

# THE MYSTERY OF THE "DAILY"

John W. Peters  
*An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*

- 1.0 [Introduction](#)
- 2.0 [Historical Overview](#)
- 3.0 [Statement of the Problem](#)
- 4.0 [Translation of Daniel 8:9-14](#)
- 5.0 [Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-12](#)
- 5.1 [Pagan/Papal Rome Identification](#)
- 5.1.1 [Gender Oscillations in Dn. 8:9-12](#)
- 5.1.2 [Gender Identification in Verse 9](#)
- 5.1.3 [Gender Identification in Verse 10](#)
- 5.1.4 [Gender Identification in Verse 11](#)
- 5.1.5 [Gender Identification in Verse 12](#)
- 5.1.6 [Self-Consistent Gender Summary](#)
- 5.2 [Verse 11 and “The Daily”](#)
- 5.2.1 [The Antecedent of “From Him” \(\*mimmennu\*\)](#)
- 5.2.2 [The Daily](#)
- 5.2.2.1 [\*Rum\*: “take away” or “lift up”](#)
- 5.2.2.2 [\*Hattamid\* Linkage with \*Gadal\*](#)
- 5.2.2.3 [\*Hattamid\*: The Daily Identified](#)
- 5.2.2.4 [\*Tamid\* and Paganism in the OT](#)
- 5.2.3 [The Place of His Sanctuary](#)
- 5.2.3.1 [\*Miqdash\*](#)
- 5.2.3.2 [\*Makon\*](#)
- 5.3 [Verse 12 and “The Transgression”](#)
- 5.3.1 [The Daily, the Host and the Horn](#)

- 5.3.2 [The Transgression](#)
- 5.3.3 [Truth Cast to the Ground](#)
- 6.0 [Cultic Terminology in Daniel 8:9-14](#)
- 7.0 [Cultic Language in Leviticus and Counterfeit Parallels in Daniel 8](#)
- 7.1 [Identification of \*Hattamid\*](#)
- 7.1.1 [The Burnt Offering](#)
- 7.1.2 [The Grain Offering](#)
- 7.1.3 [\*Hattamid\* /Sweet Aroma Connection](#)
- 7.1.3.1 [\*Hattamid\* Burnt Offering](#)
- 7.1.3.2 [\*Hattamid\* Grain Offering](#)
- 7.1.3.3 [\*Hattamid\* Bread](#)
- 7.2 [Counterfeit \*Hattamid\* /Sweet Aroma](#)
- 7.3 [Counterfeit Priesthood](#)
- 8.0 [The Audition About the Sanctuary Exegesis of Daniel 8:13-14](#)
- 8.1 [Verse 13: The Daily and the Transgression](#)
- 8.1.1 [The Daily](#)
- 8.1.2 [The Transgression](#)
- 8.1.3 [Causing Desolation](#)
- 8.1.4 [\*Qodesh\*](#)
- 8.2 [2300 Evening-Morning: Cultic Significance](#)
- 8.2.1 [The Daily Burnt Offering](#)
- 8.2.2 [The Continually Burning Lamps](#)
- 8.2.3 [The Continual Cloud](#)
- 8.3 [Sanctuary Trampled 2300 Evening-Morning & Cleansed: Thesis-Antithesis](#)
- 8.3.1 [The Daily and Trampling the Sanctuary](#)
- 8.3.2 [The Integrity of the 2300 Evening-Morning](#)
- 8.3.3 [Termination of the 2300 Evening-Morning](#)
- 9.0 [External Evidence from Daniel 9:23-27](#)

- 9.1 [Verses 26-27: Translation and Explanation](#)
- 9.2 [Summary](#)
- 10.0 [External Evidence of Daniel 11:31](#)
- 11.0 [External Evidence of Daniel 12:11](#)
- 12.0 [Conclusion](#)

## **APPENDIX**

### **The Daily and the Restrainer**

#### **2 Thessalonians 2:6-7**

- 1.0 [Introduction](#)
- 1.1 [The Man of Sin](#)
- 1.2 [The Restrainer and the Daily](#)
- 2.0 [Translation of 2 Thessalonians 2:3-9](#)
- 3.0 [Exposition of 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7](#)
- 3.1 [Linguistic Evidence of Concurrent Time](#)
- 3.2 [Linguistic Evidence from \*ginomai\*](#)
- 3.3 [The Mystery of Lawlessness and “The Daily”](#)
- 4.0 [Conclusion](#)
- [Bibliography](#)

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The fundamental pillar of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the sanctuary doctrine, “a key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844” and which “opened to view a complete system of truth”.<sup>1</sup> Intimately associated with an unraveling of the time prophecy of Daniel 8:14 was an understanding of the “daily” (*hattamid*) in 8:11-13. Differing views of the “daily” have prevailed since the time of the Reformers to the present alternating initially from Christ’s High Priestly ministry to pagan Rome reverting to the current view, held by most Adventist scholars, of Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Following a brief historical overview of the interpretation of “the daily”, a statement of the exegetical problems and issues of Daniel 8:9-14 will be presented with primary emphasis on verses 9-13. Both internal exegetical evidence from 8:9-14 and external evidence from Dn. 9:23-27; 11:31 and 12:11 will be examined leading to a self-consistent understanding of “the daily” which confirms the historical roots of the foundational pillar of Seventh-day Adventism.

## [2.0 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

# THE MYSTERY OF THE "DAILY"

John W. Peters  
*An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*

## Notes:

1. E.G. White, *The Great Controversy*, Mountain View: Pacific Press, p. 423, 1950. [[Return to Text](#)]
2. "The Daily," *Midnight Cry*, Vol.5, No. 7, p. 52-53, Oct. 5, 1843. [[Return to Text](#)]
3. P.G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, p. 38, 1977. [[Return to Text](#)]
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 38 & 39. [[Return to Text](#)]
5. R.W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, Boise: Pacific Press, pp. 397-399, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
6. *Ibid.*, p. 475. [[Return to Text](#)]
7. F.B. Holbrook, Ed., *Symposium of Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 2, Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1986. (See also Volumes 1 & 3-6.) [[Return to Text](#)]
8. W.H. Shea, *Symposium on Daniel*, F. B. Holbrook, Ed., Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 2, Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Washington, DC, pp. 165-255; 256-330; 497-526, 1986. (Hereafter referred to as "DARCOM: Vol.2") [[Return to Text](#)]
9. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol 2, pp. 378-461. [[Return to Text](#)]
10. W.H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, DARCOM: Vol. 1, pp. 41-43, 1982. [[Return to Text](#)]
11. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 387-394. [[Return to Text](#)]
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 381, 399. [[Return to Text](#)]
13. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 507-512. [[Return to Text](#)]
14. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 399. [[Return to Text](#)]
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 418-419. [[Return to Text](#)]
16. *Ibid.*, p. 401. [[Return to Text](#)]
17. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 507-512. [[Return to Text](#)]
18. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 511. [[Return to Text](#)]
19. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 401. [[Return to Text](#)]
20. U. Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, p. 258, 1944. (Hereafter referred to as "Smith: D & R"). [[Return to Text](#)]

21. E. Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, Nashville: Abingdon, p.199, 1976. [[Return to Text](#)]
22. R.H. Gundry, *A Survey of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 11, 1981. [[Return to Text](#)]
23. *Ibid.*, p. 11. [[Return to Text](#)]
24. *Ibid.*, p. 35. [[Return to Text](#)]
25. E. Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, Nashville: Abingdon, p. 206, 1976. [[Return to Text](#)]
26. W.H. Shea, Personal Communication, February 2, 1993. Herein, Shea suggests that in verses 9 & 11 “two masculine verbs are preceded by dependent prepositional phrases which end with masculine objects, a pronominal suffix in one case and a noun in the other, and neither of these two verbs in the perfect (tense) is converted by *waw*. These three main features of these verbs contrast, one way and another, with the other eight verbs in this passage for the activities of the little horn. For me, this is not an interpretational feature; it is simply a matter of Daniel’s syntax.” [[Return to Text](#)]
27. G. F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 404. [[Return to Text](#)]
28. *Mimmennu* is translated as “‘from’ it” in all the Levitical cultic parallels to Dn. 8:11 (cf. Lev. 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19; 6:15). See also Section 7.0 for the cultic language parallels. [[Return to Text](#)]
29. *Ibid.*, p. 404. [[Return to Text](#)]
30. W.L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 335, 1988. [[Return to Text](#)]
31. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 204. [[Return to Text](#)]
32. *Ibid.*, p. 206. [[Return to Text](#)]
33. A.M. Rodriguez, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 532. [[Return to Text](#)]
34. G.V. Wigram, *The New Englishman’s Hebrew Concordance*, Peabody:Hendrickson Publishers, pp.1163-1164, 1984. (Hereafter referred to as "Wigram: NEHC") [[Return to Text](#)]
35. H. W. F. Gesenius, *Gesenius’s Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 582, 1979. (Hereafter referred to as "Gesenius: Lexicon.") W.L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids:Eerdmans, p. 254, 1988. (Hereafter referred to as "Holladay: CHAL.") [[Return to Text](#)]
36. Wigram: NEHC, pp. 872-874. [[Return to Text](#)]
37. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 404. [[Return to Text](#)]
38. E.G. White. *The Great Controversy*, Mountain View:Pacific Press, p. 50, 1950 (emphasis mine). [[Return to Text](#)]
39. Holladay:CHAL, p. 56. [[Return to Text](#)]
40. F. B. Holbrook, Ed., DARCOM, Volumes 1-6. [[Return to Text](#)]
41. Smith: D & R, pp. 159-161. [[Return to Text](#)]
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 165 & 271. [[Return to Text](#)]
43. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Washington DC: Review and Herald, p. 367, 1976. See also P. G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, p. 38, 1977. [[Return to Text](#)]

44. Thomas Hodgkin, *Theodoric, the Goth*, pp. 202, 203; Nugent Robinson, *A History of the World*, Vol. I, pp. 745-79, 81, 82; Richard W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, pp. 38-39. Quoted in Smith: D & R, p. 328. [[Return to Text](#)]
45. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 514. [[Return to Text](#)]
46. A.M. Rodriguez, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 533. [[Return to Text](#)]
47. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 404-409. [[Return to Text](#)]
48. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 446. [[Return to Text](#)]
49. A.M. Rodriguez, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 531. [[Return to Text](#)]
50. *Ibid.* [[Return to Text](#)]
51. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 415. [[Return to Text](#)]
52. E. G. White adapts this verse in *Patriarch & Prophets* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958), p. 34, directly quoting “A glorious high throne from the beginning” and then applies it by prophetic prerogative to the Lord's heavenly sanctuary without direct quotation of Jer. 17:12. A similar case of prophetic prerogative is the application of 1 Sam. 7:12 where Ellen White quotes, “Hitherto the Lord has helped me,” not us, as in the biblical text. See E. G. White, *In Heavenly Places*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald, p. 242, 1967; also E. G. White, Letter #1, 1904. [[Return to Text](#)]
53. Wigram: NEHC, pp. 755-756. [[Return to Text](#)]
54. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 444-445. [[Return to Text](#)]
55. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 213-215. [[Return to Text](#)]
56. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, 412-415. [[Return to Text](#)]
57. H.W.F. Gesenius, *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 471 & 502, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
58. Wigram: NEHC, pp. 756-758 & 699. [[Return to Text](#)]
59. Smith: D & R, p. 161. [[Return to Text](#)]
60. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 516. [[Return to Text](#)]
61. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 416. [[Return to Text](#)]
62. R. M. Davidson, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 2/1 (1991): 105. Also see E. J. Young, *A Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 172, 1949. [[Return to Text](#)]
63. *Ibid.* [[Return to Text](#)]
64. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 416-417. [[Return to Text](#)]
65. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM, Vol 2, pp. 415-418, 441. See also R. M. Davidson, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 2/1 (1991): 105. [[Return to Text](#)]
66. Smith: D & R, p. 271. [[Return to Text](#)]
67. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 516. [[Return to Text](#)]
68. *Ibid.*, p.198. [[Return to Text](#)]
69. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p.418. [[Return to Text](#)]
70. *Ibid.* p. 419. [[Return to Text](#)]
71. *Ibid.* [[Return to Text](#)]



72. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 196-198. [[Return to Text](#)]
73. A.M. Rodriguez, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp.527-549. [[Return to Text](#)]
74. The Hebrew root word, *qamar*, means: to offer odors, to burn (incense in honor of a deity); to give a scent, to be fragrant. *Qamar* is used for both lawful (for example, see Lev. 1:9, 17; 2:2, 16) and unlawful or idolatrous (for example, see Jer. 1:16; 7:9; 11:13; 19:14; 1 Kg: 3:3) sacrifices. See H.W.F. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 730, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
75. H.W.F. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 792, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
76. It should be noted that it was previously demonstrated from the internal exegesis of Dn. 8:9-13 that the pagan and papal phases of Rome (horn from littleness) are identified by the masculine and feminine gender of the pronoun/verbal subject respectively. In Dn. 8:11, the masculine verbal subject: "he (masculine) exalted himself (horn from littleness) even unto the Prince of the host" designates pagan Rome. [[Return to Text](#)]
77. U. Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation*, Washington DC: Review & Herald, p. 161, 1944. [[Return to Text](#)]
78. F.D. Nichol, Ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Washington, DC: Review & Herald, Vol. 1, p. 719 (1978). [[Return to Text](#)]
79. See Lev. 23:13, 18; Num. 15:3-10; 28:13, 27-28; 29:2-3, 8-9, 13-14, 36-37. [[Return to Text](#)]
80. See Num. 28:10, 15, 24, 31; 29:6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38; Num. 4:7, 16; Neh. 10:33 (2 occurrences). [[Return to Text](#)]
81. See Num. 28:31; 29:6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38. [[Return to Text](#)]
82. F.D. Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Washington, DC:Review & Herald, Vol. 1, p. 654, p. 716-717, 1978. [[Return to Text](#)]
83. See Note 74. [[Return to Text](#)]
84. For example see Jer. 7:9; 11:13, 17; 19:4-5; 32:29. [[Return to Text](#)]
85. R.H. Gundry, *A Survey of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 35, 1981. [[Return to Text](#)]
86. E. Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, Nashville: Abingdon, p. 199, 1971. [[Return to Text](#)]
87. E.E. Cairns, *Christianity Through the Centuries*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 124-125, 1981. [[Return to Text](#)]
88. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford; Oxford Press, p. 1108, 1983. [[Return to Text](#)]
89. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM, Vol. 2, p. 426. [[Return to Text](#)]
90. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 429-436. [[Return to Text](#)]
91. *Ibid.*, pp. 434-435. [[Return to Text](#)]
92. W.H. Shea, *Selected Studies of Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel & Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 1, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, p. 80, 1982. (Hereafter all citations to volumes 1-6 of the Daniel & Revelation Committee Series will be referred to as "DARCOM: Vol. #" with their respective volume numbers.) [[Return to Text](#)]



93. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 442. [[Return to Text](#)]
94. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 246; DARCOM: Vol. 6, pp. 333-334 & 341. [[Return to Text](#)]
95. S.J. Schwantes, “*Ereb Boqer* of Daniel 8:14 Re-examined,” *Symposium on Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, F. B. Holbrook, ed., Vol. 2, Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, pp.472-474, 1986. [[Return to Text](#)]
96. W.H. Shea, DARCOM, Vol. 2, pp. 196-197. [[Return to Text](#)]
97. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM, Vol. 2, pp. 430-433. [[Return to Text](#)]
98. W.H. Shea, DARCOM, Vol. 2, p.197; see also Notes 95 & 97. [[Return to Text](#)]
99. It should be emphasized that **the continual burnt offering** (*olat hattamid*), repeatedly referred to in Num. 28 & 29 and specified in Ex. 29:38-46, Lv. 6:8-13 and Num. 28:1-8, always consisted of two lambs comprising a complete unit which were offered evening and morning respectively. The evening offering could not exist with out the morning offering in order to obey and fulfill the “law of the burnt offering” (Lv. 6:9-13). This scriptural understanding precludes 1150 days/years as an interpretation of the 2300 evening-morning time prophecy. [[Return to Text](#)]
100. See, for example Ex. 29:39; Num. 28:4; 2 Kg. 16:15; 1 Chron. 16:40; 23:30; 2 Chron. 2:4; 13:11; 31:3; and Ezra 3:3. [[Return to Text](#)]
101. See footnotes 95, 96 & 97. [[Return to Text](#)]
102. S.J. Schwantes, DARCOM, Vol. 2, p. 471. [[Return to Text](#)]
103. See Ex. 27:21; 30:7-8; Lev. 6:8-13; 24:3; Num. 9:4. [[Return to Text](#)]
104. See footnote 96. [[Return to Text](#)]
105. W.H. Shea, DARCOM, Vol.2, p. 197. [[Return to Text](#)]
106. H.W.F. Gesenius, *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 510, 771, 1971. [[Return to Text](#)]
107. N.E. Andreasen, “Translation of *Nisdaq/Katharisthesetai* in Daniel 8:14,” DARCOM, Vol. 2, pp. 475-496. [[Return to Text](#)]
108. See Note 90. [[Return to Text](#)]
109. See DARCOM, Vol. 2, G.F. Hasel, pp. 3-63.; A.J. Ferch, pp. 64-74; W.H. Shea, pp. 75-118. [[Return to Text](#)]
110. See Ezra 9:1-2; 10:2, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 23). [[Return to Text](#)]
111. A.L. White, *The Ellen G. White Biography*, Vol. 6, *The Later Elmshaven Years*, Washington DC: Review & Herald pp.256-257, 1981. [[Return to Text](#)]
112. For a related discussion of the anomalies of the “thesis-antithesis” concept pertaining to Daniel 8:11 and 8:14 see: D. Hokama, “Does 1844 Have a “Pagan” Foundation?” *Adventists Currents*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 20-29, 1987. [[Return to Text](#)]
113. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 3, pp. 77-99. [[Return to Text](#)]
114. *Ibid.*, p. 94. [[Return to Text](#)]
115. *Ibid.*, p. 97. [[Return to Text](#)]
116. Holladay: CHAL, p.158. [[Return to Text](#)]
117. Wigram: NEHC, p. 600. [[Return to Text](#)]

118. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 246. [[Return to Text](#)]
119. For *zeroa`* see Daniel 11:6, 15, 22, 31; for *ma`oz* see Daniel 11: 7, 10, 19, 31, 38, 39. [[Return to Text](#)]
120. H.W.F. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 492, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
121. U. Smith, D & R, p. 270. [[Return to Text](#)]
122. *Ibid.* [[Return to Text](#)]
123. H. W. F. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 582, 1979. [[Return to Text](#)]
124. *Ibid.*, p. 272. [[Return to Text](#)]
125. D. Barrett, Ed., *World Christian Encyclopedia*, Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1982. [[Return to Text](#)]
126. G.F. Hasel, DARCOM:Vol. 2, pp. 378-461. [[Return to Text](#)]
127. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 6, pp. 338-340. [[Return to Text](#)]
128. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford: Oxford university Press, p. 307, 1974. (Hereafter referred to as Cross:ODCC) [[Return to Text](#)]
129. Quoted by U. Smith. See Smith: D & R, p. 328. [[Return to Text](#)]
130. Cross:ODCC, pp. 475-476. [[Return to Text](#)]
131. *Ibid.*, p. 1059. [[Return to Text](#)]
132. E. G. White, *Great Controversy*, Mountain View: Pacific Press, pp. 61, 74-75. [[Return to Text](#)]
133. D. Barrett, Ed., *World Christian Encyclopedia*, Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1982. [[Return to Text](#)]
134. "The Daily," *Midnight Cry*, Vol. 5, No. 7, p. 52-53, Oct.5, 1843. [[Return to Text](#)]
135. P.G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, pp. 38-39, 1977. [[Return to Text](#)]
136. Smith: D & R, pp. 159-161. [[Return to Text](#)]
137. Smith: D & R, pp. 165 & 271. [[Return to Text](#)]
138. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Washington DC: Review & Herald, p. 367, 1976. See also P.G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, p. 38, 1977. [[Return to Text](#)]
139. *Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 11, Nashville: Abingdon Press, pp. 325-330, 1955. D. Farrow, Crux, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 23-26, 1989. *New International Commentary of the New Testament*, Vol. 13, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 218-232, 1959. [[Return to Text](#)]
140. *The Complete Biblical Library*, Vol. 8, Springfield: The Complete Biblical Library, pp. 557-560, 1989. [[Return to Text](#)]
141. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, (Abridged in One Volume), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 1335, 1985. [[Return to Text](#)]
142. S.S. Smalley, *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 51, Waco: Word Book, pp. 98-99, 1982. [[Return to Text](#)]
143. F.F. Bruce, *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 45, Waco: Word Book, pp. 179-182, 1982. [[Return to Text](#)]

[to Text\]](#)

144. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Vol. 7, Washington, DC: Review & Herald, pp. 816-819, 1957. [[Return to Text\]](#)
145. *Ibid.*, p. 105. [[Return to Text\]](#)
146. *The Complete Biblical Library*, Vol. 8, Springfield: The Complete Biblical Library, pp. 557-560, 1989. [[Return to Text\]](#)
147. D. Farrow, *Crux*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 23-26, 1989. F. Martin, *Est. Ecl.*, Vol. 54, No. 211, pp. 527-537, 1979. R. D. Aus, *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, (4, '77) 537-553. [[Return to Text\]](#)
148. F.F. Bruce, *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 45, Waco: Word Book, p. 188, 1982. [[Return to Text\]](#)
149. F.F. Bruce, *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 78-96, 1984. [[Return to Text\]](#)
150. F.F. Bruce, *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 45, Waco: Word Book, p. 171 , 1982. [[Return to Text\]](#)
151. J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 737, 2235 and 3568 (1977). [[Return to Text\]](#)
152. *Ibid.*, p. 75. [[Return to Text\]](#)
153. *Ibid.*, p. 115. [[Return to Text\]](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 2.0 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The pioneer reformer of the “Great Advent Awakening,” William Miller, interpreted the time prophecies of Dn. 8:14 and Dn. 12:11 by connecting the “daily” (or the continuance) of Daniel with the restrainer in Paul’s second epistle to the Thessalonians.<sup>2</sup> Miller’s interpretation of the “daily” in Dn. 12:11-12 was based on the hermeneutical principle of analogy of scripture<sup>3</sup>, comparing Daniel with 2 Thess. 2:7. He identified the man of lawlessness as papal Rome, while the restraining power in the development of the papacy was interpreted as paganism. Through analogous reasoning Miller concluded that the “daily” also signified paganism which gave way to papal Rome. The daily was interpreted as the “daily abomination” or the first abomination and was represented as paganism in general, or Rome more specifically. The “abomination that makes desolate” was identified as papal Rome. Thus in Dn. 12:11, the Roman empire would be taken away and papal Rome would be set up.<sup>4</sup>

Following the great disappointment, the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism including Joseph Bates, James White, J. N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, J. N. Loughborough and S. N. Haskell among others embraced Miller’s identification of the “daily” as pagan Rome whose sanctuary (the city of Rome) was inherited by the papacy. This connected view of the “daily” in Dn. 8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11 with 2 Thess. 2:7 was theologically part of Adventist heritage up until 1900.

