

their viewpoint is that it was then written, at that time, which we don't follow. Well, now, the second viewpoint is this. This book was written by Daniel, it is true history, it is true prophecy of the future, it is written to encourage the people in the time of A.E., to be true and stand for the Lord, but it goes on beyond that, and it says that the great empires of wickedness are to be destroyed by the rise of the Christian Church. It predicts ~~the~~ the first coming ~~of~~ of Christ who is the stone cut from the mountain without hands that will destroy the great empire, and by Christ's first advent and his death on Calvary's cross, and Resurrection, He has destroyed the great empires, and caused that the nations of this world shall become the kingdom of Jesus Christ. That is the second viewpoint. This viewpoint plays down any relevance to events after the first coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is this view. Now I don't say that this view says there is nothing about any event after that, but it hardly mentions them, except where it feels it necessary to do so in dealing with particular verses. It doesn't even mention in its introduction, for instance, here is a commentary written about 5 or 6 years ago, the Prophecy of Daniel, by Edward J. Young, one of my students in his undergraduate days, ~~now~~ now a professor in the institution in which I was a professor, and he studied with me. He is ~~not~~ a professor in Westminster Theological Seminary. He has written this book, The Prophecy of Daniel. His primary purpose in the book is to combat the first of these views I have mentioned. It is to show that Daniel was written in the time of Daniel, not in the time of A.E., that it is a true history with true prophecy. That is his first purpose, it is an excellent purpose, much of what he has written to carry out that purpose is very well ~~done~~ done. But he has a second purpose which doesn't come out in his introduction, except negatively, but which comes out a great deal in ~~various~~ various notes. And that is to ~~oppose~~ oppose what I would call the third view. That is his minor purpose, but a very definite purpose in the book. Yes?..... AAM: I would rather confine the definite just to the book of Daniel. It is the view of the book of Daniel. It could not be a view held by any premillennialist at all. But it is a view which ^{it} would ^{not} necessarily be