

rebuttal argument surely. We say there is one animal there that shows the Medo-Persian empire. Well, yes, but it has two ~~horns~~ horns, and one comes up after the other. That's a rebuttal argument, and we'll look at that later, but the positive argument for them is one, that Darius is represented as ruling over the land between ~~the Medo-Persian~~ Belshazzar and Cyrus. He is represented as ruling over the land between Belshazzar and Cyrus. Now, let's ask now on the other hand. Is there evidence in the book to show that instead of these animals representing the Median empire, and a Persian empire, then one animal represents both empires. Well, right away we look in ch.8, and in ch.8 we find an animal of which we are told that he is the Medo-Persian empire. And it is represented that this animal has two horns. One comes up after the other. The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. Well, now, I'll tell you right away. Here is a ram that has two horns, and these are the kings of Media and Persia. That's one animal.  ~~Surely~~ Surely that is an argument which does not prove, but which suggests that by analogy it would be more to be expected than one animal elsewhere would represent Media and Persia, that there would be two animals to represent here, what is represented by the two horns in one animal. It doesn't prove it, but it suggests it. It proves this, that the person who  ~~wrote~~ wrote this book of Daniel did not think it at all strange or queer to put Medo-Persian together into one animal. There are two horns, one comes up after the other, but he puts it in one animal, and he says the kings of Media and of Persia. Well, that doesn't prove that he wouldn't elsewhere consider them as two animals, but it certainly seems rather strange he would, when you think of the tremendous difference between the Babylonian empire, and the Greek empire, and between either of them, either the Median or Persian. It seems rather strange that he would put them in one animal one time, and in two animals the two other times. I mean in two animals one, and then in two main parts in the other. So that it is not a conclusive argument against it at all, and yet it certainly is enough to raise questions, that the man's idea of history, was here is this great Babylonian empire, and this great Median empire, and then this great Persian empire. Media and Persia might be