

Antiochus Epiphanes

George Burnside

These few facts overthrow this pagan, modernistic theory that tries to make Daniel a mere historian and not a prophet of God.

To avoid and obscure the clear light of prophecy, the theory was advanced that one of the Syrian kings, Antiochus Epiphanes was the little horn of both Daniel 7 and 8. Let us consider the facts.

LITTLE HORN OF DANIEL 7, IS IT ROMAN OR SYRIAN?

1. "Little horn" rose out of ten divisions of Rome. Therefore it is Roman. Daniel 7:7, 8.
2. To say this prophecy applied to Antiochus is to teach all was fulfilled before Christ and thus Daniel was merely a historian and not a prophet.
3. This view is held by the modernist schools which reject Daniel as a prophet.
4. Christ upheld Daniel the prophet.
5. According to Jerome and Bishop Thomas Newman the Antiochus view was originated by Porphyry (Died AD 304). Porphyry was a pagan whose one aim was to stop the advance of Christianity. His theory was not to expound Daniel but to discredit and deny Daniel as a prophet. He did not try to confirm the Bible, but to deny it's divine origin. It was a pagan attack to hold back Christianity's inroads into paganism. Daniel therefore, according to this theory, was not a prophet but merely an historian. It was the amazing accuracy of the sure word of prophecy and its uncanny fulfillment that made Porphyry claim Daniel was written after the events of Antiochus, hence was not a prophecy at all. Such is the origin of this God-dishonoring and truth opposing theory.
6. "Greece" is pictured as one animal, a goat, with four horns. These were the four generals of Alexander and were not separate kingdoms. Alexander the Great's coffin is to be seen in the Istanbul museum. Goat's heads are carved in the stone sarcophagus, as the goat was the symbol of Greece. Daniel 8:5-11, 21.
7. Antiochus did not rise after the "ten kings" Daniel 7:6. Antiochus was only one of the Syrian kings and not a new kingdom.
8. Antiochus was not "diverse" from his predecessors Daniel 7:7, 24
9. It is impossible to find three kings whom Antiochus plucked up. Daniel 7:8, 24
10. He was not "more stout than his fellows" Daniel 7:20. His father, not he was called Antiochus the Great.
11. His persecutions did not last even 3.5 literal years.
12. The kingdom following the Grecian was Roman, not the everlasting Kingdom of the Saints. Daniel 7:27.

Antiochus Epiphanes

13. Antiochus did not continue until the Judgment before the Ancient of Days. Daniel 7:9-14, 26, 27. These few facts overthrow this pagan, modernistic theory that tries to make Daniel a mere historian and not a prophet of God. The vain attempts to make Antiochus the little horn of Daniel 8 fail likewise.

14. Antiochus was not a horn or a kingdom. A Horn of a beast is never taken for a single person, but signifies a new kingdom. The "four horns" of the He-goat were "four kingdoms" (Daniel 8:22). Antiochus was merely one of a line of kings and not a separate kingdom. Hence he was merely a part of one of the horns. Antiochus reigned over one of the four horns and "the little horn" was a fifth power. Therefore, Antiochus was not the "little horn". Rome was "the little horn."

15. Antiochus certainly did not "wax exceeding great". He was not even the strongest of the Seleucid section of Alexander's kingdom. Antiochus was weak and was tributary to the Romans.

16. Antiochus certainly did not wax "exceeding great towards the south" Daniel 8:9. His march to the south to Egypt was stopped by the mere word of an unarmed Roman officer. When Antiochus said he would think about the Roman's demand the Roman drew a circle in the sand around Antiochus and told him he would do his thinking within that circle. Antiochus turned and retreated. He was frightened out of Egypt by an unarmed representative of Rome. He was later routed by the Jews. To apply this prophecy of a world power a super power which waxed "exceeding great towards the south" to this cruel but weak creature appears to be the height of folly and is advanced merely to avoid or explain away this divine prophecy.

17. His push to the east resulted in his death. He certainly did not wax "exceeding great" in that direction.

It is very apparent that the "little horn" of either Daniel 7 and 8 does not apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. The facts do not fit the specifications of Prophecy. Applying the prophecy to Antiochus was a poor pagan's attempt to avoid his God required responsibilities and to excuse his rejection of truth. He tried to discredit the divine predictions of the one whom Christ called "Daniel the Prophet". Daniel was not a mere historian as this truth-rejector would imply.

The finger of Daniel's prophecy points with infallible accuracy to the awful Roman apostasy that climaxed in the Papacy who cast down the truth, wears out the saints of the Most High, and continues through the "time of the end" and will continue to the "end of time".

Antiochus Epiphanes was one of the weakest of the kings of Syria. He gave himself the name "Epiphanes" = "The Illustrious". Prideaux, the historian says that this title could not be more alien to his character. The Syrian people called him "Epimanes" - "The Madman".

The prophecy points to not only a persecuting power that would "cast down some to the ground and of the stars to the ground and stamped upon them?" But he also "magnified himself even to the Prince of the host" (Christ) Daniel 8:10, 11. "He shall stand up against the Prince of princes" Christ. Daniel 8:25.

This Rome did but Antiochus died 164 years before Christ. Antiochus just does not meet the specifications of prophecy. If a power meets some of the specifications but not all of them, then it must be rejected.