and by the time of Christ the Roman empire had taken over all of Alexander's empire and it lasted another four centuries, after the time of Christ.

So the Roman empire lasted nearly as long as the three previous ones put together. Thus we are looking at the picture and seeing in the distance, we see the fourth kingdom. But the Roman empire was not taken over by another empire. Instead of that the Roman empire divided into parts and was taken over by various groups, all of whom claimed to be successors to the Roman emperor.

Even in the Middle Ages the title of the Roman emperor was taken by the German emperors who would get the pope to crown them. Thus the great historian said of this, the Holy Roman Empire was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire! That's a fact, and yet the name was kept right up until 1814 when the name was abandon. But the general culture and features of the Roman empire did not come to an end like the other three being conquered by another, but there has been gradual change and there has been revived interest in Rome and ~~revived interest~~ revival of features, and all through it the RC church has retained quite a bit of machinery of the Roman empire.

The word "diocese" was a province of the Roman empire. The RC church took it over for a region a bishop controls. The Roman emperor as the man who built the bridges around Rome was called the Pontifex Maximus, the chief bridge builder and when he came to be head of the pagan religions he'd always use that title. Julius ~~Caesar~~ Caesar though he probably never built a bridge called himself the Chief Bridge Builder, the Pontifex Maximus. The Popes use that exact title to this very day! They call themselves Pontifex Maximus, Chief Bridge Builder and you refer to the Pope as a Pontif.

So it's possible as we look at the future that in the perspective there is a long interval in between, and then something else that may look to us like a second phase of the Roman empire or it is possible that what the prophet saw as this empire expresses a long period coming to the second coming of Christ. If we go on we may find evidence that presupposes us to one or the other of these interpretations. But at this point I believe we should consider them both as life options. I did not mention that in my outline and I appreciate greatly the question that was handed in which I think makes a valuable improvement in our understanding at this point.

III The Prophecy of Daniel 7

There are many incidental features of great interest in Dan. 7 but I question how much time I should spend on them because I have a great deal of great importance in the book of Daniel we want to look at in the time we have in this semester.

So I'll run over some of these a bit rapidly.

A. The setting of the prophecy.

It is important to remember that it was 45 yrs. after Dan. 2. So with a 45 yr. span between, I think we are justified

in using Dan. 2 in interpreting Dan. 7 and seeing how they fit together, but not in reading features from Dan. 7 into what Daniel should have understood from Dan. 2 since there is all this time in between.

Why do I say at least 45 years? Because we read it was in the first year of the reign of Belshazzar. If we had an additional hour in the course of the next two minutes, I would go into the historical evidence about Belshazzar, how not ~~xxx~~ so many decades ago it was said there never was a king Belshazzar! That Nabonidus was the last king of Babylon! That's a mistake in the book of Daniel and further proof that this book was not written at that time but four centuries later!

But it has now been clearly proven and it is accepted by all historians and historical scholars though most of them prefer to mention it in a footnote rather than to give it much prominence, but it is recognized by all scholars that Belshazzar was a king of the Babylonian empire but that he did not reign alone; that Nabonidus made his son Belshazzar co-king along with him. And Nabonidus went off to the Arabian desert for a number of years to study archaeology! And while he was there Belshazzar was in complete control of the empire. But when Nabonidus -- we know the exact year, or I should say we know within one year of the exact year when Nabonidus became king. We cannot say the exact year because different countries have begun the year at different times. But we know within a year when Nabonidus became king.

But when he made Belshazzar king along with him we don't know. So we don't exactly when this came, so I say it was at least 45 years after Dan. 2.

2. This vision was given to Daniel himself Quite different from the other ch. in which there was a vision given to Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadnezzar received the vision and Daniel interpreted it. Here Daniel himself received it.

3. In this case the vision includes the interpretation. That you have all noticed by this time, of course.

4. A part of the vision is retold with added detail. That's a very interesting thing about this ch. Daniel has a vision and then we read Daniel turned to one of those who stood by. That, of course is still in his vision. He said, I came to one of those who stood by and asked him the truth of all this. So he told him the the interpretation of these things.

"These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most high shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." That word here translated "take" is not the word to seize something. It is the word to receive something. It is kabal which is quite different. It is used comparatively few times in the OT but it is very clear the times it is used it means to receive, not to seize or take hold! It does not say that the saints won't conquer the kingdom, but it doesn't say they will. All it says is that they will get it.

But that's all we have-- these two verses. Then v. 19 says, "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast." Then we have several vv. up to v. 22 in which Daniel recapitulates fill -- still in this vision and tells us again what he has already told us but he adds further detail.

So we have part of the vision retold with added detail. Very different from ch. 2 where Daniel tells Nebuchadnezzar what his vision is and then tells him what it means.

5. Symbolism and plain language are not so sharply separated in ch. 2. In ch. 2 everything in the vision is a symbol, everything in the interpretation, or practically everything, is given in clear language. But here they are not so sharply separated as is brought out by the fact in all these ~~statements~~ symbols we have a literal statement "he saw the (a) son of man coming in the clouds of heaven." We have literal statements mixed in ~~xx~~ with the symbols here. We have literal statements here like that mixed in with symbols here which we did not have in ch. 2.

B. Though the symbolism is entirely different there ~~is~~ are four obvious ~~parallels~~ parallels with ch. 2. I think I'd better not mention these specifically. I think you all know them from a previous assignment. I'd better not mention them because I'm always telling other faculty members we should not run over time. I want myself not to go so late you do not have ample time to make the change from one class to another. So we will stop at this point.

I'm sorry so many were late today; we've a lot of ground to cover. Concerning the assignment today-- the first part, Daniel 8 -- I think everyone did pretty well on that in noting which verses were included in the vision and which verses in the interpretation. That is much simpler in that passage than in ch. 7.

Then, how many kingdoms were involved? I believe you had no difficulty with that.

Which kingdoms in ch. 2 and in ch. 7 do these kingdoms correspond to? I believe most of you said the second and third kingdoms, in chs. 2 and 7. Of course the critical view would say it's with the third and the fourth, but I believe we saw pretty clear evidence it is with the second and the third.

The second part: glance over the last 6 chs. of Daniel and see what divisions you would make of that. Let's look at that. We noticed the first verse of ch. 7 says, "In the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream"

I had a very interesting question given to me at the end of the last hour. Does this mean that Daniel saw real, things, or does it mean that God caused Daniel to ~~see~~ appear before him, or that he had a dream and there were pictures in his head. How God gave it to him we really don't know. You might say that everything we see is a picture in our heads. Did you ever think that you get light in through the right eye and light in through the left eye. But you only see two pictures; you see one. They tell us that everything from the right side of both eyes goes to the left side of the brain, and everything from the left side of both eyes goes to the right side of the brain. How are those four things put together to form one picture? We don't know. But we see one picture, and God caused Daniel to see one picture.

Maybe it was simply a dream. Maybe he was still conscious when God caused him to see things, but he knew it was a vision. ~~Though~~ He knew it was not things that were actually happening then, but things God caused him to see. These things sometimes might be representations, the actual picture of something that was going to happen in the future but more often they are symbolic, they are represented in the statue like that Nebuchadnezzar saw and in the four beasts he saw, they are symbols.

Ch. 7 starts, In the first year of Belshazzar, Daniel had a dream. Then we read about the dream and the interpretation mixed in with it.

Ch. 8 begins, In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar, a vision appeared unto me, even unto me, Daniel, after that which appeared unto me before. So here we have a new vision, a new experience= two years later.

In ch. 9, In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes . . . in the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by books the number of the years..... And he goes on and tells what happens.

At a later time in ch. 8 he tells of his prayer and of God's answer to prayer

Ch. 10 begins, In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel . . .

So all four of these chs. start with a new time at which Daniel either received a new message from God, or made a prayer as a result of which he received a message from God. There were several who made a division which put ch. 9 - 11 together as one unit. Well, the beginning of ch. 10 is a clear break, and just as clear break at the beginning of ch.9 and and of ch. 8. But I was sorry to see anyone make the division that way.

At ch. 10 we have how Daniel prays and the Lord says he will send him an answer and he sends him an angel who says, Now I will tell you the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they . . ."

He goes right on with God's message to him through ch. 11 and at least part of ch. 12. So if you want to say that 10-12 is one unit as compared to the three previous units, that is a good division even though it makes your last one much longer.

In ch. 12 I believe there should be a break, that there are a few vv. that are separate from the rest. For that you really have to study the ch. carefully to find out where that would be. We are not to that as yet.

However, I was quite disappointed to find a few--not a great many-- who began a division with ch. 11:1. Of course you are not much worse than the archbishop is who made the ch. division there but after all he was probably riding a horseback so there he had an excuse for not seeing it very clearly.

But you notice how different it is. Ch. 10-- In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel. Ch. 11-- Also I, in the first year of Darius, the Mede, even I stood to confirm and to strengthen him." That's not an introduction to a vision. That's a continuation of what's been said by the messenger before who is now introducing his message.

So if you want to make a break at 11:2, having the prayer and the coming of the messenger, and then a break between that and what the messenger said, that is alright, as I believe a very large portion of the class made a ch. division there, at 11:2. But to make one at 11:1, as I say, the archbishop had an excuse for it. I'd won't mark him down of course. But I was sorry to see any of the others of you do it. I won't mark you down for it either, but I certainly will if you put it in the ~~xxx~~ test. Because there is a very marked difference there.

Now we want to look at all of these chs. But we want to go further in our examination of ch. 7 for today so we will turn back to it now. In ch.7 we noted it was at least 45 years after Dan. 2. We don't know exactly how long because we don't know how long Belshazzar was associated with his father as co-king.

Second, we noted what is true of all the succeeding chs. that the vision was given to Daniel himself. That is true of the entire last half of Daniel.

No. 3. We've already noted that the interpretation was included in the vision. That is true of the rest of the book too. In contrast to ch. 2 in which Daniel had == Nebuchadnezzar had a vision, and Daniel gave him the interpretation.

No. 4. Parts of the vision retold with added detail. I think you've all noticed that. I've mentioned it once or twice already. A peculiar feature of ch. 7 not paralleled anywhere else in the book.

No. 5. Symbolism and plain language, not so sharply separated as in ch. 2. That we've already discussed.

B. Though the symbolism is entirely different there are four obvious parallels in ch. 2. The first of these is that there are four kingdoms presented. In ch. 2 we had five parts to the image. The question we could not give an answer to from ch. 2 alone: Are there 5 kingdoms or 4? But there was a possibility that 4 were intended because iron was in both of them last two parts. There was a definite possibility in two but you cannot say positively from two alone.

But when you get to ch. 7 you find that there are four beasts, and you find that the fourth beast had additional things said about it that would be later than the time when it began. So we learn from ch. 7 ~~am~~ that we are justified from carrying this back into ch. 2, that ch. 2 has four kingdoms, and not five!

I say we are justified in carrying it back because it is not introducing a new thing into ch. 2, but it is deciding which of two possibilities is the correct one. Ch. 7 gives us the answer on that.

No. 2. The parallel in the fourth is to have a second phase. That is a marked similarity.

No. 3. The complete destruction of the kingdoms. In ch. 2 the statue is so completely destroyed that no slightest trace of it remains. In ch. 7 the fourth beast is burned; its body is given to the fire it is completely destroyed. A complete destruction of these kingdoms. Not a taking over of their qualities into any new kingdom.

No. 4. There is a new universal regime in both of them. So we have these marked similarities between ch. 2 and ch. 7 which justify us in saying these two are giving a picture of the same thing. A foreview of certain important events in history, running for a long period after the time of Daniel. And a fourth in which certain features are suggested in ch. 2, a few things told about them, but added matters are told in ch. 7.

C. The Four Kingdoms.

1. As in ch. 2 there is no specific prediction of the overthrow of any of the first 3 kingdoms. That is to say, the whole statue is destroyed. But what happened was the Babylonian kingdom

was conquered by the Persian and taken over. And the Persian kingdom was conquered by Alexander and taken over. And there were parts of Alexander the Great's kingdom that were conquered by the Romans and taken over. But the Scripture merely says, and After you shall be another kingdom. And after it a third which shall rule over the whole world.

So in the first three kingdoms there is no specific prediction in either ch. of any overthrow of any one of them. This is something that someone might immediately question. I myself would have questioned it not very long ago. Because you noticed that in ch. 7 it speaks about the first kingdom in a way which at first sight might seem to tell of its destruction.

7:4, The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings; I beheld till its wings were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made to stand upon the feet as a man . . . At first sight you can say, Here's the first kingdom described and it is lifted up from the earth; it is destroyed. But it is no way something is destroyed to make it say to stand on its feet like a man and a man's heart was given to it! That's no account of destruction.

Certainly the conquest of the Babylonians by the Persians could not be called "a man's heart was given to it." It is quite obvious when we look closely at it that this verse describes something quite different from that.

2. The added detail about the first kingdom, v.4. What it means is shown in Dan. 4, because in the fourth ch. of Daniel we have the account of how Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar that Nebuchadnezzar was going to go out of his mind, he was going to grovel on the ground, live like an animal. Then he was told that after a certain length of time, God would raise him up again from this and again give him a man's heart and return his kingdom to him. So this is a description of what happened to Nebuchadnezzar, not to the Babylonian kingdom.

That fits with the way the first part of the statue is introduced in ch.2 where it says, O king thou art the head of gold. This describes something that has happened to Nebuchadnezzar at least 10 years, maybe 20 years before Daniel had this vision. So here he is giving them a statement about the first kingdom which shows to him clearly that the first kingdom is the same as the head of the statue; that it is Nebuchadnezzar. And that shows him something that has already happened. And therefore that strengthens his faith that what follows in ch. 7, is also going to happen.

So here, a part of the description is not a prophecy, but a picture of what has already happened.

3. The second kingdom, v.5

"And behold another beast, a second, like a bear, and it raised up itself on one side." Many think this statement "raised itself up on one side" suggests the fact that the second kingdom was the kingdom of the Medes and the Persians in which the Persians had been subordinate to the Medes but in which they gained superiority over the Medes before the time that they conquered the Babylonians.

itself

And raise themselves up on one side. And other say that's a description of the way a bear walks with one side sort of lifted up! Well, I haven't see enough bears walking to make a judgment, between those interpretations.

At any rate that was true of the second kingdom, does this here give a picture of that or not? I don't think we can say for certain. At least it's a possibility.

Then it says: It had 3 ribs in its mouth between its teeth. And they said, Arise, devour much flesh. This is a good picture of what Cyrus did because Cyrus rose in his kingdom and gained supremacy over all the beasts, and then he led his army westward and conquered the region north of Babylonia and all of Asia Minor and then he led it back and down again and conquered Babylon and then again he went east and conquered further going right to the very borders of India.

So this "rise and devour much flesh" is a picture of the conquests of Cyrus going way beyond the territory held by the Babylonians. But it says there were 3 ribs in its mouth, between its teeth. Many commentators will tell you what these three ribs represent.

I have a footnote here: That is Lydia, Babylonia, Egypt, etc. And the important word in that note is ETC. He conquered many areas, and I don't think we have a right to pick three and say these are the most important. We can't because he conquered so many areas including several of very great importance.

I think we can say here of the three ribs that a vivid picture of the fact he was conquering nations and absorbing them and the number three here is not just the conquest of the Babylonian empire; it was the conquest of _____. But the attempt to precisely say what these three refer to, we have no clear evidence in history to pick out three and I think it just means he conquered a number, a lot.

So I don't think there is any special significance here to the number three.

Then we look at what we are told about the fourth kingdom. We read in v.6, "After his I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon its back four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads, and dominion was given to it." I don't think the number four in four wings of a fowl has any particular ~~significance~~ importance. But I do think you'd never expect a leopard to have wings, and to say it has four wings stresses the fact of great mobility. The kingdom of Alexander, and the conquests which he made so rapidly, can hardly be paralleled in history until you get to Napoleon and Hitler and the blitzkrieg that ~~sign~~ each of these men carried out.

Cyrus was a tremendous conqueror and conquered ~~many~~ many areas. It was hard to parallel, but it was a steady constant conquest over a series of years. But Alexander in a short reign of only 12 years conquered the greatest empire the world has ever seen to that time. It was marked by its tremendous rapidity.

The four wings shows his tremendous movement. I think we are justified in taking that from that, but not in giving any particular attention to the fact there were four wings rather than three or five.

The ~~four headed~~ beast also had four heads. That's strange that the beast would have more than one head. Four heads. I believe we are justified in saying there is a suggestion there 200 years in advance that Alexander's empire would not remain united very long. It had one great head-- Alexander-- whose genius conquered all these areas, and to whom all his soldiers were devoted and who controlled definitely everything that was done during the 12 years of his reign. After his death his generals could not decide who should succeed him, and they tried to make one nominally succeed him, but the others would not submit to him and after a period of disagreement and discension, they fought with each other, 40 years and finally ended up with dividing it up into various sections each independent of the other.

Yet we can think of them still as being one empire because Greek culture was made predominate in all of them and there was a similarity in outlook and attitude in all of these kingdoms, into which Alexander's empire was divided. So when we say it has four heads it is predicting something that people 200 years after Daniel's time could look at and say, Yes, that corresponds to what actually happened. And that would give them confidence that what else ~~was~~ was said would also come to pass.

We come to the fourth kingdom v. 7-19.

We have a number of things said about the fourth kingdom. That is what Dan. 7 is really leading up to. We find in these verses it is strong and destructive. We find ~~what is~~ that is suggested in Dan. 2 by the fact it was iron and like iron it crushes. Here we are told part of it is iron and part of it is bronze. It is strong and destructive.

It is not named. It is simply a beast-- very great and very terrible. So we find it is different from its predecessors. I don't think it was different in being more terrible. I don't think it was different in being more brutal. I don't think it was different in being more determined to take a great oversight over every one of its citizens. But it was when there were _____ when its citizens were upright, or when someone refused to submit.

How was the Roman empire different from the preceding? Actually the ways in which it was would hardly be suggested by the three statements here. But it was very different in three ways.

First, there was an entirely different type of organization. That's one reason why the Roman empire lasted longer than any two of the others put together. Almost as long as the three put together! Because the preceding ones were dependent upon hereditary control, and the power went from father to son, and sometimes the son inherited his father's abilities and strengths but very often he doesn't. So throughout history a hereditary type of control has not been very satisfactory.

In the case of the Romans, in the long period of democracy actually in which for many years the Roman people decided what would happen in their realm until they got into such a chaotic condition that some individuals of great strength were able to seize control, but even then they had these types of organization so established that gave continuing strength to them that lasted for four more centuries when they had a man whom they called an emperor.

Very seldom were there as many as three men in a row who went from father to son. In a great many cases in the Roman empire when a Emperor tried to have his son succeed him, he was found to be a failure.

Perhaps the best government that any part of the world has every had in any part of its history, was the government of the Roman empire in the second century A.D., a government perhaps which had more justice for its citizens, more general equality opportunity and freedom and general safety than almost any period in history was the 2nd century A.D. What made the 2nd century such a wonderful period was that each emperor during that period carefully studied to pick the man who would be most fitted to carry on as he did, and adopted him and then he became his successor.

Until you get to the end of the century there is no going from father to son, but neither did its leaders come to power because they could speak well and make a good impression with their personality but because of careful study of their qualities and abilities and they were selected for that. Toward the end of the 2nd century, Marcus Aurelius, very foolishly, made his own son succeed him and he proved to be one of the worst emperors Rome ever had. And it broke this succession.

But even so, even tho this was broken and for the next century the Roman ~~emperors~~ emperors were selected generally by the army, and it was an average of four years that one of them would last before he was killed and another one put in, yet generally the strength of the empire was such that it lasted in full strength for another two centuries after the end of that wonderful period fo the 2nd century A.D.

So a different kind of organization, altogether different from that of the preceeding rulership, no longer a hereditary monarchy might be considered part of the _____ but it is so important, I listed it separately. And as a result of this it lasted far longer than the others.

The Roman Senate theoretically had power over the conquered nations and the Emperor always said the Roman Senate has decreed, etc. It was a system that had great strength in it.

At this time when the Roman Catholic church endeavors to find a new head, we can notice that part of that which continues -- there has been only one time I know of when a Pope has tried to get his son made the Pope to succeed him, and since according to the law a Pope isn't supposed to have a son he did not succeed! But there is a marvellous organization in the Roman

But there is a marvellous organization in the Roman Catholic church in that the Pope can appoint Cardinals, but he can't say what those cardinals are going to do after he dies. And various Popes have tried to dictate who would be his successor, and rarely if ever has one succeeded him. So you have a group of men who have been selected by the previous Pope, or by previous Popes and have had to make decisions among themselves, instead of having a great number of people to decide which is apt to be on the basis of who makes the best personal impression.

So it is the type of organization which is one of the main reasons why it has lasted so long, and another reason why we might be able to think of the Roman empire as to some extent continuing all through this period.

It was not conquered like the three previous ones were and taken over by another one, but instead it disintegrated and various features of it have continued in the many little sovereignties that have taken its place since. But whether we should think of it as continuing through this period, or whether we should think that the empire having actually come to an end that the second phase must be something that is still future with an unmentioned interval in between.

I don't want to be dogmatic at this point, but you can say there is this long perspective that the prophet has.

D. The Second Phase of the Fourth Kingdom. Here is a very interesting thing.

1. There is no obvious similarity to the fifth part of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. If you just had the account of the fifth part of the statue; if you just had told what happened to this beast, how it had ten horns and then one came up and three disappeared in front of it and then it had a voice that spoke great boasts and how it tried to change times and seasons, etc. well nobody would think that represented the same thing as the feet and toes being made of iron and clay. It is very very different from the account of the second phase there.

But since we have so many similarities between the two we are justified in saying that these two utterly different pictures of the second phase of the fourth kingdom are referring to events or situations that take place in the sixth time period. And therefore be putting them together.

In this second phase we find something which we had no hint of in the statue, that there will be ten new kings. We have in the interpretation, v.17, the one who stood by said these great beasts, which are four, are four kings. The beasts are four. Yet it says that the ten horns on the fourth beast are four. So we know that the word king and kingdom are used rather indiscriminately in these chs.

Sometimes they are used to represent, as it does here, a whole long period or two or more centuries -- spoken of as a king or a kingdom. Sometimes they are used for individual kings. So when he

said to Nebuchadnezzar, Thou art this head of gold, we are left with the question, Is Nebuchadnezzar that head of gold, or is the neo-Babylonian empire the head of gold, or is it the whole period of Assyro-Babylonian spuremacy? Which latter I think is most likely, but I would not be dogmatic about it.

We have these ten new kings, and immediately you ask: We are simply told there are 10 horns. This beast had 10 horns. Do these 10w horns represent 10 kings who reign at the same time? Or do they represent 10 kings who came one after the other? We have no way to prove from the statement in ch. 7. Either is a possibility of interpretation, whether they are simultaneous or whether they are successive. We find that a little horn came up and before it three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots. That seems to suggest that this represents 10 kings who reigned at one time in different areas and that a new one came up and got control of three of them. It suggests that.

On the other hand those who hold the critical theory say that before Antiochus Epiphanes his father had died and his brother who had ruled just before him had been murdered, and the brother's son who should logically have succeeded him, he got in ahead of him and seized the power. So they say the three kings disappeared before him. Well, I do not think the critical interpretation is correct, but I ~~can~~ can't say on this particular idea it might be three successive kings, rather than three simultaseous kings - that they are necessarily wrong in that particular teaching. We cannot draw a great deal more from this passage. We have two possibilities.

3. The Rise of the Little Horn. vv.8,11,20

You of course have looked at these in the course of your study of the chapter and you have noticed that vv.8 and 24 tell about the growing power of this little horn. This little horn came up and became bigger than the others, stronger than the others. Three disappeared before it.

We find it arrogant in v. 25. He shall speak great words against the Most High. This is part of the interpretation. In the picture it said he had eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things. He shall speak great words against the Most High and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change the times and the seasons.

It wasn't so many years ago when some were suggesting that this was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who tried to change the date of Thanksgiving! But he did not succeed. Since that time we have had Congress change the dates of a number of our holidays but I don't think it applies to Congress here! But it describes the arrogance of this one, his attempts to make great changes. Some have thought this was fulfilled in Julius Caesar because Julius Caesar changed times and seasons when he introduced a new calendar which we have used ever since except for a slight modification made 200 years ago. But I certainly don't think it is speaking about Julius Caesar.

Then we have this specific feature that he makes war against the saints. Verse 21: I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High..."

Very different from the idea that is widely taught in some circles now that the church is gradually going to reach more and more people with the gospel until the whole world is going to be converted, and this will happen before the return of Christ.

This doesn't fit all with what it says here that he makes war against the saints and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High. They did not seize the judgement, they did not take it by power; it was given to them. Notice in connection with that

It's apparent victory, vv.21, 25. He prevailed against them.

4. The Destruction of the Fourth Kingdom, v.11, 26.

"I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spoke; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and its body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." It does not say the horn was destroyed; it says the beast was destroyed. It's like in ch. 2 where it does not say it's feet and toes were destroyed; it says the whole statue was destroyed. So the entire fourth kingdom is to be completely destroyed.

But here there is a very interesting little feature. v. 12 (puzzled me when I first studied it.) "As for the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." Nothing is told here of the destruction of the of the other three. But we are told in ch. 2 that the whole statue is destroyed. So I feel when it says their lives were prolonged for a season and a time that it means they were prolonged until the fourth beast was destroyed ~~xxx~~ but that they all are destroyed, which means of course not that certain individuals are destroyed but that all the principles that enter into the type of human government represented by Nebuchadnezzar and represented by the Persian and Greek leaders, that that type of human government --all its pieces are going to be completely destroyed.

But he doesn't specifically say that about the other three, but he does say they had their dominion taken away but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. That makes it clear that the four together are one statue. That the qualities of the Babylonian kingdom were many of them taken over by the Persian, and the qualities of the Persian were many of them taken over by the Greeks, and the qualities of the Greeks were many of them taken over by the Romans. But their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. But the whole thing is to be completely destroyed at the time the beast is killed and its body given to burning.

