

sion in connection with particular points where he labels, what is the dispensationalist view, and see what it has to do with dispensationalism in any proper sense of the word, what he attributes to dispensationalists, in many cases, and how he distinguishes his view in some cases from it, it is very interesting, and sometimes a very difficult line to draw. Now we were in the midst of a subject and it wasn't an even place to break. So I didn't stop at 20 after. Suppose we stop for 10 minutes.....

.....There are two copies of this book of Young's in the library. Please don't anybody take it out of the library. I am not sure whether it has been put on reserve or not. If you find it not on reserve, mention it to the librarian. I would like you at ~~xxxxxx~~ some of these key points to see what Dr. Young says, ~~xxx~~ about these interpretations. ~~Farrar~~ Farrar's Expositor's Bible is a good example of the first view I mentioned. There are many liberal commentaries, and they all take this view. Farrar is not a modernist in the usual sense. He was a fine believer in Christ. His life of Christ is a splendid work, but on the ~~xxx~~ book of Daniel he takes the modernist position, and his book is a good presentation of that view. ~~The~~ Young is a good presentation of this. Pusey wrote his work on the prophecy of Daniel which is not strictly a commentary, but a series of lectures, written about a hundred years ago. Pusey belonged to the so-called Oxford movement in England, a High ~~Church~~ Church movement in the church of England. But a movement which strongly opposed modernism, and stood for the dependability of the Word of God, and put great emphasis on the death of Christ. Many of the Oxford movement ~~went~~ went over into the ~~the~~ Catholic Church, two of them, I believe became cardinals in the R.C. Church. Others such as Pusey did not do so, but remained in the Church of England. Pusey's book is a fine presentation from this second viewpoint. Now someone may say, We here are interested in interpretation. We none of us take the modernist viewpoint. Why bother now then to consider it? Why not put ~~our~~ our whole attention between the second and the third views. My answer is that while it is true that this is not a critical course, and our primary basis is not to prove the authenticity or