

# OpenTheo

## Daniel Overview (Part 2)



### **Bible Book Overviews** - Steve Gregg

In "Daniel Overview (Part 2)" by Steve Gregg, the accuracy of the book of Daniel and its prophecies are discussed. While some critics have attempted to disprove the book's inspiration as scripture, many events recorded in it are supported by secular history. The discussion covers various aspects of the book, including the prophecies in Daniel that cover a vast period, the identification of the little horn in Daniel 7, and the destruction of Jerusalem as a significant event in both God's and secular historians' perspectives. Despite some difficulties in interpreting certain passages, the speaker emphasizes the importance of considering the original context and imagery used in other parts of the Bible.

### **Transcript**

I mentioned I want to talk a little bit about some apologetic issues with reference to Daniel because as I said at the beginning, Daniel is possibly the one book more than any other in the Old Testament that is attacked by critics who want to disprove the inspiration of scripture. Scripture has so many evidences of being true. Anyone who wants to try to disprove it really has their work cut out for them.

Because over half of the Old Testament, for example, is historical narrative. Most of which can be verified, at least in the broad outlines of history, with actual events known from secular history of the time. The pagan historians of the time confirm a great number of things that the Old Testament declares in its narrative.

The interesting thing is though, that the Old Testament stories are following the stories of people like Abraham or Moses or Daniel or somebody like that. Whereas the broader sweep of history is sort of in the peripheral view. It's sort of the background noise.

What's going on in Babylon and Persia and stuff like that is not as much the focus as the characters are. But what is going on in the background is verifiable. The exact things that these individuals did cannot be verified from other history.

But that shouldn't bother us. The Bible is a historical book as good as any other. Sometimes you say, well, only the Bible gives us that story.

It must not be true. Well, why wouldn't it be true? Just because we only have one history book telling us so. You don't really expect an awful lot of books to be writing stories about a guy named Abraham.

How many people knew him? How many people cared about him? To write books about him? The ones who did left a record. And it's a reliable record. Now, with reference to Daniel, there are historical things about Daniel that critics used to criticize.

Now, I think some of them might still, but only because they hope that you've never heard that their criticisms are outdated. I mean, one very important criticism was that Daniel chapter 5 describes the fall of Babylon to the Medes and Persians under the reign of Belshazzar. That feast that was happening in Babylon when the Medes and the Persians marched through the riverbed into Babylon and conquered the city and replaced Babylon with the Persian Empire.

That king in Babylon in Daniel 5 is said to be Belshazzar. Now, the problem that historians had with this for centuries was that we have ancient historians, pagan historians, that have recorded the fall of Babylon. Herodotus, Thucydides, you know, quite a few other pagan historical sources and inscriptions that said that when Babylon fell to the Medes and Persians, the king in Babylon was named Nabonidus.

Now, Nabonidus is not another form of the name Belshazzar. Daniel says that Belshazzar was the king when Babylon fell. All the other ancient historical sources, Nabonidus was.

And therefore, critics of Daniel said, well, whoever wrote Daniel just didn't know. Someone writing much later didn't know much about Babylonian history, didn't know that there was no one named Belshazzar reigning in Babylon and that the real king in Babylon was Nabonidus. And this was one of the historical criticisms.

They have others, but they're all similar to this, as we'll see. Well, in 1853, an inscription was found in Babylon on a temple to one of the Babylonian gods and an inscription by Nabonidus. Now, just so you won't be confused, Nabonidus is the one that all the pagan historians said was the king of Babylon when it fell.

And his being king is that which made Daniel seem unreliable in saying it was Belshazzar. Nabonidus wrote an inscription that was discovered in 1853 to a god saying, may reverence for you remain in my firstborn and favorite son Belshazzar. Now, before that inscription was found, the name Belshazzar was 100% unknown to historians except from Daniel Thott.

Only Daniel remembered Belshazzar. What's interesting is that Herodotus, who wrote 400 years before Christ and 200 years after the events of Daniel, Herodotus knew about Nabonidus but didn't know about Belshazzar. But Daniel knew about Belshazzar.

And now everyone knows about Belshazzar because the archaeologists have found it.

But more than that, in the 1920s when they found the, I think it was that's when they found the Nabonidus chronicles, these cuneiform tablets from the period, we know even much more. Nabonidus was indeed the king of Babylon but he was in semi-retirement.

He left the rule of the city of Babylon under his son Belshazzar while he, Nabonidus, went into semi-retirement in Arabia. And therefore there were two kings of the empire. The father Nabonidus who was down in Arabia and Belshazzar the second king who was in Babylon when it fell, exactly as Daniel said.

Now what's interesting is that in Daniel chapter 5, when Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall and could not interpret it, he said, whoever can interpret this, I will make him third ruler in the kingdom. Daniel does not explain why he would give that particular position. Daniel doesn't mention Nabonidus but he certainly knew about him.

He took it for granted that he and his readers knew. But Belshazzar is only the second ruler. He couldn't give a position higher than third to somebody else.

And so almost artlessly, almost inadvertently, Daniel proves that he had knowledge of the historical situation better than people, historians who were writing 400 years before Christ. And yet the critics want us to believe that Daniel was written in the 2nd century BC, about 165 BC. But how could somebody writing in 165 BC know about Belshazzar when all the historians for the previous 400 years had forgotten about him? Daniel always comes out ahead in these controversies but sometimes you have to wait because it takes time for the archaeologists to catch up.

This has been true about many other situations in the Bible, not in Daniel. In the Pentateuch we read a lot about the Hittite civilization. For many centuries critics said there were no Hittites, there were never any Hittites, we can't find any evidence of any Hittites.

The Bible must have just made them up, it's a fictional group, a fictional story. And then they began to discover Hittite civilization. The archaeologists, they now can document 1,500 years of Hittite civilization, one of the greatest civilizations of the ancient world.

But the critics are very quick to decide that when you've got pagan sources on this side saying one thing and the Bible on this side seemingly saying something else, it's the Bible that must be wrong. When historically it's turned out it's usually the others that turn out to be wrong, the Bible never has to be embarrassed. The Bible has nothing to lose by further discovery.

It's as further discovery is made by archaeologists and so forth that the criticisms of the Bible fall away. Because cases like Belshazzar are classic. Same thing is true of Sargon II.

Isaiah 20 verse 1 mentions Sargon II attacking the northern Egypt of Israel. Historians said there was no Sargon II until they discovered his palace and discovered all kinds of

things about him as one of the great rulers of the Assyrians. This kind of thing has happened again and again in biblical archaeology and Daniel is one of those places where that has proven to be so.

There are supposed to be other inaccuracies in Daniel according to the critics. But it turns out that Daniel's information tends to be more accurate than the critics themselves. There's a problem, they say, between Jeremiah 25.1 and Daniel 1.1. If you look at that, Jeremiah was contemporary to Daniel and they're both talking about the time when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem.

And that was mentioned in Jeremiah 25.1 in a way that's different than the way that Daniel mentions it in Daniel 1.1. Jeremiah 25.1 says, The word that came to Jeremiah concerning the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, which was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. Now the one thing you need to note as we turn from this passage to another, and remember, is that it says that the fourth year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. There's a given year.

The year in question was 605 BC. And that year was the fourth year, it says, of Jehoiakim, and it was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. If you turn over to Daniel 1.1, it says, In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came to Jerusalem and besieged it.

Now, this was 605 BC, as I said. And it's the first year of king of King Nebuchadnezzar. But what year of Jehoiakim is it? Daniel said it's the third year of Jehoiakim.

