

premillennialist position to say that only A.E. is in view here, and that it is not the antichrist who is here referred to. The question of whether, as the SRB note says, vv.24-25 deal with a different matter, separate from what is in 9-13, and 23 is another question altogether. But I think this is sufficient to prove that particular point. And we want to go further, but this particular point is the vital one at this time. Now in this book of Daniel we have, of course, many varieties of interpretation which have been taken, but among the different ones who have interpreted the book, there are three main approaches, and the most important thing, I am interested in this here, is ~~the~~ deciding something as between these three main approaches. To get an idea of what each of the three main approaches is, to see the evidence for one of the three main approaches, and to see what the principles are that enter into it, that is, to lay a foundation on which to go on and interpret details. Then, ~~how far~~ how far we get into details, depends how fast we get over these particular points. We can't cover everything in one semester. We may get ~~much~~ much further, or much less far. These foundational things ~~are~~ are the most vital. Well, now the viewpoint which is held by all modernists today is the viewpoint that this book was written in the time of A.E. Now that is, of course very vital to the question of criticism. Was it written then, or was it written in the time of Daniel? It is very vital to the authenticity of it, to the dependability of it. Was it written then, or early? It is not in itself tremendously vital to the subject of our work here, because this is not primarily a class in criticism. Our purpose this year is not to determine whether the book of Daniel is authentic, whether it is truly from Daniel, whether it comes from the time that says it was, ~~or~~ or not, that's not our main purpose this year. ~~We'll~~ We'll touch on that to some extent. But this is particular class is a class in interpretation, rather than criticism, and from the viewpoint of interpretation alone, you might say, it doesn't matter so much when the book was written, the important thing is what is it talking about? Now, so that ~~that~~ it would be conceivable, though I don't know anybody who hold the view, that it had been written at the time of Daniel, and yet