Then L. R. Conradi in Germany reinterpreted the “daily” as referring to the true sanctuary service and Christ’s High Priestly ministry in heaven. Conradi believed the papacy took away Christ’s priestly ministry by substituting the mass and a system of human priesthood in which the pope had assumed the position of Jesus. This so-called “new view” of the daily was not new at all, but was taught and held in principle by many of the leading Protestant reformers.<sup>5</sup> In reality what many considered new light was the view embraced by William Miller and the pioneers which leads to the fundamental and foundational pillar of Seventh-day Adventism, the sanctuary doctrine. However, by 1919 many prominent church leaders, including A.G. Daniells and W.W. Prescott, accepted Conradi’s view of the “daily”.

Conradi and some others who endorsed his view of the “daily” later apostatized by gradually adopting divergent views concerning the heavenly sanctuary, rejecting the inspiration of E. G. White having opposed the message of Christ’s righteousness by faith at the 1888 General Conference. This opposition extended to Ellen White’s unequivocal endorsement of the message. Conradi later adopted the evangelical concept that Luther had heralded the three angels’ messages.<sup>6</sup>

Implications of Conradi’s New View. Desmond Ford was Adventism’s most notable scholar to have followed Conradi’s view of the “daily” resulting in his ultimate rejection of the sanctuary doctrine as the central pillar of the SDA church. Ford’s scholarly arguments swept away numerous Adventist ministers and bright lights. Largely in an effort to stem the tide of this rejection and to justify Conradi’s new view of the daily as Christ’s High Priestly ministry, a theological counter-attack was

initiated. Some of Adventism's foremost theologians and scholars under the auspices of the Biblical Research Institute published monumental works supporting the historical view of the sanctuary.<sup>7</sup> These efforts have resulted in significant and beneficial achievements; however, the exhaustive exegesis of Dn. 8:9-14 has left unresolved certain linguistic and contextual difficulties regarding the new view of the "daily" in Daniel.

### **3.0 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

#### **Index of This Study**

## 3.0 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Linguistically some of the most apparently difficult passages in scripture occur in Dn. 8:9-14. The text abounds with linguistic and contextual nuances. For example: 1) The gender of the verbal subjects and pronouns referring to the “horn from littleness” in verse 9 oscillates from masculine to feminine in verses 9-12; 2) Does the “daily” refer to an earthly power or an activity? 3) What is the self-consistent relationship of the “daily” in Dn. 8:11, 13; 11:31 and 12:11? 4) What is the significance of Daniel’s use of the Hebrew verbal root *rûm* for the action imposed on the “daily” in 8:11 in contrast with the Hebrew root *sûr* in 11:31 and 12:11? 5) What is the significance of Daniel’s use of two different Hebrew words, *miqdash* in 8:11 & 11:31 and *qodesh* in 8:13 & 14, translated as sanctuary? 6) Does the use of *makon* for “place” in 8:11 instead of *maqom* have textual significance? 7) Is there a self-consistent application of the Hebrew participle *shomem* (desolating) in 8:13; 9:26-27; 11:31 and 12:11? 8) What is the significance of the Hebrew cultic language used in Dn. 8:9-14? An examination of these questions among other issues will help to shed light on the interpretation of the “daily” (*hattamid*) in Daniel.

### [4.0 TRANSLATION OF DANIEL 8:9-14](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

## **4.0 TRANSLATION OF DANIEL 8:9-14**

Vs. 9 And out of one of them he (masculine) came, a horn from littleness, which became very great toward the south and toward the east, and toward the glory.

Vs. 10 And it (feminine) became great even to the host of the heavens. And it (fem.) made fall to the ground (some) from the host and (some) from the stars and trampled them.

Vs. 11 Even unto the Prince of the host he (masculine) exalted himself. And from him (mas.) was lifted up the daily (continuance) and the place of his (mas.) sanctuary was cast down.

Vs. 12 It (feminine) was given even a host against the daily by means of transgression. And it (fem.) cast down truth to the ground and it (fem.) worked and it (fem.) prospered.

Vs. 13 Then I heard a certain holy one speaking and another holy one said to that one who spoke, “Until when the vision, the daily and the transgression which desolates making both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled”.

Vs. 14 And he said unto me, “Until 2300 evening-morning, then the sanctuary shall be put right (cleansed)”.

## **5.0 EXEGESIS OF DANIEL 8:9-14**

[Index of This Study](#)



## **5.0 EXEGESIS OF DANIEL 8:9-12**

The vision (*chazon*) described in Daniel 8 of the ram and the goat with a broken horn “in place of which four notable ones came up toward the four winds of heaven” forms the contextual framework, discussed in depth by

Shea<sup>8</sup> and Hasel,<sup>9</sup> of Dn. 8:9-14. The origin of the “horn from littleness” which comes out of the four winds of heaven has been clarified previously.<sup>10,11</sup> There is general agreement among Adventist scholars that the horn from littleness in verse 9 which “became very great” and “cast down some of the host” in verse 10 represents Rome in its two phases, both pagan and papal Rome.

### **5.1 PAGAN/PAPAL ROME IDENTIFICATION**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

# 5.1 PAGAN/PAPAL ROME IDENTIFICATION

Although there is agreement that both pagan and papal Rome are represented in 8:9-12, there is significant disagreement between Hasel and Shea in distinguishing papal and pagan activity in the individual verses. For example, Hasel<sup>12</sup> argues that a “horizontal activity” of pagan Rome is represented by verses 9 & 10 whereas the vertical activity of papal Rome is revealed in verses 11 & 12. Shea,<sup>13</sup> on the other hand, argues for a horizontal movement of pagan imperial Rome in verse 9 but a vertical movement of papal Rome against the host of heaven in verse 10. Shea suggests that an attack of a religious character is portrayed in vs. 10 similar to that in Dn. 7: 21-22, 25, 27 by papal Rome against the saints of the Most High.

## [5.1.1 Gender Oscillations in Dn. 8:9-12](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.1.1 Gender Oscillations in Dn. 8:9-12.

It is readily apparent from the Hebrew Masoretic text that the gender of the verbal subjects and pronouns alternate from feminine to masculine to feminine in verses 10-12 respectively. Hasel argues that the gender change from feminine in 10 to masculine in verse 11 denotes a change in activity from pagan to papal Rome; he suggests further that verses 9 and 10 are of a pagan nature and verses 11 and 12 of a papal nature.<sup>14</sup> His reasoning by gender identification fails to explain the reversion to the feminine gender in verse 12 (“it cast truth to the ground”) which is a definitive reference to papal Rome which should be, by his reasoning, in the masculine gender. Hasel dismisses this anomaly simply by suggesting the feminine (it) refers to another aspect of the horn’s (feminine) activity alluded to in verse 9.<sup>15</sup>

We agree with Hasel in principle that the gender alternation in Dn. 8:9-12 has significant implications regarding the identification of the specific phase of the horn’s activity. But a more comprehensive and self-consistent approach to gender oscillations is adopted in this exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14.

### [5.1.2 Gender Identification in Verse 9](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.1.2 Gender Identification in Verse 9.

The primary verb in verse 9 is yatza (to come out) in a Qal perfect, masculine form. However, the nearest subject noun, “a horn of littleness” is feminine which grammatically precludes a subject-verbal linkage. Hasel attempts to explain the anomaly based on Hebrew syntax of a verb preceding an animal subject requiring a masculine form.<sup>16</sup> Although this may be a viable solution based on Hebrew syntax, it is suggested that a more substantive and realistic solution revolves around Daniel’s intentional use of Hebrew syntax to create a distinction by gender between the 2 phases of the horn from littleness and their independent and unique activities delineated in verses 9-12. In verse 9 the evident solution to the gender anomaly is that Daniel intended the masculine verbal subject (he came out) to be accompanied by an explanatory appositional phrase, “a horn from littleness”. Thus verse 9 reads; “out of one of them he came, a horn from littleness, which became great toward the south...”). The net effect is that the horizontal activity of the horn described by Shea earlier<sup>17</sup> in verse 9 is correlated with the masculine gender which in turn corresponds to pagan Rome’s expansion of power. Daniel’s intentional use of Hebrew syntax to distinguish between the two phases of the horn by means of gender distinction will become evident as the discussion on gender in verses 10-11 proceeds.

### 5.1.3 Gender Identification in Verse 10

#### Index of This Study

## **5.1.3 Gender Identification in Verse 10.**

5.1.3 Gender Identification in Verse 10. In verse 10, the subjects are all verbal in nature and each one is feminine in form. Although it can be argued that feminine verbal subjects refer to the horn from littleness (inherently feminine), this logic would also require the verbal forms of verse 11 to be feminine (it exalts itself); but the verbal form is masculine (he exalts himself). Hence it is suggested that Daniel intended a gender change from masculine in verse 9 to feminine in verse 10 to indicate a distinct phase change in activity of the horn. The papal aspect of the activity in verse 10 is readily apparent. According to Shea the focus of the activity in verse 10 has a vertical dimension clearly exhibiting a religious character with the horn attacking the host and stars of heaven, symbolically the people of God.<sup>18</sup> This religious persecution is described in Dn. 7:21 & 25 which is explicitly related to the papal phase of Rome according to all historicist expositors.

### **[5.1.4 Gender Identification in Verse 11](#)**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

## 5.1.4 Gender Identification in Verse 11.

The dramatic shift in gender to masculine in verse 11 (he exalted himself) reflects a change in phases of the two entities which the metaphor symbol of the horn represents as suggested by Hasel.<sup>19</sup>

Whereas Hasel argues that the masculine gender in verse 11 indicates a shift to papal Rome from pagan Rome in verse 10, it is suggested the change to masculine in v. 11 represents a renewed emphasis on the pagan phase of Rome contrasted with papal phase in verse 10.

The one who magnified himself even to the Prince of the host is identified in Acts 4:26-28 by the apostle Peter: “The kings of the earth---gathered against the Lord and His Christ. For truly Your holy Servant Jesus whom You anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatever Your hand and Your purpose determined to be done”.