Jeremiah said it was the fourth year of Jehoiakim. They're both talking about the same year. They're both talking about the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, the year he laid siege to Jerusalem, 605.

But Jeremiah calls it the fourth year of Jehoiakim. Daniel calls it the third year. Is this a mistake? It sounds like a mistake, but again, historians can clarify this now.

It is known that when you talk about the years of a king's reign, the Jews had their own peculiar way of calculating the years, and the Babylonians had a different one. The Babylonians followed what we would call the accession year method. And what that means is that the first year of a king's reign, if it was not a full year, was not called the first year.

It was called the accession year, the year he acceded to the throne. So let's say a king became king in July. Well, from July to December, until the calendar year, that's the accession year.

That's his accession year. It's not a whole year. The next whole calendar year would be his first year.

And the next whole calendar year is his second year, and so forth. So a portion of a year at the beginning of a king's reign in Babylon was called the accession year. And the first full calendar year would be called the first year.

Now, the Jews spoke differently. To the Jews, any portion of a year was counted as a year. So if the king became king in July, from July to December that year was the first year.

Then the calendar year that followed would be his second year. Because the portion of the year at the beginning of his reign was called a year. It wasn't called that in Babylon.

They called it the accession year, then you got the first year. To the Jews, you got the first year, then the second year. The very year that would be called the first year by the Babylonians would be called the second year by the Jews.

Now, Jeremiah is a Palestinian Jew. He's using the Jewish method. He's talking about a particular year, 605 B.C. He calls it the fourth year of Jehoiakim.

Daniel's in Babylon, writing to a Babylonian venue. He uses the Babylonian venue. It's the third year of Jehoiakim.

Because what Jeremiah would call the first year of Jehoiakim, the Babylonians would call the accession year. And therefore, what is called the fourth year by the Jews is called the third year by the Babylonians. There's not a mistake here.

It's a cultural difference of the way that you count the years. It's not a historical error. In fact, it's frankly, in a sense, a confirmation that Daniel really was in Babylon, or at least not in Jerusalem, writing these things, because he would have used the Jewish method.

That's the kind of thing that people find fault with, which isn't really a fault. It is said by the critics, or they used to say, that in Daniel, the word Chaldeans was thought to be just a group of soothsayers and astrologers. Because Nebuchadnezzar, whenever he had his dreams, he'd call in the Chaldeans and the astrologers and so forth.

The Chaldeans were thought to be a class of priests or wise men or, you know, sorcerers or somebody. The Chaldeans, whereas in fact, Chaldeans were a race. But Daniel also uses the term as the race of the Chaldeans.

There's a couple of times in Daniel where he actually mentions them as a race, as well as the other way. So he's not unaware that the Chaldeans are a race. It's not a historical problem in Daniel.

One of the biggest problems that has been brought up is the madness of Nebuchadnezzar. In chapter 4, I mentioned that he went mad and ate grass like an ox or like a cow. And his hair grew out long like feathers on an eagle.

His claws, his fingernails grew out long like claws. Now, it is said by many that there's no record of this, Nebuchadnezzar's madness in secular history. The truth is, it'd be strange if there was in the Babylonian history.

It's like, it's the same kind of problem that the, you know, the Egyptian history doesn't record the exodus. I wonder why not. Because kings were proud.

And their court historians knew how to keep their heads. You don't record humiliating things about your king. And you only record the great exploits of your king, not the times when he's embarrassed himself or when something humiliating has happened to him.

And therefore, it would surprise me, actually, if the Babylonians did record his madness. But there's some interesting things that do exist. The Babylonian history records no governmental activity by Nebuchadnezzar from 582 to 575 BC.

That's a period of seven years, actually. From 582 BC to 575 BC, the Babylonian historical records, which are fairly complete, have no governmental activity on the part of Nebuchadnezzar during those years. That doesn't prove he was mad.

But there's a bit of a gap there of just the right length that could easily be filled in with what Daniel tells us. Daniel didn't mind recording things that were humiliating to the Babylonian kings. Sir Henry Rawlinson discovered a damaged tablet from the period of Nebuchadnezzar, which read, and this is the words of Nebuchadnezzar that was found on a damaged tablet, quote, For four years, in all my dominions, I did not build a high place of honor.

The precious treasures of my kingdom I did not lay out. In the worship of Merodach, I did not sing his praises. I did not clear out the canals, unquote.

Now, it's not a very complete inscription. It doesn't tell us much. It does speak of a four-year period, which isn't quite the period we're looking for, but it does talk about a series of years where he didn't do anything that he'd normally do.

And, you know, the idea that this could be somehow related to his madness is something to consider. Eusebius, who was an early church historian, 325 A.D. Eusebius quotes an earlier source, Abitinus, as saying that Nebuchadnezzar's later years, he was, quote, Possessed by some god or other, the king went up to his palace and announced the coming of the Persian mule, thought to be Cyrus, who would bring the people into slavery. Abitinus continues, he, when he had uttered this prediction, immediately disappeared.

Now, I don't know much about Abitinus, but the historian Eusebius quotes him and says that there was a point near the end of Nebuchadnezzar's reign where he kind of went mad. He was possessed by some god or other, or maybe some demon or other. But he went up to his palace and announced publicly that the Persian mule was coming and

then he immediately disappeared.

Not like vanished, like, you know, beam me up, Scotty, but went somewhere and was not seen. This could have been the beginning of his period of madness. We don't know.

We're not arguing, I'm not arguing that these things prove that he was mad for seven years, but they certainly indicate that something mysterious, something out of the ordinary that lasted several years took place in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and that it might well have been exactly as what Daniel recorded in Daniel chapter 4 is not at all something I would consider myself safe in denying. If you want to deny that Daniel's true about any particular historical fact, you're taking your risks. Because the more that's discovered, the more it sounds like Daniel's got credibility.

These are the main, you know, historical criticisms that have been made of Daniel and they just don't hold any weight. And as I said, there's like incidental, there's incidental proofs that the writer knew details about Babylonian and Persian society, which someone living 400 years later wouldn't necessarily know because they're known only now because of extensive research and scholarship. But the average person walking around the streets two centuries before Christ wouldn't have known, for example, that the Medes and the Persian laws could not be changed even by the king, but the Babylonian laws could be, which we find in Daniel.

Or that when the Babylonians executed people, they burned them. Whereas when the Persians executed people, they threw them to wild beasts. You see Nebuchadnezzar put Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the fire furnace and Darius the Persian put Daniel in the lion's den.

Those are actually in keeping with the known practices of those cultures, which are incidentals. It's not like they'd be famous for that centuries later. But Daniel is simply correct He just doesn't know how to be wrong.

I suppose for the Christian the best evidence that Daniel was really written before the events that he prophesied is found in Matthew chapter 24. The testimony of the greatest witness of all. In Matthew 24, 15, Jesus said Therefore, when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing in the holy place then let those who are in Judea flee.

Daniel the prophet. Jesus said Daniel was a prophet. He was not some fake writing after the events claiming that he lived before them and that he was predicting them.

Jesus recognized him as a genuine prophet and one whose words could be expected to be seen fulfilled. When you see it, what Daniel spoke about, then know. So, the Christian of course when you hear criticisms of Daniel realize that the unbeliever is extremely desperate when they come to the book of Daniel.

They have to find a way not to believe it. Because you can't believe Daniel to be true and not believe there's a supernatural God who reveals the future to his servants on occasions. And the only way you could say that that didn't happen is that this book which we know is written because it's here it had to be written after the events.

And they say the latest unmistakable events in it are the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes around 165 BC. So, they say well maybe this is written around 164. No.

