

Work on it, and improve it, and make it better. The sad thing ~~that~~ is that there a lot of ministers who have agot two or three wonderful sermons that they have worked on, and the rest of ~~what~~ what they give is just hot air, and they'll go to a church, and they will preach two trial sermons, and the people will think they are perfectly wonderful, and they call them, and then they find they haven't any other sermon half as good as those two. And within a month they are completely disillusioned. Well, now, in this case, then, try to plan your time, — so as to take three or four commentaries, and see if you get an impression that you can feel, that if you took Polybius and the other historians, as these men should have done, some of them have, others have just copied other commentaries, why that you would find that this gives you a pretty good running summary of precisely this period of history, about 150 years, and that it leads directly up to a situation, so that if the man who is talked about in v.21 comes chronologically next after the man talked about in v.20, then you can know who he is. See if you get that conclusion. And then, you see whether these various commentaries feel that the man described in v.21 ff. is not only the man who comes chronologically next after all the men just talked about, but that actually the description given here fits it, yousee. Now, of course, it is just a question of how much you can cover in ~~these~~ these four hours, and so I am trying to give you the problems in the order in which we deal with them. You see, the first problem is, Do you cover a period of 150 years in a pretty definite way, here? I picked up a book on the 11th chapter of Daniel in the library at Penn, and I saw this book, The Eleventh Chapter of Daniel, so I picked it up and brought it home. I didn't have time to look into it then. I thought, maybe it will have some interesting, helpful stuff, a whole book on the subject. O, by the way, another commentary I didn't mention to you is Montgomery's, that's in the ICC, and he'd got alot of detail in the book. ~~He~~ He was Professor at Penn, a very fine man, a very careful scholar, not a fundamentalist, but a man who did careful work, very different from many of the radicals. He's a liberal, not a radical, and you will find much of great value in his commentary, even tho it is definitely a modernistic commentary. But, that's our first question. Can we say what these verses are talking about? Now, of course, the question between