

is quite evident that they both are ~~xxxx~~ talking about the same individual, and I would be very very much surprised if you would find any commentary anywhere, now I won't say that, you may find some that say anything, but I will say, I would be very much surprised if you found any substantial number of commentaries, or perhaps, I'll say, any commentary that is generally considered as good, that will take any other view than that ^{v. 11:3, 4} ch.3 and 4 are ~~xxxx~~ talking about Alexander the Great. I think that is one thing that practically all interpreters, probably all, can agree on, that that is who we have presented here. And then just as in ch.8 we went on and told what happened in one of these sections, here we go on and we discuss four of the two regions, the king of the south, and the king of the north. And who is this king of the south, and who is the king of the north? Well, in the context, it seems reasonable to think that the king of the south is the king of a section of Alexander's empire which is south of another section, and the king of the north, the king of one that is north of that. And we have a rather cryptically presented discussion of the course of the history of the relation between the northern and southern kingdoms that goes on for about 20 verses.....end of D 15

D 16

.....for me to go in this class into the details of this history here, this the interesting thing is that you will find that practically all commentaries, perhaps all commentaries, I'll say most anyway, will say specifically that the history that begins with v.5 of ch.11, is a history of the relationship between the kingdom of the Seleucids in the north, and the kingdom of the Ptolemies in the south. Now I think it is worthwhile at this point to remind those of you who know it, or to inform those who don't, of the history of the beginning of these two kingdoms, because they are very important in ancient history. Seleucus was a general who belonged, one of Alexander's generals. Ptolemy was another of Alexander's generals. Now, when Alexander died, and within the next 3 or 4 years, it became quite evident that there was no unity of agreement upon one successor to Alexander. It was evident that there was no man who could go and hold the whole empire together, and rule over it. They had fighting, divisions, which didn't effect most of the people, most of the people were so completely