Acts 4:26-28 is an allusion to Ps. 2:1 in which the “kings of the earth have set themselves and the rulers have met together against Jehovah and His Anointed”. Further evidence that the one exalting himself in Dn. 8:11 is pagan Rome is found in 8:25 where “he (a king) stands up against the Prince of princes” which bears a striking resemblance to Ps. 2:1. Contrary to most Adventist expositors, it is suggested that the kingly power of 8:23-25 is an explicit description of pagan Rome throughout, although papal Rome may be implicit. Three reasons for this proposition are set forth: 1) All the verbal subjects and adjectival pronouns are masculine corresponding with the masculine designations of verse 9 and 11 which it was suggested referred to pagan Rome; 2) The strong linguistic similarity of Dn. 8:25d (“also against the Prince of princes he shall stand”) with Ps. 2:1 and also the internal relationship of Dn. 8:11 with 8:25d, and finally 3) the one (a king) who “shall be broken without hand” in 8:25e is linguistically similar to the Aramaic of Dn. 2:45 (“a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands and broke in pieces the iron...”). The reference in 2:45 refers to pagan, political powers and the linguistic similarity to the Hebrew of 8:25 lends credibility to the suggestion of pagan, kingly power throughout 8:23-25. For example, “he shall destroy the holy people” in 8:25 alludes to Rome’s action of destroying the city and the sanctuary in Dn. 9:26 and 11:22. The deceitful tactics of this kingly power are alluded to in 8:25 and its pagan, deceitful characteristics are revealed in 11:23, a clear reference to pagan Rome.<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, the historical record substantiates pagan Rome’s consistent self exaltation to the Prince of the host. Emperor Octavian’s (31 BC-AD 14) adoptive father Caesar, at the Senate’s decree, was elevated to a place among the deities. “Thereafter Octavian called himself son of the Caesar, imperator Caesar divi filius.” Octavius added to his name the one of “Augustus” emphasizing the unique dignity of his position. Until that time this designation (meaning “the exalting one”; cf. Dn. 8:11, “he exalted himself”) had been employed only as a surname of deities conveying the impression that his position of power was of incomparable loftiness.<sup>21</sup> Herod the Great, a native vassal ruler of Palestine under the Romans, exalted to the Prince of the host by slaughtering the infants in Bethlehem seeking to destroy the Christ (Mt. 2:3-16).<sup>22</sup>

Emperor Caligula (AD 27-41) exhibited exaggerated striving for godlike exaltation and demanded worship of himself and ordered his statue placed in the temple at Jerusalem which was thwarted by his death in AD 41.<sup>23</sup> Emperor Nero (AD 54-68), along with Caligula and Domitian, claimed deity for himself while still alive and each one failed to receive the honor at death which was normally the customary practice of the emperor cult started by the Roman Senate of deifying their deceased emperors who had served well.<sup>24</sup> Emperor Domitian (AD 81-96) emphasized his unlimited power as ruler and sought to exhibit the sanctity of his person publicly and liked to be greeted by the cry: “Hail to the lord and his consort!”<sup>25</sup> The biblical and historical records are clear and confirm that the one exalting himself to the Prince of the host is characterized by pagan Rome, the precursor to papal Rome who inherited the same characteristics.

### **5.1.5 Gender Identification in Verse 12**

#### **Index of This Study**



## **5.1.5 Gender Identification in Verse 12.**

Further evidence that pagan Rome is represented by the masculine gender in verse 11 is the very fact that the gender reverts back to feminine verbal forms representing papal Rome in verse 12. Verse 12 in its entirety is an unmistakable allusion to the action of papal Rome opposing the “daily” in which it cast truth to the ground, it worked, and it prospered (all feminine verbal subjects in Hebrew). Exegesis of verse 12 will be developed in a later section.

### **[5.1.6 Self-Consistent Gender Summary](#)**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

## 5.1.6 Self-Consistent Gender Summary.

Further evidence that pagan Rome is represented by the masculine gender in verse 11 is the very fact that the gender reverts back to feminine verbal forms representing papal Rome in verse 12. Verse 12 in its entirety is an unmistakable allusion to the action of papal Rome opposing the “daily” in which it cast truth to the ground, it worked, and it prospered (all feminine verbal subjects in Hebrew). Exegesis of verse 12 will be developed in a later section.

Shea has suggested that the gender oscillations in verses 9-12 are due to Hebrew syntax which is unique to Daniel.<sup>26</sup> Since this effect of syntax (see preceding footnote) on determining the gender of verbs finds no precedent in other portions of the book of Daniel or the OT, it seems more reasonable to conclude that Daniel’s intentional use of unique syntax in chapter 8 is to create a distinction by gender between the two phases of the horn delineated in verses 9-12.

The net effect of the gender oscillations from masculine to feminine to masculine and to feminine in verses 9-12 reveals a thematic parallelism of gender with the pattern A:B::A’:B’. Daniel emphasizes the two-phase aspect of Rome by two distinct parallel and repetitive cycles (masculine:feminine) in verses 9 & 10 and again in 11 & 12. The thematic parallelism of gender in verses 9-12 with the A:B::A’:B’ pattern is summarized below in the following chart. Confirmation of the significance of the pagan/papal identification by gender distinction will be established from evidence derived from the counterfeit cultic language and symbols of Daniel 8 which will be presented in Sections 6.0 & 7.0.

### THEMATIC PARALLELISM OF GENDER

A:B::A’:B’

Verse Gender Verb/Pronoun Horn’s Phase

A 9 (MASCULINE) HE CAME (*yatza*) PAGAN

B 10 (FEMININE) IT BECAME GREAT (*tigdal*) PAPAL

A’ 11 MASCULINE

a) HE EXALTED (*gadal*) PAGAN

b) FROM HIM (*mimmennu*)

B’ 12 FEMININE

a) IT CAST DOWN (*shalak*) PAPAL

b) IT WORKED (*'asah*)

c) IT PROSPERED (*tzalehach*)

## **5.2 Verse 11 and the Daily**

### **Index of This Study**

## 5.2 VERSE 11 AND THE DAILY

A foundation has been laid for the identification of Rome in its two phases in Dn. 8:9-12 by demonstrating the earthly expansion of pagan Rome in verse 9 and the religious attack of papal Rome in verse 10 on the hosts of heaven. Attention will now be focused on 8:11. The literal translation of the first clause in verse 11a reads, “even unto the Prince of the host he exalted himself”. Evidence was previously presented by context and gender identification that the one exalting himself was pagan Rome. However, the pivotal issue concerning the interpretation of the “daily” is a determination of “from whom” the “daily” is removed or lifted up in the second clause (verse 11b) which literally reads, “and from him the daily was lifted up”. Thus, the pivotal issue of the exegesis revolves around the identification of the antecedent of “from him”.

### [5.2.1 The Antecedent of “From Him” \(\*mimmennu\*\).](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.1 The Antecedent of “From Him” (*mimmennu*).

Two choices are possible for the antecedent: 1) the Prince of the host or 2) the one exalting himself. Upon this choice, the “daily” will be associated either with the Prince of the host or the pagan phase of the horn from littleness. Hasel dedicates three short sentences in his 84 page exegesis to this problem. He relies on “grammatical nearness” supported by the Greek Septuagint, the Theodotian and the Latin Vulgate for his decision that the antecedent of “from him” is the Prince of the host.<sup>[27](#)</sup> However, relying solely on the Hebrew Masoretic text, rather than a secondary Greek translation, and strictly using the basis of “grammatical nearness”, the first clause in verse 11a concludes with “he exalted himself” (*higdil*) and the second clause in verse 11b begins with “from him” (*mimmennu*). The translation of *mimmennu* as “from him” in contrast to “by him” is confirmed by the cultic language parallels (see Section 7.0) in Leviticus where both *rum* and *mimmennu* are used in conjunction with one another.<sup>[28](#)</sup> It is immediately evident on the basis of grammatical nearness that the antecedent of “from him” is the one exalting himself or pagan Rome. As Hasel points out in a footnote,<sup>[29](#)</sup> syntactically the first two clauses in verse 11 are inverted verbal clauses, meaning the object precedes the verb which contains the subject, contrary to normal word order. It is suggested that Daniel inverted the normal Hebrew syntax of these two clauses for the specific purpose of making an unmistakable connection of the antecedent (he exalted himself) associated with the phrase, “from him”, by placing them adjacent to one another (“...he exalted himself, and from him...”). An internal reflection of the type A:B::B’:C results from this inverted syntax with the end of verse 11a reflecting the identification of the first word (prepositional phrase: “from him”) in verse 11b.

[This is illustrated in the following chart.](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

# INTERNAL REFLECTION OF DANIEL 8:11 A:B::B':C

A = EVEN UNTO THE PRINCE OF THE HOST VERSE 11a

B = HE EXALTED HIMSELF VERSE 11a

B' = AND FROM HIM VERSE 11b

C = THE DAILY WAS LIFTED UP VERSE 11b

This internal reflection of the Hebrew syntax supports the contention that the “daily” is lifted up “from” the one exalting himself and not “from” the Prince of the host. This is in addition to the fact that the thrust of emphasis of 8:9-13 is on the horn from littleness and not on the Prince of the host. Additional lines of evidence are presented which lead to the conclusion that the “daily” is intimately associated with the horn from littleness and not the Prince of the host. The evidence will focus on the syntactical and contextual interpretation of the “daily”. Furthermore, conclusive evidence that the antecedent of *mimmennu* represents the horn from littleness is derived from the cultic language parallels of Daniel 8 with Leviticus which will be examined in depth in the later Section on Cultic Language.

## [5.2.2 The Daily.](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.2 The Daily.

In this section the distinction between *rum* (lift up) used in Daniel 8:11 and *sur* (turn aside, remove or take away) used 11:31 and 12:11 in connection with “the daily” will be examined. A preliminary identification of “the daily” will be suggested and the linkage of tamid with paganism in the OT will be examined.

### [5.2.2.1 RUM: take away or lift up.](#)

[Index of This Study](#)



## 5.2.2.1 RUM: take away or lift up.

The Hebrew verbal form *huraym* (hophal form) derives from the Hebrew root *rum* meaning exalt, raise up, offer, lift up, pick up, take up, serve, elevate, extol. Examination of Holladay's Hebrew lexicon reveals that all forms of the verb have this general "uplifting" sense of meaning.<sup>30</sup> In every instance where the Hebrew root *rum* is used in Daniel it is translated by its customary meaning of lift up or exalt. This applies to the Aramaic sections of Daniel (5:19, 20, 23) and the Hebrew sections of Daniel (11:12, 36; 12:7). Compared with these occurrences, Shea acknowledges that the use he proposes for *rum* in 8:11 ("take away") appears to be exceptional.<sup>31</sup> Shea then proceeds to argue that the "extended" meaning in Dn. 8:11 is based on the use of *rum* in the first seven chapters of Leviticus describing the sacrificial services (Lev. 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19; 6:10, 15). He then suggests that out of the approximately 200 occurrences of *rum* in the Hebrew text, where the meaning is lift up, that the 6 occurrences in Lev. 1-7 should be translated in a uniquely equivalent manner with the Hebrew root *sur* which has the primary root meaning of "to turn aside" or "to go away;" other meanings include "to take away", "remove" or "depart" in its approximately 300 uses in the Masoretic text including those in the first seven chapters of Leviticus (1:16; 3:4, 9, 10, 15; 4:9, 31, 35; 7:4). Shea states that *rum* and *sur* are not synonyms, but claims that there is unique overlap between them in the special sacrificial altar applications of Lev. 1-7 approved of God.<sup>32</sup> In summary, Shea argues for the specialized use of an extended meaning of *rum* in Dn. 8:11 based on its "unique" use in 6 occurrences in Lev. 1-7.

