

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 did cover 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