

talks about the fourth kingdom it has to be the Greek kingdom. They claim everything points to it. Well now ch. 8 deals very specifically with Antiochus Epiphanes, the persecutor in the time of the Maccabees. Ch. 11 tells about it. But in ch. 2 I don't think there is anything about him. But the modernist claim it was all written at the time of the Maccabees and that where he speaks of previous he predicts as if it was in Daniel's day, but he predicts what he knew had already happened, and it's given as if it was a prediction and when he gets to the time of the Maccabees everything after that is just guesses.

But in order to get the fourth kingdom to be the Greek kingdom and the Maccabees when there were actually only three of them, they have to say there was a Median kingdom as well as a Persian kingdom. And they make the fourth kingdom the Greek kingdom.

And there was no such Median kingdom. The Kingdom of the Medes and Persians. So they are completely wrong in that. That I think is the big point in the weakness of that approach.

Student: Question about the details of ch. 11

AAM: Ch. 11 tells you the history of the Persian conquest and then the Greek conquest, and then it gives you a picture of the Antiochus Epiphanes the great persecutor. Then after -- First it tells a little about his accession to the throne and his character, then it tells about his career, then it tells about the fate of the people of God facing him.

Then it again tells about the character of a king, then the career of a king, and then about the fate of the people of God leading up to the resurrection. They say it all relates to Antiochus Epiphanes and the account it gives of Antiochus Epiphanes is exactly true.

But then when it goes on and repeats those three ~~stages~~ stages again, the character and career and fate of the people of God, there is the resurrection which certainly did not happen in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The career there does not fit with Antiochus Epiphanes. The character does not fit ~~it~~ with Antiochus. So most Christian interpreters have held that it jumps forward and jumps about Antiochus and then about Antichrist.

So the critics have got the task of trying to show how that can be a description of Antiochus and it does not fit him. It is a different man. Then the career does not fit. There are similarities but it definitely differs from the account which you have earlier in the ch. of Antiochus.

Student: Could you explain the in chapter 2.

AAM: He tells about the dream. . . Dan. tells the king what he saw., v. 21, the great statue . . . while he was watching a rock was cut out . . . and struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed it, and then the statue was completely broken to pieces . . . but the rock that struck the statue became a huge mountain and filled the whole earth.

Daniel goes on to explain that the four kingdoms are four great empires, and the first was Nebuchadnezzar. Of course that does not just mean Nebuchadnezzar, it means his predecessors also. It's the empire that lasted thru a number of centuries. That he