It was written in the 5th and 6th century BC before these things happened. Now, let me go through some of these prophecies that are often difficult. Daniel chapter 2 is the first prophecy in the book and Daniel chapter 7 is the second prophecy in the book and they kind of cover a lot of the same ground.

In chapter 2 Nebuchadnezzar's dream which Daniel interprets for him is that of an image a human image perhaps it's Nebuchadnezzar himself we don't know. He had a dream and this image had a head of gold Now, Daniel when he gives the interpretation says the head of gold is you Nebuchadnezzar so it might have actually been an image of Nebuchadnezzar himself and the next chapter he builds a gold image all gold which may well have been of him and expects everyone to worship it but the head of the image was gold the chest was silver the belly was bronze or brass and the legs were of iron the feet were of a mixture of iron and clay and the only action in the dream was that a stone not of human origin not made with hands comes into the scene and strikes the image in the feet this topples the image but doesn't just topple it it grinds it to powder because the stone doesn't just stay the same it gets bigger and bigger the stone becomes like a great mountain to fill the whole earth but it does so while it's grinding these metals into dust and the wind carries the dust away like the chaff on a threshing floor he said now he gave the dream and everyone said that's it that's it for sure what's the interpretation he said okay you're the head of gold after you there will be an inferior kingdom that will come after you which was the media Persian empire under Cyrus that's the chest of silver after that will come another world empire the Grecian empire he doesn't mention it as the Grecian but we know that's what it was Alexander the Great conquered the Persian empire that's the belly of bronze the legs of iron and the iron would then be the Roman empire which conquered the Grecian and the feet of iron and clay are the Roman empire in its deteriorating form where it says just as clay and iron do not cohere so the kingdom in its latter years will be partly strong and partly brittle is what he says but what about the stone he says well and this is Daniel 2 44 in the days of these kings that is before these four kingdoms when the four kingdoms or empires have run their course and disappeared in the days of that period the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed it will be not left to another it shall consume all of these kingdoms and it itself will endure forever now the stone then that struck the image of the feet is striking a series of world empires Babylon Media Persian Grecian and Roman empire these followed one another by direct conquest Persia conquered Babylon Greece, Persia Rome, Greece and then the kingdom of God the God of heaven will set up a



kingdom that's that stone it strikes it in the feet when would this kingdom be set up? well he said it will be in the days of these kings so it has to be before the end of the Roman empire so right there without the 70 weeks we already know that since the Roman empire fell in the 5th century AD the Messiah is not coming after that the Messiah comes and sets up his kingdom now the more popular teaching today but it's a rather newer teaching is the dispensational teaching and it teaches this that the stone that comes and strikes the image is actually the second coming of Christ but how can that be? the terms of the vision itself say that it's going to happen in the time of the Roman empire the fourth kingdom and that empire has been gone a long time ah, not to worry there will be a revived Roman empire in the end times now does that say that somewhere in the bible? no well then why does anyone say it? well they need it if you're going to have that stone strike the image of the thief and be the second coming of Christ you're going to have to have another Roman empire come up so that the stone can hit the Roman empire but what this means of course is that the Roman empire which fell in the 5th century AD must have ended at the ankles somewhere and the feet then are a future Roman empire 2500, excuse me, 1500 years removed now the whole period from Babylon to the end of the Roman empire was less than 1500 years but they want us to believe that unmentioned by Daniel there's this gap at the ankles that's longer than the whole period represented in the vision a secret gap why? why do that? well because that's the only way you can get this stone being the second coming of Christ you've got to have a millennium and a half unmentioned in the prophecy now the irony is that the people who have this view are the ones that say they take the literal view of prophecy I don't know if you're aware if you're familiar with dispensationalism when dispensationalism came out Darby in the 1830s he said that he differed from all other bible interpreters in that he took the bible literally and that's exactly the boast that dispensationalists make oh you know those are millennialists those post-millennialists those reformed theologians those other people they spiritualize they don't take the prophecies literally we are consistent we take the prophecies literally really? where do you literally find a 1500 year gap at the ankles of this image? you find none you invent it because you have a pre-designed outcome you want that kingdom to not be here now you want it to come when Jesus comes back and be a millennial kingdom in the future why would they want that? well because they believe and this is a dispensational view that when Jesus came he actually did offer the kingdom of God to the Jews but they rejected him so it got postponed that when Jesus was crucified the kingdom was postponed until the second coming the church is a parenthesis I'm using the words the dispensationalist use in their own writings the church is a parenthesis between the Jews rejection of the kingdom in the first century and Jesus coming to establish the millennial kingdom at the end of time church is just an afterthought now Paul said in Ephesians the church is God's eternal purpose which was the great mystery not made known to the sons of men previously but finally revealed it's God's eternal purpose and plan but dispensationalism no it's just a parenthesis it's just what God does to keep himself busy while he's waiting for the right time for Israel to come back around well that's made up

stuff you will not find one verse in the bible that speaks of any kind of restored Roman Empire in the end time it's a theory of convenience it's of necessity because they don't want to acknowledge that the kingdom of God in fact was never postponed when Jesus came he said the kingdom of God is at hand when they said when will the kingdom of God appear he said the kingdom of God is right here in your midst he said if I'm casting out demons by the spirit of God then the kingdom of God has overtaken you it's here Paul even told his converts you have been translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom revelation 5.10 the people the redeemed saying you have made us a kingdom of priests you've redeemed us from every nation kingdom of hell and made us a kingdom of priests the kingdom is not future only it was established right when Jesus said it would be right when Daniel said it would be it was established at the time of those kings during the time of the Roman Empire it was not postponed there is no parenthesis the kingdom like Jesus was like a little mustard seed in his day only a few followers in him but it grew into a great tree or like a little stone it grew into a great mountain to fill the earth has it not hasn't the kingdom of God been preached throughout the world and Christ ruled now is in the lives of people in every nation this is exactly what Daniel predicted what Jesus predicted why make stuff up when the interpretation is so obviously untroubled just take it literally like you're supposed to right literally okay well we've got then the next prophecy is chapter 7 and Daniel in that one doesn't see an image made of metal but he sees four beasts coming out of the sea a lion a bear a leopard and a beast with ten horns interestingly they turn out to be the same empires that are represented by the head of gold the chest of silver the belly of bronze and the legs of iron and again you find at the end of that prophecy the Messiah one like the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven and he comes to the ancient days now I want to show you something here in Daniel 7 you've got these four beasts and it turns out they represent the same four empires Babylonian Median Persian Grecian and Roman but then there's something else because out of the fourth beast that is out of the Roman Empire there grows this little horn and it becomes kind of the focus of attention for a little while in the chapter he says verse 8 I was considering the horns and there was another horn a little one coming up among them before whom three of the first horns were plucked out by the roots and there in the horn in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking pompous words he says in verse later on verse 19 then I wish to know the truth about the fourth beast which was different from the others exceedingly dreadful with its teeth of iron its nails of bronze which devoured and broken pieces and trampled the residue with his feet and the ten horns that were on its head and the other horn which came up before which excuse me before which three fell namely that horn which had eyes and a mouth etc. etc.