E. A Division of Deity, vv 9-10.

This is still in the dream, still in the vision he had. In the KJV the first v. of it I think gives us a very wrong impression at first --"I beheld till the thrones were cast down." The Aramaic word there normally means to place or to put. It is used in Ezra where the king says they shall not place an impost or taxes upon these people.

It means that he looked and saw coming into his vision, he saw thrones, and it might suggest it fits with the destruction of v. 8, but there's no destruction until you get to v.11. So this is simply As he looked he saw come into view ~~xxxxxxx~~ before him thrones. How many people sat? Just says one did. Says the Ancient of Days sat. Yet there were thrones.

That, of course has cause many people great curiosity. Why were there thrones? When only one sits? It is a peculiar thing. Some say he was merely a presiding officer, like a judge. It seems that the various attorneys are fair in what they do and they make the decision. But I don't think that's what the picture sounds like at all. It sounds to me like the picture of the great omnipotent God. Rather than the picture of the presiding officer at a court trial.

The fact that it has the plural "thrones", we with~~out~~ our understanding of the NT can think perhaps there is a suggestion of the Trinity. But I think perhaps that is reading back too much into this. Perhaps we think of the greatness of deity using the word in the plural, but there certainly is no suggestion here that there was any other powerful one sharing power with the One pictured here. That's why I call it a vision of deity; I don't think it is a picture of a court case.

That's why I'm disturbed that practically all recent translations translate the end of v. 10 "the court sat and the books were opened." That sounds as if he was the presiding judge and that others sat while he makes the decision. I don't think that is the picture we have here at all.

I think you have a picture here of the powerful God, the great, pure One, the One who has absolute authority who looks down upon earth and sees the little horn ranting against Him and trying to change times and seasons and establish things the way he wants them on earth, and in contrast He sees something that illustrates the great power and majesty of God.

Certainly he did not see God. God is a spirit. God does not have a body. He did not see God, but he saw a representation which symbolized the power and greatness and eternity of God. The Ancient of Days sat. His garment was white as snow. The hair of his head was pure wool. His throne was a fiery flame. KJV has "~~xxxxxx~~" in "like" in italics. His throne was a fiery flame. The wheels of the throne were a burning fire. A fire issued and came forth from before him; a thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousands times ten thousand stood before him."

Whether these ten thousand times ten thousand-- are they the members of the court that are going to make a decision? It is quite obvious you don't need to have a judge to make a decision to decide what to do with the beast. It is pictured very clearly, his wickedness, his arrogance, his brutality, and here we have in contrast to the vain boasts of the beast, we have the great power of the great God! His authority and a tremendous number of His representatives are ready to do His bidding.

So when it says "the judgment was set" the word here translated "the judgment" is not a concrete word. Most of those who take this as "court" say that the word for decision or judgment is here used the abstract for the concrete-- it means the court! But the word -- it seems to me the KJV represents the thought of the whole situation much better.

God's judgement was set, it is determined, it continues. It still sat there. The beast and the little horn with his declarations and his attempt to destroy all that God desires could not succeed because God's judgment has been set from all eternity. It is not a judgment scene, in my opinion, in the sense of a court making a decision, but it is God carrying out his decision He has made long before.

The books were opened. That I would take as being symbolic representation of God's omniscience; of the fact He knows everything and He acts wisely in all that he does. I would not take it as _____ their trying to ~~expa~~ explain to Him just what is happening, and all that. It seems to me that is what we have here in this picture.

7. The Son of Man.

Here in a picture which is symbolic we have something happen in which as far as this passage is concerned could be symbolic, but I believe we have in the midst of the symbols ~~we~~ we have a literal, thing; that is he saw something-- he saw all these things of course, but he saw this thing which was not meant as a symbol but as a picture in advance of something that was going to happen. I don't think we ~~x~~ could say that dogmatically apart from the NT evidence. But I think the NT evidence makes that clear.

He saw in the night vision, and behold one like the Son of Man. Notice this word Son of Man is used in Dan. 8:17 where God's messenger says to Daniel, Understand, O Son of Man. Son of man just means a man, one of the class of man. But here he saw one who looked like a man. But this picture here came to be recognized by the Jews as a picture of the coming of Messiah. Jesus uses of himself the term the Son of Man clearly referring back to this use ~~xxxx~~ of term not to ch. 8 where it just means a man. Not to Ezekiel where it ~~xxxx~~ is used dozens of times Ezekiel is addressed as Son of Man. But this picture shows the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven.

Here we have one coming who has great authority. Now whether you would say that he saw one who would be coming with the clouds of heaven, who came to the Ancient of Days and was given authority prior to His coming, or whether you would say He saw Him coming and He realized what had already happened, that he had been brought before the Ancient of Days and had been given dominion, glory and a kingdom that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him, which ever way you take it, I believe the usage in the NT shows and also Ps. 110:1 shows that the giving of authority to Him precedes His coming with the clouds of heaven. And that this is a literal picture of One coming in the clouds of heaven as shown by the NT reference.

1

Of course the coming is symbolic. He is brought before the Ancient of days-- that is symbolic. The Ancient of Days is a Spirit. It would not be a physical thing, but it is exactly what is described in Ps. 110:1 that the Lord said to him, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

Now we discussed the subject -- the son of man -- a bit already, and I have only a little more to look at in this chapter. So I think this would make a good place to make a break. I'll have a little more to say about the chapter.

I did not know for sure whether it would be best to finish this before giving a mid-semester test, or to give the test at this point. I think it is better to give the test right at this point. So next time, if you will come prepared to take a test on which we have covered this far.

I make very definitely on whether you do the assignments, because I want them to be done on time so you will have some of the problems in mind when I discuss them. I do not mark them particularly on how well you interpret, but of course in the examination or the test, I think they will count about one-third of the semester's mark. We will see how well you thus far.

So next time we will meet sharply at 10 o'clock. You will have 25 minutes until 1025 for a test, a half-hour test, and then we'll collect the papers promptly and continue our discussion after that.

I have copies of the assignment for next time for you. Please don't forget them at the end of the class.

I hope everyone remembers the topic we discussed last time: The fate of the first three beasts. That was one of the questions we presented. I hope you all remembered it.

We look at the vision of deity, vv.9-10. We did not have time to much more than glance at it. I believe I mentioned that the translation "thrones were cast down" which is in the KJV is not accepted by anyone I know of today. Perhaps when they wrote it by casting down they meant putting thrones in place.

The same word is used in Daniel 6 for putting Daniel in the lion's den; and also for putting the other people in the lion's den after he was taken out. Also for putting the men in the fiery furnace. In any of those the meaning "cast" might fit. But there is a reference in Extra which seems to settle it's meaning "to place" where the king says they shall not place upon them tribute or tax. This is accepted by all interpreters today, I think, as showing that here the thrones were set up rather than cast down.

We noticed in this the symbol of the thrones. The plural of the word is pretty hard to find a conclusive answer as to why it is== it should be plural there. Certainly everyone who is mentioned in the passage is standing before the throne, before God. There is no mention of anyone else sitting.

The whole impression of the passage is of the tremendous power and glory of God.

I got a question: How do we know that this is the Ancient of Days here standing standing for the triune God? I believe we should feel that in the OT where we read the word God, it must be the triune God who is referred to, unless there is something in the context that clearly shows that it is to be taken as referring to only one person of the Godhead.

Most of the statements in the OT referring to God would certainly refer to the triune God. In this case the picture of God's power, majesty, and authority is the thing stressed in vv.9-10. There are mention of thrones but there is no mention of anyone other than God sitting upon these thrones in this picture.

The great emphasis is on His great purity and great knowledge and tremendous power - the fire issuing from it, thousands thousands serving him, ten thousand times ten thousand standing before Him. It does not at all give the impression of being a judgment scene.

In Revelation we find all the dead brought before God, and we find that books are opened and they are judged according to what is written in the books. That is a judgment scene of individuals. But here as Daniel sees the terrible situation on earth with this awful beast and the one horn that came out of the beast that is

described as such a terrible anti-God figure, then we find that he turns his eyes away from that and sees the great unseen reality of the tremendous power, knowledge and wisdom and authority of the triune God.

It is not a matter of God having to decide whether the beast deserves to be punished or not. The whole evidence is very clear. There is no question about it. -- that this beast deserves to be destroyed. It is a destruction that is not of individual human beings who are judged for their acts. But it is certainly God's judgment upon this great ungodly figure which represents so much of the characteristics of human government all through the ages.

In a world of sin, government is needed. We would all kill each other off if we did not have government. We need government. We need order. When we read about these great empires we think of them as great beasts, creatures of terror. They establish their will with force. But when we think of the world of sin, there is another way it is perfectly reasonable to think of these as that they were tremendous improvement over the situations that existed before them.

Because before these empires took control over great areas and in those areas established a great deal of peace and a considerable amount of justice, you had little tiny sections constantly fighting against each other, and no one's life was safe for very long. There was always lots of fighting and confusion between these very small sections, each of which had its sovereignty and was fighting against other sections in one conflict or another, and then a third one attacking these, etc.

So the establishing of empires is a necessity in a world of sin. We are not told anywhere in Scripture that God is going to establish a condition of anarchy in the world in which no government is needed. But we are told that all the wicked features of human government are to be completely destroyed, and that the One who will rule who is absolutely just and true and free from all sin.

So in this Vision of Deity it seems to me that it is a picture of the power of the great God as over against the wickedness of these great empires. That it is not a deliberative body in any sense of the word. This is a sign of God's judgment, a sign of His pouring out of His wrath upon ungodliness, rather than a picture of judgment of individuals. However, it is quite common to speak of it as a judgment scene.

Although I am quite convinced that the general bearing of the whole passage of these two verses is definitely different from a court scene, yet there are arguments on both sides. All recent translations that I have looked at take it as a court scene which seems to me to go against the general impact of the passage.

But in favor of its being a scene of judgment, is the placing of thrones. It seems as if they --- which looks as if they might be meeting for a judgment or court. It seems to me that instead of that he sees thrones which are in place there; the great God is

represented by one sitting there. And a stronger argument in favor of it is the last phrase & of v. 10, "and the books were opened." That suggests that they were looking for evidence in order to decide whether the beast needs to be punished. That does not seem reasonable. There is certainly _____ in the passage that fits the judgment of individuals.

So I would feel that the books being opened here is rather a symbolic ~~xxx~~ statement of God's complete knowledge of everything that the beast has done. Seen as happening on earth at the time that is here pictured. But one must say that the phrase does suggest the other. And I believe all recent translators have taken it as the other.

The key phrase to this question is the phrase which the KJV translates "the judgment was set." That translation ~~ix~~ it seems to me would fit with the general tenor of the key verses. Here is the mighty God, the sovereign God there with all these firey flames going out from him; the wheels of burning fire and the thousands of thousands ready to perform His will. And His judgment was set. His judgment against the beast had been determined from long before the time the beast had ever come into existence. It is set, and even though you see the little horn speaking his great boastful words and making war on the saints and seems to win against them, and things look hopeless from a human viewpoint, God's judgment is set and will be carried out in its own time.

Now in favor of that interpretation is the fact that the word "judgment" is a word that does not mean a court; it means a decision. The decision for the judgment was set. All the recent commentaries that take the interpretation that this is a court ~~xxx~~ scene, translate that phrase "the court sat" and the books were opened.

It seems to be quite out of relationship with the general tenor of the two verses. And they say the word "judgment" here means decision or judgment, but they say the abstract is here used for the concrete! That can be done, but I'd like some proof that it is done before I accept it. I'd like some other passage _____

This word din here which means judgment is used in the Medieval Jewish writings-- in the Talmud-- a great deal. And there when they refer to a court, they call it Beth Din i.e. the house of judgment. And if this meant "court" it would seem to me that place of judgment or house of judgment,-- something like that would be more appropriate ~~xxxxxxx~~ than the word which means a "decision" rather than a body to make a decision.

However, the fact remains that it does say it sat, and uses the ordinary word "to sit", and that seems, at least to our modern minds, to fit more with a court than with the fact that the judgment was set, that it was sitting from all eternity. So I would not be dogmatic on this. I would state my opinion about it, but all the recent interpretations that I have seen take it the other way.

A very interesting question was turned in to me right on this point. It says, Is it not possible that== no this is not the one. This is the one: In the French Judicial system the Judge is also Jury

Could this be the type of scene in Dan. 7:9-10. the court being an audience or followers or crowds as in a monarchy(?) And it seems to me that fits more with this situation. If you say the court sat, and by that you mean that the Lord's court was sitting to which He gave His decision, rather than a court in our American sense of ~~ex~~ a body in which the Judge is just an impartial arbiter, and the lawyers fight it out, it would seem reasonable, to fit better.

P. The Son of Man.

This I do not believe I'll take much time on now because we have discussed it rather fully in connection with your assignment at an earlier time. We mentioned that in Daniel 8:17 he addresses Daniel as Son of Man. In Ezekiel, dozens of times, the Lord addresses Ezekiel as son of man. So the word itself simply means a human being. One like a son of man could mean one who looks like a man.

It's interesting that he does not say a man, but one like a man. Some find in that a suggestion of the fact that Jesus Christ was not only a man but was also God. Whether that is valid I could not say. But the interesting thing is that Jesus Christ himself so frequently called himself the son of man and he was certainly not there simply saying he was a human being.

It is agreed, I believe by all interpreters that when Jesus called himself the son of man he was connecting himself with that one OT usage of that term. And referring to Himself as the Messiah as the Coming One, the Son of Man.

We noticed that this picture of the Son of Man coming in clouds parallels the stone in chapter 2. That the judgment upon the beast is brought about by the coming of the stone cut without hands which destroys the statue and which grows so that it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. Here it is pictured as One like the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven.

This whole passage is so much of it figurative or symbolical that the natural interpretation of this would be that the son of man stands for a church, stands for a group, stands for the Jewish nations, something like that in the context if it were not for our clear evidence in the NT that Jesus applied it to himself as something that was specifically to happen in relation to one individual.

Therefore I believe we have conclusive evidence that here in the midst of a highly figurative passage we have a literal picture of something that is to happen, the Son of Man to come with the clouds of heaven. As the angel said to the disciples, This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye see him go. This is right in connection with the statement in v. 11 that the beast is slain and its body is given to the burning flame. The destruction of the image in ch. 2 is tied to the coming of the stone. Here ~~is~~ it is not ~~xxx~~ quite so tightly tied to that. But it is given in connection with it. And it leads to the result which was there of building a great kingdom.

Right at this point this other question fits which says that, Is it not possible that Jesus received the authority at the time of the resurrection, figuratively raised at the right hand of the Father, but only received the kingdom upon His return to earth, much as an ancient traveller== ancient ruler would travel to the castle to receive the kingdom from the king as in Luke 19:12? It seems to me that is a very good statement of what the situation is.

He approached the Ancient of Days. They brought him near to him and there was given to him dominion, glory and a kingdom thall people and nations should serve him, and an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away. His kingdom is that which shall not be destroyed. It seems to me that the second thing stated here is happening before the first. That he sees the One coming who HAD been brought near to the Ancient of days. The Ancient of days has given him this authority and so he is sitting at his right hand waiting until his foes be made his footstool.

So Jesus combines the two passages, putting them in chronological order. "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." So much for the time order there and the next point we look at is

G. The New Kingdom.

We are told his kingdom is that which shall not pass away which shall never be destroyed. It's an entirely different kind of regime. It follows the destruction of the beast. It's an entirely different kind of regime. It covers the entire earth. It is given to the saints. We find that in vv.18,22, and 27. It nowhere says that the saints are going to destroy the established kingdom. It nowhere says that the saints are going to established the kingdom.

It says that the Son of man will come in clouds of heaven and He will establish the kingdom. I believe God wants us to do everything we can as an incidental part of our activities on this earth to make it a better earth for in which all men to live. But if we take an objective to make a perfect world and to set up the kingdom of God on earth, I think we'll have disappointments ahead because God has never promised that human beings will succeed in doing this.

We've had wonderful people starting out to establish a perfect society, time after time and it always has degenerated and proven in the end to be a failure. God is interested in the development of individuals who will live forever, and He has individuals here in the midst of a condition upon this earth which is a condition where sin is on the earth, where government is necessary but where human government has these many evil features which will be completely destroyed.

The new regime is to be indestructible, and at that point I read in some commentaries, This is not the millennium; it is an

eternal kingdom. But I don't believe you can find any Scripture which says that this situation which is established when Christ comes back is going to go on and on and on forever. We don't know what God has way ahead in His plan. But we do know that the kingdom which he sets up will be indestructible. No one can destroy it.

God can change certain features of it if he chooses, and so I think that premillennialism means that man is not expected to establish a perfect regime on ~~his~~ earth here, or to destroy all wickedness. God is going to do that at the end of the age.

Some think of premillennialism as very pessimistic-- that everything is going to get worse. I don't think that is a proper interpretation. Whether things are going to get a great deal worse or a great deal better, I don't think God has told us. But he has told us that at the end of the age there will be a period when things will be very bad, when the little horn will seem to be about to ~~xxxxxx~~ utterly destroy ~~xxxxxx~~ and will be winning victory over them, and they will be given ~~vxxx~~ victory not by their succeeding in establishing a perfect world and in destroying those wicked men, but by our Lord coming back and setting up his kingdom of righteousness and peace, and this kingdom is an indestructible kingdom. Because in Revelation the word "millennium" of 1000 years is used six times in relation to it, we call it a millennium.

Whether we have to take that 1000 years as literally an exact 1000 years, or a long period of time, I don't think we should be dogmatic about. But we are not told that it is to be destroyed, but after a long period of time, God will make certain changes, and the exact nature of those changes we have not been told. There are many things in the future we have not been told.

But these few specific features which are called premillennialism seem to me to be very clearly taught in the Scripture.

We'll have to stop there and don't forget to get the assignment for next week which I will have up here for you.

I had to be away the last half of last week and did not finish (grading) the tests though very substantial progress has been made in marking them. I had a very worthwhile time in Chicago, extremely busy, many meetings. Three hundred people, most of them rather prominent in Christian work. People from a number of different denominational viewpoints from many parts of the country. I met some I had not seen for 20 years and had many interesting contacts. At the end they signed a statement which was hammered out -- a statement about eight pages long -- which was hammered out with many different sections with different ones discussing, with one group and another, and then all together. Two or three men worked all night on it a couple of nights. So I believe it's a very fine statement.

Question: You say all 300 signed the statement?

I had to leave to catch my plane before the end, and I don't know just how many signed it yet. I did sign it before I left, but those I have heard from have said that most signed it. But I am just not sure. I hope they did. In some of the discussions you wondered if anybody would sign it, because people were fussing about little points, but when it came to the end I think there was a pretty good consensus. Of course it was not dealing with anything but inerrancy. But inerrancy is a matter that has to be carefully defined or you can infer other things that you don't mean.

For instance there is a big disagreement about the matter of dictation. There are people who think that God dictated the whole Bible. There are other people who think that the worst thing we could suggest is such an awful thing that God dictated it. Well, I've dictated to a secretary and that's no reason God couldnot have dictated if He chose! But we don't believe He did because we see such evidence of personality of the different writers. Yet certainly some of it was dictated like the ten commandments. God spoke these words.

So to make a statement that would avoid misunderstanding and wouldnot err this direction or the other was difficult, but I think a good job was done.

Question: Be able to get copies of the statement?

I hope so. I hope it will be given wide publicity. But it is a long statement and what they were afraid of was that people would pick out a sentence here or there and might give the wrong impression, so great care was taken to avoid that possibility. I know that Satan's people are veryclever at misrepresenting things. I just hope that nothing is quoted in a way that would give a different impression from what is meant. I'm sure the wholething will be made available.

Student: Dr. Newman put a copy of it on our bulletin board this morning.

Very good. That's fine. It went through several editions, and there was a great deal of discussion. Just about every word of it was carefully studied. It is very well written too.

I think that a great part of the credit for that goes to Dr. J.I. Packer who spent the greater part of two nights working on the wording of it. There were others who made real contributions too.

I'd better not take more time on that right now. I maybe better go on to mention a question that was turned in to me that I think is very important. So I want to read it to you.

It's called a practical question: Dan. 7:10. The judgment was set or the court sat. What do you suggest we do about preaching this passage? Is it possible to bring out an interpretation such as yours without bewildering and distracting the audience? Do we simply mention the problem and our opinion, or add remarks about the difficulties of translation, etc. It has been my experience that people have been very touchy about any change in what their version says. Here a difference of meaning seems to be involved.

This, I think is a very important question. Because the spokesman for God has two very important duties. One is to be sure what God says. The other is to say it in a way that will get the truth across. Well now, a person can be sure that God has said that whosoever believes in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved. He can be sure that there is only one God. He can be sure there are three persons in the Godhead. There are many things of which we can be absolutely sure.

The vital task of the Christian interpreter is to get these things across which are absolutely clear in Scripture. Therefore God sometimes uses people with no education who read a few simple truths and present them. It's far better to present a few simple truths and have them -- people get them, than to have a great deal of truth presented in such a way that nobody gets any of it.

So this is a very very vital part of the work of every one of us, and we do not want to confuse people. If a person says, Some say this and some say that.... I remember hearing of a minister one of whose congregation brought him a big sack of potatoes. He said, I surely appreciate this, but why did you bring me these potatoes? She said, I've so often heard you say that the common taters (commentaters) disagree with you! I think she had no idea what he was talking about, and there is no point in that. We have to have some idea of the people to whom we talk how much they can understand.

At the same time God gave his Word not simply to ~~the~~ deal with a few simple truths, or He would have given us two or three chapters-- for the whole Bible. His Word gives us a great deal that is absolutely clear and a great deal that has tremendous relevance at one time and is difficult to understand at another time. There may be parts of the Bible that we have great difficulty in understanding today that have just exactly the truth God's people will need 10 years from now, if the Lord tarries. New problems arise all the time, and the answer to the problems is in the Bible.

So we are training people whom we hope will be able to give the great central truths of the Bible in a way that they will get them across.

But we here have a greater objective than that. We want to train those who can go to the Word and see exactly what it means and what its truth is as it relates to situations as they change.

So there are two duties of our graduates and of people of the calibre we hope our graduates will be. There are two different duties. One is learning what the Bible means, and the second is getting to people the great truths of the Bible. I believe we should keep these two sharply separated in our minds.

So I think it is vital that where you can't be sure what a passage means you don't jump to conclusions, but you see what the possibilities are and as you study some other passage or situations change you may then see exactly what it did mean and how it fits in with the insights you've gotten from some other passage or with the changing situations in the world. So I believe it is tremendously important that you study it very carefully. That you have a certain number of people who are able to say. This verse is absolutely clear. This verse has two possibilities and we are not at present in a position to decide between them. This verse has two possibilities one of them I feel ~~xx~~ almost sure is correct, but I'm not going to build a truth on that except as I find support from other passages.

That is a very important part of your work. That is you understanding of the Word. And a very important part is getting people the truth you == they need without confusion without confusing them.

Now right there there is really a second element in this question. Some people are very touchy about anything in what their version says. As someone said, If the KJV was good enough for St. Paul, why isn't it good enough for us? Well, we all know that was not the case. That the KJV came 1500 years after St. Paul wrote, yet I got a printed piece of literature yesterday from a very active Christian worker who actually said in it, Are we to believe that God left us 1900 years without knowing what the true Bible is? Which certainly implies that KJV is the Bible that St. Paul had!

We know that the KJV was a translation made by godly men and excellent scholars aware of the situations of their day using a language ~~x~~ that nobody can speak today! There are == we can understand it fairly well. But there are many words in the KJV that very few people today understand, because some of them are not used and some of them have changed their meaning. Most of it we can figure out fairly well what they mean. And there are places where the translators certainly erred in their decision, though on this ground I find many cases where I think the KJV translators, as ~~x~~ far as meaning is concerned, did a better job than any recent interpreters have done.

But now that the Bible that is most widely used is in a language that most people == that nobody living can understand

every part of it without consulting the dictionaries of the Elizabethan language, and that sort of thing. And most people have a little difficulty themselves. We Christians are so used to it, it sounds perfectly natural, but we don't talk that way any of us today. Consequently we can be sure that we don't exactly _____ in a great many places.

In that situation it is absolutely necessary that the people of today have the Bible in their own language, that they can understand today. Naturally, as in the days of King James there were a dozen different versions competing for attention. There will be versions competing for attention today. Though I don't believe many intelligent Christians are going to stay long in a situation where one particular English version seems to be so exactly right that you cannot differ from it. I think that's a problem that won't stay with us very long.

People will recognize that getting an exact translation is impossible, and yet we have a good approximation in a number of recent versions. The NIV has just come out. It is, as far as I can see the best translation that has yet been made. It ought to be with the tremendous number of hours, thousands of hours, that have been spent by literally hundreds of translators in working on it. It ought to be the best that has yet come out. But it is a very good version that has just come out, in fact this is to be presented tomorrow to people in Philadelphia. There will be two or three pastors there, a press release and I have been asked to go and participate in the presentation of it.

I wish that the time would come again when we would have one English version that most of us would use. I don't if that will come for a number of years. But ordinarily, I don't think in preaching you want to enter into problems of translation. But I do believe there will have to be times when if you give the Word of God sincerely, you will have to say, This English word, this Hebrew word, this Greek word cannot be translated exactly into English. Here is a good approximation. Here is a good attempt at it.

You have to do that. But in a matter where there is such a difference of meaning as to whether this is a judgment scene or whether it is a presentation of God's omnipotent power as he carries out the judgments he has already made, in a situation like that I would say that ordinarily it would be wise to take the great truths of the passage that are vital and of which there is no doubt and stress them, and only lightly touch on the possibility of a difference of opinion there. I would think that in the ordinary group that would be the wise thing to do. But there will be, if you have an intelligent audience, when it is wise to enter into a problem like that and show the reasons on each side and how it fits in with other passages.