### [The cognitive quality of \*rum\*](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# The cognitive quality of *rum*

It will be demonstrated that the distinct cognitive quality of *rum* (to lift up) and *sur* (turn aside, take away, remove) are maintained in both Lev. 1-7 and Dn. 8:11; 11:31 & 12:11. The distinctive root meanings of *rum* and *sur* are contrasted in Lev. 4:8, 9 & 10 where *rum*, *sur* and *rum* are used respectively. If the meaning of *rum* and *sur* were synonyms in these consecutive verses, it would make no sense to use two different verbs. Clearly the author intended a distinct and different activity in verses 8 & 10 where *rum* is used compared to verse 9 where *sur* is used. In verses 8 & 10 the priest offers up the fat or lifts up the fat from the sin offering to burn it on the altar of burnt offering. In verse 9, the priest specifically removes or turns aside the fold on the liver beside the kidneys. The literal translation is rendered: “And he shall lift up from it all the fat of the bullock of the sin offering, the fat which (is/was) covering over the inward parts (verse 8), and the two kidneys and the fat which (is/was) on them, which (is/was) beside the flanks and he shall remove (turn aside) the fold on the liver beside the kidneys (verse 9). As it is lifted up from the sacrifice of the peace offerings of the bullock, the priest also shall burn them as incense on the altar of burnt offering” (verse 10).

Careful examination of every use of *rum* and *sur* in Lev. 1-7 reveals two distinct and consecutive actions. First, the fat is removed (turned aside) or separated (*sur*) from the inward parts and second, the separated fat is lifted up by the priest from the sacrificial offering and burned on the altar. It is especially noteworthy that in the case of food (cereal) offerings, there is no fat to remove (turn aside) or separate (*sur*) and without exception the root verb *rum* is used where the priest lifts up from the food offering, its memorial offering, and burns it as incense on the altar (see Lev. 2:9; 6:15). The activity involves offering up or lifting up the cereal to burn as incense as opposed to removing the food offering. It is also noteworthy that Lev. 6:15-20 is the only passage in the OT where *rum* and *tamid* are closely linked. This linkage does not exist for *sur*. The flour lifted up (*rum*) in Lev. 6:15 was to be a “continual” food offering in verse 20. This is parallel to the linkage of these two words in Dn. 8:11.

The sequential activity of first removing the fat from the inward parts of the sin offering and then lifting up the fat as a burnt offering in Lev. 4 is confirmed by an examination of *sur* in Lev. 3 in connection with the peace offering of the bullock. A reading of Lev. 3:1-5 reveals that the priest brings near to Jehovah the fat only after it is removed (turned aside) or separated (*sur*) from the inward parts including the fatty fold by the liver. It is then burned as incense on the altar (v. 5). The same sequence is described more explicitly in verses 9-11. This reading alone would suggest that the *rum* activity of lifting up the fat following its separation or removal was not involved. However, Lev. 4:10 explicitly states that just as the fat was lifted up (*rum*) from the sacrifice of the peace offering of the bullock, described in Lev. 3:1-11, so also the fat of the sin offering of Lev. 4:1-12 is to be lifted up from the sin offering and burned as incense after its prior removal (*sur*) as described in Lev. 3. Hence it becomes clear that there is a two-fold sequential activity involved with both the sin and peace offerings of sacrificial animals. First, the fat is turned aside or separated (*sur*) from the inward parts and second the separated fat is lifted up (*rum*) from the animal as an incense offering on the

altar of burnt offering. This two-fold sequential activity is in contrast to the singular *rum* activity associated with the cereal offering. The exclusive cognitive quality of *rum* (lift up or offer up) is again set forth with the food offerings in Num. 15:19-20 in which the children of Israel are to lift up (*rum*) a cake of the first of their dough as a heave offering. The use of *sur* is superfluous since nothing needs to be separated which was previously intimately united such as fat to the inward parts.

The distinctive root meaning of *rum* is also clearly evident in Lev. 6:10-11 in which the priest “lifts up” the ashes from the altar and places them beside the altar. The priest does not remove (*sur*) the ashes from the altar since they are first lifted up from and then placed beside the altar. Then, only after changing his garments, the priest brings (the removal activity) the ashes outside the camp.

In every case where *rum* is employed in the cultic service of Leviticus and Numbers, the accurate, literal rendering is “lift up” or “offer up” in harmony with the root meaning of *rum*. Rodriguez correctly points out that *rum* is often used in cultic settings in the sense of “to donate” or “to give a gift” (Num. 15:19-21) but simply acquiesces to Jacob Milgram’s assertion that *rum* should be rendered “to remove, set aside” in Lev. 2:9 & 4:8. However, the context of the passages and the evidence presented reveals that the priest does not set aside but lifts up a food offering and burns it as incense (Lev. 2:9) and lifts up the fat following its separation from the inward parts as offering of incense in Lev. 4:8-10.[33](#)

It is suggested that the evidence convincingly demonstrates that the distinct cognitive qualities for root meanings of both *rum* and *sur* are maintained throughout Leviticus and Daniel as well as the entire OT. The evidence will not substantiate a claim of a specialized use of an “extended” meaning for *rum* for the cultic functions of Leviticus.

The only two instances among the hundreds of normal renderings where *rum* is translated as “take away” are found in Dn. 8:11 and Eze. 45:9 in the KJV. The New Englishman’s Hebrew Concordance confirms these observations.[34](#) The phrase in Eze. 45:9 translated as “take away your exactions from my people” is more accurately rendered “take up or lift up your exactions (oppression) from my people”. The “daily” is, in fact, “turned aside or taken away” in Dn. 11:31 and Dn. 12:11; but the Hebrew verb *sur* is used in these instances. Lexical evidence confirms that the basic sense of meaning for *sur* is “to turn aside” or “to depart” with occasional extended meanings in the hiphil and hophal of “taken away” or “be removed”.[35](#) The Hebrew concordance again confirms that the hundreds of uses of *sur* in the various verbal forms always have this sense of meaning.[36](#) The translators of the Hebrew text, apparently in an effort to maintain consistency of “activity of the daily” in Dn. 8:11 with 11:31 & 12:11, translated *rum* of Dn. 8:11 in this particular instance as “take away” (rather than the correct rendering of “lift up” or “raise up”) to correspond with *sur* of Dn. 11:31 & 12:11.

Hasel does not give any linguistic evidence for his acceptance of the rendering “take away” for *rum* in Dn. 8:11. He devotes only 4 lines out of 84 pages to this key issue.[37](#) With the correct translation of *rum*, Hasel’s rendering of the second phrase of verse 11 would be: “from Him (Christ) the daily (Priestly ministry) was lifted up or raised up and the place of His sanctuary was cast down”. This

rendering is self-contradictory and retains no self-consistency with the text, if the antecedent of “him” is the Prince of the host. The accurate rendering of the second phrase of verse 11 in view of the evidence presented thus far, is: “and from him (Rome: masculine, pagan phase) the daily was lifted up.” When “the daily” represents the self-exalting behavior of pagan Rome, as it will be demonstrated, the text is self-consistent and becomes significant. In this case the little horn lifts up this self-exalting character. Ellen White supports this meaning: “paganism” and “her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were *incorporated* into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ” which “resulted in the development of ‘the man of sin.’”[38](#)

#### [5.2.2.2 Hattamid Linkage with Gadal.](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.2.2 Hattamid Linkage with Gadal

The vision (*chazon*) sets forth four major actors: 1) the ram, 2) the goat, 3) the horn from littleness (masculine phase) and 4) the horn from littleness (feminine phase), each with a similar dominant characteristic. Examination of the vision reveals that Daniel consistently introduces and characterizes each of the four major powers with the Hebrew word *gadal* with the root meaning of “to become great” or “make oneself great”.<sup>39</sup> The ram became great in verse 4, the goat “grew very great” in verse 8 and “he came, a horn from littleness, which grew exceedingly great” in verse 9 and the horn from littleness (feminine phase) “became great” in verse 10. Finally in verse 11 the masculine phase of the horn (pagan Rome) “exalts” (becomes great) even to the Prince of host. Furthermore, this characteristic activity (*gadal*) is transferred or “lifted up” (*rum*) from him (pagan Rome) by papal Rome. The chart below summarizes the exalting characteristic of the 4 world powers in Dn 8 which culminates in the final step (v. 11) in which papal Rome lifts up the “daily”, which is characterized by “*gadal*”, from pagan Rome.

<i>Hattamid Characterized By Gadal</i>		
Verse	Exalting Verb	World Power
4	<i>Gadal</i>	Ram
8	<i>Gadal</i>	Goat
9	<i>Gadal</i>	Horn (Masc)
10	<i>Gadal</i>	Horn (Fem)
11	<i>Gadal</i>	Horn (Masc)

Paganism consistently magnifies itself against the Lord in the OT: In Jer. 48:26, 42 Moab magnifies itself (*higdil*; root is *gadal*) itself against the Lord; in Ps. 35:26; 38:16 & 55:12, all with Messianic implications, the rebellious magnify themselves (*gadal*) the Lord. Finally in Dn. 11:36-37, paganism (King of the South) “magnifies (*gadal*) himself above every god...nor regards any god for he shall magnify (*gadal*) himself above all.

The perpetual, continual activity or characteristic of paganism throughout history has been self-exaltation. This characteristic was personified by the four pagan world powers: Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece and Rome. Daniel purposely emphasizes this “continual” characteristic with the word “*gadal*” which is the essence of pagan worship or Baal self-worship. Daniel associates *gadal* with the cultic term “hattamid” meaning “the continual” which is a substantive rather than the usual adjective. Thus, verse 11 may be rendered: “...he exalted himself and from him the continual was lifted up...”.

It is suggested that the evidence strongly supports the view that the *hattamid* or “the continual” is represented and characterized by the Hebrew word, *gadal*, in the context of Daniel 8 meaning “to exalt oneself” in the hiphil form (*higdil*). This characteristic has manifested itself by the forms and practices of pagan worship or Baal worship which were first exhibited by Cain with the grain offering thereby avoiding the cross of Christ. The phenomena of self-exaltation whose author is Satan (Is. 14 & Eze. 28) has exhibited itself not only in every pagan culture but infiltrated Israel itself (Jer. 23:13; Hos. 2:16-17) as well as apostate Christianity personified by Rome.