the little horn now he is told in verse 23 the fourth beast is a fourth kingdom the ten horns in verse 24 are ten kings that shall arise from that kingdom from the Roman Empire and then at the end of verse 24 and that little horn he shall be another one who subdues three kings he shall speak verse 25 pompous words against the most high shall

persecute the saints of the most high and shall intend to change times and law then the saints shall be given into his hand for time times and half a time but the court shall be seated and they shall take away his dominion that is this little horn now I want to say that dispensationalists believe that the little horn is a future antichrist and that this is again a prophecy that culminates in the second coming of Christ when the antichrist of the future is destroyed at the second coming of Christ now they've got a problem of course because again you've got the same four kingdoms the last of which is the Roman Empire and then the little horn they say the little horn is a future antichrist but he grows up out of the Roman Empire and that's been gone for 1500 years ah not to worry there will be a revived Roman Empire everything about their own empire they can just say ah it's not the real Roman Empire that we actually know from history but an imagined one in the future that we know nothing about from the Bible or from any way to predict the future ah there will be they say a revived Roman Empire and then the antichrist will rise out of that so he'll be the little horn however until dispensationalists came along the little horn was seen very much differently by church fathers and by ah and reformed theologians and that was that the little horn was actually something that would grow out of the Roman Empire lo and behold the real one the historic one that would have that would blaspheme God and would persecute the saints and so forth and the reformers believed and some before the reformation believed that this was a reference to the papacy now I won't say it had to be but this was the universal view of everyone who's not a Roman Catholic ah you know from about frankly from probably from about the 14th century on to the 19th century I say 14th century which was before the reformation because there were pre-reformation people like Wycliffe and Tyndale and Huss 100 years before Luther who believed this they believed the little horn is the papacy they believed that the fourth beast was the Roman Empire and out of the Roman Empire grew another power in the same place of a different sort different from all the other kingdoms because it was not secular and it subdued all the kingdoms and if you know much about church history you know the papacy of course fits the bill very well but did they say blasphemous things against the most high the little horn will did the papacy ever say blasphemous things well not unless you think it's blasphemous from say we popes are God on earth we have the right to change times and seasons whereas Christ one pope said whereas Christ told his disciples to put away the swords I Pope Leo command the bishops of France to draw out their swords and go out and fight I have the power to change laws and things like that now some people would consider that blasphemous for a human leader of the church used to say that he's got more authority than Christ that he's God on earth and that was not only a few times these kind of quotes have come from the popes throughout history so the reformers thought yeah I think that's blasphemous I think he is speaking great things against the most high and also persecuting the saints wasting the saints yeah yeah what do you think the inquisition was the inquisition was not primarily to wipe out heathen it was primarily to wipe out the Waldensians and the Albigensians and and these were non-conformist Christian groups that that broke away from the Roman Catholic Church before it was safe to do so that is

before the reformation and you know so it was they that killed John House it was they that killed Tyndale it was they that persecuted the saints and and they tried to kill Luther but he escaped and eventually you know they didn't have the power to because they didn't have the hegemony over Europe that they previously had but when they had hegemony over Europe for about a thousand years time they definitely wasted the saints some people have estimated as many as 50 million Christians were killed one way or another under the rule of the papacy so this is why the reformers had kind of a bad attitude toward the popes and they thought well they're the antichrists and you know they really had the church fathers on their side because the church fathers said they didn't live the church fathers didn't live to see the papacy rise but they said when the Roman empire falls that's when this antichrist power will rise I actually have in my notes here I told you I have notes I can't take time to read I've got the quotes from the church fathers and I've got the quotes from the popes but all I'm saying is that historically this passage was understood by the church fathers to say when the Roman empire would fall it would be replaced by this antichristian power and that reformers who of course a thousand years after the rise of the papacy looked back and said yeah they were right Rome did fall and uprose the papacy in its place and did all those things that were said so that was the view that is still the view of many reformed groups and by the way this is an aside extra information for no extra charge when Paul talks about the man of sin in second Thessalonians 2 the church fathers and the reformers felt that Paul was alluding to this little horn in Daniel 7 they believed that this little horn that would grow up out of the fall of the Roman empire is the man of sin and the man of lawlessness that Paul talked about and that when Paul said you know what it is that prevents him from rising you know what it is that restrains him but when that is taken out of the way then he will rise the church fathers and the reformers all believed that he was referring to the removal of the Roman empire and then would rise the man of sin now I'm not here to defend that view I'm simply giving you historical information this is what all the reformers taught and that's this is what all the church fathers taught at least all the ones that I have been able to find and teach I've got their quotes with me here so you can look at the map if you're interested but the point is there's no reason to suggest there's going to be a revived Roman empire and that the little horn is going to rise out of that future revived Roman empire as a future antichrist so already twice we've seen in chapter 2 and in chapter 7 the dispensations have taken prophecies that very plainly talk about a historical progression an unbroken procession and they've stuck gaps of hundreds or thousands of years long between elements in the prophecy that don't testify to any such gaps don't even hint at them this is certainly not a literal means of interpreting prophecy no matter what anyone may say to the contrary in chapter 8 of Daniel then we have the ram and the he goat the ram is identified as media Persian empire so it is actually the second beast that came out of the sea in chapter 7 the first was Babylon the second was the media Persian empire it is the second medal of the image the first the head was the gold of Babylon the chest was media Persian so in chapter 8 we've got actually the two middle of those four kings here the two middle ones

mentioned you don't have Babylon you don't have Rome but you've got media Persian and Greece and it's about the fall of the media Persian empire to the Greeks the goat with the single horn is the Grecian empire and Alexander the Great is the horn now in that prophecy after the he goat destroys the ram it's horn it's single horn is broken and four horns come up in it's place that's not a very much concealed idea Alexander died he was about 33 years old his children were slain and his generals vied for power to take over his empire they couldn't defeat each other so they divided it up four ways and so we have there the division of the empire oh there was something very important I left out in chapter 7 there's so much in chapter 7 but this is perhaps the most important thing I want to point out and then we've already taken chapter 8 just now in chapter 7 after this reference to you know the Roman empire and so forth we have this passage verses 13 and 14 it says I was watching in the night visions and behold one like the son of man coming with the clouds of heaven he came to the ancient of days and they brought him near before him then to him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom that all peoples nations and languages should serve him his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away and his kingdom the one which shall not be destroyed now this reference to one like the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven sounds so much like our images of the second coming of Christ that many read this just assuming that it is the second coming of Christ and then again that's confirmed by their idea that the little horn in the passage is a future antichrist at the end of time so that we're in the end times here what I'm suggesting I don't think we are in the end times of this passage this is not a reference to the second coming of Christ which I believe in I do believe Jesus is going to come in the clouds but in this passage Daniel is on the heaven side of the clouds he says he sees the son of man coming in the clouds to God not to earth when Jesus ascended in Acts chapter 1 his disciples watched him go up and a cloud received him out of their sight Daniel is on the other side of that cloud he sees him coming in the clouds and brought to the ancient of days and given his throne at the right hand of God this is not talking about the end of the world this is talking about Jesus ascension when he was given his kingdom throughout the new testament we are told that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God God has said sit at my right hand until I make all your enemies your footstool Paul says he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet, that's what's going on now Jesus is reigning from heaven and he will reign until he's conquered all he's going to conquer then he's going to come back now what's interesting about this it's a picture of the Messiah coming to heaven through the clouds given a throne in heaven and reigning from there he's given a kingdom and dominion so that all men should worship and serve him didn't Paul say that's how it is every knee should bow and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord is that not true now he's saying it is true now it is true now of course Jesus has all dominion and power he said all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me all authority in heaven and earth has been given to him at his resurrection he is not going to receive more power when he comes back because he already has all of it he's at this point conquering while he's through his armies of the church conquering the resistance the

