

the modernists who say it is a historian who looked back and made a summary, and in detail the conservative who says that God enabled Daniel to see ~~andxxxxxxx~~ what was going to happen, that doesn't concern us here. We doubtless all of us believe that the book of Daniel is genuine, that all of it came from Daniel, and that if this is a history of the period, it is a predicted history, rather than a history written later, but to be sure that is what is talking about. Oh, I started to tell you about that book I picked up. It was The Eleventh Chapter of the Book of Daniel, and it was a little dusty, but it looked like a nice book, and I brought it home. Sparks, I think, is the name of the author, and I got it home, and I started looking at the introduction, and the man said, I feel that it is time that I should write this book. This was 1843, I guess. I feel, it is time I should write this book, he said, the Crimean war has finished, and as one sees what happened in the Crimean war, and what the general world situation is now, it is very ~~clear~~ clear that the 11th chapter of Daniel is now being fulfilled, precisely in these events, and therefore, it is important that I publish the book and ~~make~~ make it clear to everybody just how it is. I am afraid you won't find any commentary written today that says that the Crimean war is described here. So I didn't put that book on the shelf for you to use, tho he may have some good stuff in it, despite that one aspect that is probably rather bad. But it should be a warning for us against being too ready to find too many details of our own day in this prophecy. They may be there, but don't ~~jump~~ jump to the conclusion they are unless you are mighty sure. But, is this that 150 years summarized, with the important things dealt with? Can you tell who these kings and queens are who are referred to in this way? The king of the north shall do, the king of the south shall do, there shall arise in his place a vile man, a raiser of taxes, etc. Does it fit with the history? Well, tell me what commentaries you look at, and what you think it generally means, and how definite the agreement is, ~~and~~ and where you think there is an important difference. That's the first problem. The second is, Who is talked about in 21 on? Do the commentaries agree, or differ. Do we have evidence to be quite sure who v.21ff is? I notice in the SRB at the head of v.21, there is a heading that says,