### **5.2.2.3 Hattamid: The Daily Identified**

#### **Index of This Study**

### 5.2.2.3 *Hattamid*: The Daily Identified

Recent Adventist scholarship has concluded that “daily” is associated with the high priestly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>40</sup> The pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism until 1900 identified *hattamid* interchangeably as paganism or pagan Rome which evoked virtually no controversy. For example, U. Smith identifies “the daily” in Daniel 8:11 as pagan Rome,<sup>41</sup> but in Daniel 8:13 and 11:31 he identifies “the daily” as paganism.<sup>42</sup> Similarly, William Miller linked “the daily” of Daniel 8:11 with “the restrainer” in 2 Thessalonians 2:7-8 identifying both as paganism which was interchangeable with pagan Rome.<sup>43</sup>

However, a clear distinction must be maintained between the term “pagan Rome” and “paganism.” Pagan Rome is a national power or the exceedingly dreadful beast with teeth of iron (Dn. 7:7, 19). On the other hand, paganism is an “activity” or false religious system in rebellion against God manifested by character attributes of self-exaltation against God. Succinctly stated, “the daily” is a rebellious activity manifesting self-exalting character attributes.

If pagan Rome is represented by the masculine pronoun in the prepositional phrase, “from him (*mimmennu*) the daily was lifted up,” in verse 11, then “the daily” cannot represent the entity or power of pagan Rome. It is a non sequitur to suggest that pagan Rome is lifted up from pagan Rome. It is suggested that “the daily” must be carefully defined as a principle, namely the self exalting character of paganism, inherent in mankind, of which Arianism became integrated. The “abomination (transgression) which desolates” in Daniel 8, 11 and 12, which supersedes and replaces “the daily,” may be defined as the self exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head. The essence of “the daily” is “the mystery of iniquity” which seeks to become like God (Is. 14:12-14; 2 Thess. 2:3-7). The point of commonality between “the daily” and the “abomination which desolates” is the “mystery of iniquity.” This character attribute was lifted up by the papal Rome from pagan Rome with the result that the false religious systems (paganism) were replaced or superseded (taken away or turned aside) by nominal Christianity, a new false religious system professing Christ, uncreated, in contrast to Arianism’s created christ. This process commenced in AD 508 when Arian powers under Theodoric made peace with Clovis and the resistance of the Arian powers began to come to an end.<sup>44</sup>

The conclusion stated above that “the daily” is represented by the principle of self exaltation manifested in the character of paganism and inherent in mankind, and the conclusion concerning “the abomination which desolates” will be confirmed as the explication of Daniel 8



proceeds.

#### **5.2.2.4 *Tamid* and Paganism in the Old Testament**

#### **Index of This Study**

## 5.2.2.4 Tamid and Paganism in the Old Testament

The expression, *tamid*, occurs 103 times in the OT and is used regularly and without exception either as an adverb or adjective meaning “continually” or “continual” respectively. Only in Dn. 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31 and 12:11 does the word *tamid* occur as an isolated substantive without adjectival designation, *hattamid*, meaning “the continuance”. Of the 103 occurrences in the OT *tamid* is used 30 times in connection with several different types of activity of the priests in the sanctuary (Ex. 25:30; 27:20; 29:38; 30:8; etc.). Shea<sup>45</sup> as well as Rodriguez<sup>46</sup> and Hasel<sup>47</sup> all agree that *hattamid* in Daniel refers to the Hebrew cultus of the sanctuary service. This exegesis will confirm that “the daily” is a Hebrew cultic term in a later section, but only in a counterfeit cultic sense in the book of Daniel. Consequently, *hattamid* should be understood in its broadest possible sense including its use in a pagan context.

The connection of *hattamid* with “*gadal*” (to become great) and *rum* (lift up) in Dn. 8:11 has its closest parallel in Ps. 74:23, “Do not forget the voice of Your enemies; the tumult of those who rise up against You increases continually (*tamid*)”. The Hebrew word for rise up is *alah* which has the root meaning of “lifted up”, “elevated”, “exalted” or “offer” which is nearly identical to the root meaning of *rum* and similar to *gadal* in Dn. 8:11. The continual (*tamid*) activity of the Lord’s foes (paganism) is to rise up or exalt themselves against Him in Ps. 74:23. The parallel to Dn. 8:11 is extremely close.

Other uses of *tamid* in a pagan context include Is. 52:4-5 wherein the past oppression of Israel by Egypt and Assyria and Israel’s future captivity is evident and the Lord says “those who rule over them make them wail and My name is blasphemed every day continually (*tamid*). Again there is an implicit connection of *tamid* with exalting against God (blaspheming) similar to Dn. 8:11 and Ps. 74:23. In Obadiah 15-16 there is a clear allusion to the “continual” exalting against God by Edom and other pagan nations on God’s holy mountain. The continual (*tamid*) wickedness of Assyria in opposition to and rebellion against God is evident in Nahum 3:18-19 (cf. 1:2).

The self-exalting, rejoicing behavior of Babylon by virtue of their world-conquering prowess is decried by Habakkuk in chapter 3:15. The pagan nation ascribes his power to his god (1:11) and worships in a counterfeit cultic setting (1:6) while sacrificing to his net and burning incense to his fishnet. In 1:17 *tamid* is connected with the false cultic worship in self-exalting rebellion against God: “shall he therefore empty his net, and shall he not spare to continually (*tamid*) slay nations?”

Finally the counterfeit cultic application of *tamid* by rebellious Israel, exalting against God, is seen in Is. 65:2-3 in which “a people provoke Me to anger continually (*tamid*) who sacrifice in gardens and burn incense on altars of brick”. The continual (*tamid*) exalting against God, associated with pagan

nations, has been lifted up and incorporated by God's professed people of Israel. The parallel to Dn. 8:11 is again unmistakable in which even unto God, pagan Rome magnifies itself and from him *hattamid* (continual self-exalting) is lifted up by papal Rome.

The Biblical evidence clearly reveals counterfeit cultic applications of the Hebrew term "*tamid*" with the connotation of self-exalting behavior against God. Based on the foregoing discussion, it is suggested that the substantive *hattamid* represents neither the continual heavenly ministry of Christ nor the nation or power of pagan Rome, but represents the "continual" self-exalting character of paganism inherent within fallen man and which has been manifested in the false religious systems of every pagan nation throughout history. Daniel explicitly attributes this *tamid-gadal* behavior to Media-Persia, Greece, and Pagan Rome from whom it was "lifted up" (*rum*) by papal Rome.

### [5.2.3 The Place of his Sanctuary](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.3 The Place of his Sanctuary

The Hebrew text uses two words for sanctuary: *miqdash* and *qodesh*. Both words are used in Dn. 8:9-14. *Miqdash* is the chosen word in verse 11: “and the place of his sanctuary was cast down”. *Qodesh* is the chosen word in verses 13 and 14: “until when the vision...to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled”; “unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed”. It is suggested that Daniel used two distinct words for sanctuary not for recapitulative emphasis as suggested by Hasel<sup>48</sup> but to emphasize the stark contrast of two different sanctuaries.

### [5.2.3.1 Miqdash](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.3.1 *Miqdash*

Concerning the use of *miqdash*, Rodriguez correctly points out that out of the 74 occurrences in the OT it most often denotes an earthly sanctuary (Ex. 25:8; Lev. 26:2, etc.).<sup>49</sup> Both Rodriguez<sup>50</sup> and Hasel<sup>51</sup> suggest that *miqdash* in a few instances refers to the heavenly sanctuary. Ps. 68:35 is cited as the first example. Although the immediate context in verse 33 & 34 seems to imply a heavenly connection with *miqdash* in v. 35, the overall context of Psalm 68 more convincingly suggests the earthly connection. Specific words for “holy place at Sinai”, “sanctuary” (earthly) and “temple” appear in verses 17, 24 and 29 respectively, and in each case the connection is with the earthly setting of Mt. Sinai or Jerusalem. The message of the Psalmist is that kings will bring presents to Jehovah because of His temple at Jerusalem (v. 29) because they have seen the procession of God into the sanctuary (v. 24). Therefore, sing praises to God you kingdoms of the earth (v. 32) because “awesome is our God out of His holy places (*miqdash*), the God of Israel who gives strength and power to the people” (v. 35). The concluding verse is a reference to God coming out of the earthly tabernacle to guide his people day (cloud) and night (fire) and fight their battles. The awesome power of God out of His sanctuary during the wilderness experience is explicitly alluded to in Ps. 68:7-8 in which God went out before His people and marched through the wilderness and the earth shook.

The second example is Ps. 96:6. The context within verses 6-8 reveals that the people bring an offering and come into the His courts. In verse 6, “Strength and beauty are in His sanctuary” (*miqdash*). The surrounding context clearly suggests that the sanctuary of verse 6 is earthly.


In Ps. 78:69, the prior context alludes to the apostasy of Israel’s high places (v. 58). The Lord forsook the tabernacle at Shiloh, the tent He had placed among them (v. 60). Following the temporary rejection of His people (verses 61-64) the Lord chose Judah, Mt. Zion and He built His sanctuary (*miqdash*) and chose David (v. 69-70). The earthly sanctuary setting is clearly in view in Ps. 78:69.

Finally the last example cited is Jer.17:12, “a glorious high throne from the beginning (is) the place of our sanctuary”. Both Jeremiah and Jehovah speak alternately in Jer. 16 & 17. Jehovah speaks in Jer. 16:1-18 and Jeremiah responds in verses 19-20; Jehovah continues His warnings and admonitions in 16:20 through 17:11; Jeremiah responds in verse 12 and 13a which is followed by Jehovah’s response in v. 13b. Finally, Jeremiah prays in 17:14-18. With this understanding in view, Jeremiah’s words in 17:12 immediately make it self-evident that “the place of our sanctuary” refers to the earthly sanctuary in Jerusalem. The plural pronoun “our” based on the context of the passage excludes the heavenly sanctuary of Jehovah, since Jehovah speaks in the singular person throughout the passage (“I, Jehovah”; Jer.17:10).<sup>52</sup>

It is suggested that all 74 occurrences of *miqdash*, with a high degree of probability, may refer exclusively to an earthly sanctuary, structure or a dedicated place. In one instance a portion of a gift/

heave offering associated with the earthly sanctuary system is described by *miqdash* (its sanctified part) in Num. 18:29. Irrespective of whether *miqdash* refers exclusively to an earthly sanctuary, the transcendent issue is that *miqdash* often designates a pagan, unholy earthly sanctuary which will be demonstrated in the following discussion. On the other hand, *qodesh*, when denoting the sanctuary, always connotes a holy sanctuary, either earthly or heavenly.

The biblical evidence suggests, with a reasonable degree of probability, that *miqdash* may always refer to an earthly structure either associated with the Jehovah’s sanctuary or to a heathen/pagan structure.<sup>53</sup> *Miqdash* is Satan’s dedicated place in Is. 16:12 and Eze. 28:18 and is used derogatorily in Eze. 21:2 and Lev. 26:31. *Miqdash* also means a “dedicated place” requiring contextual or adjectival designation. *Qodesh* is used 469 times in the OT and refers exclusively to holiness associated with both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary and also holiness associated with God, the Levites, priests and God’s people.<sup>54</sup> *Qodesh*, translated as sanctuary in Dn. 8:13-14, always carries the connotation of holiness and exclusively refers to the Lord’s true sanctuary (either earthly or heavenly), usually without adjectival designation. The distinctive qualities of *miqdash* and *qodesh* are summarized in the chart below.