kingdom of Satan but Jesus is ruler already he's the one guiding he's the head he's the captain and when the war is over he'll return and claim the prize that his armies have won for him or that he's won through them now this is something Jesus referred to in Luke chapter 19 when he said the kingdom of God is like a nobleman who went away to a far country to receive a kingdom and to return and he left with his servants his estate Minas, he had 10 Minas he gave each to 10 servants told them occupy Jalicum and then when he came back after a long time he returned and settled up with his servants now he's describing himself he went away to a far country to receive a kingdom which he received a long time later he comes back to see how his servants have done settling things this is what Daniel describes he's gone away, he's gone to heaven, he's got his kingdom he hasn't returned yet because he's ruling from there by the way Herod Archelaus who was the one of the sons of Herod the Great who ruled in Judea after Herod died he had had to go he was contemporary with Jesus and he had had to go to Rome to have the emperor grant him his kingship and then he came back to rule and when Jesus said the kingdom of God is like a man who goes to a far country to receive a kingdom and to return in his listeners minds they're probably thinking oh that's what Archelaus did he went to Rome in fact what's interesting is in the parable Jesus said but his subjects didn't want him to reign and they sent messengers saying we will not have this man rule over us that's in Luke 19 the parable that's what the Jews did when Archelaus went to Rome to get set up as king over Judea the people of Judea sent messengers to Rome saying we don't want him but you know Jesus' parable is kind of modeled after something that really happened in their time but it's also modeled after Daniel 7 when the Messiah goes to heaven, receives his kingdom later he'll return okay we talked about chapter 8 about the ram and the hegoat that's the Persian empire falling to Alexander and then the four generals taking over there by the way it goes on these four horns that come out of the hegoat one of them is Seleucus and out of that one comes a little horn not the same little horn that came out of the Roman empire in chapter 7 but this one comes out of the Grecian empire this is going to be Antiochus Epiphanes and there's very few evangelical scholars that would disagree with that that's pretty universally understood let's talk about Antiochus Epiphanes now we've got the 70 weeks of Daniel now we cannot give this the time it deserves we can only say this much Daniel is told that there's going to be a period of 490 years it begins he said with the decree to restore and build Jerusalem remember when Daniel received this Jerusalem had been burned down earlier by Nebuchadnezzar there's no temple there's no city, it's just ashes it had been like that for decades but now it was Jeremiah had said that that Babylonian exile had lasted 70 years it was nearly 68 years or so when Daniel was reading it so he knew hey, time's coming God's going to take us all back to the land and he prayed and prayed and an angel came to him and said okay, I've got some new information Jeremiah told you about the 70 years I'm going to tell you about the 70 times 7 years and he said yes you are going to go back and there will be a decree of an emperor that will tell you you can go back and rebuild Jerusalem and from that decree until the Messiah comes is initially said 483 years that's 69 times 7 the whole period in under consideration is 70

times 7 490 years less one of those periods of 7 takes it back to 483 years that's 69 7s and the prophecy brings it up to the 69th week the end of the 69th week and then we have disputed not surprisingly prophecy because once again the dispensationists make this prophecy be about a future antichrist and a future tribulation in doing so they have to make there be a huge gap of approximately 2000 years between the 69th week and the beginning of the 70th week again a period of time 4 times as long as the whole period describes where as you will notice there is not the slightest hint in the bible here is what it says let me just read verses 24-27 70 weeks are determined for your people that's the Jews and for your holy city that's Jerusalem to finish the transgression to make an end of sins to make reconciliation for iniquity to bring in everlasting righteousness these are things Jesus accomplished by the way at the cross to seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy the most holy is a reference to Jesus some think it's the most holy place if so it's the most holy place in heaven because Hebrews chapter 9 tells us that when Jesus ascended he sprinkled his blood in the holy of holies in heaven on the ark of the covenant there so it could be referring to that either Jesus or the holiest of holies in the heavenly tabernacle anyway that's how long it says verse 25 know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the command to restore and build Jerusalem that's the beginning of this period until Messiah the prince that's the end of this period there shall be 7 weeks and 62 weeks well 7 weeks is 49 years that's only 7 of the 70 then you've got 62 more that makes a total of 69 accounted for 7 plus 62 is 69 so you've got 69 weeks or 483 years accounted for there until the Messiah came and then it says the street shall be built again in the wall even in troublesome times and after the 62 weeks now follow me here there were 7 weeks before the 62 remember? there's going to be 7 weeks and 62 weeks so after the 62 weeks is really after the 69th week it can be confusing but if you follow what he says it's not too disputed so at the end of the 69th week after 62 weeks which was after the first 7 Messiah shall be cut off and that's the Hebrewism and he's killed but not for himself and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary the city and the sanctuary are Jerusalem and the temple Messiah was cut off in the year 30 AD in all likelihood in 70 AD the city and the sanctuary were destroyed by the prince of the people the people of the prince who would come that was the Romans and it says in the end of it shall be with a flood until the end of the war desolation is determined now this gets really tricky he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week but in the middle of the week he shall bring an end to the sacrifice and offerings and on the wing of abomination shall be one who makes desolate that's where the term abomination of desolation is first found it's found two other times in Daniel later even until the consummation which is determined is poured out on the desolate now let's face it some of these words are very very difficult to just even know what the phrases mean but what we have that's not difficult is there's going to be 69 weeks or 483 years from the starting point and that's when the Messiah is there now it doesn't say he's going to be born that time begin his public ministry at that time die at that time it's just until Messiah and therefore there's differences of opinion as to what date first of all it ends but there's also differences of opinion as to what date it

starts because Cyrus was the one who made the decree that would most naturally be taken to be the one referred to but he made it in 538 BC or 539 BC if you measure 490 years forward you fall short of the time of Christ you're going to be over 50 years before Christ there so so there's two other decrees similar one was made that allowed Ezra to go back and make some improvements and then another that allowed Nehemiah both of these were issued by Artaxerxes the Persian and they were like at I forget the exact year 444 BC or somewhere one of them was I forget what the other one was but the point I want to make is it doesn't really matter what year it is because scholars can't agree which one is the beginning anyway there's actually scholars who take Cyrus's decree as the starting point there's other scholars who take the first Artaxerxes decree as the starting point and there's some who take the second Artaxerxes decree as the starting point and they can fight it out because there's evidence for all and there's problems with all okay the point is though if you measure 430 years forward from the Artaxerxes decrees you do fall pretty much within the range of Christ's adult life now some have calculated it that the 69th year ends with the baptism of Jesus others dispensationalists particularly have taken it so that the 69th week ends with the crucifixion of Jesus that's three and a half year difference depending on where you started depending whether you use the lunar year or the solar year calculation which is one of the things that people get into I don't even care about the calculations all I know is that prophecy places the coming of the Messiah right there right around the time when Jesus is walking around now I believe personally and there are people who have two other opinions at least but I also have some good scholars who believe the same thing I do that the 69th week ended with the baptism of Jesus and his ministry of three and a half years was the first half of the 70th week it says if you look at the warning of the passage after the 62 weeks sometime after the 69th week the Messiah's week cut off well he was it was after that three and a half years after it doesn't say the day after it but it says also he shall confirm the covenant with many for a week and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifices and offerings to cease did Jesus cause the sacrifices and offerings to cease three and a half years after the beginning of his ministry he certainly did his death was the last sacrifice God will ever acknowledge the Jews still offered them so do pagan religions to this day but that doesn't mean they haven't ceased as far as God's concerned as far as God's concerned he ended the sacrificial system with the death of Jesus so Jesus started a ministry that could have gone seven years but they cut him off in the middle of that time and brought an end to their temple system the sacrifices and offerings then the next thing mentioned is the city and the sanctuary will be destroyed by the people of the prince who shall come well we know that was actually 40 years later so it didn't fall within the 70 weeks but it's just an afterthought the 70 weeks end with Jesus but it also mentions after he's killed there's going to be a destruction of the temple and that happened in 70 AD now in other words this is one of the greatest prophecies in the world to point directly to Jesus as the Messiah and how any Orthodox Jew who accepts the inspiration of Daniel cannot see Jesus as the Messiah they just have to do you know all kinds of twisting of the passage but no one twists it more than the



