

a book written by one of the editors of the SRB, Dr. Arno C. Gaebelin, it is called The Annotated Bible.....end of D 7

D 8

In the ~~annotated~~ Annotated Bible by Dr. Gaebelin, which goes thru the whole Bible, the section on Daniel here, on page 28, he says, speaking 1st of the 4 great division of Alexanders army, he says, "Then a little horn appeared out of one of these divisions. It sprung up out of Syria. The little horn is, of course, not the little horn mentioned in the previous chapter. For the little horn in Daniel 7 has its place in connection with the fourth beast, Rome, while this one comes from a division of the third beast, the Greco-Macedonian monarchy." Gaebelin continues, "History does not leave us in doubt as to how and when this great and prophetic vision was fulfilled. This little horn is the 8th king of the Seleucid dynasty. He is known by the name of A.E. ~~Antiochus~~ After his wild and wicked deeds, he was called Epimanes, the mad man. Long before he invaded the pleasant land (Israel's land) Daniel saw what he would do. He conquered Jerusalem. He took away the daily sacrifices of the temple, and offered a swine, and swine's blood upon the altar. He introduced idol worship, devastated the whole land, and killed some 100,000 Jews. In vv.13-14 is an angelic conversation. 2300 literal days (cover just about the period of time during which Antiochus did his wicked deeds) when they were ended Judas Maccabeus ^{cleansed} the sanctuary about December 25, 165 B.C." So here are these statements from Gaebelin, and from the footnote of the SRB, which very explicitly take the position that in ch.8 here it is a prediction which was historically fulfilled in A.E. And which say that it cannot be the same one as the little horn of Daniel 7, which they both say is antichrist. Because that comes out of one of the divisions of the Roman empire, and this comes out of one of the divisions of the Grecian empire. Now that does not prove, of course, that they are right. But it does prove this, that it is not a modernist, or an anti-premillennialist position to say that A.E. is here predicted. It does not either prove that it is only A.E., that it is not looking forward to ~~Antichrist~~ antichrist in these ~~particular~~ particular verses. But it does show again that it is neither a modernist, nor an anti-