That is so important I thought it was worth taking a bit of time on that particular question.

In our discussion we spoke about how in ch. 7 (of Daniel) we have the new kingdom which _____ we looked at. We noticed the different factors there.

I believe we had finished our general discussion of what is given about the new kingdom in that ch. Then we were ready to look at

H. Conclusions regarding chs. 2 and 7.

We have four kingdoms described in both of them.

Now as a matter of methodology === when we had ch. 2 I said from this ch. you can't tell whether there are four kingdoms or five. I think that is vital we recognize that. We do not get from ch. 2 the assurance there are four kingdoms. Ch. 2 has either 4 sections or 5, and you can't tell which. But when you come to ch. 7 this question is answered.

So 45 years later God reveals that there were four, not five. But there is a second phase of the fourth animal which is represented by the fifth part of the statue. So there is a very important part of the teaching of these two chapters.

The four kingdoms there described can be seen in history. We believe that Daniel wrote this book in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and have no trouble fitting them with history. The Babylonian kingdom, the Persian empire, the Hellenistic empire and the Roman empire. Those who hold the critical view that it was not written until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that it goes up to that period only, they have a history of three kingdoms, and predictions of four and they have to imagine a separate Median kingdom which did not exist.

So as far as the history is concerned, those who accept it as a genuine book by Daniel have no problem. Now as to the relation of the second part of the fourth kingdom to the first, it is quite evident that that second part has not yet occurred. The nearest to it would be from 400 to 600 A.D. which would come very near to fitting it, but there is a phrase in there about mingling with the seed of men which is pretty hard to understand. It's hard to know what it means. Personally I think that what it means will become clear when that period comes.

If you say that fits with the period 400 - 600 A.D. that could fit with almost of all history before that, so it's not much of a distinctive feature. More important is the fact the stone hits the statue on the feet and toes, and at the end of the Roman empire there was no establishment of a new kingdom which completely destroyed every vestige of the four kingdoms. That is to say of the qualities that enter into the human governments as shown in those four kingdoms.

So it seems to me that this second part must be something that is still future. There we have two possibilities. One is that there is an unmentioned interval. You have the first part and then you have a long space that is not seen, and then you have the second part.

The other possibility is that the === that you have the four great kingdoms as they would seem looking forward from Daniel's time, the first three being taken over by the succeeding ones; the fourth one not being taken over but having many different changes as they were overrun by new peoples and gradual changes taking place so that as the prophet looked forward he would see that

that extended and there would be that final stage yet to come. Both can be represented by the figure of the mountain. As you see the near peak which looks very large, and then beyond you see others, and beyond you see others. Then beyond that there may be a space between or there may be a long ridge reaching along with it. There may be a great mountain at a distance which you can't tell whether it comes right directly behind the first part of the fourth kingdom, or whether it is way distant.

So inbetween whether there is an unmentioned interval or whether there is a continuing ridge, we cannot be dogmatic at this point.

One thing that was brought out in ch. 7, and not brought out at all in ch. 2, is what is today generally spoken of as Antichrist. In a way that is an unfortunate term. It might be better if we called it the Little Horn. I don't know. But John said the Antichrist == that there are many antichrists and that antichrist is already here.

The Reformers declared that the Papacy was the antichrist. There was much to suggest that in those days, very much then. But the papacy has gone through all kinds of changes through the years. At the time when the papacy was so strongly opposing salvation by faith alone, in such a strong definite way, it was easy for the Reformers to reach that conclusion.

We must say as John said there are many antichrists. But there is one who is represented by a little horn. It is customary today to call that one antichrist. I suppose we might as well stick to the term, but since the term can be applied to others I wish we had another term to use for it.

This one who is called the Little Horn and fights against the saints and almost overcomes them, and it is only the supernatural interevention of God that prevents him from overcoming them, this one is mentioned in Isaiah 11, where we read about the coming of the Son of Man and we read in ch. 11 at the end of v. 4, With the breath of His lips shall he smāy the wicked.

This phrase "the wicked" does not convey the idea of the original to people today. A very good illustration of how our language has changed. When I was in Germany they would refer to me as the Large. The German word "large" simply means tall. It does not refer to your girth at all. They would simply refer to me as the Large, or the Tall. Now in English if you say the Tall, you mean a lot of tall people. We don't use it of one(person) -- an adjective, today. But in King James' time they did. They do today in German. They do in Hebrew. They do in Greek, and in most languages that I know that have different forms for singular and plural, you can put a the before it. But this word "wicked" is singular. He will destroy the Wicked One with the breath of His mouth. It's paralleled in ch. 7 when the Son of Man comes with the clouds of heaven, and as a result the Little Horn that fought with the saints is destroyed. Paul refers back to Isaiah very clearly in 2 Thess. 2 where he says in v. 3, "that Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition who opposes and exalts himself above all that is God."

And he is referred to again in v.8. "Then shall that Wicked One be revealed whom the Lord shall consumewith the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. This one whom Paul predicted, this one whom Isaiah predicted is certainly the one who is called the Little Horn of Dan. 7. Now whether we are to call him antichrist, if we do call him anti-christ lets just keep in mind that the term is used for others.

But here is one special one whom perhaps we should call Antichrist with a capital A, who as far as anyone knows is yet to come. I remember back just at the end of World War One, I read an account by a missionary from the Near East who said we have already seen the Antichrist. He said he was living there, and was not yet revealed to the world, but he said I've seen him performing simple miracles like simply looking at someone and they would drop dead, things like that, but he'll do things far greater than that later on. Well, many years have passed since that time so I ~~xxxx~~ think that missionary was wrong as to who he thought was the Antichrist.

The Antichrist may be living today, but I doubt if anybody could identify him. He may not come for many years. The Lord said that we do not know when the Lord is coming. We are not to know. So for all we know it might be another century or more, before the Antichrist comes. But it is made clear by Paul, by Isaiah, and by Daniel that there is THE one who will be the great center of wicked power, and who will make war with the saints and he would win the war if ~~we~~ if were not for the interventions by the Son of man.

In ch. 2 we had the account of the stone that hit the statue and completely destroyed it and then grew until it became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. Here in ch. 7 we have the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. Then we have the beast destroyed, which includes the little horn, of course. He is destroyed and his body is given to the fire. Not a vestige of it remains but he establishes a great newkingdom which cannot be destroyed.

We noted that does not mean there may not be a change in the organization after 1000 years. God is certainly not going to establish a permanent fixed condition with no change whatever. That was an idea of some old Greek philosopher who thought that God was onexxx like a great wooden indian, ~~xxxxx~~ standing there immoveable, unchangeable past present, and future ~~are~~ all the same ~~xxx~~ to Him. That is not the Christian idea.

Certainly the Bible teaches that God feels sorry. That God feels joy, that God does things. To make God into some sort of a fixed immoveable thing, He is unchangeable in His qualities and unchangeable in His attributes, unchangeable in his love, but He grieves and He rejoices. He is a spirit. He has the qualities that our spirits have.

So what will happen beyond the 1000 years after the Lord's coming back we don't know a great deal about. I told someone once, how I wished I could climb a certain mountain. I've climbed many mountains and there are many others I wish I could climb.

But there was just not time enough to climb them. And I said I used to be very sad because I could not climb all the mountains I'd like, but then I realized that during the millennium I'll have time to climb a lot of those!

A man said to me, You say the millennium! Why not say the eternal state? Well, I don't think there is any such thing in the Bible as the eternal state. What will be beyond the millennium we just don't know. God may have many interesting surprises for us. All the sin and wickedness of this life is to be eradicated with the coming of the Son of man.

Now we are ready to take a jump forward which may seem strange. To jump clear forward from ch. 7 to ch. 11. But the reason I wish to do that is because there are certain things that will come out in ch. 7 which are much easier to discuss in connection with it than with ch. 8, and it will make it much easier for us to deal with ch. 8 if we look at these first.

I think it would be a mistake to look at ch. 7 first and then look at ch. 2, because ch. 2 was given and ch. 7 was given 45 years later. So we can use ch. 7 to throw light on ch. 2, but we should start with ch. 2. Here we have ch. 7 which was given in the first year of Belshazzar, and we have ch. 8 which was given in the third year of Belshazzar. Then ch. 9 in the first year of Darius whom Cyrus made king over the realm of the Chaldeans, over that portion of his empire. Then we have chs. 10-12 which were in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia.

So these chs. are given in a very short range of time. There is no great harm done in our looking at ch. 11 first. Ch. 11 is a chapter that not a great many people get a great deal out of. The archbishop who put in the ch. divisions certainly did not understand it, because as you know he put the ch. division one verse too early.

Ch. 10 tells about God sending a messenger to Daniel, and this messenger speaks, and ch. 11:1 he is telling about his difficulties in bringing this message to Daniel. But v. 2 begins this prophecy: "Now will I show you the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia, and the fourth shall be richer than they all."

The critics say, According to the Book of Daniel there were only four kings of Persia. There were only these four. The author didn't know about any others. He was just ignorant! I have given you a statement which I hope you all have with you, which records important facts about the history. It lists all the kings of Persia, except one. That one was a usurper who held the power for a very brief time.

I have not listed them all. I have listed the ones vital to us and then said, Six more kings and then named the last one. There were actually 10 kings of Persia in the period of the Persian empire, between its establishment by Cyrus and its conquest by Alexander. This says, There will be three kings and the fourth will be richer than they all, and (v.3) a mighty king shall

up who we find out is the king who destroyed the Persian empire. Well, the fact of the matter is of course that the chapter here is giving us certain vital points and not telling us of what is in between.

So we have here in order to pinpoint ~~a~~ particular points we have mention of just the first four kings. The first of these is Cyrus, and I have the dates 559 there when he became king. 546 when he gained his independence and took over control of the whole Median complex of tribes. 539 when he conquered Babylon. 529 when he died.

Then he was succeeded by his son Cambyses who reigned from 529 to 522. I did not list there the Pseudo Smrydus which is the name given to a servant who held power for just 8 months, but who certainly could be ranked there as a king of Persia.

These three then-- Cyrus, and Cambyses, and Smerdis---- well Cyrus is the first and after Cyrus there is Cambyses, Pseudo Smerdis, and Darius. And the fourth would be Xerxes.

I need to call to your attention a little bit of the history at this point. Cyrus, as you know, ~~x~~ began there in Persia with a small domain. He got control of all the realm of the Medes. Then he went westward and he conquered all of Asia Minor.

You see how large Asia Minor is here on the map. He conquered all of Asia Minor, and then he turned south again and conquered ~~all of~~ the Babylonian empire. Then he went East again, and conquered as far as you can see there on that map, clear into the area of India. He conquered -- he and his son, they conquered -- either he or his son -- conquered north-west India.

His son Cambyses also came down and conquered all of Egypt, so that was the largest empire that the world had seen up to that time. But after Cyrus's death, and after Cambyses' death this Pseudo Smerdes reigned for 8 months and then a cousin of Cambyses, named Darius, got rid of Pseudo Smerdes and proclaimed himself legitimate king, and he might be called the second founder of the Persian empire.

Because Darius organized the empire. Cyrus was conquering and bringing all these regions under him. Darius had rebellions all over the empire the first few years of his reign were occupied with putting down these rebellions, getting the whole empire under his control. But then he organized it in such a way that it continued in great strength for 200 years, and was probably just about as strong at the end of that time as at the beginning.

But Alexander the great was a very great stratigist, a great fighter, and had a wonderful army and he conquered it in a comparatively short space of 12 years. But Darius raised the empire to the highest point at which it had yet been.

So it says a fourth shall be richer than they all. The fourth inheritted greater wealth, and greater power than either of the previous kings had, except it be Darius at the very end of his reign.

So it truly says, The fourth will be richer than they all. Then the verse goes on and says, By his strength, through his riches he will stir up all against the realm of Greece.

Any of you who have studied ancient history-- in ancient history it used to be at least they _____ attention _____ to the oriental background, but they paid a very considerable amount of attention to the history of Greece. Any one who reads much about ancient Greece is familiar with the Persian war.

The Greeks had built cities and colonies along the shore of Asia Minor. These were great prosperous Greek cities. They were all conquered by Cyrus. They were part of the Persian empire. But they did not want to be part of the Persian empire, and they tried to gain their freedom. Cyrus could hold them in subjection fairly easily with his great army. And Darius could hold them in subjection fairly easily with his great army, and his wonderful organization, if it were not for the fact that the cities of Greece were constantly sending help to these cities in Asia Minor, and trying to help their fellow Greeks to gain their independence in their cities on the ~~xxx~~ coast of Asia Minor.

So Darius said, I will put a stop to this; I will conquer Greece too. He sent a great army to attack Greece, and tried to conquer Greece, but partly through bad weather, partly through mistakes in strategy by his generals he failed. And the Greeks were very proud of having fought back Darius' attempt to conquer them.

But Darius said we must conquer Greece; we can't have them constantly raising rebellions against us in Asia Minor this way. So Darius set to work to gather the greatest army the world had ever seen. Ten years were devoted to gathering this great army, and in preparing tremendous amounts of material. But before it was all ready Darius died.

So the fourth who was richer than they all--Xerxes--when this great army was ready, started out to conquer the Greeks. They say it took a whole week for the armies to walk across the bridges they built across the Hellespont near Constantinople from Asia into Europe. It was a tremendous army and tremendous navy.

The Greeks facing this would ordinarily have had little hope of defeating it. As it worked out there was a combination of circumstances, and the fact that this contained people with so many different languages it was difficult for them to communicate and to direct them as they should.

Some bad storms injured many of their ships, and the Greeks were able to manouver their ships into a place where they were at a great disadvantage. We haven't time to go into the details of it but it was a very remarkable event in history that the Greeks succeeded in defeating this tremendous attempt to destroy the Greeks.

The Greeks after that time were constantly remembering the great glory of their victory over the Persians and looking forward to the time when they would completely end the Persian control of the Greek cities there in a democracy.

So this statement, By his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece is a very precise prediction of something that took place a few decades after Daniel, if we believe as we do that Daniel wrote it.

Of course to the critics this is someone looking back and giving a correct statement of history.

Question: Xerxes is the fourth king then, Xerxes ~~XX~~ I?

Yes, he is the one by his strength, through his riches he stirred up all against the realm of Greece.

Then v. 3 says, A mighty king shall stand up that shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will. That does not tell us much about what this man was going to do. It points to his great strength and power.

But when you read v. 4, you have very specific details about Alexander the Great. So there is absolutely no doubt that Alexander the Great is the one referred to in vv.3 and 4. Alexander the Great fulfilled the great desire of the Greeks to get back at the Persians for the Persian attempt to destroy Greece! But there is an interval of well over a century. Xerxes became king in 486-- I forget the exact date, about 480 when his attempt to conquer Greece ended, and it was 336 when Alexander the Great ~~became~~ became king.

So you have 150 years passed over between v. 2 and v.3. There is an unmentioned interval of 150 years at this point. There is no question that v. 2 refers to Xerxes; there is no question that v. 3 refers to Alexander. An unmentioned interval of 150 years.

You would not know much about Alexander from v. 3. It does not tell about his conquering the Persian empire, but that is perhaps implied. We know that is what happened historically and that is specifically stated in ch. 6.

Then v. 4: "When he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven." When Alexander the Great after 12 years of constant fighting in which he performed the greatest blitzkrieg perhaps that the world has ever seen, at least when you think of the relation of the materials he had with the materials available in this century---in view of that it certainly was.

He went from Macedonia, north of Greece proper, he got Greece under his control and then he moved eastward and conquered areas there that had never been subject to his father (Macedon). He ~~xxx~~ crossed over into Asia Minor. He met a great Persian army and defeated it. Then he marched down into Syria, and he

found that he could no go further into the Persian empire without destroying the Persian navy because he would not have his line of supplies taken.

So he spent a couple of years gaining control of the costal cities there. He spent nine months in conquering Tyre.

Then he went down into Egypt. Egypt had been conquered by Cyrus, had been subject to the Persians for 100 years and then had gained its freedom. Ninety years later, Egypt revolted against the Persians --- no, it gained its freedom after a century, and then after it had been 90 years after its successful revolt, the Persians again ~~re~~ attacked Egypt and reconquered it. And they had held it only 10 years when Alexander came. So when Alexander came the people welcomed him as further protection against the Persians. Alexander claimed to be their deliverer from the Persians.

Alexander worshipped the Egyptian gods and declared himself to be a successor of the old Pharaohs. All this took time. Then he marched inland. Met another great Persian army and destroyed it. Conquered all of Persia and marched clear east as far as India, then came back to Babylon and suddenly was taken ill there and after about 10 days with a bad fever he died.

Here was a young man in his early thirties who had done this tremendous feat, who suddenly dies. It says here, His kingdom shall be broken and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven and not to his posterity.

When Alexander died the question was who shall succeed him. He had an idiot half-brother who everybody knew did not have the ability to reign. But you might say he had a claim to be the ruler. He was older than Alexander. The only way he could rule would be as a figure-head.

Alexander had married a Persian woman, and they were expecting they would have a child and that child would be the true successor naturally. So there was a division of opinion about it. In either case they had to have a regent in the mean time. The regent, as long as the idiot half-brother lived, if he became king, a regent for the boy if it should be a boy that was born until he would come to age.

So they appointed a regent and they divided all the vast empire into 20 parts and different generals agreed to control these 20 parts and to rule them. So it was divided toward the four winds of heaven. But these generals, many of them, decided they wanted to be emperor, so Alexander's child was destroyed; his half-brother was destroyed; his mother was killed; every relative was killed in the course of the next 15 years.

So "not to his posterity." There was no succeeding ruler who was related to Alexander who ruled for any length of time in actuality.

"Nor according to his dominion which he ruled." No one of these though they fought for nearly 40 years trying to get the

control of the whole empire, no one succeeded. So their dominion was much inferior to that which Alexander had held.

"For his kingdom shall be plucked up even for other beside those." Now you have that picture of the kingdom which Alexander held. It is divided up. Then the next verse begins with the words: "The king of the south shall be strong." And what would you think would be meant by "the king of the south"? It would seem quite obvious that Egypt is much further south than any other part of the empire.

One of Alexander's generals, Ptolemy, was more far-sighted than the rest. He saw that this empire would not be kept together. It would be impossible. And he said, I would like to be governor of Egypt. The rest said alright, if you want to be governor of Egypt, fine. You take Egypt, and I'll take this section, and this section, and they divided it up.

could not

Ptolemy figured Egypt ~~would~~ be attacked, except that little very small area coming in from Asia, or from the sea. And if he kept a strong navy, he could continue his kingdom safely regardless of what happened to the rest. With that as a secure base he might be able to get all the rest Egypt.

So "the king of the south shall be strong" was literally fulfilled in Ptolemy. Then it says, And one of his princes, and he shall be strong above him and have dominion, and his dominion shall be a great dominion. Ptolemy fought with the other generals. The man who had been the governor of the area of Babylon, was ~~xxx~~ driven out from his area and went to Egypt and became one of Ptolemy's leading officers. His name was Seleucus.

Seleucus became one of Ptolemy's leading ~~xxxxxx~~ officers, so he can be properly called "one of his princes." But Seleucus, with Ptolemy's help, went back up into Asia and in 312 B.C. established himself in control of Babylon, and eventually got control of the whole empire from there north to Asia Minor--- most of Asia Minor-- and eastward, clear to India!

So he had perhaps the area of Alexander's empire. So it says "he shall be strong above him"-- he was stronger than Ptolemy. He had been one of his officers. And have dominion, and his dominion shall be a great dominion. So up to this point if you looked forward, you could not tell what would happen. But if you look back to that time, you could easily see how Daniel had been able to predict the course of these important events. It was not given to satisfy curiosity about the future. It was given in order that they would see as it happened, that Daniel was a true prophet, and that his words were dependable, and ~~xxx~~ it would pinpoint to those matters to which he would give more attention later on.

I must mention the assignment for next time. You have looked at this ch. and have noted that some kings are spoken of with only a verse or two, some are given more space. One individual is given space from vv. 21-35. I'd like you to look at vv. 21-35. In those vv. I would like you to tell me (1) what does it tell about how the man who is introduced at v. 21, how did he become king?

You can easily gather that information from the next few verses. How did he become king? (2) What relation did he have to the king of the south? What does it tell about his relation to the king of the south? (3) What do these verses (21-35) tell about God's people and about this king's relation to them? Gather that ~~xx~~ information from vv. 21-35. What particular statements fall under each of these heads? We will discuss that next time. We will be discussing these verses which relate to the history of the Seleucus and the Ptolemies and I have mimeographed a general statement of the history that I would like you each to take a copy of.

Question: Repeat the third question.

What does he say about God's people and this man's relation to them?

Here are these sheets that give the principal facts about the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. I'd like each of you to have a copy. It is not for you to memorize, at all. You will have these facts before you as we discuss the next things next time. I'll put them here where everybody can take a copy.

I am very glad when you give me questions. If it's anything I don't make clear, if you can write out the question and give it to me, I appreciate it very much. I don't like to have the only way I know I'm getting the material across be one test in the middle and one examination. So if you give me questions it's great help to me. If there is anything you disagree with that I present, or if you think of a better interpretation I'm very glad to get that in writing too. So I don't feel we should take much time in class for individual questions. Unless after I read them I feel they are important enough to take up time in class.

Here's a question I was given at the end of the last hour that I think is very important. I want to be sure all of you get it so I will turn this on -- off so it will not distract your attention from it.

The question was this: Why do you call the fourth king Xerxes I when v.1 talks about Darius, and then v. 2 says, "Now I will show you the truth, there shall stand yet three kings and the fourth." It seems that the fourth would point to further kings away from Darius, and not the king next, Xerxes I.

This is a very important question because there is a matter that I have mentioned, but not stressed that if you don't have clearly in mind could cause you confusion. I might say there are two elements that enter into that.

The first is that we have noticed chs. 10-12 form a sort of unit. Of those three chs. the first verse in ch. 11 belongs with what precedes rather than with what follows. But the second point is this: this Darius the Mede is a different person from Darius the king of Persia. Darius the Mede seems to have been the man whom Cyrus put in charge of the kingdom of Babylon after he conquered it.

Most interpreters think it was a man named Gobryas who is mentioned in one of Cyrus' inscriptions. One recent writer thinks it is another name for Cyrus himself. But this Darius the Mede is different from the Persian king who is mentioned on the sheet of facts of ancient history that I gave to you. So it is very good to have that clearly in mind and I appreciate greatly having this question.

The answers to the test I gave you two weeks ago, I was not able to discuss with you last week because I was away a good bit of the time between the test and our meeting last week. But now they have been very carefully gone over. Some of them are very good, and some of them are quite disappointing. I believe it would be helpful to take the time to look at these questions; to take a few minutes and look at the different questions together.

I think I'll start with the questions given to people with odd-numbered seats. The first of those was: Briefly state the critical theory regarding the meaning of Daniel's prediction.

This can be briefly stated in about two sentences, but it is quite important at various points of our interpretation. Our purpose in this class is not to discuss the critical theory. We believe that this is a book that God inspired. The critical theory is that it was not written by Daniel but written two centuries later!

We could spend a good bit of time on the evidences. I believe that the evidences are not sufficient to raise great doubt about Daniel's having written it. But there are many commentaries written from that viewpoint, and it affects their interpretation at many points. So it is vital to have a clear understanding of what the critical theory is. And the critical theory that was advanced at least as early as the second century A.D. which was answered by St. Jerome in the 4th century A.D.

The critical theory is that the book of Daniel was written at c. 160 B.C. That it was written in order to encourage the Jews at the time when Antiochus Epiphanes, a Seleucid king was persecuting them. And that it contains == it claims to be written by a man three centuries earlier, and predicts things the writer knew had already happened. So it gives past history as if it were future prediction. And that when it comes to Antiochus Epiphanes, it gives a true account of him and his reign up to a certain point and then beyond that it just gives the guesses of the writer, and his hopes as to what might occur.

This (view) affects a great many commentaries on the book of Daniel. For instance, F. W. Farrar's book *The Life of Christ* is very highly regarded by many, he has written a commentary on Daniel that is written from this critical viewpoint that the book was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

So it should not take long to briefly state the theory, but it is very important to have it in mind.

The second question was: Discuss the meaning of the words "Thou art this head of gold." There were a few students who gave some interesting words about the importance of gold and the importance of Nebuchadnezzar and that sort of thing, which is rather obvious, but not what we discussed in class under the discussion of this verse.

I pointed out at that time as shown on the sheets of facts of ancient history that I gave you, that Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by Amil Marduk who was succeeded by Nergalsharezzar who was succeeded by Lahashi Marduk who was succeeded by Nabonidus. So if the head of gold means Nebuchadnezzar himself personally, then there are three kings after him before the next kingdom comes. You can't say that the next kingdom is his son who reigned only about three months! And the third kingdom the next king who reigned for four years! And then the next kingdom his son who reigned about three months! That of course would be absurd, so it is clear there is a break between Nebuchadnezzar-- an unmentioned interval between him and the second kingdom which it says will come after thee.

Or, as I think much more likely, when he says, "Thou art this head of gold", he does not mean Nebuchadnezzar personally but he means Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. And that could mean the period of the Neo-Babylonian empire--these who five kings together. Or, I think still more likely, the whole period of the Assyrian and Babylonian empire.

Now that we discussed some time ago, but I wish that you would review it because it is very important for your understanding of the prophecy.

The next question was :Discuss the meaning of Dan. 7:12. Someone came up to me and said, Didn't you mean, Dan. 7:13? Well, we discussed Dan. 7:13 at length. We spoke briefly about Dan. 7:12. And Dan. 7:12 says:-- it is a verse which is not carefully interpreted could be rather baffling. Because after telling about the destruction of the great beast, it says, "And for the rest of the beasts they had their dominion taken away yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time."

Does this mean that when the great beast, the fourth beast was killed and his body burned, the other beasts continued on? That wouldn't make sense would it? So it quite obviously is Daniel looking back in his vision and remembering the fact that the other beasts when their dominion was taken away, that they lived on. In other words, that their qualities remained into the succeeding rulers. All four beasts make one continuous history of human sin and human wickedness ruling over the earth. A continuous thing, and all four are destroyed when the last, the great beast is destroyed.