dispensationalists because the dispensationalists true of course they want a gap to be in there, 2000 years gap they say the 69th week ended with the death of Jesus now when the 70th week, the last seven years should have started it didn't that's when the parenthesis started the 70th week hasn't started yet that seven years is guess what future seven year tribulation therefore the prince that is to come and destroy the city of Zechariah isn't the Romans back in 70 AD it's a future antichrist of all things wouldn't it be they've got the future antichrist dotting the pages of Daniel all through Daniel says these are all things that are going to happen in the period of the Roman Empire well I guess there's another Roman Empire coming up they say the Bible doesn't say there will be but they say there will be and they say the 70th week of Daniel will be the tribulation period because it's seven years long apart from identifying the tribulation as the 70th week of Daniel do we have any biblical evidence that there is even a seven year tribulation to be expected at all there's none the tribulation is mentioned twice Jesus mentioned it in Matthew 24 21 then there shall be great tribulation such as never was since the world began and neither shall ever be he doesn't mention how long it will last no mention in Revelation 7 14 says these are those who are coming up out of the great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the lamb but he doesn't know how long that is either now people say doesn't Revelation have like seven years in there no it's got three and a half years mentioned five times if you want to make a seven year period you can artificially take this three and a half years from this passage and this three and a half years from another passage and make them end to end so you've got seven years but there's nothing in the book of Revelation that ever mentions seven years this in spite of the fact that everything else is in sevens in the book of Revelation it's not the only thing that isn't there's seven churches there's seven seals there's seven trumpets there's seven vials there's seven angels of seven churches there's seven woes there's seven beatitudes there's seven of almost everything but there isn't seven years in Revelation or anywhere there is no mention anywhere in the Bible of a future seven year tribulation where does that idea come from it comes from postponing the 70th week of Daniel and saying that the 70th week of Daniel did not come right after the 69th week when it should have come it was postponed for two thousand years and when it does come it will be the tribulation period and the antichrist will be the prince that will come now if we had some passage in the Bible elsewhere that gave us something like that scenario then we might be able to fairly read it in there but there's nothing in the Bible that gives us that scenario it's created of whole cloth from these prophecies which do not mention in any case the gap in the ankles of Nebuchadnezzar's vision you know the gap between the fourth beast in Daniel 7 and the little horn the gap between the 69th and 70th dispensationalists just makes up gaps whenever they want them they're not in the Bible they're not hinted at in the Bible there's not one line of exegesis of the Bible that could possibly justify them they are just needed in order to take everything that was fulfilled in the first coming of Christ and postpone it to the second coming of Christ you see the new testament says that Jesus fulfilled the prophecies Jesus fulfilled the hopes of Israel that God brought Jesus to fulfill

all things that were written but dispensationalists says but he didn't he'll do that when he comes back that's a couple thousand years off from his first time but where did he get that? I think it was from a guy named John Nelson Darby is where they get it but from the Bible not so much so I sometimes have said you know suppose I asked you for a ride home and you ask me how far away I live I say well I only live about five miles from here and you say oh sure and so I get in your car and we go driving we go five miles, six miles, seven miles ten miles, twenty miles and you begin to say I thought you said that you live five miles from here I said well I do I live five miles from here except I didn't tell you between the fourth and the fifth mile there's a gap of fifty miles laughter honestly it's exactly parallel it's gonna be four hundred and ninety years from this point to that point I just didn't tell you it's really gonna be two thousand four hundred and ninety years in other words the prophecy if this message is correct the prophecy has told them nothing about timing because there's this unknown huge gap between the beginning and the end and yet the prophecy seems to be all about timing it seems the very purpose of the prophecy is to talk about timing and therefore I can't go along with it now the last thing I want to say we're just out of time chapters 10 through 12 I already in our first session tonight mentioned that chapter 12 in my opinion is about the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. not the end of the world the reference to many who sleep and the dust shall arise that is a figure of speech that is not unknown elsewhere in scripture for example in Ezekiel chapter 37 the Jews being restored from Babylon is likened to dry bones arising from the dead into a great army and you know the prophets had the dry bones it's a resurrection image but it's really figurative so what about the Jews in Babylon who say our bones are dry, our hope is gone who are gonna be brought from the grave in Babylon as it were and brought back to their land through the decree of Cyrus so the Bible does use resurrection imagery figuratively now the statement in chapter 12 that many who sleep and the dust shall arise and that is verse 3 many of those who sleep and the dust of the earth shall awake some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt almost everyone takes this to be about the final resurrection it sounds like it and it even sounds very much like something Jesus said about the final resurrection Jesus certainly was talking about the final resurrection in chapter 5 of John and there he said in verses 28 and 29 he said marvel not at this for the hour is coming in which all who are in the graves will hear his voice and come forth those who have done good to the resurrection of life and those who have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation that sounds kind of the same he says all that are in the graves are going to come forth, some to a resurrection of life some to a resurrection of condemnation Daniel says well not quite the same thing Daniel says many of those who sleep and the dust shall arise some to everlasting life and some to eternal shame and contempt why does Jesus say all and Daniel says many now he doesn't mean just the righteous will because he says it's going to be some to eternal life and some to everlasting shame and contempt and those two sums make up the many many will rise and some of them will go one way some another way so Jesus said everybody's going to rise to the resurrection I'm thinking, and you don't have to think like me but I'm thinking

Jesus is talking about the resurrection at the end when it really is all that are in the graves, Daniel's not talking about that he's talking figuratively not about the resurrection of the last day and I find very similar language to Daniel's in Luke chapter 1 or excuse me, Luke chapter 2 when the baby Jesus is taken by his parents to Jerusalem to be dedicated in the temple and Simeon the old man comes in and recognizes you know, Jesus and it's in Luke chapter 2 and Simeon says this he took the child in his arms verse 28 he took him up in his arms and blessed God and said Lord now you are letting your servant depart in peace according to your word for my eyes have seen your salvation which you have prepared before the face of all peoples alike to bring the revelation to the Gentiles and the glory of your people Israel and Joseph and his mother marveled, then Simeon said in verse 34 to Mary his mother behold this child is destined for the fall and the rising of many in Israel and for a sign that will be spoken against. Now the word rising in the Greek is anastasis which is the word resurrection this child he said is born for the fall and the resurrection of many in Israel. He's not talking about the final resurrection, he's talking about the Jews that would reject Jesus and the ones that would rise and be born again passing from death into life in regeneration.

