

is no difference in that. It is a question whether that is the exclusive purpose. They all agree that ~~xxxx~~ is a major purpose of the book. According to the 1st view that is the purpose of the whole book, according to the 2nd and 3rd views there are other purposes. According to the 2nd view there is an added view to prepare people for the <sup>1st</sup> ~~2nd~~ coming of Christ. According to the 3rd view there is an added purpose which is to show the fact that God is going to put an end to the reign of wickedness in this world. That it is to assure us, those of us who suffer from persecution that God is going to interfere in a physical, material way to put an end to the great ~~xxxx~~ nati-god empires of the world. The <sup>3rd</sup> ~~3rd~~ view holds that. The 3rd view holds that the book has certain passages, by no means the whole book, but certain passages which deal with events, mighty and great an important events, which are still future, and gives us a certain amount of detail about these books, about these vents.

.....end of D 8

.....this then is the vital thing about the 3rd view. Now in Young's book he is constantly saying such things as these; About this he'll say, there are three views, or five views, or a certain number of different views, and one of these he will label as the dispensationalist view. And as he uses the term "dispensationalist" it means to him, those who think that much detail is to be learned from Daniel about events which are still true. That is actually the way he uses the term, I would say. Now he would never define it that way, he would be shocked defining it that way, but he ~~xxxxxxx~~ does use it to cover most anybody who takes such an attitude as that. Now this sentence of his here, "Now it is contrary to the nature and genius of prophecy to reveal the future as a detailed history. In all prophecy there is an element of obscurity, and perhaps even of ambiguity," is a statement which I must say is absolutely false. I have to, in an unqualified way, reject this statement. If he ~~was~~ were to say "In some prophecy there is an element ~~in~~ of obscurity, or perhaps even ambiguity I would have to agree with ~~him~~. But to say "In all prophecy...." I don't think there is any ambiguity in a great many of the great prophetic statements. Is it contrary to the nature and genius of prophecy to reveal the