That, of course, is clearly brought out in ch. 2 where it says when the stone hit the statue, the gold, the silver, the bronze, the iron and the clay were all mixed together and were all dissolved and all blown away. So that was a difficult point with this verse the way it stands, and we took a little time to explain it, and I'm sorry that some of you did not remember it.

Then, number 4, Briefly tell what is designated by the term Ancient of Days in each occurrence in Dan. 7. When I say, in each occurrence, I meant that to mean that you show the difference between the occurrences. It is quite obvious that Ancient of days means the one who existed way way back. Ancient of days -- that, of course is obvious.

In the context we learn that the Ancient of days is One with tremendous power. Thousands times greater, a million times greater than any human being has ever had. But in this ch., as we noticed, this Ancient of days is mentioned three times. In the first occurrence it is very obviously describing the Triune God. Now, of course someone may say, This is not the Triune God, this is God the Father. I would not count that 100% wrong, but I certainly do not think that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are so inferior to God the Father, that a picture of God as the great powerful one controlling the universe means only God the Father.

In the OT great stress is laid on the fact there is only

God, constantly stressed in the OT, and certainly never denied in the NT. There is one God. So it would seem to me that the Ancient of Days must be the triune God. I believe in the OT that wherever it says it means the triune God, unless there is something in the context that clearly shows that it indicates one of the Persons of the Godhead.

We find that this term Ancient of Days is used again where it says that One like the Son of man had come to the Ancient of days, and been brought near before him and been given dominion, glory and a kingdom. That very obviously refers to our Lord Jesus Christ. So the Ancient of days there cannot mean the triune God; it must mean God the Father, in this phrase.

The third reference is in v. 22 where it says the little horn made war with the saints and prevailed against Him until the Ancient of days came. That obviously is a reference to the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven. So there the Ancient of days is one person of the Godhead, the Second Person of the Godhead, the Lord Jesus Christ.

So when I say each occurrence, I was happy when you told about all three, and very unhappy if you only made a general statement.

Number five was Briefly mention various possibilities as to what is indicated in Daniel 2 by the stone and its effects and we noticed various possibilities, that might be mentioned. One of them was Islam, the Islamic empire. One of them was the papacy. Then one, of course, is the idea that the Christian church is the stone that comes and gradually grows until it fills the whole earth.

And another is that the stone that comes and hits the statue on the feet refers to the second coming of Christ, utterly destroying all the evil that is involved in human government and substituting a righteous government of the saints.

There were those four various possibilities which could be briefly mentioned. Then I said, as far as time permits, discuss the two most probable. As we noticed, the first two have been proven impossible by the fact that neither of them carried through. So it is very obviously one of the last two. To my mind it takes a good deal of twisting of the statement to represent the stone as being the Christian church. Of course it is very intriguing to suggest that the stone cut without hands represents the virgin birth. If so there is a long break between that and its hitting the image, because that happened in the very beginning time of the Roman empire, when the Christian church began.

No one can say humanly that it is impossible that the Christian church should so grow and so many people be converted that the whole world would be won to Christ, and thus the whole kingdom of happiness and peace be established, but it certainly does not look that way, and there is no promise I know of anywhere in the Bible that such a thing is going to happen. So it fits the imagery far better to say it represents the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven, putting an end to all that was

represented by the four beasts and establishing the kingdom of the saints.

Mr. Montague, you had a question?

Question: How do you justify the three parts to the Ancient of days? I did not follow you.

Yes, the Ancient of days, the first one is the mention of the great glorious triumphant God who is in control of all things, and that certainly is the triune God, not one person of the Godhead.

Question: Is that an argument because of the plural of throne(s)?

That's pretty hard to say. Some might say because it says thrones, and there is nobody else ~~not~~ mentioned as sitting, suggests the idea of trinity but I would not want to build too much on that. But unless you do, it is pretty hard to explain why it does say thrones, because there is no mention there of anybody sitting. But certainly it is the triune God, whether you had one throne or three. It is figurative, of course. It is not a literal throne.

And the second (passage) showed the Son of man brought before him and given authority. That must be Christ who sits on the right hand of God the father. And the third one is the coming of the Ancient of days to establish the kingdom on earth. That certainly must be the second person of the trinity--Jesus Christ.

Those were the questions given to the people with odd numbers. Now with even numbers, the first was: Discuss the meaning and purpose of Dan. 7:4. In connection with Dan. 7:5 WE DISCUSSED IT HERE in class. "The first was like a lion and had eagle's wings. I beheld until its wings were ~~plucked~~ plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth.

You could say, right away, Well, here's the destruction of the Babylonian kingdom. It's wings are plucked and ~~it~~ it is lifted up from the earth. The destruction of the Babylonian kingdom. But as we pointed out, there is nothing said about the destruction of any of the other of the first three. Nothing said about any such thing.

So we son't take it as the destruction of the Babylonian kingdom unless we're sure. We look further and we find "he was lifted up from the earth and was made to stand on his feet as a man and a man's heart was given to him." That's no way to destroy something--to give it a man's heart. To give a beast a man's heart. But as I pointed out, when we look back to the 4th ch. of Daniel we find there the story of how Nebuchadnezzar was given a period of insanity and he ~~grovelled~~ grovelled on the earth like an animal and ate grass. Then God gave him his sanity back, and he stood up again and God gave a man's heart to him and he had his kingdom back again.

So this would not seem to be a picture of the destruction of the Babylonian empire, but a reference to an event that had occurred in the course of the history of the first kingdom which Daniel had seen and been connected with. Knowing that, it would ~~give~~ give him further assurance that the rest of the dream of the vision, would also be carried out.

The second question was: What past time would best fit the description of the second phase of the fourth kingdom? Give reasons for and against.

If this was a course in history, and I asked you to discuss the history of the Roman empire, and you gave me a very beautiful description of the Hellenistic empire, I might say, Well, you just misread the question; it's a good account of what you thought the question meant because you looked at it carelessly, and we won't take off for it!

But this is a course in exegesis, and if you're going to exegete the Bible, you should be able to exegete a question on a test. So when I asked, What past time would fit the description of the second phase of the fourth kingdom, if I got an answer which mentioned the various interpretations of the meaning of the stone, why I could not give any credit for that naturally. Because that's about as bad exegesis as you could possibly make of a question.

We saw how ch. 2 had the static thing--the four parts to it. Then there is the second phase of the kingdom, and we saw how then there occurred the dynamic events with the coming of the stone.

So those who had an even numbered question and gave an answer to question 5 of the odd numbered questions, could hardly get credit for that particular question. But the past time which would best fit the description was very obviously-- as I think I stated several times in class--a period from 400 to 600 A.D., when the Roman empire was in rapid decline, when there was a great mixture of Germanic peoples marching through the Roman empire back and forth, pillaging and destroying, setting up kingdoms and destroying each other's kingdom. This would exactly fit the situation, except that it says there shall be in it some of the strength of the iron. There was no strength in the Roman empire that we can see in that period-- that 600 year period.

And the statement "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men" either could fit any time at all, or else must mean some very unusual thing and if so we don't know what it would be in connection with that. But the most important thing against it--that being the second phase of the fourth kingdom-- is the fact it specifically says the stone strikes the image on its feet of iron and clay.

Right at the end of that, the only thing that could be said to be the stone would be the coming of Islam, which did not carry through, Or shortly afterwards-- two or three centuries afterwards-- the development of the power of the papacy, which also does not carry through. So it would look as if what's meant by this second phase must be something still future. That was question two.

Question three: Briefly state whether the statue in Dan. 2 represents four kingdoms or five? Give the reasons for your answer.

Yes, Mr. Martin.

Martin: Question 2 overlaps with question 5 in your discussion. You mentioned this. It would seem that the possibility of Islam arising and also the papacy.

You mean question 5 of the odd numbers?

Martin: You were right at the conclusion of question 2, where you

said that the period 400 to 600 would seem a major part that would be one interpretation. Then you just said, the rise of Islam and then . Would you distinguish between what you interpreting for the interpretation of the stone, and the interpretation for the second half of the Roman empire? Because I think that was a little problem.

No, the second half of ~~the~~ the Roman empire--- the second phase of it rather, is a period described by the iron and the clay being mixed. And that could well fit the condition from 400 to 600 A.D. So that would be what the second phase would represent.

The question wasn't about the stone; it was about the second phase. But then I said, give reasons for and against. The reasons for it, would be that it fits the description ~~very~~ very well in general. The reasons against it would be that it does not completely fit it because there was no strength in the Roman empire at that time, and because that peculiar phrase "mingling themselves with the seed of men"--- I don't know anything that fulfilled it then that you could not say was present in all periods.

But more importantly, because it was not followed by the coming of the stone. You see, we're discussing--what it is, we don't think it's then because nothing came immediately after which could be the coming of the stone.

In the other question we were discussing what is the stone, and the question of when it comes enters to some extent.

Mr. Martin: Still in our discussion, the question came up later in class and you took another ~~xxx~~ class, at the beginning of another class, and you said why could not the continuation of the Roman papacy, Roman church and you presented that as another possibility of the second phase of the fourth kingdom.

Very good. What I just referred to would be the simple answer to the question. But there are two additional things that might have been said. We You were not required, but it would have been good if said.

One was, that the critics say it fits the latter part of the time of the Seleucids; the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It would in many ways fit that. But that's the third ~~a~~ kingdom rather than the fourth. So that is not a satisfactory answer, but very good if you happen to think of it and mention it as a possibility, so long as you mention the main possibility of 400 to 600 A.D.

The other thing is that the second phase, if it isn't 400 to 600, it is either something future or you might say it starts at 400 and reaches right on to the very end. Either way would be perfectly alright.

Next question, number three. Briefly state whether the statue represents four kingdoms or five. As you look at ch. 2 you cannot tell if it represents four kingdoms or five. That is to say, there is a difference between the last two parts of ch. 2. So it could be five kingdoms. But they both have iron in them, so it could be four kingdoms. So as far as ch. 2 is concerned, you could not tell whether it is four kingdoms or five. But when you take ch. 7 into account, there you have only four beasts and not five. And the fourth beast is destroyed, just as the fifth part of ch. 2, is destroyed.

So it would be reasonable to say, in view of the parallel of the two, that it represents only four kingdoms, not five.

The fourth question for the even numbers was: In the time that remains, point out the relation of the known facts of history to the predictions of Dan. 2 and 7. In relation to that most of the facts that would have helped are on this sheet I gave out. I did not mean I wanted you to memorize all those dates, or all the names on it. But the main features on it are contained.

For instances, Alexander the Great founded the Hellenistic empire. He had no connection with the Roman empire which came centuries later. Just the main facts of that. Some did very well; some did not at all. Of course if you had ancient history in college, it should be easy to do well in it. If you did not it would be worth a little extra time looking at this sheet and if that was not clear, perhaps looking in an encyclopedia or a history and getting a little clearer idea of it.

We'd better move on or we won't get finished with the prophecies this year.

I always say, It is better to have a thorough knoweldge of Greek than have a smattering of Greek and Hebrew both. I think that is absolutely certain. I hope you'll ~~both~~ all know both languages, but a smattering of both won't do anybody any good.

Here I would say, To get a good understanding fo chs. 2 and 7, and know nothing about the rest of Daniel, would be much more valuable than to have a slight smattering of chs. 2, 7, 8, 9 and 11. So I hope those of you who had difficulty with some of those questions will review them and get it more thoroughly in mind.

We were discussing, at our last meeting, ch. 11. In ch. 11 we had noticed how it begins with the Persian attack on Greece. Greece is mentioned only three times in Daniel, and only once in the rest of the OT. But here Greece is specifically named in this 11th chapter. It mentions how Darius and Xerxes made a great attack on Greece in order to protect the part of Asia Minor they had conquered and then(v.3) a mighty king rose up and ruled with great dominion and did according to his will. All agree that is a reference to Alexander the Great.

Number three: The dividing up of Alexander's empire. I had given you a statement last time about the g break-up of his empire ~~which~~ and how it occurred, and a little bit about the subsequent history. We won't go into that now, but I hope you have it in front of you, because we want to go on to

C. The Seleucids and Ptolemy.

I'm not going to make subheads under them, because we will simply look at the verses. And so we find the beginning of the description of the Seleucids and Ptolemies in v.5 == "The king of the south ~~xxx~~ shall be strong, ---and no one need have any question about what is meant by the king of the south. When you have the division of Alexander's empire, Egypt was much further to the south than anything else. And the General who took a control of Egypt, whose name was Ptolemy, was certainly one of the most powerful of the successors of 8 Alexander.

So the king of the south shall be strong. And one of his princes. All of these prophetic statements are quite clear, when you look back at what happened. But very seldom would you tell in advance from them what exactly was going to happen. It's like many of the prophecies of Christ. It would be very hard to write a life of Christ simply from the OT prophecies.

But when the events occurred, you saw how exactly they fit with ~~some~~ so many of those prophecies and it was an assurance to you that this was indeed what the Lord had predicted. So here the statement that "one of his princes shall be strong, and he shall be strong above ~~him~~ him" obviously does not mean that Ptolemy will be stronger than one of his princes. It must mean that this one of his princes will be stronger than he.

We know historically that Seleucid, after working for Ptolemy for a time, saw his opportunity and went back to Babylon, where he had previously been in charge, and in 312 B.C. he established himself in Babylon. And establishing himself there in 312, his successors continued to rule for a century == for centuries, and the date seemed so important that that is the first time in history that we know of, that people have measured dates right along from-- one, two, three, four, beyond one's king's reign.

In Ancient Egypt we read that in the 25th year of the reign of Ramasees II something happened. Then we read that in the 5th year of Merneptah, something happened. But we don't know how many years ~~a~~ a date in ~~Merneptah's~~ Merneptah's reign would be after a date in his father's reign unless we know how long his father lived. It seems a very simple thing to us simply to number right along as we do year after year, but this never seems to have occurred to anybody in ancient times, and probably more or less by accident Seleucus figured == measured from the time that he went to Babylon, in 312 B.C., and when his son became king, instead of saying, In such a year of Antiochus, they continued to number right straight along.

That numbering was continued by some as late as 1600 A.D. It is the longest continued system of chronology that the world has ever seen. Some Hebrew MSS of the Bible are dated in the == say in the year 2612 say which would mean 2612 years after Seleucus went to Babylon in 312 B.C. The unfortunate thing is that sometimes they would not bother to give the thousands, they would just say 612 or they might just say the year 12. Just like we sometimes just give the last two figures of the date. So sometimes you know the exact year a Hebrew MS was written, but you don't know which century it was.

But it starts in with 315 (You said 312 above) when Seleucus went to Babylon. So this was very exactly fulfilled. "He shall be strong above him"---stronger than Ptolemy, because he (Ptolemy) had Egypt here, but Seleucus had all the territory reaching way over to India. He had everything on the map there, and further East. So he had a tremendous area that he held. And large as all the rest of Alexander's empire put together was the area which Seleucus held. So this statement "he shall be strong above him" was very remarkably fulfilled.

His dominion shall be a great dominion. Then v.6 jumps forward. There is an unmentioned interval between v.5 and v.6, and I hope you all have the chart before you. Look at the left side of the chart, where I have the kings listed. It shows how Ptolemy I died in 283; Seleucus I died in 281, just 2 years later. But Ptolemy II reigned during the last part of Seleucus' reign, and during all of Antiochus' first reign, and during most of Antiochus' II's reign.

We find here the statement "at the end of years". Does that mean the end of the world? There are some people who would interpret the phrase that way sometimes, but this does not mean that here. Because here it means after a while, after quite a while. Because it skips ahead from Seleucus who went to Babylon in 312 clear down to the latter part of the reign of his grandson, Antiochus II. You could not tell that from the prediction, but we know that what happened fits with what is stated here.

At the end of years they shall join themselves together for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement. There was clashing between these two, each of them wanting to get a little more of the territory the other had, off and on. But the time came when Seleucus' grandson, Antiochus II, and the now very elderly Ptolemy II, who was known as Ptolemy Philadelphus, decided not to keep fighting -- a little skirmishing between them -- but to make a friendly alliance.

So they came together. "And the king's daughter of the south" (Ptolemy II's daughter) came to the king of the north to make an agreement. We find that Antiochus II agreed that in order to cement this alliance, he would marry Bernice the daughter of Ptolemy II.

So Bernice the daughter of Ptolemy II came up there to marry him, and the verse goes on to say "but she shall not retain the power of the arm neither shall he stand nor his arm, but she shall be given up and they that brought and he that begot a her and he that strengthened hi in these times." You'd never know what that means is going to happen.

But as you look back and you find that when she came up there, that she married the king and he already had a wife, and his wife had grown sons and she did not like it a bit that he married this daughter of the king of Egypt. So she left Antioch where he was living, and she went up into Asia Minor which also belonged to him, and she lived up there in Asia Minor with her grown son. Antiochus was down there in Asia Minor.

Antiochus was with Bernice and Bernice had a child, and Laodice, his first wife was afraid that he would make the child of the second wife king after him. So she did not like that at all. A great many of the people of the empire felt that she had been mistreated. The result was that after a while he got tired of Bernice and he went up there to Asia Minor with her. But she was still afraid that he might make his child by the daughter of the king of Egypt king, so it is generally believed that she poisoned him.

At any rate he died. When he died, she managed to have some of her people get hold of Bernice and kill her and also kill her child. So we read here that "she shall not retain the power of the arm, neither shall he stand nor his arm, but she shall be given up and they that brought her and they that begot her." That means her father died at about this time.

So (v.7) "out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate." What would be a branch of her roots? Her roots would be her father, king Ptolemy. And the branch of her roots would be her brother, Ptolemy III. So Ptolemy ~~III~~ III came with an army and attacked the king of the north and prevailed.

Verse 8, "and also carried captives into Egypt, their gods, their princes, their precious ~~xxx~~vessels of silver and gold and continued more years that the king of the north. So it looks as if the Seleucus was loosing out in this which had been intended to make friendship between them, yet it produced envy.

You never could have told what was going to happen, but looking back you can see how exactly it fits.

Verse 9 "So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom and shall return into his own land,"-- most interpreters consider that to mean that he shall come into the kingdom of the king of the south. That is if you take it as the Hebrew could be translated either way. You take it as it stands it could simply be a recapitulation of vv. 7 and 8. stands,

Question: Is Ptolemy III a brother of Bernice?

A brother of Bernice, yes. It says Bernice was the daughter of Ptolemy II. He was her brother. So v.9 is generally taken as being an attempt of the Seleucids to attack Egypt again, which failed. There was one which failed, but it could be simply a summary of the previous verse. So either translation would fit with facts.

Verse 10: "His son shall be stirred up and shall assemble a multitude of ~~xxx~~ great forces, and one shall certainly come and overflow and ~~xxx~~ pass through and return and be stirred up even to his fortress." It continues with the attempt of King Ptolemy to get vengeance, and the fact that eventually there came a king of the North who was very strong.

You have on your list Seleucus III here who reigned for only four years. One of the sons of Laodice, he reigned for only four years, when there was a rebellion in the army and he was killed and his brother Antiochus III became king.

Antiochus III is called Great because he would have been one of the greatest figures in ancient history-- not ~~only~~ one of the top ones, but of very second rank-- if it were not for an unfortunate thing that happened ~~at~~ at the end of his reign.

Antiochus III who is called the Great is described here in the course of from vv.13 right on up to verse 19. We have a long description here of the reign of one of the most powerful conquerors in ancient history, but largely forgotten because of the failure at the end of his reign. It describes here how the king of the north comes in v.13 with a great army and with much riches

and he attacks the king of the south.

At this point we need to remind ourselves of the situation there between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. The Ptolemies held Egypt but they also held Palestine, and southern Syria. They held that for 100 years. The Seleucids had been trying to get possession of that part of Asia, to get it away from the Ptolemies.

Antiochus III succeeded in doing so, and when he did so this is of great interest to the Hebrews, because Palestine was very prosperous under the Ptolemies and was getting along well under them. But there were some who were dissatisfied. There were some Israelites who were unhappy and they tried to get their area free from Ptolemy which would bring them under the Seleucids.

As they did that they thought that would give them more freedom and actually it led to the terrible crisis that is described in this chapter under Antiochus IV. So we read, (v.14) "There shall many in those days stand up against the king of the south." Antiochus III was making a series of campaigns against the Ptolemies. This "many" suggests people helping them. It is generally thought that this refers to the time when the king of Macedonia, for a brief period, joined with him, against the Ptolemies.

I think it could equally well refer to many in Israel, thinking they would be better off under the Seleucids than under the Ptolemies, who joined with them. You cannot say which because it merely says "many." But the next phrase says, "But the robbers of the people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall." What does that mean? The robbers of thy people? Speaking "thy people" certainly speaking about Israelites. This is considered by all interpreters to mean that there were Jews who revolted against Ptolemy, thinking they would be better off under Seleucus, under Antiochus III.

So they had a vision, they had an idea they would be much better off under the Seleucids. Freedom from the Ptolemies. But they shall fall. Actually they were much worse off as we find out in the latter part of the chapter. "So the king of the north shall come and cast up a siege mound and take the fortified cities, and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be strength to withstand. But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will and none shall stand before him, and he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed."

So that from this time on, Palestine, Israel, and Southern Syria are joined with the rest of the Seleucid territory and taken away from the Ptolemies.

Verse 17: "He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him. Thus shall he do, and he shall give him the daughter of women corrupting her but she shall not stand stand on his side neither be for him."

Antiochus III gave his daughter, Cleopatra, in marriage to ^{the} his son Ptolemy IV thinking that that would cement friendship between the two countries

but actually Cleopatra (for this is the first Egyptian woman to be known as Cleopatra, which ~~officially~~ had been the name among the Seleucids, this daughter' /formerly/ of Antiochus III, threw her whole influence with her husband and against her father. So that did not work out.'

For today you looked at vv. 21 on which deal with Antiochus IV.

If we had not had to take time to review the tests I would have gotten over that today, but we'll plan to do that next time. So we will stop at this point.

I believe you all have copies of this I gave out a couple weeks ago about the Seleucids and Ptolemies. It starts after Alexander's death. In the left column it lists Seleucid kings and kings of Egypt with their dates places next to each other so you can see who was reigning when somebody else was much easier than if you just had the two lists separately.

In copying things it is very easy to make mistakes. In fact it is very difficult to keep from making any mistake. I made a mistake on this. I don't know how I did it, but I think it is fairly easily remedied. If you have this sheet in front of you, I'd like to have your correct this. Anybody who does not have it with you, look on to someone's next to you. I have a few extras to give to any who need them after class.

This relates to the Seleucid kings. Under Seleucus II. You notice I have II in parenthesis because this device of calling them I, II, and III, and IV is a modern device-- I don't know if I should say modern, but at least not in the time they were living. So he was called Seleucus Calanicus, but we call him Seleucus II which is simpler for us. Sometimes for the Ptolemies you find the numbers a little different because there may be differing traditions as to their order, but their names are definite. So I've put their names and numbers down.

Right under him, I said married Laodice, also married Bernice' daughter Ptolemy II.

That should have been under Antichus II, of course. When I discussed that in class I ~~x~~ said they were the wives of Antiochus II. I don't know how it slipped down to the space under Seleucus there. What is written under Seleucus II should simply be moved up.

Then I have under Seleucus II reference to his two sons. That should stay as it is. That is under Seleucus II. It should not be under Laodice but should be directly under Seleucus II. The way I have these lines twisted around is so the one at the left ~~shows~~ shows the oldest son; the one at the right the youngest son. Then they go to the sons below. He was succeeded by Seleucus III and then after he had reigned 3 yrs. there was a riot in the army and he was killed and his younger brother took over, Antiochus III

Similarly below on your sheet I've shown the same way -- the older son and the younger son, and the order in which they came which is a little more complicated in the later case than in this one. That's a comparatively small thing but I wanted to be sure you had your lists correct.

Now I'd like to say a word about today's assignment. The assignment for today was to look at certain verses and briefly answer the follow ~~ing~~ ing questions. Now these questions relate to matters we have already discussed, in class. Most of you --three-fourths at least, gave a very good answer to these two questions. But there were maybe a fifth of the class who did not have in mind the two matters to which this referred. So I

thought I'd better say a word about it now. The first question was Do they have any bearing on the critical theory? I spoke about that last week and I want to reiterate again. The critical theory is that the predictions in Daniel look forward to Antiochus IV whom we've shown here on the brief list of the four kingdoms.

He came late in the time of the third kingdom as you notice. I have not shown when the third kingdom ends or the fourth begins because the third was divided into ~~xxx~~ sections and the Romans took them one at a time over a space of about 50 years. But the critical theory is that the Book of Daniel was not written by Daniel, but a later writer took the name of Daniel, writing 300 yrs. after Daniel's time, and that he wrote in the time of Antiochus IV in order to make the Jews fight valiantly ~~xxx~~ against Antiochus IV by claiming to give predictions that God was going to deliver them. So in the book when it looks forward to the time of Antiochus IV he is giving history and pretending it is prophecy. When he goes on beyond the time of Antiochus IV, it is purely guessing on his part. That is the critical theory which of course is utterly inconsistent with any belief that this is actually written by Daniel and belongs to be part of God's Word.

But there are many small arguments which the critics have given most of which have been well answered. There is a ~~big~~ point I have mentioned in class-- the fact that the critics run into a series obstacle-- that it describes four kingdoms, and then after it describes four kingdoms it describes the great crisis in ch. 7/ There are the four kingdoms in ch. 7 and then the great crisis.

In ch. 2 there are four kingdoms and then the destruction of all the kingdoms represent. Whereas Antiochus III comes at the end of the third kingdom. The critics say, The author of Daniel who gives a marvellously accurate picture of history between Nebuchadnezzar and his time, claiming it is prophecy, did make a serious mistake in this because there were only three kingdoms.