The evidence supports the contention that *miqdash* in Dn. 8:11 refers to the counterfeit sanctuary located in pagan Rome from which it practiced continual self-exalting worship against God.

### [5.2.3.2 Makon](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 5.2.3.2 *Makon*

Both Shea<sup>55</sup> and Hasel<sup>56</sup> present strenuous arguments that *makon*, which is translated normally as “place”, “habitation”, or “dwelling” should be translated as “foundation.” The argument is based in part on the conclusion that the *tamid* represents Christ’s high-priestly ministry which was taken away by papal Rome who in turn cast down the “foundation” of Christ’s sanctuary. It is asserted that the foundation of God’s throne which is righteousness and justice in Ps. 89:14 is equivalent to the “foundation” of His sanctuary in Dn. 8:11 to justify the translation of *makon* as foundation in both cases.

In addition to the evidence revealing that *miqdash*, the sanctuary in Dn. 8:11, represents an earthly dwelling of pagan Rome, evidence will be presented which contravenes the establishment of a one-for-one equivalency of the “foundation of His throne” in Ps. 89:14 with the “foundation of his sanctuary” in Dn. 8:11.

From the seventeen occurrences of *makon* in the OT a clear definition of the word is inherently portrayed in 2 Chron. 6:2 wherein “I have built an exalted house for You and a place (*makon*) for You to dwell forever”. *Makon* is equated with house and dwelling. A similar definition is provided in Ex. 15:17 wherein “...the place (*makon*) You have made O Lord for Your dwelling, the sanctuary, O Lord, Your hands have prepared.” *Makon* is equated again with dwelling and also sanctuary.

It is suggested that *makon* consistently manifests the connotation of habitation or dwelling in all seventeen occurrences. In only three instances, Ps. 89:14; 97:2 & 104:5 can *makon* be logically translated as “foundation”. In Ps. 89:14 and 97:2 righteousness and justice are the habitation of His throne which is equivalent to saying God’s throne dwells in righteousness and justice. Where God is present righteousness and justice exist, since He, the Source of righteousness and justice, is sitting on His throne.

In Ps. 104:5 God literally “founded the earth on its ‘foundations’; it shall not be shaken forever”. Equivalently, “God founded the earth on its ‘habitations’...”. *Makon* is plural in this instance, and it is suggested that God founded the earth on its two primary dwelling places: 1) its internal axis of rotation and 2) its axis of rotation about the sun. The earth’s two axes of rotation represent its permanent dwelling places or habitations which God created.

Although *maqom* from the root *qum* (meaning to stand up) is also translated as “place” in about 400 occurrences, it connotes the sense of “general locational area”. On the other hand, *makon* from the root *kun* (similar to *qum* in meaning: to stand firm) connotes the sense of habitation or dwelling and is used primarily in a cultic or counterfeit cultic context as in Dn. 8:11. The cognitive sense of *makon* and *maqom* may be deduced from a careful examination of the lexical evidence<sup>57</sup> and their application in the OT.<sup>58</sup>

In view of the evidence, it is suggested Daniel used *miqdash* to designate an earthly dedicated pagan sanctuary in Dn. 8:11 in stark contrast to God's holy sanctuary in 8:13 & 14. *Makon* specifically identifies the habitation of his sanctuary which was the city of Rome. Thus, simultaneously at the time "the continual" self-exalting character of pagan Rome was lifted up by papal Rome, the place or habitation of pagan Rome's sanctuary was cast down by Constantine and transferred to Constantinople in AD 330. Pagan Rome's original sanctuary in Rome remained and was permanently occupied by papal Rome. This is the historicist position of U. Smith and majority of the pioneers of the SDA church.[59](#)

### [5.3 VERSE 12 AND THE TRANSGRESSION](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)



## **5.3 VERSE 12 AND THE TRANSGRESSION**

The relationship of the horn, the daily, the host and with respect to the transgression will be examined this section.

### **5.3.1 The Daily, the Host and the Horn**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

## 5.3.1 The Daily, the Host and the Horn

It has already demonstrated the thematic parallelism of gender in verses 9-12 exhibiting the pattern A: B::A':B' which represents the identification of pagan Rome (verses 9 & 11) and papal Rome (verses 10 & 12). The focus of the subjective action in verse 12 resides with the feminine phase of the horn from littleness. As Shea points out correctly, the verb “was given” is in the third person, singular and feminine form and therefore its subject must be feminine.<sup>60</sup> It cannot be the “host” (masculine) and agree with the verb in gender. Thus, the sentence structure indicates that the feminine phase of the horn was given a host: “it (feminine) was given a host against the daily by transgression.” Shea proceeds to argue convincingly in concert with Hasel<sup>61</sup> that the host in verse 12 should not be linked with “host of heaven” in verse 10 which other scholars, in contrast, have attempted to do.<sup>62</sup>

The premise that the “daily” represents Christ’s high priestly ministry leads naturally to the conclusion that the “host” in verse 12 must be a spiritual army or clerical priesthood opposing the priesthood of Christ acting in or with transgression (*bepasa`*). This is a position of both Shea<sup>63</sup> and Hasel.<sup>64</sup> An alternative view put forth by Hasel is that the preposition “be” in *bepasha`* expresses cause (causing transgression). With this understanding Hasel concludes that “the transgression that is caused may be the leading of human beings to trust in the substitute service(s) of the horn’s counterfeit continuous ministry.”<sup>65</sup> However, if the preposition, in fact, expresses cause, the most natural interpretation would be that “the act of giving” causes transgression or was done in rebellion against God. Hasel’s view requires the exegete to indulge in eisegesis by reading into the text words and meaning not present (“It was given a host against the daily causing transgression of the saints”).

Furthermore, it will be demonstrated in a later section on Cultic Terminology in Daniel 8 that the context of verses 1-14 is one of a counterfeit cultic setting, not a genuine cultic setting. Thus, the transgression in 8:12 transpires in a counterfeit setting: the horn was given (it was given = feminine; papal Rome); a host (pagan army); by transgression (unrepentant rebellion of pagan/papal forces).

All exegetical arguments stand or fall based on the interpretation of the “daily” which in turn depends on the correct identification of the antecedent of “from him” (*mimmennu*), the pivotal point of prophecy in verse 11. It was demonstrated previously that the linguistic and contextual evidence strongly favors the identification of the “one exalting himself” in verse 11 with the antecedent of *mimmennu*.

With the correct understanding of the daily (*hattamid*) representing the self-exalting character of all pagan nations including Rome which was lifted up by papal Rome, it becomes clear that there is a contest or struggle not only between the horn (both phases) and the Prince of the host, but also between the two phases of Rome. For example, not only was the daily lifted up by papal Rome from pagan Rome, but the place of his sanctuary was cast down by papal Rome in vs. 11. The struggle continues in a pitched battle in verse 12 where an army is given to the papal Rome against the

“continual” self-exalting behavior manifested by pagan forces toward God. This battle matured during the period of AD 496 to 508 when the first of the ten horns, the Franks led by Clovis following his conversion, became the “Eldest Son of the Church” and used the sword to expand the power of the papacy. This culminated in AD 508 with subjection of the Arborici, the Roman garrisons in the West, Brittany, the Bergundians, and Visigoths.<sup>66</sup> The Arian Visigoths represented the epitome of self-exalting behavior against God in the view of the Roman church.

It is maintained that the host was an historical army, led by Clovis, resulting from a collaboration or union of church (papal Rome) and the state (Clovis & the Franks). This “host” or unholy union represented a counterfeit army in contrast to the genuine host of heaven (verses 10 & 13), the saints of the Most High.

### [5.3.2 The Transgression](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 5.3.2 The Transgression

The “transgression” does not represent the unrighteous rebellion against God led by the horn and his host of an earthly priesthood as suggested by Shea.<sup>67</sup> The giving of host to the horn would be done so “by”, “in”, “through”, or “with” transgression (*bepasha`*). Shea acknowledges that the “precise sense of the preposition (be) is difficult to capture”.<sup>68</sup> Hasel attempts to minimize this difficulty with the preposition by transforming a simple prepositional phrase into a causative participle, “causing transgression” and applying it to the papal priesthood which causes its adherents to transgress. Hasel also admits that the first clause of v. 12 is “probably the most difficult in verses 9-14 for understanding its meaning” thus rendering the phrase “obscure”.<sup>69</sup> This obscurity is, in part, a direct result of attempting to identify the “daily” with the heavenly priestly ministry of Christ.

It is suggested that the “sense” of the prepositional phrase, *bepasha`* (by transgression) is neither “difficult to capture” within the context of the passage nor is its meaning “obscure”. The transgression is represented by the outward demonstration of religious zealotry against pagan worship by a religious power of pagan origins. This self-magnifying behavior of the apostate Christian church attracts multitudes. More specifically, the transgression is represented by the “giving process” of the host or army of the Franks led by Clovis in support of Papal Rome. Thus, the “transgression” is manifested in the union of church and state claiming to be acting in behalf of God and doing His will. This transgression, or unrepentant rebellion against God, remains unconfessed and requires no cleansing of the sanctuary in terms of confessed sins. However, this transgression does result in the trampling of the sanctuary (*qodesh*) in verse 13 due to the exploits of a counterfeit priesthood of the horn. The trampling of the sanctuary by the horn (papal Rome) requires the sanctuary “to be put right” (*nisdaq*) in v.14. The “trampling-*nisdaq*” concept will be examined in Section 8.0 on “The Audition about the Sanctuary.”

The transgression in verse 12 resulting in the union of church and state is the same transgression that will be repeated at the end of time with the enforcement of the mark of beast. Therefore the sense and meaning of the first phrase of verse 12 becomes explicitly clear. “It (papal Rome) was given a host (support of Clovis and Franks) against the daily (self-exalting activity of pagan and Arian forces) by transgression (by union of church and state claiming to act in behalf of God).”

### [5.3.3 Truth Cast to the Ground](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 5.3.3 Truth Cast to the Ground

On the basis of the use of the word “truth” (‘emet) in Dn. 8:26; 9:13; 10:1, 21 & 11:2, truth may be understood to refer to God’s revelation in its comprehensive sense, including both the “law of Moses and the prophetic-apocalyptic revelation contained in the book of Daniel itself”. Hasel’s assessment here is quite correct.<sup>70</sup> Truth refers to the divine truth of revelation which the horn (papal phase) opposes and casts to the ground. “This revelatory truth contains the instructions about worship, salvation, and related matters including God’s plan to set up His kingdom of grace and glory” in the context of the end-time cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>71</sup>

## 6.0 CULTIC TERMINOLOGY IN DANIEL 8:9-14

### Index of This Study

# 6.0 CULTIC TERMINOLOGY IN DANIEL 8:9-14

There are a number of expressions in Dn. 8:9-14 that are directly related to the Hebrew cultus or sanctuary worship system. Both Shea<sup>72</sup> and Rodriguez<sup>73</sup> rightly suggest that terms such as ram, goat, sanctuary (*miqdash*), continuous (*tamid*), lift up (*rum*), host (*saba'*) in 8:12, place (*makon*) and horn (*qeren*) inherently possess sanctuary or cultic significance. Whereas Rodriguez argues that many of these terms such as *rum*, *miqdash*, *tamid*, and *makon* relate directly to the reality of the heavenly sanctuary, it is suggested that all of the terms described thus far exhibit counterfeit cultic significance in Daniel 8.

