

3 Christianity, and the other says he is a Jew. But they both agree he is a man who can be called antichrist because he is the great enemy of God at the end of this age.

His 8th interpretation is that it is the antichrist, and that is the one he says is right! I would think it better if he subsumed what he calls the two dispensationalist interpretations under his, and say he is either a Jew or a Christian, but in either case he is the antichrist. Mr. Brown?

(Brown: It is my impression in reading Dr. Young that he is trying to disassociate a polemical ~~of~~ ploy that are used by some dispensationalists to use the church fathers to substantiate your viewpoint rather than just looking at Scripture and seeing whether or not Scripture says it. That's what he Some people think all church fathers were dispensationalists and that's hardly the case.)

Well, he doesn't mention any church fathers here under No.5. He says one dispensationalist view is that he is the antichrist, who is a Jew; the other is that he is an antichrist who is a Gentile. And the correct view, he says, is that he is the Antichrist!

But I believe most Christian interpreters have held that these vv. are a description of the antichrist. A very interesting thing in addition to that about Dr. Young's commentary is that in chs. 2, 7, and 9 he is very much against the idea of an unmentioned interval between two great events. But here he assumes a jump of at least 2000 years without it being mentioned between v. 35 and 36! Of course we have to assume that or else to say that vv. 36-39 is talking about Antiochus Epiphanes.

There is statement after statement in this section that just does not fit Antiochus Epiphanes, and statements about things he would do that we have no historical evidence of his doing. One, for instances, is that it describes an expedition against Egypt, which is very successful. Some who hold the critical view will say this is a repetition of what's already been said that he will make an expedition against Egypt. Others say that this describes a third expedition against Egypt which is not mentioned anywhere in any of our histories.

It would be a little strange if at that period he made a third expedition that was not mentioned in any of our histories. It would be particularly strange since his second expedition was brought to an end when the Romans ordered him to go back and that was sufficient to ~~xxxx~~ lead him to go back. If he'd made a third expedition under those circumstances, we can be sure the Romans would have come with power, and it certainly would have made enough stir that ~~we~~ there would be some mention of it in history. Young without saying so, assumes an unmentioned interval of at least 2000 years at this point between Antiochus Epiphanes and the antichrist.

You notices the section ends with the resurrection. Verse 2 of ch.12, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."