So, they say, he imagined that between the Babylonian kingdom and the Persian kingdom there was an empire called the Median ~~x~~ kingdom, the empire of the Medes.

So in relation to that I assigned you these verses which --the first said, the most important of them in this regard is the first where in Dan. 5:28, Daniel said to Belshazzar, Your kingdom is given to the Medes and Persians. He put them together as one group. In ch. 6 in three cases it speaks of the law of the Medes and Persians.

We would not speak now about you would have to obey the laws of Great Britain and the U.S., it's one or the other. Great Britain controls ~~xxxxxx~~ this country until 1776 and then the United States controls it. But the law of the Medes and Persians. And 8:20 says, Speaking of the animal he described as making a great conquest, he said, This is the kings of Media and Persia. In ch. 10:1 he refers to Cyrus King of Persia. In 11:2 still in Daniel's lifetime ~~xx~~ he says there are yet three kings of Persia.

So there are all these evidences that there was no kingdom of the Medes in between. The Medes were a scattered ~~to~~ group of tribes over which there was a sort of a general authority held and to which the Persians were for a time subject, but over which they gained supremacy before the end of the Babylonian empire.

The second question. Do they prove anything about the place of the kingdoms in Dan. 8 in relation to those in Dan. 2 and Dan. 7? There were one or two who thought "place" referred to geographical situations. I gave you an assignment some time ago in which I asked you to look at the beginning of ch. 8 and see if you could tell which of the four kingdoms these two there are related to. That's what I mean here. The place of the kingdoms in ch. 8 in relation to those in ch. 2 and ch. 7. Because in Dan. 8 they are specifically named. One is the kings of Media and Persia. The other is the kings of Greece.

So these are specifically named. Somebody said to me after ~~we~~ gave that assignment, the ~~next time~~ next time, he said, We learn that only from the history don't we. It was the end of class, and I was a little tired, I guess and I said, Yes. But I should have said, No. You learn it from these verses which will be in the assignment three weeks from now.

You notice the verses make it clear it was the Persians who succeeded the Babylonians, and the Greeks who succeeded the Persians, and therefore ch. 8 is speaking about the two middle kingdoms and says nothing about the first except it ~~implies~~ implies -- it tells about his great conquest, it does not say what he'll conquer, but it implies that. And it does not refer to the fourth kingdom at all.

So much for ~~regarding~~ regarding that assignment for today. Incidentally if any of you have questions I am glad to discuss them with you.

(Question: About the annoyance caused by the squeaking of the tape recorder)

I will give you back the test papers either today or tomorrow. They have been marked for some little time, but putting the marks on the papers I have not been able to get to. I'll do that today or tomorrow, and give them back. If any of you have any questions about them, I will be glad to discuss them with you. They will not make questions individually but simply give a mark for the paper as a whole.

There's hardly been a time since I've taught that somebody to whom I gave a D did not think he should have an A. There's usually not more than one like that, but even if you have a B and think you should have an A, don't hesitate to let me know and I'll arrange to see you and be glad to go over the paper with anybody who wants to do so.

After class it is a little hard to take much time to discuss particular questions. I would prefer you would write them out and give them to me. If they are of general importance I could discuss them with the whole class rather than with one person, or at two

or three different times with different people.

I have to say a word about the assignment for next time. I don't want you to try to write down the assignment now. It is already posted, and you can copy it from the bulletin board. It is fairly simple but it takes a little space to state it.

I want to read it for I want to mention one phase of handling it. The assignment is: In Dan. 9:25-26 the word "Messiah" occurs twice. What Hebrew word does it represent?

Those of you who have had Hebrew can easily look it up in your Hebrew Bible, unless you are lazy. If you are lazy you look it up in ~~the~~ Young's Concordance. In Young's Concordance if there are different words translated "Messiah" it will give these words with an English transliteration and the Hebrew word and give you the reference. You can easily see then what Hebrew word is used for Messiah in these two places.

Then if you have a Hebrew concordance, you can look up this Hebrew word and see all the cases where it is used. If you want, however, you can look up this Hebrew word in the back of Young's Concordance. You can do that -- they are arranged in English type letters so it is easy to look up even if you know no Hebrew. Look it up and see how many different ways it is translated in the OT.

For instance if it is translated Messiah twice and if it is translated dog five times, those are two ways this word is translated. In such a case you would have to decide from the context which of the two was right, or whether in some way they represent two different phases of the same idea.

The assignment continues: How many times is this word used in the OT? Be sure to include any instances where it has a pronominal suffix such as "his" or "my." In how many ways does the KJV render the word into English? List the verses where it occurs.

You can easily get them out of the Heb. concordance or out of Young's Concordance. You can also get them out of Strong's, if you want, but it takes a little bit longer. List the verses where it occurs. After each reference state whether it refers to a prophet, a priest, or a king or to something else. You should be able to tell that at a glance in each ~~xx~~ case, I believe.

Count the references in each category. If there are some you are not sure of, put them with a ~~q~~ question mark. Then, a further question: Is the term ever applied to a non-Israelite? If so, where? This takes almost longer to give than it takes to do, but you will find it on the bulletin board.

We were speaking about ch. 11. Ch. 11 has much in it that is rather difficult to understand precisely what it means. There are two reasons for this: 1) Because the prophecy relating to future events is not given with real explicitness. You take the prophecies of Christ in the NT and it says, This was done that it might be fulfilled. But in most cases you can see how it has

been fulfilled, but you would not in advance be able to predict how it would be fulfilled. So these predictions, while none of them are figurative, they are practically all in plain language, yet the language is a bit vague in these predictions of the future. It is not given to satisfy curiosity about the future.

It is given in order that people can see that he really spoke from God. And see how these things were fulfilled. So we notice how the statements about Seleucus Nicator were fulfilled in v.5. Seleucus the Conqueror, literally, he was called that in his lifetime and later on they called him Seleucus I.

We read in v. 5 how he was a prince of Ptolemy, the king of the south, but he became stronger than Ptolemy and had a great dominion. So we have that ~~about~~ Seleucus predicted 200 years in advance! You could not tell what was going to happen, but if you see it happen you know that if the words had been stated differently it would not have been fulfilled.

Then we noticed No. 2. Antiochus II and Bernice. That was a very striking event, an event which everyone in Syria and in Egypt was aware of what happened. I don't think you could have told later exactly what was going to happen. You notice v. 6 says "In the end of years, they will join themselves together." In other words there is a space of time in between here and it skips over Antiochus I completely, and goes to Antiochus II.

Antiochus II and Ptolemy II, your sheet shows you, were reigning at the same time. When Antiochus II was reigning, Ptolemy II was becoming an old man, because you notice he began to reign in 283, and Antiochus II only in 261.

There had been considerable strife between the two kingdoms. Now they tried to make a treaty of alliance. In those days they usually tried to seal such treaties by having an inter-marriage. So as we mentioned last time, Seleucus, who was already married to Laodice who had grown sons, now discarded her and married Bernice, the daughter of Ptolemy II.

As the verse says, The king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement. But she shall not retain the power of the arm, neither shall he stand nor his armies.

You remember he lived with her a brief time and then he left her and went up to Asia Minor where his first wife was living. His first wife was afraid he would make the children of Bernice his successors, the infant child of Bernice, so it is usually thought she poisoned him.

"But she shall be given up, and they that brought her and he that begot her and he that strengthened her in these times."

After he died, the people who favored his son to succeed him managed to get hold of Bernice and of her child and kill them. This phrase "he that begot her" is usually taken to mean that her father died at just about this time. Thought I noticed the NIV changes it to

to "and her son" and basis that on the ancient translations from the Syriac and Latin which render it that way. "He that begot her" render it rather as "the one that was begotten by her", her son, who was killed along with her. Whichever way you take it, it fits with what happened.

No. 3. We go down to Egypt. Ptolemy III. And vv. 7-9 say, Out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate. "His estate" suggests that it refers to her father's death, "he that begot her." He shall stand up in his place, a branch of her roots, i.e. her brother. And he made a great attack as we read in vv. 7-9 in which his armies went through a great part of the Seleucid empire and he took a great amount of booty and carried it south with him and he continued ~~four years~~ more years than the king of the ~~north~~ north. He outlived Seleucus II, and even Seleucus III.

Then we have the second Son of Seleucus II, namely Antiochus III. And as I mentioned last time Antiochus III was one of the great conquerors of antiquity. Eleven verses are devoted to the history of Antiochus III. As far as we are concerned the interest of these is that though it would be pretty hard to tell in advance what is predicted, from the history it is easy to see that it touches upon most of the great events of Antiochus III's reign. It touches upon them in the order in which they occur. We will not take much time for that now.

By the way I have been asked if someone would like to look further into this particular matter. On this material up to Antiochus IV there is no difference of opinion. Conservatives believe it is a remarkably accurate prediction that Daniel makes of events up to the time of Antiochus IV.

And liberals believe it is a remarkably accurate picture of what occurred written by someone who already knew what had occurred. If you are interested in details on it beyond what we have time to go into in class, almost any extensive commentary on Daniel will give it to you. Whether it be a liberal commentary or a conservative commentary, there will be no difference on this particular section.

Any good commentary will do that. There are a number of books on the history of the Seleucids. One of the most extensive I know of is the one by Bevan called the House of Seleucid which I have used a considerable amount. He is an English scholar who gave a great deal of attention to the ancient sources about this period.

But we had better not take much time on the history of Antiochus III (these 11 verses). I must point out two or three matters about it. I believe I mentioned last time that the Palestine and Southern Syria had belonged to Egypt for 150 yrs. Antiochus III in addition to his spending 15 yrs. conducting expeditions to the east and reestablishing control that Seleucus III had made over the area that Alexander had conquered right to the borders of India-- in addition to that he fought with Ptolemy, of Egypt, and he took away from him Syria and Palestine. Palestine and S. Syria. He took them and annexed them to his territory.

We read in v. 14, "In those days shall many stand up against the King of the South, also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision but they shall fail." And that is usually taken to mean that there were Jews in Palestine, who not satisfied with the generally decent way they had been treated by the Ptolemies for 150 yrs., thought they would be much better off under the Seleucids.

Therefore to establish their ~~fr~~ vision of freedom from the Ptolemies they gave thier help to Antiochus III in getting them away from Ptolemy into the Syrians. But they shall fail. Their vision, their idea of how much better off they will be under the Seleucids proved to be utterly false because they were far worse off. At least they were when Antiochus IV became king.

So that was v.14. We have at the end of v.17 that "he shall give him the daughter of women corrupting him, but she~~x~~ shall not stand on her side neither be for him.

Anitochus III thought he would emulate Alexander the Great's conquests. He had reestablished the Seleucid empire over the whole east, but he did not have the territory that Alexander had come from i.e. Macédonia, the section of Europe which belonged to him. So he wanted to make his situation safe over here, and so he made a ~~mx~~ peace arrangement with Ptolemy V, and he gave Ptolemy V his daughter, Cleopatra in marriage to seal the bond thinking she, as Queen of Egypt, would give her support to him. But she didn't.

It says, But she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him. That was a great dissapointment to him when she threw her full loyalty to her husband and to the Egyptians. She was the first Egyptian queen to bear the name Cleopatra.

Verse 18 says, And after this he shall turn his face unto the isles and shall take many. We know that Antiochus III turned westward, north and westward. He already held most of Asia Minor which the Seleucids held for a century and a half. He now marched across the Hellespont into Europe, and began seizing territory in Europe. He was quite successful in seizing Macedonia and the territory to thenorth and much of Greece.

Then he got a message from Rome, and a Roman representative said to him, We want you to stop trying to make conquests in Europe. And he said, I don't interfere in Italy in your region. What right have you to interfere with what I do back here? So whether they had the right may be questions, but they(the Romans) had the might! They sent an army which defeated him in Thermopàly and drove him back out of Europe and then followed him to Asia Minor and there defeated him at Magnesia.

So v.18 says, After this he shall turn his face unto the isles and shall take many, but a prince on his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease. Without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him. Then he shall turn his face toward the fortresses of his own land but he shall stumble and fall and not be found. A very brief summary of what happened when the Romans after driving him out from Greece, ~~mxmx~~ after their

great victory at Thermopylae, followed him into Asia Minor. There in Asia Minor they fought a great battle at Magnesia and in and as a result of this battle they completely defeated him.

When he was thus completely defeated, the Romans made him pay them the whole cost of their expedition, reparations for all that it had cost them to send them expedition, promised to pay a large sum of money each year for the next 12 years, and give them 20 of his leading supporters including some of his own sons to go to Rome and live there as hostages for his good behaviour.

So his complete and utter defeat to Antiochus III completely ruined the great glory he had gotten in 35 years of ~~an~~ hard fighting. It is summarized here. "He shall turn his face toward the fortresses of his own land. But he shall ~~be~~ stumble and fall and not be found."

This word stumble is interesting. It does not suggest he is killed in war. It does not suggest he died in his bed. It does not suggest there was an uprising. What happened was that in trying to pay the heavy reparations to the Romans he went eastward in order to loot the temples of various deities. He came in to a little temple of a small tribe that he looked upon with utter contempt, but he knew had considerable treasure in it. He had taken treasure from temples of various deities. He went into this one. He was getting careless. The local guardians simply got excited and killed him. So "he stumbled and fell."

He was killed in such a minor, little thing. A man who had carried on these tremendous successful and warlike expeditions. So that is what is said about Antiochus III in eleven verses.

Then I have listed Seleucus IV, v.20. It is very interesting that we have only one verse, but the verse shows a remarkable contrast to Antiochus III. The oldest son of Seleucus IV succeeded him, and the kingdom was in pretty bad shape because they had to pay these heavy reparations to the Romans, and they had so many of their leaders in Rome as hostages. So there shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom.

The glory of his great warlike expeditions will have gone. All they could do was try to get money together to pay ~~and~~ the indemnities and to get in good shape again. Seleucus IV reigned for eleven years but he got no glory, but he did get the government on a good fiscal basis ~~and~~ again by raising taxes and getting things organized in the kingdom.

Then we read "in a few days"-- and compared with Antiochus III's reign from 223 to 187, eleven years seems like a few days! Within a few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle. How are you destroyed ~~and~~ neither in anger nor in battle? His chief minister made a plot against him and murdered him. So he was destroyed neither in anger nor in battle! His chief minister who destroyed him that way tried then to reign in the name of his infant son. He had an older son who was a hostage in Rome. But in the name of the infant son ~~by~~ the chief minister tried to reign.

But he did not succeed very long. And the next ruler is so important from a Biblical viewpoint that I'm giving him another head.

D. Antiochus Epiphanes(Antiochus IV called himself Epiphanes. He is given 15 vv. here, and in the history of Judaism he is one of the most important rulers. Why is he important to Israel? Because he is not simply a man who won conquests, though he did. He is not simply a man who caused trouble for the Jews, and made persecution which he did. But toward the latter part of his reign set himself on a definite policy of completely destroying the Jewish religion. And force the Jews to become pagans.

When he tried at first to be nice and give all sorts of favors to the ones who would turn pagan, and many did. But when some stood strongly against he proceeded to extremely harsh measures, and the religion of the OT, humanly speaking, would have been completely wiped out except that a priest who resisted his efforts to force the people to sacrifice in every little town, came to the town where this man worked, he and his sons fled into the wilderness and he and his sons became such good guerilla fighters they came to be called the "hammers" or the Maccabees. Through them others joined and eventually they gained their freedom, from him.

2. His career. In order to understand something of this thing that occurred at this time, it is necessary to know something about man Antiochus IV.

Antiochus IV as you know from your chart was the second son of Antiochus III. The oldest son was Seleucus who succeeded Antiochus. When Antiochus IV was a hostage in Rome, and we don't know how many years he lived there. If he lived there long enough to become very familiar with Roman customs and situations and ~~many~~ methods of doing things.

And then he was released from his being hostage in Rome and Seleucus III's oldest son, who became Antiochus === who became Demetrius, down at the very bottom of your sheet, he was made a hostage in Rome, and Antiochus was released.

Antiochus then went to Greece and lived there. He lived there in Athens and became an important official in the Athenian government. I've even heard him called the mayor. I don't know what the title or position was, but he was pretty successful there. He had no right to become king because his oldest brother had a son who was a hostage in Rome and should succeed him properly.

But when Seleucus, his older brother was killed, Antiochus immediately got in touch with some people in Asia Minor who had considerable funds and got them to fund him to try to become king. He came with a small force into Asia Minor and he managed to get support with all kinds of promises and he became ~~king~~ king after his brother's death and killed Heliodorus, and also killed the infant son in ~~whose~~ whose name Heliodorus was reigning.

So v. 21 says, In his estate shall stand up a vile person to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. So he secured

control and reigned from 176 to 164 and he was a man with very peculiar characteristics. He called himself Epiphanes.

Epiphanes means--- now there is a feast in many denominations called the Feast of the Epiphany, or the Feast of the Appearance of the Lord. So when he called himself Epiphanes, he was claiming to be a god on earth. He was the outshining god; he called himself Antiochus Epiphanes, but he began when he first came to Antioch going around among the people soliciting votes acting as if it was a democratic organization like Rome and Athens and looking for votes which he had gotten in Athens.

He went from one extreme to the other in his reign. He would be a tyrant who would kill people at the slightest provocation, and he would turn around and do all kinds of things for people and act as if he was == act in a way as if he was just one of the commonest of people. He was very unpredictable. One thing he wanted was, he wanted a unity in his kingdom. He wanted everyone to worship him as a god and to worship the gods he worshipped.

His brother had gathered considerable funds by this time. He set out to build a new temple to Zeus in Athens. He built a tremendous temple, one of the greatest temples in Athens. He was unable to complete it in his life and it remained that way 200 years and then a Roman emperor completed this great temple, one of the largest temples in Athens.

After a time -- he saw -- his sister was a queen in Egypt, and when her husband and there were two small boys, the oldest of which was nominally the king though his ministers were actually ruling. Antiochus decided he would try to take over control of Egypt. So he led an army down into Egypt. There in Egypt he made up with his nephew who was nominally the king-- he was in his teens still and the two of them ate together and he thought he would rule Egypt through his nephew being a nominal king so he talked to him as though he was going to do everything for him while the nephew was actually planning to throw off his control just as soon as he could.

So we read here how they told lies at one table. They sat there eating and telling lies to one another. The city of Alexandria, one of the great centers of Egypt, he was unable to get control of. He thought he had established his nephew and that his nephew would get control of Alexandria. He went back to his own land, and on the way he stopped in Jerusalem in order to rob the temple. This brought him into sharp contact of course with the Jews and gave him an idea of how opposed they were to his desire to make them all pagans. Then he got to Antioch and held a tremendous celebration at which he invited people from all over the known world and spent tremendous sums on a tremendous celebration in which he himself put on a great dance and he did all kinds of things mixing with the crowd in many different ways.

Then he found that his nephew in Egypt had thrown out all relationship with him, declared himself entirely independent and so he marched to Egypt again with a large force and he came

down to Egypt and got practically of Egypt under his control. When he had it practically all under his control except the one city of Alexandria which he was expecting soon to get control of, a ship arrived from Rome. The ship arrived. He heard there were important Roman officials on this ship. He went down to the shore in order to greet them.

One of them, a man named Popilius Laenas had been a good friend of his when he was in Rome. He greeted and said, Hello, Popilius; so nice to see you." Popilius did not smile but he sternly said, I have a message for you from the Roman Senate. He said, O that's find. Let's have a good chat. Let's have dinner together, and than I'll read the message." Popilius said, The message must be read right now." He said, What is the message then?" He took out the message: The Roman Senate declares that you must immediately leave Egypt and return to Asia and give up all attempts to conquer any of Egypt!?

And he said, Oh, ~~well~~ well, that will require a bit of consideration." Popilius took his staff and made a mark on the ground, a circle around where Antiochus. He said to him, You can consider it just as long as you stay inside of that circle. When he said that, well he was pretty well familiar with the rising power of Rome having lived in Rome some years himself. He said, Oh, alright alright, of course I will then, if it's that important and serious.

Come on, he said, let's have dinner. So they went and had a dinner together and were good fellows. And the other fellow who had been so stern now became friendly and cordial. But he wasn't as happy as he made out to be. So he went back to his own land and he was very upset after that. And the Romans for years after that loved to tell about that incident showing how their power was recognized even as far away as Egypt, by his abject surrender on this occasion.

But when he got back now he determined that he was going to put an end to the attitude of these Jews. So now he began harshly persecuting them, trying to seize copies of the Scriptures. Forcing and sending agents to all the little villages forcing them the people to sacrifice to Jupiter, going into the temple in Jerusalem and taking away == and putting up by the altar a statue of Zeus, the Greek god, and forcing the people to sacrifice to him and to sacrifice swine's flesh on the altar.

The persecution was so intense then. If you ever get a chance -- Longfellow's dramatic poem, The Maccabees gives a very beautiful picture of events that occurred them. We once had it read at one of our occasions at the beginning of the school year several years ago and went through the main parts of it. It's a very fine picture of the general course of events at this time.

After this persecution was well under way, Antiochus thought he was beginning to run out of money. So he went east in order to try to recoup his fortunes from some of the centers

where there was a good deal of money available and there he was taken with a nervous illness and shortly died. His youngest son became king for a brief time after him. The persecution was continued. The group of Maccabees fought and eventually they gained their independence and gave a pledge of mutual support with Rome. They were completely independent for half a century or more before the Romans finally took over what remained of the Seleucid empire.

So Antiochus IV is a very vivid and dramatic character. To him the attack on Judaism was a comparatively small part of his activity, but it was something that would have meant a complete end to the OT and to the teachings given in it had it not been for the Maccabean uprising. When the Maccabees however, began to gain power, then other people began to join with them who were not so interested in the real _____ of the issue and eventually the descendants of the Maccabees ruled independently but fell very far short of the standards with which they began. So they are not remembered with great favor among the Jews.

It was the great crisis perhaps in the history of the religion of Israel prior to the time of Christ. So Antiochus IV is so important in this regard that it is important to see how in Dan. 11:21-35 we have events of it described. If you read through these verses you'll see how many of the things I've mentioned are suggested there.

The assignment is posted as you go and we'll continue there next time.

(Introductory remarks regarding the last assignment on Dan. 9:24-27.)

Here was a very good paper that was turned in but at the end it said, Dr. MacRae, It seems to me that I am not up to the level of your assignment." Now that was hardly necessary because it was an excellent paper. But he adds, "I think it would be better if you set a prerequisite of a year of Hebrew and a course of inter-testament history before attempting to take the course in Daniel."

It is true of most every course in the seminary except the course in introductory languages courses, that we could do much better in it if we took it after other courses were taken. We have only 3 years to crowd things in to, so I'm trying to give this course on a level in which people with no knowledge of Hebrew and no knowledge of the inter-testament period can get all that is required in the greater part of what is given.

Of course those who already have some background in these matters naturally can go further into the subject. Wherever it refers to Hebrew, I am either referring to it or as in the last case referring you to a book like Young's Concordance. Because in Young's Concordance you look up your English word and find what the Hebrew word is, and it gives it in Latin words as well as in Hebrew letters.

So if you don't know a single Hebrew letter, you can take what is given there in Latin letters and look it up in the back and see how the word is translated. This word Messiah you find translated Messiah twice in the OT, and nearly 40 times it is translated anointed. So the word simply means an anointed one.

Of course that's what the word Christ means -- an anointed one. It's the Greek for Messiah. We use it for the one whom God anointed for the most important purpose that ever was done.

But the same word is used of those whom God has anointed for other purposes. Therefore when we find this word in Hebrew we have, in translating, to make a judgment. Does this mean an anointed one, or is it referring specifically to the greatest of all anointed ones, the Christ. As the translators of the KJV have in these two cases rendered the word as Messiah, but in all the others they have simply rendered it my anointed or the Lord's anointed or something like that. Actually it's identical. That is, the decision whether to say Messiah or to say the anointed one is a matter of private determination by the student. And the translator gives you his judgment, but it's only his judgment.

(Question: about the pronominal suffix ? ? I don't know what the pronominal suffix is. I don't know whether . . .)

I'm sorry about that. Pronominal suffix. I did not make it clear but I thought I had made it clear. I said pronominal suffix such as my, his, etc. I thought that would indicate what it was. It is true you have to have--- I guess they don't have them in Greek. And in Hebrew you have to have maybe a month before you get it.

I should have said, Use with his, my, etc. I am sorry that was not clear.

Here I wanted to bring out to you by your own observation the fact that this word Messiah or anointed one is used in the OT for a king in about half the cases. It's used for the people of Israel in a number of cases. It's used for a priest in 4 or 5 cases only. It is used for a prophet in only a couple of cases. But it is used for a king for about half of the cases where it is used!

Now here is a commentary, The Prophecies of Daniel, by E.J. Young. A commentary which has some very good things in it. Dr. Young has made a very thorough study of the book of Daniel, and wherever ~~x~~ he has not -- is not prejudice on a certain point, his material is often of great value. But there are a few points where he has very great prejudices and in covering a big subject like that he sometimes jumps to conclusions rather quickly.

Here he makes the statement that in the verse to which I referred in Daniel 9 where he says Messiah the Prince, Young says, This must refer to Christ. It must be a prediction of Christ because he is the only one who was both a king and a priest! Well, now, Messiah the prince-- the prince suggests he is referring to a king. But does Messiah mean he is referring to a priest? You have gathered your own evidence by looking at the use of the word in the Hebrew or in the OT.

That Hebrew word is translated anointed in most cases. In half the cases it is used of a king. So Messiah the Prince might be one who is a king and a priest but it does not have to be. It is simply one whom God has set apart for a certain important task. So in that verse, whether it is talking about Christ or not is something to be decided on other grounds, but not simply on the fact that the KJV used this particular word. Or by such an argument as this one which unfortunately Dr. Young gave, which as you see when you look at the original is quite out of place.

