

rather cryptic language, but most ~~xxx~~ interpreters feel that it is not difficult in the history of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids to see exactly what is meant by every one of these verses as they go on for a period of 150 years, telling you step by step what happened. And that is the assignment for half of you^r for next week, and for the other half for the week following. The reason I make it two weeks is to make it ~~xxx~~ less strain on the book.end of D 16

D 17

discussion of assignment..... half of class to look at 11:5-30, in commentaries.up to ~~xx~~4.I don't think you will have much question that v.21 ff ~~xxx~~ for quite a distance is talking about one man. Previous to this you have had a king to a verse, maybe two or three vv about a kigg, sometimes, but it is covering a period of 150 years with a brief summary, looking at this, or that, and the other. And as you look at it you can see that it is a sort of a survey of that period, and some people say, Prophecy is not history given in advance. The prophets never tell us detail after detail of history in advance. Therefore, this which is wonderfully complete history of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies cannot have been written by Daniel, must be written afterwards as they look back and describe the history. Now that's what your modernists say. Your fundamentalists say, No, God could describe the details of the history in advance if he chose to do so. And, they say, here He did. And that's the peculiar thing, to find a book like Dr. Young's book on the book of Daniel, from which I read you his statement that prophecy is not history in advance, it never gives detail, everything is symbolic and somewhat peculiar, not to say, ambiguous, and yet when he looks at ch.11, what does he do with it? Does he say, This is not detailed and correct history? Or does he say, This is correct and detailed history, but was not written at the time, but was written at a later period. There is one conservative writer who does that. One ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ conservative writer says, The book of Daniel originally written had about three verses covering this whole period of 150 years, but a later writer filled it in with all this detail from all his knowledge. Now, that's pure guess. There's absolutely no foundation for it. I don't know any other writer who holds such a view. All other writers hold either the modernist view that it was written after history ~~after~~ by a man