He's saying that in Israel there's two destinies one for the faithful remnant who will receive eternal life coming into the kingdom of God by following Jesus the others are the apostate of Israel they're going to fall and he's talking of course about the fact that within 40 years of Jesus' death there will be no Israel, everyone will have either escaped as a follower of Jesus or they will have gone down in the holocaust of 1870 I the fact that he says the fall and the rising of many and Daniel says many of those who sleep in the flesh shall arise some to everlasting shame and contempt and some to everlasting life. You know the reference to shame and contempt is interesting because the word contempt there is found only one other place in the Bible and that's in Isaiah 66 24 when it talks about those in Gehenna it says their contempt is something like forever it's the last line in Isaiah but the word contempt is said to be of those who in that passage I think are the Jews who are destroyed in 70 AD when God wipes out the old system because he brought the new system the new system replaces the old God gave them 40 years after the death of Jesus to get on board with the new just like he gave his 40 years after he came out of Egypt to learn to get Egypt and golden calves out of their system you know before he took them into the promised land a generation God made a covenant at Mount Sinai gave them 40 years to get the old system out of their blood and a new generation to come up to enter the promised land God brought the new covenant in 30 AD and gave the Jews 40 years to adjust to the idea that the temple is no more you don't need the temple it's going to be gone, we've got a new king, a new messiah is here the point I'm making is it's not it's not as easy to understand some of these things Daniel as some people want to make it and the people who do sound like they make it easy often are introducing elements that are not in the text and which a lot of times I don't think they've studied it except in the books and sermons of people who believe the same way they do that's not my idea of research I was only taught one way I was taught the

dispensational way and I interpreted all these prophecies dispensationally until I studied them and when you study them you say wait a minute I'm supposed to take this prophecy for what it says and it doesn't say anything about a gap here or a gap there or a gap there but it makes perfectly good sense without a gap, it just changes the whole thing from talking about the second coming of Christ to talking about the first coming of Christ it's talking about Christ accomplished in setting up his kingdom and being enthroned at the right hand of God and reigning at this present time rather than his kingdom that he announced was at hand being in fact postponed for two thousand years to be only a thousand years long given when he comes back although all the prophecies say his kingdom will have no end and be forever dispensation says it's a thousand years but I don't know I'm not trying to be hard on dispensationists it's just I was one and now that I'm not one I look at it and I think why did I ever think that you could play so fast and loose with the Bible just to make it say what you determined in advance that you wanted to say anyway I'm done with Daniel today I've run a little over time for this second session but there's much more my notes are can be found at [Matthew713.com](http://Matthew713.com) and we're going to pray and then we'll have some Q&A okay thank you father for this wonderful time that we can be with people we love our brothers and sisters and for the freedom to do this even though there's some who would try to deny us this freedom at this present time we thank you for your word we thank you for your spirit and I pray that your spirit will guide us into all understanding of your word as you would have us to know it and we ask this in Jesus name Amen we have a question back here yes just a quick question on the 12th and the 70th week so the first three and a half years so what was the second three and a half years how did I know you were going to ask that if Jesus' ministry was the first half of the 70th week what was the second half hmm it would apparently start at the crucifixion and end when well presumably about three and a half years later what happened three and a half years after Jesus was crucified well that's very approximately the time that Saul was converted and became Paul and was the first apostle sent to the Gentiles now the 70 weeks are God dealing with Israel, Daniel's people 70 weeks are determined for your people Daniel and after Jesus was crucified the gospel only went out to the Jews for a few years until some point and God determined what it was we don't know, it's approximately three four years we don't know God takes this man and says okay I'm sending you to go to the nations we're done just reach out to the Jews they've been doing that, they've had their chance we're going to the nations, so I suspect that the conversion of Saul, the first appointment of an apostle to go actually to the Gentiles specifically would mark the end of the period that God was dealing exclusively with Israel that's my opinion Ron? The critics one point the question is the critics who place Daniel at a late date do they place Ezekiel later too? the answer is generally not, they usually acknowledge it and yet he mentions Daniel yes that's my point 14 yeah I mean in Ezekiel 14 God is saying that the city of Jerusalem is so doomed that even if these three Noah, Job and Daniel were in it, they would spare only their own lives, they would not even spare sons and daughters like Lot was able to do they'd just spare their own selves so and he says it twice or three times there and then he mentions

Daniel again in chapter 20 no 20 ok but chapter 27 or 28 I think 28, Ezekiel 28 also, he's talking to the king of Tyre and he says oh you are wiser than Daniel, remember I mean he's being sarcastic the king of Tyre thinks he's wiser than Daniel but it's interesting that Ezekiel, the timing of that book's writing is one of the few that critics have hardly ever doubted, there's so much in it that ties it directly to the period of the exile where Ezekiel was that although critics love to tamper with the dates, the traditional dates of almost all the books of the Bible they pretty much leave Ezekiel alone and yet but you know what they do with that, they say that Ezekiel is not talking about our Daniel they say, and this is literally what they say and it's absurd they say there was a Eucharistic hero a pagan myth a guy named Daniel that they know about from some from the Rosh Shomer text or something that they found and that there was a, in pagan mythology there was a Eucharistic hero named Dan-el or Daniel and they say that must be who Ezekiel is referring to because Daniel certainly wouldn't have been around yet because he didn't live for centuries later according to our assertion, now but imagine, here God's trying to pick three examples of the greatest virtuous guys and the wisest guys he's got Job, he's got Noah and what some pagan mythology character who doesn't particularly stand out for his virtue I mean no way, it's, I mean they're just desperate, they're desperate because if Ezekiel mentioned Daniel, our Daniel then Daniel was contemporary with Ezekiel and that makes him a 5th century BC or 6th century BC character yes brother yeah the ten horns are ten kings that come from the fourth beast the Roman Empire there are ten ancient nationalities that have been listed by many commentators nationalities are everywhere now, the Ostrogoths the Visigoths, the Heruli the Vandals, the Saxons, what's that? pardon? so you're speaking in tongues I'm guessing? no these are these are ancient European races into which the Roman Empire when it fell dissolved and you can make a list of ten of them but it's a little bit artificial making it ten, I mean the list usually really include maybe twelve and they mention the Angles and the Saxons as one or something but the truth is that the number ten and the number seven and numbers like that are often figurative and for example the number ten in Revelation 2.10 God says to the church of Smyrna you will have tribulation ten days nobody I know has ever believed that, referring to ten days literally most commentators would say well it just means a short time, you know, ten days is not very long, it's long enough to be in a comfortable tribulation but I think that the ten nations simply represent a number of nations which happens to be something close to ten, anyway it could be literally ten depending on how you list them but if I gave you the list and I don't have it with me but I've read them in many commentaries most of our nations that normally exist as nations, say they are ethnic nationalities that were in ancient Europe, you know, that aren't the Germanic peoples and the Britains and things like that, you know that have different names now, but to say there's literally ten, I believe it's pushing it to say there's literally ten, I don't think it needs to be literally ten I think that the image is, it's like well, you know there's ten kings on the beast in Revelation 17 also who give their power to the beast for one hour, I don't think the one hour is literal, sixty minutes really, and I don't know that the ten is exactly, I think that there's a number of kingdoms into which the