So much for that assignment. The next assignment deals with those same verses in ch. 9. A brief passage which has had a tremendous amount of discussion in the Christian world. It only relates to one verse in it. It is quite a simple thing which you can probably do in a very few minutes, but it takes longer to explain what it is. Therefore I have posted the three copies of the assignment on the board. I believe once you read it you will have practically all of it in mind, and won't need to copy more than a tiny part of what's on the board. I posted three copies and I'll take two of them down after today --

We are looking now at Dan. 11. In the last two lectures we spent quite a bit of time on Dan. 11. I've been sorry to note a couple who have missed those two lectures and I would suggest that Mr. Neher tells me he has been turning over cassettes of the lectures to the library, and you may borrow those cassettes and listen to them if you would like. Anyone who has questions about any of the matters that were discussed in the test-- I went through it rather carefully 2 weeks ago-- those questions are on the cassette of that lecture.

But as we have noticed in Daniel 11, it contains a great many statements which would be very difficult to interpret in advance, but statements which when the events occur, some of them, you can say, Well this fits. But it can fit with a dozen other things. But other statements very specifically fit. And we noticed in ch. 11 how it starts with v. 2 and refer to the fact that there will be yet three kings in Persia and the fourth will be far richer than they all, and by his strength through his riches he will stir up all against the realm of Grecia."

You would not know exactly what's going to happen if you lived in Daniel's day according to this verse. You could form a pretty good verse that there would be three more kings of Persia and then a fourth one who would be richer than any of the previous ones (as Xerxes was) and that he would make a great attack on Greece, as perhaps as great an attack as has ever been made on it. Perhaps one of the greatest attacks in all history, was that tremendous army which he turned against Greece and made such a tremendous impression on the Greeks from their managing to survive that attack that it was very important in all their thinking for 200 years later, and they were psychologically prepared for Alexander the Great to go back and attack the Persian empire and destroy it.

Then in the third verse we notice: "A mighty king will stand up and rule with great dominion and do according to his will." Of course this could be said of many a ruler. But the following verse speaks specifically about Alexander the Great, so we know that v.3 was a description of Alexander the Great, the mightiest king the world had perhaps seen up to that time who nothing seemed to be able to stand before.

But you notice between vv.2 and 3 there is an unmentioned interval of over 150 years. It simply passes from Xerxes who attacked Greece to Alexander the Great who destroyed the Persian empire. It skips over 150 years without any reference to it.

Then in v. 4 it tells about the division of Alexander's empire. In advance it might be hard to know what is meant by "when he stands up his kingdom will be broken." In other words he didn't have the power very long. He was just a young fellow in his early 30's when he rather suddenly died. His kingdom was broken. They tried to keep it together but it was so broken and they soon got to fighting and it was soon divided into three large important sections and a few smaller sections.

So it was divided not according to the dominion which he ruled, and not according to his posterity. Within the next 50 years every relative of Alexander -- his mother, his brother, his children-- every relative of his was killed! Not according to his posterity nor according to the dominion which he ruled. It was given to others.

V.5 says the king of the south shall be strong and one of his generals, who took the most southern part of it i.e. Ptolemy who took Egypt was a very strong king. You could not ~~perx~~ predict

exactly what this would be in the future, but when it came to pass you could say, Isn't it wonderful that Daniel predicted it 300 yrs. in advance. Tremendous!

The king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes and he shall be strong above him." and have doming." When you find one of Ptolemy's generals going up and having control of the whole eastern half of the Persian empire that certainly is a remarkable fulfillment of this. You wouldn't know in advance what would happen, but when it happened you would see how tremendously accurately Daniel had predicted this.

"He shall be strong above him." He had a far wider area than Ptolemy had. And have doming; his dominion shall be a great dominion.

Verse 6, "And in the end of years they shall join themselves together for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement. Between vv. 5 and 6 you skip over Seleucus' son. You skip to his grandson. So there is an unmentioned interval of about 30 years. Then you find an attempt to bring the two together. They -- "The king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement." In the treaty, as you know, Bernice, the daughter of Ptolemy II was married to Antiochus II. "But she shall not retain the power of her arms neither shall he stand on his arms, but she shall be given up and they that brought her and he that begat and he that strengthened her in these times."

We took time to notice that how Bernice, the conflict between Bernice and Laodice the former wife and how in the end Bernice and her child were killed. Her father died, ~~but~~ about the same time and the man who had married her was thought to be poisoned by his first wife. Very exact fulfillment of this. You might not know exactly how it would be, but when it happened you would say, how wonderful that Daniel could predict all these details.

Verse 7. But out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up -- one descended from her ancestors, a rather poetic way of describing her brother. But ~~with~~ who came up with his army and attacked. In the next two vv. we have his tremendous victory over the next king.

Verse 10, referring on to the king of the north: His son shall be stirred up and assemble a great multitude, and their fighting goes on through two or three verses. Then we have the account of Antiochus III as we noticed. We went through the details of his conquering Palestine which is specifically referred to here. The people of Israel who tried to help him to get away from the Ptolemies in order to establish the vision -- their idea of being better off which proved not to work, and the mention of his conflict with Rome.

In v. 20 we had his son. There shall stand in his estate a raiser of taxes and the glory of his kingdom, but in a few days

he shall be destroyed neither in anger nor in battle." It will be hard to tell what it's going to be, but when it happened, you saw that Antiochus III had to pay such large tremendous reparations to Rome that it was necessary that his son devote himself to trying to reestablish fiscal stability in the kingdom and spent most of his time raising taxes and making up for the great expenses. Mr. Montague?

Yes, Seleucus IV, either he raised the taxes or he sent somebody to raise the taxes. It could be taken either of the two ways, but his principal activity was in reestablishing fiscal stability.

Then vv. 21ff. we noticed the account of Antiochus Epiphanes. At the end of the last hour we discussed his career. We won't go into much detail about it again. I looked a couple of days ago at the latest ~~xxxxxxx~~ edition of Encyclopedia Britannica (which you may know was completely re-written a couple of years ago, with an entirely different ~~xxx~~ plan.) I looked up the article. In most of the previous issues they continue articles on and on and on. If you get an Encyclopedia 10 years away you don't know whether an article in it was written that year or 15 years before because there were just little changes all the time. But this was a complete change.

So I was interested in seeing what they would say about Antiochus IV. They said he was a very able king, a very effective king and an able fighter and quite inadvertently he gave the occasion for the establishing of an independent Jewish state. Which is a modernistic way of saying he tried to destroy the Jewish religion, that he took over the temple in Jerusalem and established the worship of the Greek Gods there, killed Jews who would not sacrifice to idols and made things so terrible that the Maccabean uprising developed. And an independent Jewish state lasted for the next century.

It's easy to see what was the bias of the man who wrote that particular article on Antiochus. But the interesting thing is that in the beginning of the Article he says that Antiochus IV Epiphanes, also called ~~Epimenes~~ Epimenes. That's really the only detrimental thing he said about him in the article, and unless you know Greek it will not convey any meaning to you.

He called himself Antiochus Epiphanes, which means Antiochus the outshining god. Now all the Seleucid kings before this and the Ptolemies also called themselves gods. But he was the first one to put it on his coins. The word Epiphanes. He was the outshining god. The Epiphanes. But his people seeing his crazy antics -- which we noticed, he would steal from the temples and go ~~on~~ around just throwing money around. He would kill somebody at a crazy impulse and then he would take some poor person and lift him up and give him lots of honors. He was very erratic. So the people instead of calling him (when he wasn't around) Epiphanes, the outshining god, called him Epimenes, the Mad One.

This article is funny -- it says, he was also called Epimenes. And everything else they say about him is very favorable. But the

account of him that is given here is not particularly favorable, as you can expect when he tried to destroy all knowledge of God and bring a complete end to the OT religion.

We saw various aspects of his life last time, and noticed how they were carried out. So we go on from 2 to 3

3. What the Bible tells about it. The Outline of Daniel 11:21-12:3.

I've put some other figures to the right in red. You don't have to worry about them quite yet. I'll explain about them later. We read about his character in vv. 21-24. In vv. 36-39 we have another description of character of a king. In vv. 25 to 30a, we read a general account of his political activity. We have an account of the political activities of a king in vv. 40-45.

We read about the trouble and relief for God's people in vv. 30b-35. And in vv. 1-3 of the next ch., which continues right on, as you know ch. 10-12 is one continuous thing. We have there what could be described as trouble and relief for God's people. So you go through three subjects about Antiochus, and then you again go through three subjects about a king. Of course according to the critical view you are dealing with the same man. You told these things about him, and then you go over it again in different words. But it doesn't work out. So I've just incidentally mentioned those figures here. We'll speak about them later.

But we go on to mention specific points of clear fulfillment. There are remarks made about him as there are about other rulers that could be made about any great conqueror. We don't concern ourselves particularly with them. They fit him, so they are a proper part of the prophecy. But we note specific matters such as in vv. 21-23 we find he was not the legitimate ruler. We find he came in by an unusual arrangement.

Verse 21 "In his estate shall stand up a vile person." "Vile" in Old English does not necessarily mean a wicked person. It may mean a person of unworthy standing, a person who did not have the right to take what he got. In this case Seleucus IV's son, who was a hostage in Rome, was the one who was according to the laws entitled to come over and become his successor. But before he could come, while the man who had killed Seleucus was trying to establish himself as ruler in the name of Seleucus's infant child, while that was being done, Antiochus IV managed to come in and kill the man who had killed his brother and the child also, and establish himself as king.

So in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor and the kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably. He did not make a conquest. He got the kingdom, in the neighboring area to lend him some money, and help him to get there with a small force, and then came in and declared he was the son of Antiochus the Great and killed the murderer and took power before people realized what was happening. He took over the power and obtained the kingdom by flatteries, and he

became strong with a few people. He worked deceitfully. These three verses tell about his assension and they exactly fit his and would not fit any of the kings we looked at before.

Then we find in v. 24 the strange contrast in his character. He entered peaceably even upon the fatest places of the provinces. This word peaceably here has more the idea by stealth; taking something without people realizing what is happening. He would get hold of things and get into their temples and seize their treasures. He would do that not only with the temple at Jerusalem but also with the temples of various gods. He raised very large exactions from people who had a considerable amount of money. Then he would scatter among them the prey and spoil and riches. There is a man who made seizures and also squandered the money that he got. It's typical of his character and he's not the only man who ever had such a contrast, but it is not common.

Then we have his attack on Egypt, vv.25ff. Of course many of these Seleucid kings made attacks upon Egypt, but here we find that the treasury of Pharaoh's suppoeters, vv.25-26, those who were supposed to help Antiochus' nephew, the legitimate king of Egypt, but he was a young boy and consiired against him.

Then v. 27 he told told his nephew he was going to help him. "The two kings ~~aaa~~ sat at one table telling lies." Each of them making the other think he'd stand with him, and really being against him.

Then the first part of v. 28, his return to Antioch with great wealth. But on the way back his heart was against the holy covenant. The word "exploits" is inserted in the KJV. He did things at Jerusalem and returned to his own land. He tried to rob the temple. He gave strict orders that the Jews were not to be circumsized, that they were not to follow the Mosaic law. He returned to Antioch with great wealth, but returned to Jerusalem _____.

We have these matters predicted in such a way that you would not know very much exactly what was going to happen, but when it did happen you could see it was exactly fulfilled.

On the right hand of this picture, you find his second invasion of Egypt. In v.29ff, which we looked at last time. I mentioned Popilius Laenus here. You remember how the Roman emissary came and told him to withdraw from Egypt when he was about to have it all in his hands. He said, That would require consideration. And he drew a line about him and said, You can consider it as long as you stay in that circle. He gave in to the Romans, but he was very much irritated by it naturally. When he returned he took it out on the Jews.

So we have v.20 the reference to the ships of Chittim come against him. Chittim is a word regularly used in the OT for regions to the West of the Mediterranean. Therefore he was grieved, and returned and had indignation against the holy covenant. That was his reaction to it, was partly to hold his great games in Antioch

to which he invited people from all over the then known world and spent tremendous sums of money. But the other part of it was to try to unify the religion of his empire by destroying all who would not worship Zeus. It was now that his armies seized the temple in Jerusalem and so polluted it that no pious Jew could possibly go into it again until it had been purged and cleansed.

So we have his severe persecution of Judaism described in v.30b. "So shall he do. He shall return and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant. V.31, They shall pollute the sanctuary of strength and take away the daily sacrifice and place the abomination that maketh desolate. When they put up the statue of Zeus right in the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem, it made the place so desolate in the eyes of any pious Jews that he could not think of going into it.

V.32, tells about the beginning of the Maccabean revolt, vv.32-25. The people, some of them rose up against him and then they succeeded a little bit. Others joined with them that were not really thoroughly with them. In the end while the Maccabean people did free Judea into an independent kingdom for nearly a century, yet there was -- the leadership of it was quite mixed.

Question: Will you discuss a little bit double reference?

We will a little later in this hour. A very important question. If somebody were to tell you back in 1750 and made a prediction, There will be a great ruler in who will rise up in one of the countries of Europe, and will lead armies making rapid marches across most of Europe and conquer many countries and make take great wealth, but he will be completely defeated and his regime utterly destroyed. You could say that was exactly fulfilled in Napoleon. But then again you could find it exactly fulfilled in Hitler.

Well it may be fulfilled in somebody else yet! Who can say? I would say it would have to be one or the other. It would have to be a prediction of Napoleon, or if it did not fit Napoleon you would have to say ~~xxxxxxxxxxxfulfillment~~ its fulfillment is still to come, and you would find it in Hitler.

Someone could say, Napoleon was just a type of Hitler. He was merely a symbol of what Hitler would be like. If you are going to say that, then maybe Hitler is just a symbol of somebody who is coming 20 yrs. from now. It seems to me there is great danger in that sort of thing.

There are cases where Scripture sees two things that are related, that are similar. A sort of composite picture. But that is rare. I would say, God very slow about accepting any such thing. If you find definite fulfillment of something, I would say, It is complete. When it says, Ships of Chittim will come against him. That might refer to the American ships going during the last war and putting an end to Hitler's regime-- ships from the west coming. But I don't think it does. I think it is fulfilled in Popilius Laenaesus. My feeling is that in almost every case, when something

is predicted, look for one fulfillment. Now, of course, there are two exceptions. One is, if you say there will be great conquerors who will conquer many countries. That would include both Napoleon and Hitler because you have used the plural.

Or there can be a succession. They asked Moses, What shall we do? How shall we know the Lord's will after you are gone? He said God will raise up a prophet like unto me, him shall ye hear. After Moses was gone, God raised up a succession of prophets. How are we going to know God's will when you're gone Moses? Well, look to God to raise up a prophet. And God raised up one prophet after another, and as time went on the Jews understood that this succession of prophets that was predicted would have its culmination in the greatest of all the prophets.

So they came to John the Baptist and said, Are you that prophet? Are you the great climax of the succession of prophets? But in general I say, look for one fulfillment of any statement that is given. That is little aside, but it relates to the whole subject. So thank you for the question.

We have then these various remarkable fulfillments of the history tracing through telling about Antiochus III at length. Telling exactly about his son, Seleucus IV. Then telling about the other son, Antiochus IV at considerable length. We have all these things which when the events occurred you could see how it fit, but you would not know in advance ~~which~~ of the details of God plan.

So much for Antiochus Epiphanes.

5.Dan. 11:36-12:3. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, as I gave under No. 3, The Character and Accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, vv.21-24. Now we go back again to the description of the character of the king, v.36ff.

We have Antiochus' political activities in vv.25 to first part of v.30, and we have the political activities of the king given again in v.40-45. We have trouble and relief for God's people in v.30c-35 and in vv.1-3 of the next chapter. We have a section that could very well be called Trouble and Relief for God's People.

Of course the holder of the critical view insists that vv.36 on is still talking about Antiochus IV. We are still knowing about him. It is strange, but not impossible that you go back and tell all over again about his character after you have told these other things. It is strange but not impossible that having told so much about his career you go back and tell again about his career or about additional events in his career, and that having told a little about trouble and relief for God's people you again go into it. That is not at all impossible, but it doesn't fit. Most of what it says here has no precise fulfillment in Antiochus Epiphanes. So the critics are in great difficulty when they say it is still talking about Antiochus Epiphanes. So we have the question, If it is not talking about Antiochus Epiphanes, who is it talking about?

This commentary by E. J. Young, ~~we~~ to which I referred a few minutes ago, speaks of this section and says there have been many interpretations. He says the following are the principal interpretations. No. 1, Antiochus Epiphanes. No. 2 Constantine the Great. No. 3 Omar, the Islamic king. No. 4 The Roman Emperor. No. 5 The Dispensationalist interpretation. No. 6 The Pope of Rome and the Papal System. No. 7 Herod the Great. No. 8 The Antichrist. No. 8 is the one he insists is the correct one.

Young says, The Antichrist, this may be called the traditional interpretation in the Christian church. It was advocated by St. Jerome in 400 A.D., and in this he has been followed by many. The term Antichrist is not particularly a good term. John says, there are many antichrists. Antichrist is a very general term. But there is a specific person referred to in 2 Thess. where Paul says that there is one of whom Isaiah said that the Lord will destroy him at his coming, one who it is said will sit in the temple of God showing forth that he is god and should be worshipped. One whom Paul described-- the terrible things that he is to do just before the return of Christ.

It is quite common for us to refer to this one as the antichrist. Notice Young does that. He calls him the Antichrist. I see no harm in that usage so long as we remember it is not a scriptural practice. Scripture uses the term antichrist in a more general way for all great enemies of the Lord's work. You notice a ~~xxxx~~ strange thing about Dr. Young's commentary. He is very good on many of his statements; has much that is excellent in the commentary, but has a strong prejudice against what he calls dispensationalism.

If anyone whom he calls a dispensationalist holds a view that's almost enough in his mind to condemn the view. So we notice here on p. 246 of his Commentary that as the 5th he gives the Dispensationalist interpretation -- which of course are wrong as all the first seven are here. Then the 8th he gives, the antichrist. He gives two dispensationalist interpretations. He gives a) the king, v. 36 is the little horn of Daniel 7 who is an apostate, not from Judaism but from Christianity. He establishes his palace in Jerusalem from which times runs the great tribulation, the last three and a half years of Daniel's 70th week.

That would certainly be the one who would be called the antichrist, wouldn't it? He does not use the term antichrist here. He says he is the Little Horn of Dan. 7, the apostate not from Judaism but from Christianity.

The other "dispensationalist" interpretation he gives is b) he is the antichrist, not to be identified with the little horn of ch. 7, either with him, or with the horn of ch. 8. This wilful king will be a Jew who in the midst of Jewish people will assume kingly honors, be recognized ~~as~~ by the Jewish apostates as Messiah king, and by the Christian apostates as the antichrist. In the middle of the 70th week he will come and take his seat in the Jerusalem temple, and will claim divine worship.

The only difference between these two interpretations as he calls them, is that one says the man is an apostate from

Christianity, and the other says he is a Jew. But they both agree he is a man who can be called antichrist because he is the great enemy of God at the end of this age.

His 8th interpretation is that it is the antichrist, and that is the one he says is right! I would think it better if he subsumed what he calls the two dispensationalist interpretations under his, and say he is either a Jew or a Christian, but in either case he is the antichrist. Mr. Brown?

(Brown: It is my impression in reading Dr. Young that he is trying to disassociate a polemical ~~of~~ ploy that are used by some dispensationalists to use the church fathers to substantiate your viewpoint rather than just looking at Scripture and seeing whether or not Scripture says it. That's what he Some people think all church fathers were dispensationalists and that's hardly the case.)

Well, he doesn't mention any church fathers here under No.5. He says one dispensationalist view is that he is the antichrist, who is a Jew; the other is that he is an antichrist who is a Gentile. And the correct view, he says, is that he is the Antichrist!

But I believe most Christian interpreters have held that these vv. are a description of the antichrist. A very interesting thing in addition to that about Dr. Young's commentary is that in chs. 2, 7, and 9 he is very much against the idea of an unmentioned interval between two great events. But here he assumes a jump of at least 2000 years without it being mentioned between v. 35 and 36! Of course we have to assume that or else to say that vv. 36-39 is talking about Antiochus Epiphanes.

There is statement after statement in this section that just does not fit Antiochus Epiphanes, and statements about things he would do that we have no historical evidence of his doing. One, for instances, is that it describes an expedition against Egypt, which is very successful. Some who hold the critical view will say this is a repetition of what's already been said that he will make an expedition against Egypt. Others say that this describes a third expedition against Egypt which is not mentioned anywhere in any of our histories.

It would be a little strange if at that period he made a third expedition that was not mentioned in any of our histories. It would be particularly strange since his second expedition was brought to an end when the Romans ordered him to go back and that was sufficient to ~~xxxx~~ lead him to go back. If he'd made a third expedition under those circumstances, we can be sure the Romans would have come with power, and it certainly would have made enough stir that ~~xx~~ there would be some mention of it in history. Young without saying so, assumes an unmentioned interval of at least 2000 years at this point between Antiochus Epiphanes and the antichrist.

You notices the section ends with the resurrection. Verse 2 of ch.12, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

There is the resurrection there -- at which it ends. According to the critical view this is the vain hope of someone in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes who wrote the book of Daniel! But if you take it as a true message from God, ~~xxxxxxx~~ it runs to the resurrection. So even if there was not this unmentioned interval between Antiochus and Antichrist, if some of this continues to be about Antiochus, there would have to be that unmentioned interval somewhere because you get to the resurrection right there.

Now I don't know how much time we ought to take in looking at points in this that were not fulfilled in Antiochus. Let us look quickly at vv. 36-38, 39 where it where it speaks about his character. In v. 36 it says he shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished. Antiochus died while his persecution was still in progress. He did not prosper until it was accomplished.

Verse 37, Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers. Antiochus built great temples to the pagan gods; he put up monuments here and there. Those who hold the critical view say in trying to get around this, his ancestors worshipped Apollo and he worshipped Zeus. Apollo was the son of Zeus, so anyone who worshipped Apollo also worshipped Zeus. It is not a satisfactory interpretation. "Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers"-- that is what suggests what Young refers to that he is an apostate from Judaism or that he is someone with a Christian background who turned away from it. But it certainly does not fit anything in the life of Antiochus.

"Neither shall be == "Nor the desire of women." It is not quite clear what that means. Some take it that means he destroyed a licentious religious cult in Syria which could be called the desire of women! But there is no evidence of his ever doing such a thing, and it does not fit with his general attitude toward paganism.

"Nor regard any god, for he shall magnify himself above all." He built a tremendous temple to Zeus in Athens in addition to the great temples he built in Palestine and Syria.

Verse 38. But in his estate shall he honor the god of forces." No one in ancient times could even guess what that means. So the Greek word mauzim Jerome simply took it as a personal god. He will honor the god mauzim! But we don't know any god mauzim. But the god of fortresses he will honor. What is that that? A god whom his fathers knew not shall he ~~xxx~~ honor with ~~gdaa~~ gold and silver and precious stones. & Thus shall he do in the most strongholds with a strange god. To people in ancient times this would make no meaning whatever. Because all ancient rulers worshipped some god.'

But in our day it is quite common to find those, in fact a third of the world is now today in the hands of those who say there is no god except the god of power. They say that when Winston Churchill suggested to Stalin that at a peace conference they should have a representation of the Pope, that Stalin said, And how many divisions does he control? In other words Stalin was only interested in how big an army you had, not in any spiritual force. That is the attitude of

of the communists; they have completely wiped out religion at least outwardly from China. No one is allowed to have any outward manifestation of any religion in China. In Russia, while it is not legally ruled out, it is in actual practice it is tremendously persecuted. A part of the belief of these who now hold a third of the world in their power, and the belief of a great many leaders in other countries, is materialism, the god of forces; the god of fortresses. That's the god they honor.

So this would be a very good description of what the character of antichrist will be very different from the character of Antiochus.

We will not take time to go on further through these verses. There are specific things said in them for which we find nothing comparing to them in the life of Antiochus Epiphanes. So there would seem to be a definite jump, an unmentioned interval between v.35 and 36. Here from v. 36 to 12:3, a description of events to occur at the very end of the present age, just before the return of Christ. We'll continue there next time.

Please review a little bit of what you've already done on ch. 8, because I'm going to try to rush through ch. 8 quite quickly and then get to those verses that I've assigned to you for next time for ch. 9.

The 27 suggested questions for the final examination are up here on two sheets and at the end of the class, if each of you could take one of each of the two sheets it would save me having to combine them. The final exam questions will probably be all taken from that list on the two pages. It would be helpful to you in reviewing to have them.

I have taken more time in reviewing certain sections than I had expected to. I think it is wise to get well in mind the material we are covering. It means there are four verses which are quite unrelated in most ways to the rest of the prophecy which I had thought I would be able to spend two or three hours on and as it is we won't spend a great deal of time on them.

On those there are three or four questions in this list of 27, but those questions will probably be covered next week rather than today. If you have a chance to look them over between now and next class it may be that it will suggest certain things to your mind that are not clear that you would think it wise to have me say a word about in the next class. In such a case I wish you would write out any such questions and get them to me if possible ahead of class, but at least as soon as class starts.

We have looked at the history of Antiochus Epiphanes and we have seen how precisely there are statements about him in ch. 11. The idea that ch. 11 all the sudden at v. 21 has an unmentioned interval jumping forward to antichrist would be rather ridiculous because the preceeding vv. tell about his ancestors and his brethren in so much detail and there's not much point to it except to this leading up to this terrible crisis that was faced by Judaism. This terrible crisis is described by the long account of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes which was Sec. D.

In Sec. E, we already spoke about 11:36-12:3 under which we noted 1. The King's Character and Career. I mentioned a number of points in which it was quite obvious that most of the material from 11:36 to 12:3 could not possibly be considered as a continued account of Antiochus. Those who hold the Maccabean view either say these are the guesses of the writer as to what might happen in the future or else they say that these are things that actually happened but we have no historical record of them. So that the particular events described in them just don't fit with anything we know about Antiochus Epiphanes.

