

Keil, but he takes evidently from what you ~~say~~ say, a rather peculiar attitude. But that you would find that practically all commentaries, liberal or conservative, pre-, a-, or postmil, what every<sup>f</sup> their views, they say, this is Alexander the Great. They say, these are his four successors. They say, This is Ptolemy, this is Seleucus, and they go on then with Seleucus' descendents, and some of the relations to ~~prophetic~~ Ptolemy's descendents, and I doubt if you would find a case where one of them would say, this is a certain king, and others would say this is a different one. I doubt if you would find a case where anyone would say this prediction here has nothing that we can relate it to. Keil's attitude is evidently peculiar on the whole thing. I haven't looked into it, I have to see what it is. But of the others, if they say<sup>y</sup> anything about them, ~~the~~ they will say, this is such and such a king, and such and such a campaign, and such and such an act, and you will find they agree. Now, some of them will say, the liberals will say the man knew the history, and he's writing this in the time of ~~Ex~~ A.E., and he is filling in the historical references that he knows, in order to make these people think that this man centuries before was able to predict the future, he writes as if it had been predicted. The conservatives, some of them will say, most of them will say Daniel predicted it. A very few conservatives get carried away by the arguments that you do not find such detailed prediction of a long period of the future as this anywhere, that therefore, it is contrary to the genus of prophecy, that argument is made by some who ~~claim~~ claim to believe in predictive prophecy, but they say, prophecy does not predict the future. It is not history written in advance. It just gives a certain few main things, and they say, this has a general quick summary of the period, and then a later ~~writer~~ writer has filled in....13<sup>1</sup>...., maybe you came across one or two that said that, but regardless of whether they thought that all the verses before, or part before, and part after, as this view that some conservatives in any event, are pretty well agreed that these verses are describing step by step, point by point the main events in the history from 330 B.C. right straight up to 180 B.C. when A.E. was dead. And, of course, there would be no reason or purpose for m.....14.... such a thing, except that it was to lead up to