Roman Empire dissolved and it could be that ten is approximate, it could be that ten is exact but it doesn't have to be literal in my opinion some people might hold out for a more literal approach, and that's fine yes? ... .. No, they're more like, well of course there were churches all over the Roman Empire the main centers of Christian activity were in, there was an important Christian center in Jerusalem in the first several centuries one in Antioch one in Edessa one was in Ephesus, one was in Carthage how many have I listed, there was also I've listed five Alexandria was the other, right? Well, Rome, certainly when we talk about the schools, the Roman school was actually in Carthage, under like Tertullian North Africa, but it was really it was part of the Roman church, but yeah, Rome would definitely be the main one Constantinople, Constantine did move his capital to the east and he named it Constantinople but there was a church there before, I don't remember ... .. There could have been ten, well there were actually there were actually ten churches in Asia that we know of, you know Revelation only mentions the seven churches of Asia but at the time Revelation was written there were more than seven because there was also Colossae, which isn't mentioned in Revelation, there was Troas and there was Hierapolis, those were three additional Asian church centers that the book of Acts mentions that aren't mentioned with the seven in Revelation, so, you know I don't know that anyone has ever made a complete list of all the churches ... Yes ... .. Airplane travel, wow! Computer science Yeah, it says in Daniel 12, 4 that many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall increase ... .. You know, popular Bible prophecy teachers love to talk about, oh man, we run to and fro all the time, man, we have air travel, you know, we drive cars all over the place, people are running to and fro like crazy and knowledge increase, man, there's never been a time when knowledge increased so rapidly as in the past hundred years or so, so we definitely are living in the end times Well, it doesn't say first of all, that people run to and fro and knowledge increase in an unprecedented amount, it doesn't really say how much so The truth is, that when Jesus came, he sent his disciples to go into all the world to preach the gospel so that the knowledge of God would increase from just, not just Israel, where it had been confined for 1400 years, now knowledge will increase worldwide of the gospel and people will run to and fro, I mean, Paul traveled all over the world, a lot of other apostles did too, man, with the Holy Spirit knowledge, right right, so I mean, there's really nothing in that statement that has to make it be about now, it's sort of like when people say, well, there's more earthquakes now than there's been at any time in history, so the Bible doesn't say that in the end times there'll be more earthquakes than any time in history but didn't Jesus say there'll be earthquakes? Yeah, he said there'll be earthquakes there are, there always have been he didn't say there'll be more or less, he didn't say anything about their frequency, he just said there'll be earthquakes and pestilences yeah, that's true, there were in his time there have been in all times since he didn't say anything about them being more numerous, these, it's we live in exceptional times there's no question about it, the last century has been incredible, increase in knowledge, increase in technology increase in disasters and so forth, and therefore it's hard, living in times like these not to assume we are living in the most important of all

times, it must be the end of the world but the measures we're using to determine that are not frankly measures that the Bible gives us to measure by so, I'm not saying we're not living at the end of the world, I kind of hope we are and I think we might be, but the point is these particular things that people love to point to are not necessarily directly connected to any prediction about the end times. Brother, your hand was up, right? You know, I got a little didn't end times start post-Pentecost and we're living in the end times right now? Yeah, Peter said, yeah, at Pentecost Peter said, this is that which was spoke by the prophet Joel, who said, in the last days, I'll pour out my spirit, so Peter definitely said they were living in the last days now based on that, there's a couple of ways we could see that.

We could say that every every year from Pentecost to the present and to the end of the world is the last days that's a lot of days or we could say these are the last days of the Jewish order, which is what prophecy all focused on, you know remember Jesus said, when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies he said to his disciples these are the days of vengeance that all things that are written may be fulfilled. We often underestimate the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem. You have to realize that God established the temple order, or at least the tabernacle order, which became the temple order 1400 years before Christ and for, that's a pretty big chunk of history, about a quarter of human history.

People had to deal with God through the sacrifices, through the temple system through the covenant that God made at Mount Sinai. And then that whole covenant is scrapped. The covenant is replaced.

There's a new covenant now. And that system is destroyed permanently. I mean that's a major earth shaking turn of events and it's even more so from the point of view of God than from the point of view of secular historians, you know but that would be that'd be my you had a question well you have to realize I'm not an expert so my opinion wouldn't be any better than yours um uh I've probably seen a lot of the same things and heard the same things you've heard, you know, if you're on if you're on the internet if you read, you know, on YouTube if people send you links I have people send me a lot of links you hear all kinds of things.

I will say this I believe I believe coronavirus is a true threat to some people I've never felt threatened by it myself um I don't, you know if people feel more comfortable with me wearing a mask around them, I can do that but if no one else cares I don't either, you know um I don't think coronavirus is a more serious threat than many other flus that are around in fact we we lose far more children to the flu than we do to coronavirus. Now old people that's a different story coronavirus kills more old people flu kills more young kids both are bad, but we don't change our whole course of life because there's viruses around, at least we don't usually so it seems to me that though there is a real virus that really kills people we've always had viruses around that really kill people I don't know

that this one is that much different. It may be different in some measure but I don't think it's different in the measure that would qualify for disrupting all of civilization.

I think that it is being exploited for political purposes political purposes, exactly yes Chris right, no one no one is denying that COVID is very very dangerous for very old people and people who are already immune compromised any virus yeah any virus is, right exactly, but if you remove from the statistics the people who are like over over 75 or 80 who've died of the virus it kills very very few people compared to flu for example so we can't deny that old people need to be careful about this but certainly it doesn't make sense to me to close schools and things like that, but I'm not here to make political statements yeah I'm only 67 so I've got a few years but no I'm not worried because I don't mind dying. In fact I've never been afraid to die so I've never thought no one is going to control me by threatening that I'll die that doesn't control me yes Naomi, well I you know people see things differently New York City has had probably more deaths than anywhere else but they've had the most mismanagement of it too total mismanagement by the state I mean they have sent COVID infected people into nursing homes yes Chris your point was well taken about the little horn representing the vacancy possibility is there anything that precludes Nero from being that double one no I don't think so I think Nero would fit reasonably well it depends on the chronology of course Nero was not anywhere near the end of the Roman Empire it went on for centuries after his death whereas some people read Daniel 7 as if it's saying that it is the death of the Roman Empire that causes the little horn to rise to fill the vacuum and so it could be read more than one possible, let's face it Daniel even the way things are worded is very very difficult sometimes there's certain passages more than others it's pretty mysterious about the little horn but yeah Nero is not I don't suppose could be fully ruled out yes sir it's a good cross reference Revelation 12.4 says that the dragon with his tail drew a third of the stars and cast them to the ground now it's very popularly understood that the stars represent angels and that this is talking about how Satan caused a third of the angels to fall which if it's so that's the only verse that mentions it again a lot of things that we have taken for granted yeah a third of the angels fell to Satan really where does it say that again well it's found only in Revelation 12.4 which doesn't say anything about angels directly it says stars but stars could be angels but that's only one possibility Daniel 8.10 which you also mentioned is about Antiochus Epiphanes and it says that he himself cast the hosts of heaven to the ground many of the hosts of heaven to the ground now we know that he didn't cast angels out of the sky but he did cast down what we call the Hasidim, the holy Jews that were resisting him Antiochus Epiphanes was trying to secularize and paganize Israel and the Hasidim were the holy Jews who were fighting against them actually fighting, just dying because he would attack them on the Sabbath when they wouldn't lift a weapon so he just slaughtered them in cold blood because they wouldn't fight on the Sabbath but to say he cast down these stars I think Antiochus didn't cast down any angels and Daniel 12, is it 4 or right around there it says those that turn many righteous, they shall shine like the stars forever so the stars in



Daniel represent people righteous people Revelation picks up that image directly from Daniel 8.10 about casting the stars down and says the devil does that with his tail to assume that the stars in Revelation are angels is not at all justified it could be, but since the image it's taken from Daniel is talking about people it could be talking about casting down righteous people but let me just say this Revelation takes these images from other places in the Bible like Daniel or like like Zechariah or somewhere else in the Bible they'll take imagery and they'll use it thank you Revelation uses it in a different connection but the imagery can't be totally disconnected from its original source so I think that it'd be very reasonable to assume that the stars cast down by the tail of the dragon in Revelation 12.4 are holy people rather than references to angels Ron? Yes. Is that you behind that mask? Who's that masked man? I'm not wearing a mask for the Bible That's the low ranger I'm here to rob you and if you leave your gifts here for Steve, leave them here it's easier for me to take the money That's right Alright, well it's 9 o'clock we probably should close it up alright, so we already prayed to close so thank you for coming it's good to be with you Thanks for watching!