The account of the character of this man is utterly different from ~~the~~ Antiochus who built great temples to the gods of his fathers. This is one who disregards the gods of his fathers, and turns away from them.

We noticed this is one who will honor the god of fortresses, a good expression for a purely materialistic viewpoint which would have been rather uncomprehensible to people in ancient times, but which today fits exactly with the attitude of the leaders of a very large part of the world.

2. The time of trouble and deliverance. We looked briefly at that-- the very terrible time that is described which could be taken as describing the time of the crisis under the Macabees. But since we have the description of a very different situation, it is more reasonable to take it as something that is to happen in connection with a different one ~~xxxx~~ than Antiochus. A much later one. Then we noticed

3. 12:2 describes a resurrection. So this section goes clear to the resurrection, it is very obvious there must be a long unmentioned interval. At least 2000 years somewhere between the account of Antiochus Epiphanes and the end. It would be rather absurd to put it just before the mention of the resurrection; it is much more logical to put it in the place we did between vv. 35 and 36, though some have suggested other points at which to place it. That was E. I want to go on to glance at

F. Dan. 12:4-13. As we have noticed chs. 10-12 are one unit, and it is very unfortunate that the Archbishop made the division at ch. 11 where he did. If he had made it one v. later, it would have made a reasonable division. Though actually it is one continuous passage, chs. 10 through 12. So 12:4-13 I want to say a few words about v. 4.

I'll read from the NIV: "But you Daniel fold up and seal the words of the scroll ~~xxx~~ until the time of the end. Many will go ~~bb~~ here and there ~~add~~ and increase knowledge." That is the translation the NIV has. In KJV it was a little more ambiguous. They rendered it, But thou O Daniel, shut up the words and seal up the book even to the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased." There's not a tremendous difference between the two in the wording, but there's a tremendous difference in the meaning.

Shut

As it ~~xxxxxx~~ stands in KJV, "~~seal~~ up the ~~w~~words and seal the book even to the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased." I think Newton, one of the greatest scientists who ever lived, wrote a discussion of Daniel. In his discussion he stated this described how things would come to pass in the latter days. That many would go to and fro. There would be travelling, he said, such as the world had never seen before. In fact, he said, I would not be surprised if people would travel as fast as 60 mph. And Voltaire, the great French Athiest said, Newton's commentary on Daniel was a good example of how when a great mind -- scientific mind -- turns to a study of the Bible, it gets into ~~s~~ nonsense! He said, How could anybody travel 60 mph., they would not be able to take their breath! They would die immediately. We know now how completely wrong Voltaire was. We know that to us today what Newton thought was a tremendous speed is quite commonplace.

But actually that's not what the passage means at all. It does not mean there will be a great increase in travel. It is definitely related to the first part of ~~the~~ the verse, that he is to seal up the book until the days approach when the statements in the book are immediately relevant to the people's situation. Then many will hunt back and forth and knowledge shall be increased." NIV says, "to increase knowledge." Both are a possible interpretation of the Hebrew. I think KJV says that as they hunt back and forth they are

going to find more understand of what the passage means. NIV says "in order to try to get more understanding of what it means." I think perhaps in this regard KJV is a little better there, but either of them-- I mean the NIV in the first part is much clearer than KJV "travelling to and fro." The same word is used-- Heb. word-- where it speaks of the eyes of the Lord go to and fro throughout the earth in order to observe the good and the wicked.

It is not a travelling, but a hunting. A searching and a seeking out.

We won't take time to look into details of the rest of the book since we have a number of important things to look at and some of this is not clear exactly as to what it means. Daniel is told that the greater part of the purpose of this prediction is for time in the future, quite a distance off. Those who hold the Maccabean view hold that it was actually written at the time of the Maccabeas but pretended to be written by Daniel telling things for that period. That would fit to be a long distance off, to have it written c. 530 B.C. and have it look forward to events c. 160. It's a period of c. 4 centuries, as you see, which is a very very long distance.

If someone had predicted events now in the times of the Pilgrim Fathers, that would be very ~~xxx~~ difficult to do. It would be looking way ahead. So there is much in the book that looks ~~xx~~ way ahead to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But as we also found in ch. 11, there is a great deal that goes way beyond the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The interesting thing is that we start our prophecies with ch. 2 where we see the complete destruction of the statue representing human government throughout the years. That complete destruction has not yet come, so that his prophecy begins with a look way on to thousands of years to the future. But in ~~xxxx~~ later chs. he looks at the great crisis that comes at an earlier time.

Now we have-- I've given you a couple of assignments on ch. 8 but we have not looked into ch. 8. Ch. 8 is a parallel to these other chs. which I thought it was good to leave, and to have our discussion of Antiochus Epiphanes under ch. 11 instead of under 8. Though in some ways ch. 8 is clearer about Antiochus Epiphanes than ch. 11. Each of them tells us a good deal about him, and there is no contradiction between the statements but various aspects are emphasized.

I turn now to ch. 8. Under that

A. The Setting. I think I may have made a mistake under that of copying the dates of these chs. because if you try to copy all of that it may divert your attention from the amount of material we want to get over. I wanted to bring out the fact that ch. 2 is given in the 2nd year of Nebuchadnezzar, c. 602 B.C. Then the next prophetic vision we have is at least 45 years later. I say ~~xxx~~ the first year of Belshazzar, 556 or later. The reason I say "or later" is because we have no record of the time when Belshazzar became king. His father Nabonidus became king in 556, if I recall correctly. It is on the sheet I gave you of the historical dates of the kings. Nabonidus at some time in his reign made his son Bēshazzar co-king with him. I would think it unlikely he did it immediately.

But he certainly did it a few years before the conquest by Cyrus in 539. So the first year of Belshazzar is either ~~555~~ 556 or later. Forty-five years at least after ch. 2 we have Daniel's vision which not merely shows the four kingdoms shown in ch. 2, and not merely tells about the complete destruction of human government as predicted, but in addition shows something of the latter days before that destruction. It tells about the little horn that fights against the saints and prevails against them until the Ancient of Days comes and gives the victory to the saints and destroys the -- destroys entirely and completely the beast which was represented by the little horn.

Then in the third year of Belshazzar two years later we have this eighth chapter. The ninth ch. says in the first year of Darius the Mede who was made ~~king~~ king over the realm of Babylon and the statement "was made king" should make it rather obvious that Darius the Mede ~~a~~ was not the great emperor, but was Cyrus' representative.

Prof. Weisman thinks this was another name for Cyrus. It seems more likely that it is one spoken of in his inscriptions as Gobyrus. At any rate he was a man who was made king over the Babylonian province under the great emperor Cyrus. He evidently did not hold ~~xxx~~ that position many years. In fact, it says he was quite elderly when he received the kingdom because ch. 10 begins "in the third year of Cyrus the Persian." Which would be about 537.

And so ch. 8 is in the 3rd year of Belshazzar. And No. 2 I said, Shushan. It says in KJV that in his vision he was at Shushan the palace. NIV says, "In my vision I saw myself in the citadel of Susa." Now Shushan is what the Hebrew says. Susa is what the way the NIV takes it. The fact is that both are true because the ancient Babylonians wrote the word as Shushan. But we have pretty good evidence that they did not pronounce it as sh; they pronounced it s. So one is what's actually written in the Hebrew--Shushan. Susa is probably actually the way they pronounced it.

Susa was a great capitol of a regime that had fought the Assyrians for many years though was finally conquered by them. It was probably part of the area that was held by Cyrus at this time when Daniel had this vision. So the fact that Daniel saw himself in this ~~way~~ place to which he had probably gone in the past as a diplomatic representative, but now he sees himself over there is a suggestion of great changes to come.

3. The Order of Presentation. This ~~is~~ we need not linger over because it was an assignment I ~~had~~ gave you some time ago, to look at ch. 8 and not how much was vision and how much was interpretation. Vv. 2-12 was vision; then while he was still in the vision he hears a saint ask another a question that the other saint answers. That you might say is still part of the vision but I've simply listed it separately here, vv. 13-14. Then we have 5 vv given where God sends the angel Gabriel to explain the vision to Daniel. He says he will explain it to him, so vv. 20-26 are interpretation. Then the final vv. is Daniel's reaction. He was tremendously upset, as we read in this last verse, by this ~~xxxxx~~ vision, which he had then.

B. The Two Beasts. We have two animals described and they are very different from the animals in ch. 2. We have in vv.3-8, we have them described in vv. 20-22 we have the interpretation. And instead of the ferocious looking beasts described in ch. 7, we have a he-goat and a ram. The first one goes butting his way, pushing and covering the ground, going across the earth toward the west, toward the north and the south. It is a good description of Cyrus' conquests.

The goat is described as coming from the west and going so fast that he hardly touches the ground. It exactly fits . . . So we have the description of Alexander the Great's very rapid conquests. Cyrus was tremendous but Alexander the Great was much faster. These vv. describe it rather vividly. We won't ~~take~~ take time to go into it in detail, ~~but~~ but we noticed that in the interpretation in vv.20-22 that the NIV reads: "The two-horned ram that you saw represents the king of Media and Persia. The shaggy goat is the king of Greece, and the large horn between his eyes is the first king. The four horns that replaced the one that was broken, represent four kingdoms that will emerge from his nation but will not have the same power." That would seem to make it very definite that this was a picture of the same events which are described in ch. 7 and described again in ch. 11.

Then we have a new thing in ch. 8. We are confused by the fact that in KJV it speaks of a little horn. The NIV says, "But of one of them came another horn which started small but grew in power." That is quite different from KJV, a little horn. Actually in ch. 7 where we had the little horn, that represents the anti-christ, the little horn was in the Aramaic there literally that. The words were a horn a little one. Here, the word ~~King~~ in the Hebrew is a horn from littleness.

A horn from littleness, the NIV has very well described by saying "another horn which started small but grew." A horn from littleness. It's interesting that the words a horn from littleness could point this way to the origin of it, or it could point to an opposition, away from littleness. The Hebrew preposition is used in those two senses. It shows origin(from) or it shows opposition (more than). So if you took it "a horn more than littleness" you could mean a strong horn, and the ancient Greek translation here renders it a strong horn.

I think probably the NIV interpretation is more accurate-- "one that began little and became great", but it is not the same terminology as in ch. 7. The holders of the Maccabean interpretation would say the little horn in ch. 7 is Antiochus Epiphanes and so is the little horn in ch. 8. They are both Antiochus Epiphanes. Well in ch. 7 the little horn comes out of the fourth kingdom. In ch. 8 it comes out of the Greek kingdom which is the 3rd kingdom. This horn from littleness describes Antiochus Epiphanes who did not have a right to the throne, and who came in with a small force and managed to get control.

So the tendency of the critics to try to equate the two is one we must avoid, but that does not mean we should go to the opposite

extreme and say wherever it speaks of a great enemy of God, it describes antichrist! Because we have two great crises in the book of Daniel. We look forward to the coming of Antiochus Epiphanes a long ways off (nearly 4 centuries after the time that Daniel wrote), and we look forward to the coming of antichrist at least 2000 years after that! So we have two different crises shown. Now this one comes out of the third kingdom, not the fourth as in ch. 7.

So in ch. 7 we look forward to a great crisis that has not yet occurred. Here we are looking to this great crisis that did occur in the time of the Maccabeas. So the account tells us about him, how he came out of one of the parts of Alexander's empire. It describes his arrogance. It says he shall cause sacrifice to cease, v.12. "The daily sacrifice was taken away." He did away with the daily sacrifice. We find how exactly that was fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes who so polluted the temple that no pious Jew could enter it, and the regular morning and evening sacrifices were no longer made. Instead of that they put up a statue to Jupiter and polluted the temple and the Maccabean revolt eventually resulted in their getting control of the temple again and taking out the altar that had been polluted from it.

So this description of Antiochus Epiphanes then-- all these things are precisely fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes. Yet we must not go the other extreme from the critics and say that every time it speaks of a great enemy of God in these passages it is speaking about antichrist! But there are many who find it difficult to think that ch. 8 is telling about the great crisis under Antiochus Epiphanes, that that is what is there described.

They think that Antichrist must in some way be in ch. 8. He is very clearly in ch. 7 and very clearly in ch. 11. They both are very clearly in ch. 11 as we have seen. But there are many who insist that he must be also in this chapter. Some have even gone so far as to say the vision here is about Antiochus Epiphanes but the interpretation is all about Antichrist. Well since the interpretation starts with saying that it represents the kings of Media and Persia and it is the king of Greece that is described, it is rather ridiculous to take that view. So a larger number will say this is describing Antiochus Epiphanes, but that he is a type of Antichrist.

It seems to me we introduce unnecessary confusion into the Scripture when we make some future thing a type of some other future thing if there is no Scriptural statement that says that is correct. It seems to me quite clear that here in ch. 8 we are talking exclusively about Antiochus Epiphanes.

The reason why many feel this must be about Antichrist is v.17 and 19. I'll read them from the NIV. Starting with v.16. "I heard a man's voice from Ulai saying, Gabriel tell this man the meaning of the vision. As he came near the place where I was standing I was terrified and fell prostrate. Son of man he said to me, Understand that the vision concerns the time of the end." That phrase "the time of the end" can suggest it means the time of the end of the age. But "end" is used in Scripture in many different ways.

The end of your faith. You are receiving the end of your faith even the salvation of your souls, the NT says. You speak of the end of somebody's reign, the end of some situation. It means -- concerns something that is not in Daniel's time but is quite a distance forward a time of the end. There are many instances where it very obviously does not refer to the very end of the age.

So continuing in v.19, "I am going to tell you later what will happen in the time of wrath because the vision concerns the appointed time of the end." One commentary says, Nothing ended at the time of the Maccabees; so it must look forward to antichrist. Of course that is an erroneous statement--"nothing ended at the time of Antiochus. The great persecution that Antiochus began came to an end when the Maccabees gained their freedom and set up Judea as a separate state. Or if you want something bigger than that to come to an end the captivity began in the time of the taking of Jerusalem. The captivity began then and the exile began then.

The exile ended in 538 B.C. because Cyrus gave a decree that the people who desired could go back and could rebuild the city. So the exile ended there but not the captivity because they were still under the control of the Persians. They continued under their control until Alexander the Great ~~tried~~ destroyed the Persian empire and then Palestine was under the control of the Ptolemies after Alexander died === under the Ptolemies for 100 years. Then under the Seleucids and so the captivity continued until the time of the Maccabees. But the captivity ended with the Maccabees. They had c. 100 yrs. of being independent before the Romans took them over.

So it surely is the time of the end of a very vital development of the history of Israel.

There is more detail that is interesting in this ch. if we had considerable time. I would like to take the statements about Antiochus in the first part of the vision and parallel them with the statements in the interpretation and it is very interesting to see how each of them gives some information that is not given in the other. But I don't think we will take time for that now, since the semester is drawing so near to a close.

I will put on the board now a brief outline of these four different chs. It does not cover anything but what we have already looked at, but perhaps it makes it a little more vivid. In Daniel 2 the four parts of the statue. The five parts of which the last two are joined together.

In ch. 7 the four animals, followed by the little horn. An ch. 2 leading up to the complete destruction of the statue. Ch. 7 the beast of which the little horn is part being completely destroyed and his body given to the fire. Then the new kingdom in ch. 2, the Son of Man came in ch. 7.

One of the suggested questions I have put there is, What is said about saints in the book of Daniel? We found one place this morning where in ch. 8 he heard a saint ask another. That word *saint*, a holy one, -- we don't know exactly what it refers to there. But the word saint is used several times in ch. 7 where the antichrist fights

against the saints, and seems about to destroy them but the Ancient of days comes and his kingdom is given to the saints. The Son of Man has been given a kingdom that he shall reign, a kingdom that cannot be destroyed, but the kingdom that is given to the saints. So there is at least a part of the time when the Son of man reigns in power over this earth when the saints, as His representatives, are in power.

You find many people talking about the eternal age. Some say there can be no millennium when Christ comes back. There must be an eternal age because the kingdom cannot be destroyed. The kingdom of Christ. Well, it is quite plain that the kingdom of Christ cannot be destroyed, but there is no reason it cannot change its form in such ways as He may choose.

So the kingdom of the saints would seem to last for 1000 years add what is after that we do not know. I do not find the words eternal state anywhere in Scripture. I think they are a philosophical conception that has no solid basis. I see no evidence that time comes to an end. Time is simply the possibility of things following one another. There is no reason that things cannot follow one another after the Great White Throne judgment. God has not revealed to us what will happen then.

We noticed ch. 8, I put the ram a little lower down in the picture here, because it does not tell us in ch. 8 which of the animals or parts of the statue it corresponds to, but the description makes it very clear that it is the second and that the he-goat is third. And that the horn from littleness there and there we have the great crisis. In Can. 11 we have the same two kings described-- Persia and Greece. Then we have a crisis in vv. 21-35 and then we jump to the still greater crisis in vv. 36ff.

There is much more we could say about ch. 8, but I want to have a few minutes at least on the 4 vv. that are found in ch. 9. So I'm going to make

VI Daniel 9:24-27

In Dan. 9 we have a great prayer which Daniel gives. He sees there had been a prophecy made by Jeremiah that Jerusalem would be desolate for 70 years. When did the desolation begin? Does the desolation begin with the destruction of the city, or does the desolation begin with the great destruction in the territory near and the great number of people who were taken into captivity at the time when Daniel was taken into captivity. It is pretty hard to be sure of when those 70 yrs. would begin.

In ch. 9 we find Daniel, after the Babylonians are destroyed, and Darius the Mede has taken over as Cyrus' representative, Daniel prays and he figures it has been about 70 yrs. he has been away from Jerusalem, and that the territory around Jerusalem has been desolate.

Now he prays, O God you said there would be 70 yrs. of desolation. Now is the time when we can go back to the homeland. We can reestablish the glory of Jerusalem. We can have things established as they were before. But, he says, we were a sinful nation. We deserved what you have done, and we still are sinful. So what is the Lord going to do? The greater part of ch. 9 is made up of this great prayer. Then God sends the angel to Daniel to bring him the answer. The angel gives

an answer in four vv. which have been argued about perhaps as much as any four vv. in the Bible. There is much in these four vv. that is not at all clear. There are about 6 views of them that are held very tenaciously by various individuals. People become very emotional that their view is correct. Most of those who interpret these 4 vv. (Dan. 9:24-27) most who do so approach it with a definite idea in mind. Then they try to fit everything into that definite idea.

There are two definite ideas that are widely held. As an approach to it there are those who say, These vv. must tell us exactly how many years it would be before Christ would come. That would be a very strange thing if 400 years in advance he told us exactly when Christ would come! That would be a very strange thing. We do not find predictions like that elsewhere in Scripture. God could do that if he chose. But we have no right to assume that He did that, and no right to twist the statements around in order to force them into giving us an exact number of years from the time of Daniel to the time when Christ will come.

I would say, We have no right to do that. There are others who say we must do it. At least they do it without saying anything about it, just insist it occurred. But I say we should not approach it with such a presupposition. We should look at it and see what is there, and when we do we should emphasize what is clear first, and then try to fit in with what is clear what is less clear. That, I feel is the only reasonable approach to it.

Now I see that I have already discussed what I have put here as A. The Situation (by discussing Daniel's prayer and the answer coming to him. This is the situation.)

B. The Purpose, v. 24 "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness and to seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy."

I asked you for today to look at these vv. and see exactly what you think they mean and whether there is a definite order. Many commentators will insist that the first three are paralleled by the last three. The first by the fourth; the second by the fifth; the third by the sixth. I think that is entirely imaginary. So I was interested in seeing how many of you would suggest that sort of an arrangement. There were one or two papers that were given me last Wednesday which said that the first three were negative and the last three positive. That is an important observation.

You can say there are three that are rather negative. They speak of destroying sin, and then number four speaks of bringing in everlasting righteousness. So it might be divided two threes on that basis. But to say that one corresponds to four and two to five and three to six, you find dogmatically stated in many commentaries and I do not think it is warranted.

I should mention at this point that there is another approach that is taken which does not contradict the first false approach

I just mentioned. To say this must point exactly to the time of Christ, this other factor which may be in connection with it or may be separate from it, is the assumption that this passage must look to the first coming of Christ and nothing else!

There are a number of books written in recent years which take that assumption, which assume it can point to nothing else. It can only point to the coming of Christ. We noticed in the other chs. they all look, except ch. 8, they all look specifically to the time of the complete destruction of human government. We have not found in the book of Daniel any other clear prediction--any clear prediction anywhere else than in these four vv. of the first coming of Christ!

Therefore to assume that these vv. must point only to the first coming of Christ is quite unwarranted. I believe they do point to the first coming of Christ, but to assume that is all they point to is quite unwarranted. There are many who interpret the statement in v. 27 which says "he will put an end to sacrifice and offering i.e. he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease"--interpret that as meaning that Christ by His death on the cross put an end to sacrifice and offering. It seems to me that is taking an assumption and reading it into the text.

Because we have statements in two other places in Daniel how the little horn is going to cause sacrifice and offering to cease, referring to his putting an end to it. To say that in this case that Christ by His death on calvary will cause sacrifice and offering to ~~cease~~ cease, is quite out of parallel with what you find elsewhere in the book of Daniel.

These other chs. point very definitely to the second coming of Christ. It would be strange if there was nothing nothing in this particular prediction that pointed to that. That does not prove it does, but to assume it points only to His first coming, is utterly unwarranted.

If you look at these purposes, some of them have been interpreted in many different ways. I believe that to approach the passage we should emphasize what is clear and then fit in what is less clear. Consequently I believe we should place considerable emphasis on the third purpose, which in the NIV is to atone for wickedness. In KJV it says "to make reconciliation for iniquity." But ~~xxx~~ this word is used c. 70 t. in the OT to mean atone. There are only 4 cases where it is trans. "to make reconciliation" in KJV. I don't know why they did it in this passage because there is no passage I know of where it means "to reconcile" in today's sense.

Now perhaps in the time of King James that meaning would fit. But today if I reconcile you it means that I make each of you stop thinking false things about the other, and become friends again. That's not what this term means. This term means when one is at fault to provide some way of remedying the ~~xxx~~ fault so that they can again be friends. In other words atonement. It is used constantly in the OT in connection with the sacrificial system. The making of atonement. This is the standard word for atonement. So I don't know why KJV in this particular case translated it "to make reconciliation."

The word definitely means atonement. And the few cases where it is not used in connection with the sacrificial system it is used of somebody making somebody else friends with him again, but by repaying him for something or making up for something that was done to hurt him so that it is an exact parallel in the few cases where it is used in relation with people to what it means of our relationship with God.

So this third one, I think we can say is definite proof ~~ix~~that this passage, the only one in the book of Daniel, does look to the first coming of Christ. I think we can say that positively from that third purpose.

Then when you look at the first, second, and fourth they read in KJV, "to finish transgression, to put an end to sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." There have been various interpretations of those. I know of one very fine Christian writer who insists that they all describe what Jesus Christ did at His first coming. One of them, I think, he makes an end of wickedness, he makes describe His going into the temple and driving out the moneychangers! for instance. Which it seems to me is a rather small thing to make in view of the great purposes that are here described.

But there are a number of writers now who insist that it must all refer to the first coming of Christ. But these three purposes (1) to finish transgression (2) to put an end to sin (3) TO BRING IN everlasting righteousness-- it seems to me must refer to that which is so stressed elsewhere in the book of Daniel i.e. ~~xxx~~ to the complete end of the reign of wickedness over the world, with the complete destruction of the statue and the complete destruction of the fourth beast.

So I think we can say that we can reasonably expect to find references, clear references, to both the first advent and the second advent in this passage.

I see I got ahead of my outline there. I mentioned the second advent, some or all of the first, second, and fourth purposes.

In this ch. there are a number of uncertainties. These uncertainties I believe we should not assume something, but see what fits the context. There are also some things which are absolutely positive, and definite which we can overlook if we approach it with a presupposition and try to fit everything into that presupposition.

The first of these uncertainties is

1. Are the weeks weeks of years or general periods of time? There are some who insist they must be general periods of time. They think they cannot be exact periods. But in the OT we have the sabbatical year, we have the seven sevens followed by the Jubilee. I feel it is utterly wrong to say they can't be precise periods. But we have no right to dogmatically assume they are precise periods! It is also possible to approach it with the question: Are they exact numbers of years, or are they general

periods of time? Some very good interpreters have taken this latter view.

2. Is the anointed one in v. 25 Christ or Cyrus? I believe that is important. Isa. 44:26-45:1 says, Cyrus will rebuild Jerusalem. He will rebuild my city. He is my anointed. This very term Messiah (Anointed) is used of Cyrus. We have no right to assume that this word Messiah in v. 25 means Christ. I believe it does, in v. 26. But in v. 25, we have no right to assume it in either case without examination, and certainly no right to assume it in v. 25.

I'd better stop here because you will want to get copies of these questions for review. I'm not giving any assignment for next time to give you time to look over these questions. Please read those 4 verses: 9:24-27, and have them in mind so that we can discuss them at our next meeting.

We have noticed in ch. 2 how the statue predicts the events from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, through the Persian empire, then through the Hellenistic empire and then the Roman empire, and the stone that destroys then destroys the statue and puts a complete end to all that these indicate. We noticed ch. 7 the picture that E. J. Young says shows the whole process of human history from the time of Nebuchadnezzar down to the very end, a picture which reaches its climax in the coming of the Son of man in clouds of heaven and with authority to overcome the little horn which has made war with the saints, overcoming them and which has -- and which is to be completely destroyed and a kingdom set up that can never be destroyed.

We noticed in ch. 8 how it looked forward to the coming of Antiochus Epiphanes and while he is very similar to antichrist we have no reason to think antichrist is in that ch. It is a clear picture to come many centuries after the time of Daniel, but it reaches forward to that point and stops, that point the critics think was the goal of all of Daniel and to which they would apply all the presentation of Daniel.

