

This commentary by E. J. Young, ~~to~~ to which I referred a few minutes ago, speaks of this section and says there have been many interpretations. He says the following are the principal interpretations. No. 1, Antiochus Epiphanes. No. 2 Constantine the Great. No. 3 Omar, the Islamic king. No. 4 The Roman Emperor. No. 5 The Dispensationalist interpretation No. 6 The Pope of Rome and the Papal System No. 7 Herod the Great. No. 8 The Antichrist. No. 8 is the one he insists is the correct one.

Young says, The Antichrist, this may be called the traditional interpretation in the Christian church. It was advocated by St. Jerome in 400 A.D., and in this he has been followed by many. The term Antichrist is not particularly a good term. John says, there are many antichrists. Antichrist is a very general term. But there is a specific person referred to in 2 Thess. where Paul says that there is one of whom Isaiah said that the Lord will destroy him at his coming, one who it is said will sit in the temple of God showing forth that he is god and should be worshipped. One whom Paul described-- the terrible things that he is to do just before the return of Christ.

It is quite common for us to refer to this one as the antichrist. Notice Young does that. He calls him the Antichrist. I see no harm in that usage so long as we remember it is not a scriptural practice. Scripture uses the term antichrist in a more general way for all great enemies of the Lord's work. You notice a ~~xxxx~~ strange thing about Dr. Young's commentary. He is very good on many of his statements; has much that is excellent in the commentary, but has a strong prejudice against what he calls dispensationalism.

If anyone whom he calls a dispensationalist holds a view that's almost enough in his mind to condemn the view. So we notice here on p. 246 of his Commentary that as the 5th he gives the Dispensationalist interpretation -- which of course are wrong as all the first seven are here. Then the 8th he gives, the antichrist. He gives two dispensationalist interpretations. He gives a) the king, v. 36 is the little horn of Daniel 7 who is an apostate, not from Judaism but from Christianity. He establishes his palace in Jerusalem from which times runs the great tribulation, the last three and a half years of Daniel's 70th week.

That would certainly be the one who would be called the antichrist, wouldn't it? He does not use the term antichrist here. He says he is the Little Horn of Dan. 7, the apostate not from Judaism but from Christianity.

The other "dispensationalist" interpretation he gives is b) he is the antichrist, not to be identified with the little horn of ch. 7, either with him, or with the horn of ch. 8. This wilful king will be a Jew who in the midst of Jewish people will assume kingly honors, be recognized ~~as~~ by the Jewish apostates as Messiah king, and by the Christian apostates as the antichrist. In the middle of the 70th week he will come and take his seat in the Jerusalem temple, and will claim divine worship.

The only difference between these two interpretations as he calls them, is that one says the man is an apostate from