

And because Porphyry saw that all these things had been fulfilled and could not deny that they had taken place, he overcame this evidence of historical accuracy by taking refuge in this evasion, contending that whatever is foretold concerning Antichrist at the end of the world was actually fulfilled in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, because of certain similarities to things which took place at his time. But this very attack testifies to Daniel's accuracy. For so striking was the reliability of what the prophet foretold, that he could not appear to unbelievers as a predictor of the future, but rather a narrator of things already past.

Some writers say that the chapter is primarily about Antiochus, but that here Antiochus is a type of Antichrist. It is doubtless true that there are many similarities between Antiochus and Antichrist, but there is no Scriptural statement that one is a type of the other. I know of no other instance where it has been suggested that an extensive prediction of a future event is not only important for itself but also as a type of something still further in the future.⁶ Such a method of interpretation can easily introduce confusion into the understanding of Scripture. It is much safer to consider each prediction as relating to one particular event, unless there is definite Scriptural authority for considering it as a type or symbol of something else. While it is not impossible that God might choose to give a conflate picture in which aspects of two events are blended together, passages where such a phenomenon might reasonably be suggested are extremely rare.

A few interpreters say that the vision itself is entirely fulfilled in the activities of Antiochus Epiphanes but that the explanation given by Gabriel is really an account of events or persons at a much later time.⁷ To the present writer such a theory seems strange indeed. He finds it hard to believe that God would first give Daniel a vision of Antiochus Epiphanes and would then send Gabriel with orders to