Then we looked at chs. 11 and 12 which give us a picture starting with the latter kings of Persia, summarizing through the kings of Greece and then telling us about Antiochus Epiphanes in detail and then jumping forward with a long unmentioned interval to the antichrist; making statements that can't possibly be referred to Antiochus Epiphanes, but that clearly describe Antichrist and reaching forward to the picture of the resurrection in the beginning of ch. 12.

In all these chs. we had nothing that can be positively said to be a prediction of the first coming of Christ. Unless it be the origin of the stone, that the stone was cut without hands, which could

be applied to the virgin birth, but could apply equally well to the eternal existence of Christ who was cut without hands. The actual striking of the stone would seem to come at the end of the age. All these great blessings God is going to bring us are founded upon the atonement of Christ, founded upon what He would do at his first coming, but in none of these chs. have we seen any explicit pointing to His atonement, to that thing which is at the very center of Scripture.

We have looked now at all the prophetic passages of Daniel in which he looked forward into subsequent centuries, except one. That one consists of only four verses: Dan. 9:24-27. These four vv. have been argued as much as perhaps any four vv. in Scripture. I wish we had three hrs. to spend on them and to discuss them and look at various questions that might rise in your minds about them. In a way I was tempted to devote today to review of our previous chs., and to looking at any of these exam questions and seeing if there were any of them on which you sought further clarification ~~in~~ that would be helpful and not go into these 4 vv. at all. But I believe we ought to take time to look at the most important matters connected with these 4 vv.

I began looking at these last time. Incidentally, the exam will be scheduled for an hr., and the plan will be for the ordinary student in one hr. to ans. the questions. However, anyone will be at liberty to write as long as an hr and a half. It will count very heavily toward the semester's mark. The assignments have been assignments mostly not been assignments to test your ability or ~~to~~ your knowledge but to prepare you for the understanding and discussion of the matters in class. While I've kept definite record as to whether the assignments have been turned in and turned in on time, and I am planning to returning them to everyone who has given me a note requesting that

or will be giving me a note requesting they be turned back, I don't think they'd be of any particular help in preparing for the exam. I'm not planning to give them back to you until after that. I had one with -- One of the assignments last time, a paper was turned back to me on which a request was made that I go over the paper with the student, a test paper taken some time ago. I shall be glad to do so. I did not have time this past week, but I'll get in touch with him this week. If anyone else would like any personal help between now and time of exam please leave a note for me at the office, and I will certainly arrange to do so.

Dan. 9:24-27. We already glanced at what is on this paper about it. We want to emphasize what is clear and then fit in what is less clear. It is not the usual way of approaching the Scripture. It is not necessarily the correct way to do, when you give an exposition to people with comparatively little background, but when you try to learn what Scripture means that is certainly the right approach, but one which I fear is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

We mentioned last time

A. The Situation. Daniel saw by 9 books that there was to be 70 yrs. fulfilled in the desolation of Jerusalem. He, of course, was referring to Jeremiah, but Jeremiah nowhere makes any specific statement that Jerusalem will be desolate for 70 yrs. Jeremiah says in 25:11-12, "This whole land shall be a desolation and a horror and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 yrs. The seventy years is a time when all these nations are going to serve the King of Babylon. Most of this, the area of Jerusalem, will be ~~ix~~ in desolation. But it's tied up to the nations rather than to Jerusalem. The next verse says, It shall come to pass when 70 yrs. are accomplished that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, says the Lord, for their iniquity and the land of the Chaldeans, I will make a perpetual

desolation. There is one other reference in Jer. 29:10: "This saith the Lord, after 70 yrs. are accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you and perform my good word toward you in causing you to return to this place." So when this ch. begins in Dan. 9, it was in the first yr. after the/Babylonian power. In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuares of the seed of the Medes who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans by Cyrus the conqueror. At that time, Daniel realized that nearly 70 yrs. had passed since he himself had been taken prisoner and carried away to Babylon. But just when would the desolation of Jerusalem have started? Just when would these nations have started to serve the King of Babylon? The King of Babylon had already been defeated by the Persians. How soon would the people of Israel go back?

He did not assume, God has promised it, God has said he's going to fulfill it; let's just rest in God's promises and be content. That's not his prayer. His prayer is O Lord you've sent these terrible things upon us because we deserve them. We have sinned against you. We have done what is wrong. You have given a promise, and we pray, O Lord you will enable us to be such that you can give us these things you have spoken of; that you will forgive our iniquity, that you will carry out these things.

So he prayed this great prayer to the Lord and the Lord sent Gabriel to him with the answer. The answer must have been very discouraging to him. Instead of saying the 70 yrs. are over, the captivity is over, you are free! He said, Seventy & weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to bring in everlasting righteousness, etc. It must have been a disappointment to him.

There are two clear facts about the purposes that are given in v. 24. The first -- the third of these purposes is to make atone-

ment for iniquity. That is the first clear statement in the book of Daniel about Christ's atonement. There are earlier clear statements about it in the Scriptures. The great event of calvary is clearly predicted even as early as Gen. 3. But here is the first statement in Daniel that must relate to the first coming of Christ i.e. to make atonement for iniquity.

The first, second, and fourth purpose to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to bring in everlasting righteousness would seem to require what is pictured in the complete destruction of the statue, in the complete burning of the four beasts, in the end of the power of antichrist. It would seem thus to look forward to both the first advent and the second advent.

Now these four vv. have had much discussion and disagreement about them. I have not gone at this moment into the other purposes given because there are very widely differing interpretations of them that you will find in discussions of them. I believe we should look at what is clear and definite. Before we do so I want to look at certain important uncertainties in vv. 24-27. I do not mean, of course, that these are the least bit uncertain in God's sight. What I mean is, of course, that there are places where we do not find it easy to know exactly what it is meant. In anything that anyone has written there will be points of uncertainty. You have to clarify them by what else is said by the one who speaks. That is no weakness of Scripture; it is true in all writings. So before we make any dogmatic statements about this passage, it is vital we note certain things in it that we should not jump to conclusions regarding.

The first of these is: Are the 70 weeks, weeks of years, or are they general periods of time? There are books which say they must be weeks of years! And there are books which say they cannot possibly be weeks of years! This latter statement, I think, we can flatly contradict.

They can be weeks or years. We can say that definitely because the law of Moses includes a provision for 6 yrs. of planting and reaping and for one year the land is to lie fallow and it is to enjoy its sabbath. The picture of the week in relation to a seven year period is very clear in that provision in the law of Moses. That doesn't prove these are weeks or years. But it does disprove the statement that they can't be weeks or years.

Leupold, in his commentary on Daniel, says positively that the word "wek" is never used in Scripture for a week of years. The NIV does not translate it "weeks" it translates it "sevens" and that, of course, is playing safe. The word means seven, but it is exactly the same word that is translated "week" in Scripture. But is it a week of days? of months? of years? Is it a general period? That we cannot be dogmatic upon. We must get our evidence elsewhere and see what fits in.

2. Is the anointed one (v.25) Christ, or Cyrus? I have already mentioned the fact that E. J. Young says in his commentary that since Christ is the only one who is both a priest and a king, the statement Messiah the Prince must mean Christ! But this is a demonstrably false statement because the word Messiah, or anointed, is used far more in Scripture of a King than of a priest. In fact it is rarely used of a priest. It means one set apart by God for a special purpose. It is used a very few times of a priest. It is used a number of times of a prophet but it is used a great many times of a king. So Messiah the Prince, or an anointed one a prince, can very easily mean a king. It certainly does not have to mean a priest. It does not have to have refer to Christ. In Is. 44:26-45:1, as you have already noticed in connection with your study of this word "anointed", the Lord specifically calls Cyrus, "Thus says the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus." A few vv. before he said of Cyrus, "The Lord is the one who performs the word to his servant and performs the counsel of his messenger, who says

to Jerusalem thou shalt be inhabited and to the city of Judah, Ye shall be built. Who says of Cyrus, He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built and to the temple thy foundations shall be laid."

God predicted through Isaiah that Cyrus would be his anointed one to rebuild Jerusalem. When he says 70 weeks are determined upon thy people, upon thy holy city, and he says understand that from the going forth of the commandment ~~to rebuild Jerusalem~~ to Messiah the prince shall be seven weeks," we cannot rule out the possibility that the word Messiah in v. 25 refers to Cyrus, regardless of whether it refers to Christ in v. 26.

3. At the beginning of v. 25 it says, Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem . . ." The word translated "commandment" in KJV is simply the Hebrew word "word", not the common word for commandment. It is occasionally used for a commandment, but it can also be and is far more often used for a message, a declaration, a prophetic prediction, or something else. So we cannot dogmatically say "word" here indicates a human command. It might indicate a divine command. It might indicate a divine prediction such as the one found in Jer. 32:42 42-44.

4. A fourth point of uncertainty: Will the three predicted periods of time follow immediately after one another, or are there unmentioned intervals between them? The prof. of OT, a very fine godly, Christian man wrote to me after I gave a paper on this subject about 3 yrs. ago and he said, Two noted authorities (whom he named) have proved that these 70 weeks must be continuous. And he gave the page numbers, and I looked them up and in each case the author dogmatically said, Of course the 70 weeks must be continuous! That is no proof! When you

have 3 periods of time, do the 3 periods immediately follow one another, or are they separated by unmentioned intervals? When he was so dogmatic about this, and when many seem to have that impression-- if you say 70 weeks divided into three periods, it must mean three continuous periods-- I looked around to think of an illustration, and I made an illustration which I believe is true to fact and which corresponds exactly to the form of this prediction.

This prediction says "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince shall be 7 weeks, and 62 weeks the street shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times, and after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off but not for himself." And v. 27 says, "He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week and in the midst of the week he shall cause sacrifice and oblation to cease. So you have just about an exact parallel with this. I don't say my parallel proves the three periods do not immediately succeed one another, but I say it shows that it is entirely possible that they do not succeed one another. I have the sentence there on the board; I hope you will write it down. I have difficulty remembering it myself. The principle in it is clear.

Since World War I the Republican Party has held the presidency for 28 years. (Does that have to mean 28 continuous years?) From the election of Harding to Franklin D. Roosevelt was 12 years, and eight years Eisenhower occupied the White House. (You don't have to mention the fact that between the coming of FDR and the election of Eisenhower there was a period of 16 years. I say Eisenhower occupied the White House.) In the course of the last two-term period Nixon resigned. Now that is an exact parallel to the structure of this sentence. That does not prove that these 3 periods have intervals between them, but it shows you cannot dogmatically show they must be continuous. They may

have intervals between them. It is an exact parallel to the structure of these three verses.

5. A fifth uncertainty in the passage. What is the meaning of the phrase "and will have nothing" in v.26? Can the KJV paraphrase "but not for himself" be defended? It is very interesting that if you look at the NIV of v. 26, you will read "after the 62 sevens the anointed one will be cut off and will have nothing." KJV says, "And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off but not for himself." There's quite a difference, isn't there? Is KJV a translation or a paraphrase? Those who have much Hebrew would immediately recognize it as a paraphrase. The NIV has a footnote reading: "or will be cut off and will have no one, or will be cut off but not for himself." Now there's quite a difference between those statements. The Heb. form says, He will be cut off and have nothing. How then can KJV say, Be cut off but not for himself? One thing we should notice is that the Hebrew word translated "and" is also very frequently translated "but." So the translation "but" in KJV is entirely possible. He will be cut off but have nothing, or he will be cut off and have nothing. Then we have a question, He will be cut off and have nothing of what? Notice NIV said "or be cut off and have no one" because it doesn't say whether it is nothing of possession, whether it is nothing of power, whether it is nothing of supporters, or nothing of people. But one ancient Greek translation, or to some extent paraphrase of the passage translates it this way "He will be cut off while having no crime, no iniquity. So he will be cut off and have nothing, nothing of what? Nothing of guilt. Nothing of desert to be cut off. Thus I say the KJV is not a translation, but a paraphrase, but an entirely permissible paraphrase. The "and" can just as well be "but" and the "have nothing" can be "nothing of guilt" nothing of reason why he should be cut off. Instead of be cut off and lose all of his possessions.

Those are five points which should not be decided in advance. But the problems should be noted and then we should proceed to see what the evidence is and therefore decide which of these is most likely. Some move on to

D. A Fact Clearly Involved but Generally Ignored should be Recognized at the Start. This fact is that there are three periods, not two that are predicted. And the first of these is seven weeks, not 69. Most modern translations including KJV say "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks; (semicolon) and the street shall be build again and the wall. . . ." But the Hebrew is accented in such a way as to show that in the ~~W~~ the opinion of the Hebrew scribes, the semicolon should not be after 62 weeks, but after 7 weeks, exactly as in the parallel sentence which I gave. To Messiah the Prince is seven weeks; and 62 weeks the following situation will exist. That is not nearly as important, the fact of the accentuation of the Hebrew, as the beginning of v. 26 which begins, "And after the 62 weeks shall Messiah be cut off." After the 62 weeks. Now most interpreters take it as if there were two periods; one of 69 weeks and one of one week. While they may in a footnote somewhere or in some small type make a guess as to where there is a slight break between 7 weeks and 62 weeks, they treat it as if it were one period--69 weeks.

But clearly the passage makes 7 weeks. And the clear proof that the Hebrew accentuation is right is found in the beginning of v. 26 because v. 26 says "after the 62 weeks" it does not say, "after the 69 weeks." It says after the 62 weeks.

The Living Bible is a paraphrase. It ~~attempts~~ attempts to give you what the translators think the original means, rather than to give a real translation. KJV and NIV both attempt to be translations. Most any translation occasionally, like the KIV's in "but no for himself," will

occasionally fall into a paraphrase. It is impossible in translation to avoid doing so, but we must keep it as seldom as possible that we fall into a paraphrase. However, in making a paraphrase like the Living Bible it is good to show exactly what you think it means. So the Living Bible begins v.26 with the statement "after the 69 weeks". That is what the ~~Hebrew~~ Gabriel would have begun it with if that is what he meant. But Gabriel specifically begins it with the words "after the 62 weeks" which makes it clear that there are 3 parts, not two, and that to Messiah the prince is seven weeks and the 62 weeks is the second period, during the period in which there is a rebuilt city standing there.

So this is a fact that should be recognized that there are 3 periods, and that the first period is a period of 7 weeks; not a period of 69 weeks.

E. It is equally clear that, if a human command to rebuild Jerusalem is in view, it must refer to the edict of Cyrus in 538 B.C. From the command to rebuild Jerusalem-- to restore and build Jerusalem-- to Messiah the prince is 7 weeks. If this refers to a human command it must be Cyrus' edict in 538 B.C. and many many commentators say explicitly this is what it means, this is what it must mean. Cyrus is the one who gives the command to rebuild. Yet there are some commentaries, and quite a number, who insist that is not the command it refers to but a later command. That, I say is completely impossible. Because the edict Cyrus gave is quoted in Ezra 1:1-4, his command that the people be enabled to go back and build their temple, and building a temple implies building a city around the temple. That is a command clearly given Ezra 1:4 and then, some years later that edict of Cyrus is quoted by Darius in Ezra 6, quoted and reaffirmed by Darius, quite a few years later. More important than those fact, though I think those facts would complete prove it, more important even than those is the fact

that Isaiah said in Isa. 44:28-45:1 that Cyrus is the one who will rebuild Jerusalem. He is the one who will build my city. God predicts it will be Cyrus through Isaiah. If Cyrus is not the one who is meant --the going forth of the command-- if it means a human command, then Isaiah must be a false prophet and we should cut his book out of the Bible! It must be Cyrus if it refers to a human command!

F. Great confusion has been caused because the passage is generally approached with unwarranted assumptions. That is why there is so much confusion.

1. It has been generally assumed that the prediction shewed the exact time when Christ's first advent would occur. Now that is an assumption that is taken by just about all of those who take the weeks to be weeks of years rather than general periods of time. The assumption that they point right to the time of Isaiah(?) Messiah. And the one time head of Scotland Yard wrote a book called the Coming Prince in which he said, These 69 weeks come right to Palm Sunday, the exact date. Only he gave a date that hardly any scholar I know of now believes to have been the date of Palm Sunday. It was a couple of years later than most scholars would place Palm Sunday. But I would say that such an assumption is quite unjustified because it would be contrary to usual practice in Scripture. It is not usual in Scripture to tell us a century or two ahead when something is exactly going to happen. And we should note the NT statements about the time of the second advent in which our Lord so clearly said, It is not for you to know times or seasons. He said you are not to know when the Son of Man will come back. ^{Father} The Lord has kept that in His own power, but you are always to be ready. He told the patriarchs you go down to Egypt and after 400 years these people will come back and scholars argue whether those 400 years include the time in Palestine in the time in Egypt, whether it's from Abram's first visit

to Egypt when they came back, or whether it is after Jacob went down to Egypt. It's an approximation, but a precise time for something centuries ahead would be quite contrary to usual practice in Scripture. If Daniel had predicted so closely that you could know within a decade or so when Christ would appear, it would be strange indeed that no NT writer points out the fact that Daniel did so! That would not prove that he had^{not}, but it is a very strange thing if Daniel gave a precise prediction like that.

Equally important, such an assumption does not work out. The decree of Cyrus was given in 538 B.C. Seven weeks of years would be 49 years. 49 years after 538, Jerusalem had been rebuilt but Jerusalem was simply standing there as a small town. Most of the people were in exile. No one came then who ^{could} properly be called Messiah the prince. 62 weeks after would be 434 year after-- still more than ¹⁰⁰ ~~1000~~ years before Christ's birth. If you take 69 weeks as one period instead of two, that is a period of 481 years which is still more than 50 years short of reaching the time of Christ. So an assumption which takes the only reasonable interpretation if this means a human command, that it refers to the decree of Cyrus, does not work. But it also fails if the unwarranted assumption is made that it starts from the 20th year of Artaxerxes, 445 B.C. Now this head of Scotland Yard said we will start from the 20th year of Artaxerxes. Why did he say that? Because we read in the first ch. of Nehemiah that Nehemiah heard that much of Jerusalem was in disrepair. The walls were in bad shape and the tombs of his ancestors were not being kept up, and he went to before the king, carrying on his regular functions there as a high functionary in Artaxerxes court. Artaxerxes saw him looking sad and said Why are you so sad? Nehemiah said, Because the tombs of my ancestors are not in good repair. The king said, What would you like me to do? He said, I wish you'd send me to Jerusalem and give me permission

to fix things up a bit there. He said alright I will give you the permission. There is no edict quoted by Artaxerxes. There is no command by Artaxerxes to rebuild the city; it had already been rebuilt for over 100 years though in nothing like its ancient splendor. It was standing there as an unwalled city which had been rebuilt nearly a century before. There was something of walls around it, something remaining of the old walls but there certainly were many people living there and the temple services were being carried on.

Dr. Walvoord in his commentary on Daniel says, This must start from the 20th year of Artaxerxes following the suggestion of the detective from Scotland Yard whom I mentioned. Prof. Wood from Grand Rapids wrote a commentary on Daniel not long ago in which he said, If you figure 481 from 445 B.C. you get about 10 years after Christ. So, he said, that doesn't work out, so he said we will take the edict Artaxerxes gave in his 8th year instead of his 20th year. Well, Artaxerxes did not give any edict to build a city in ^{the 8th year} ~~8 years~~ therefore very few people make it start at that point. But Artaxerxes did give an edict them permitting Ezra to go to Jerusalem and ordering him to make sacrifice and offerings in the temple in Jerusalem on behalf of the king Artaxerxes. Well, in order to make sacrifices in the temple which the order recognizes as already standing, is not an order to rebuild Jerusalem. So Wood is the only book I have happened to notice which begins from the 8th year of Artaxerxes. There certainly is no evidence of an edict to rebuild the city starting them.

Now Anderson, the Scotland Yard leader, realizing that it would run at least several years after any date for the death of Christ that is now known, certainly ^{far} after any date for the birth of Christ, he says Let's figure the years not as 365 day years but as 360 day years. The reason for that is that sometimes a month is spoken of as 30 days.

And sometimes as a general way of speaking, for instance, of five months and say 150 days. So he says, There is a prophetic year consisting of 360 days. That way he gets rid of a certain number of days and by moving back that way and moving the death of Christ ahead that way he thinks he makes it come exactly together. There are charts today and some books that contain that exact statement. But there is no evidence of any so-called prophetic year of 360 days ever having been used by any people in any country anywhere!

2. A second false assumption that is sometimes made: Some recent writers assume that the entire prophecy must be related to the first advent. It is very interesting that E. J. Young's commentary which recognizes Antichrist as the subject of the last part of ch. 11 and which recognizes that ch. 7 goes right to the very end of the age, says of ch. 9 that everything in it must relate to the first coming of Christ. He says on p. 209 of his commentary, This entire passage is Messianic in nature and the Messianic is the leading character and ~~leading~~ general theme of the passage introduced in v. 24 is surely Messianic. The blessings therein depicted were brought about by the Messiah and they form their climax in the anointing of a holy of holies." Now that is a purpose on which there is much argument on exactly what it means--the anointing of the holies.

There is no place where it can be proven that the holy of holies refers to a man. It's used a number of times of a building. It is a part of the purposes which we cannot be dogmatic about. The absurdity of thus interpreting it all as relating to the first coming of Christ becomes clear when you note the statement that "in the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease." Young says, When it says, he will cause sacrifice and oblation to cease he means that Christ by His death on the cross will cause sacrifice and oblation

to cease. But sacrifice went on for 40 years after Christ's death! He did not cause it to cease then. The answer some would give then is, Yes, but the sacrifices were no longer valid after Christ's death. They no longer had validity. Well, what validity did they have before? Paul says, The blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sin. The sacrifices point to Christ. You can point to Him before and you can point to him afterwards. But they did not cease; they were not made to cease if you meant something different, different phraseology could be used. It is utterly absurd to interpret it this way. But Young is far from being the only one who interprets it in that way.

There are many now, more in recent years than before who try to make the whole thing point to the first coming of Christ.

3. It is often but unnecessarily assumed that the periods must immediately follow one another. We have noticed that rather clearly.

As quickly as we can I want to examine the view of Keil and Leupold. It is very interesting that Young in his commentary says in the beginning of it that he must his great help from Keil's commentary. This, he says, is I believe by far the best commentary on Daniel. Yet, where he quotes the views of many ~~scholars~~ ^{scholars} on ch.9 he makes no reference whatever to Keil's view which is about as far removed from his view as any view could possibly be! But he makes not mention of it. He many recent writers whom he derides and shows that their views are utterly impossible, but Keil's view which is just as different from his as any of them, he does not even mention.

The view of Keil and Leupold is this: There are 3 periods. They are indefinite periods. The first period of 7 weeks reaches from Cyrus to Christ. The second period of 62 weeks reaches from

Christ to the coming of antichrist. The third period of one week is the period of antichrist before the return of Christ. That view is held by Keil in what Young says is the finest commentary ever written up to his time on the book of Daniel. Leupold, the Lutheran commentator who has written a number of commentaries, follows Keil in this view.

Points in favor of this view are (a) it recognizes 3 periods; It does not make merely two periods; (b) it parallels the other predictions as other chs. go to the bringing in of eternal righteousness, to the ending of sin so does the 69 weeks according to ~~this~~ this view; (c) it recognizes the decree of Cyrus as the starting point if it is a human command to which it points. However, the theory has two very questionable features. (a) One of these is that the periods are quite disproportionate. If there was a period of 7 weeks from Cyrus to Christ, then if you are going to have a period of 62 weeks nearly 9 times as long before the coming of antichrist, that should be at least another two or three thousand years! Now that can still be for all we know, but it does seem to be too long a period. That is a small objection to it. (b) The big objection to it is the fact that it has the problem, of it takes the first Messiah as Christ (Messiah the Prince), but the second Messiah where it says that "Messiah shall be cut off and have nothing" it says, that means when antichrist takes over at the beginning of the week, Christ loses all power on earth; he is cut off, and has nothing now! I don't believe Scripture teaches there will ever be a time when you can say that Christ has absolutely no power on earth, when you can say He'll have no followers on earth, when you can say He has nothing. Christ's power is universal, it cannot be destroyed. He may withdraw parts of His power for a time, but to say that He

will have nothing, I think is impossible! So to my opinion this problem of "to be cut off and have nothing" completely destroys Keil's and Leupold's view.

Finally, the solution that will fit the facts. The solution that will fit the facts where the facts are clear and will take the choice where a choice is possible, will be to take

1. The Word as not a human command, but a divine prediction. The prediction to which I already called your attention in Jer. 32:1, 42-44. Verse 1 shows it was in the last year before Jerusalem was destroyed which was long after Daniel had been taken to Babylon. Verses 42-44 show that God ordered Jeremiah then to say that in this place there would be business transacted and carried on again, which is a prediction of the re-establishment of Jerusalem. So we have the divine prediction of the re-establishment of Jerusalem which Jeremiah gave exactly 49 years before Cyrus made his edict. This thing of giving 3 parts to a prediction of which the first part had already been fulfilled is exactly like what we found in ch. 7 where the account of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity which had already occurred is described in the description of the 4th beast, and that which had already occurred and you could see it had already occurred gives you renewed assurance that the ~~xxx~~ rest will be carried out. And so that would be the first period of 7 weeks. Then there would an unmentioned interval, so you have a period of 62, a period of something around 400 years. Just when it starts you don't know. You have a general period that would clearly end before the return of Christ, but not much before. Or that would run to that and leave an unmentioned interval of 60 or 70 years. Then you have a break in between that and the second period. There is no mention in the passage of the start of the second period. This easily fits the

chronology. Then after the death of Christ which is described in this verse, then you have, also v. 26 tells about the new destruction of Jerusalem, the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and then after that there would be another unmentioned interval and then the coming of antichrist which is the way that Keil and Leupold and many interpreters take v. 27.

We've already passed time so I'll have to stop here, and if you find that we have covered too much in this period don't worry too much about it because we have covered a great deal else in the course of the year. I would say if you forget everything of this period you could still get a B+ in the course if you did everything in the other == if you have everything we did in the other periods well in mind. And much of that was gone over very carefully on more than one occasion.

Applause!