The key which unlocks Daniel's use of cultic terminology is the identification of the cultic ram symbol as the pagan power of Media-Persia and the cultic goat symbol as the pagan power of Greece. From this initial clue, it becomes apparent that Daniel intends that many of his cultic symbols and terms will represent counterfeit cultic applications. The following chart contrasts the true and the counterfeit applications of these terms in the OT with Daniel 8. From the comparisons of cultic symbols and their counterfeit applications, it becomes evident that the primary emphasis of Dn. 8:9-14 concerns the activity of the horn from littleness in a counterfeit cultic setting. This false worship system is ultimately "incorporated" into papal Rome by lifting up of the continual (*tamid*) self exalting behavior (*gadal*) inherent among pagan nations. The false system of worship includes occupation of the habitation (city of Rome) of pagan Rome's sanctuary and results in casting truth to the ground and trampling the heavenly sanctuary and the high priestly ministration of Christ. This false system manifests itself by establishing a "daily mass" and interposing a priestcraft between God and His people. A counterfeit worship system equivalent to Baal worship of the OT is established in opposition to the worship of God.

## CULTIC LANGUAGE CONTRASTS

Old Testament Cultic Application	Cultic Symbol Term	Daniel 8 Counterfeit Cultic Application
Trespass offering (Lv. 5:15)	RAM	Media-Persia (8:20)
Trespass offering (Lv. 5:15)	GOAT	Greece (8:21)
Continual fire (Lv. 6:13)	TAMID	Continual exalting (8:11-13)
Continual incense (Ex. 30:8)	"	"
Fat lift up (Lv. 4:8, 10, 19)	RUM	Tamid lifted up (8:11)
God's earthly Sanc. (Ex. 25:8)	MIQDASH	Pagan Sanct. (8:11)
Habitation of God (Ex. 15:17)	MAKON	Pag. Habit: Rome (8:11)

Levite's work (Num. 4:3)	SABA' (host/army)	Pagan forces (8:12)
God's army (Ex. 12:41)	" "	" "
Heaven's host (Dn.8:11/ Dt.4:19)	" "	" "
Horns of altar (Ex. 27:2 / Lv. 4:7)	HORN	Pagan nation (8:3, 5, 9)
Evening-Morning True Worship Cycle (Lv. 24:1-4)	ᵀ EREB-BOQER	False Worship Cycle (8:13-14)

**7.0 CULTIC LANGUAGE IN LEVITICUS  
AND COUNTERFEIT PARALLELS IN DANIEL 8**

**Index of This Study**

# 7.0 CULTIC LANGUAGE IN LEVITICUS AND COUNTERFEIT PARALLELS IN DANIEL 8

The pivotal question, upon which depends the identification of the “daily” (*hattamid*), is directly related to the antecedent of *mimmennu* (from him) in Dn. 8:11: “Even unto to the Prince of the host he exalted himself, and **from him** the daily was lifted up...”. Is the daily lifted up from: 1) the Prince of the host or 2) the one exalting himself? Alternatively does “from him” refer to the Prince of the host or the one exalting himself? Sufficient exegetical evidence has already been presented strongly suggesting that the antecedent of *mimmennu* is the “one exalting himself” or Rome in its pagan phase. However, overwhelming support for this conclusion derives from Daniel’s use of cultic language and symbols taken from the “typical” sanctuary service recorded in Leviticus and Numbers. It is immediately evident, as previously demonstrated, that the ram, goat, and horn in Daniel 8 are all counterfeit cultic symbols which strongly suggests the further use of counterfeit cultic symbols and language in this chapter of Daniel. One specific phrase in Dn. 8:11 has unusual significance: “from him was lifted up the daily.” This phrase consists of three Hebrew words which are used repeatedly in the worship setting of Leviticus and Numbers. The three root words include *min* or *mimmennu* (from, or from him), *rum* (lift up) *hattamid* (the daily). More specifically the phrase “he shall **lift up** (*rum*: root) **from it** (*mimmennu*)” is utilized a total of five times in Leviticus: four times in the active voice (2:9; 4:8; 4:19; 6:15) and once in the passive voice in 4:10 (it is lifted up from the ox of the sacrifice). In three occurrences the cultic priest lifts up from the cultic beast sacrifice (ram, goat, bull, lamb) the fat which is then burned as incense. For example, in Lev. 4:19, “and he shall lift up (*rum*) all its fat from it (*mimmennu*) and shall burn it as incense on the altar. In the other two occurrences (Lev. 2:9 & 6:15) the cultic priest lifts up from the cultic food offering a portion of the flour (a memorial offering) which is then burned as incense on the altar. For example in Lev. 6:15, “he (priest) shall lift up from it his handful of the flour of the food offering and of its oil and all the frankincense which (is) on the food offering and shall burn it as incense on the altar, a sweet fragrance, as a memorial offering to Jehovah.” In all five cases where this cultic linguistic phrase, employing *mimmennu* and *rum*, is used the item which is lifted up from cultic offering is always burned as incense (*qamar*) as a sweet aroma to Jehovah.<sup>74</sup> The cultic language and activity in the five passages in Leviticus are contrasted with the cultic language in Dn.8:11 in the following two tables respectively.

## Cultic Language Parallels in Leviticus and Daniel

Lv.4:8	Lv.4:10	Lv.4:19	Lv.2:9	Lv.6:15	Dn.8:11
rum	rum	rum	rum	rum	rum



mimmennu heleb	min heleb	mimmennu heleb	min 'azkarah	mimmennu solet	mimmennu hattamid
<b>Cultic Activity Parallels in Leviticus and Daniel</b>					
Lv.4:8	Lv.4:10	Lv.4:19	Lv.2:9	Lv.6:15	Dn.8:11
Hi Priest lifts up from cultic beast	Hi Priest lifts up from ox	Hi Priest lifts up from cultic beast	Hi Priest lifts up from food offering	Hi Priest lifts up from food offering	Hi Priest lifts up from cultic beast
the fat	the fat	the fat	memorial offering	flour	"the daily"

The striking parallels of the language and activity in Leviticus with Daniel 8:11 are unmistakable. The genuine priest is replaced by a counterfeit priest (papal Rome); the genuine cultic beast sacrifice is replaced by a counterfeit beast sacrifice (pagan Rome); and the genuine portion of the offering (fat or flour) is replaced by the counterfeit *hattamid* (the daily).

The pivotal question, “what is the antecedent of *mimmennu*?” or alternatively, “is the daily lifted up from the Prince of the host or the one exalting himself?” is unequivocally answered by the cultic language parallels with Leviticus. Just as the “fat” is lifted from the cultic beast sacrifice so the *hattamid* must be lifted from the counterfeit cultic beast sacrifice. (The nature of *hattamid* will be clarified in the next section.) The term, Prince of the host, conveys not the slightest hint of cultic significance. Although *sar* (prince, ruler, commander) inherently possesses no cultic or cultic sacrificial significance, it may be used in conjunction with cultic terms such as rulers of the sanctuary (Is. 43:28) just as it is used in conjunction with other categories such as rulers of the soldiers, rulers of the cupbearers, rulers of a prison or rulers of the host.<sup>75</sup> Moreover, *sar* possesses not a trace of counterfeit cultic significance in Daniel 8 which would be demanded by the cultic-counterfeit cultic parallels of Leviticus and Daniel 8 respectively. Nowhere in the cultic language of the sanctuary service in Exodus, Leviticus or Numbers does a princely ruler play a cultic role.

On the other hand, the “one exalting himself” or the horn from littleness exhibits clear cultic significance. Indeed, the horn from littleness derives from the four winds of heaven to which the four horns of the goat grew great from the broken horn of the goat (Dn. 8:8-9). By implication the horn from littleness is directly associated with the counterfeit cultic goat symbol or cultic beast sacrifice. The horn from littleness thus symbolizes a new cultic beast power derived indirectly from the cultic goat (beast) power by way of the four winds of heaven. This new cultic beast power or sacrificial beast, the horn from littleness, is analogous and parallel to the cultic sacrificial beast in Lev. 4:8, 10 & 19 from which the priest lifts up the fat. Hence, the antecedent of *mimmennu* (“from him”) in Dn. 8:11 is the cultic beast power/sacrifice symbolized by the horn from littleness or Rome in its pagan phase; and from him the “daily” is lifted up.<sup>76</sup> Pagan Rome represents a counterfeit cultic sacrifice since it yields to (is sacrificed) and is replaced by papal Rome. This conclusion reinforces the view that the dragon who represents pagan Rome in Rev. 13:2 gives the beast (papal Rome) his throne,

power, and great authority.[77](#)

The counterfeit cultic language and activity of Dn. 8:11 which is parallel to the genuine cultic activity of Leviticus provides conclusive and decisive evidence that the *hattamid* is lifted up not from the Prince of the host but from the cultic beast power/sacrifice symbolized by the horn from littleness or Rome in its pagan phase. The cultic language parallels of Leviticus with Daniel 8 demand that “the daily” be lifted up from the cultic beast symbol in Dn. 8:11. The counterfeit cultic language confirms the pagan/papal identification by gender distinction in Section 5.0.

## [7.1 The Identification of \*Hattamid\*](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# 7.1 Identification of Hattamid.

From a surface examination of cultic language and activity parallels in the previous tables, there appears to be no cultic-counterfeit cultic connection between the fat which is lifted up from the cultic sacrifice and the daily (*hattamid*) which is lifted up from the cultic beast sacrifice in Dn. 8:11. The following discussion will establish the relationship and the connecting link between the up-lifted fat and “the daily” which is lifted up. Throughout the discussion it must be recognized that when the priest lifted up the fat from the sacrifice to the altar of burnt offering, it was burned as incense and always resulted in a sweet aroma to Jehovah (eg. see Lev. 3:5, 16; 4:10; 4:31; 17:6; Num. 18:17).

## [7.1.1 The Burnt Offering](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 7.1.1 The Burnt Offering

The continual burnt offering is first described in Ex. 29:38-46 and consisted of two lambs, one each offered in the morning and evening along with the grain (food) offering and drink offering. It was a sweet aroma to Jehovah and it was a reminder that He would meet with the children of Israel, that the tabernacle would be sanctified by His glory, that He would dwell with them and that Jehovah redeemed them from Egypt to dwell among them. It may be observed that the adjective, *tamid* (daily), describing the burnt offering is connected with the sweet aroma (Ex. 29:41-42).

Further instructions for the continual burnt offering are given in Lev. 6:8-13 where the fat of the peace offerings is burned together on and with the burnt offering itself (6:12) both of which were a sweet aroma to Jehovah. The simultaneous burning of the fat of the peace offering upon the burnt offering itself as a sweet aroma to Jehovah is also specifically directed by God to Moses in Lev. 3:3-5 and performed in Lev. 9:22-24 (see also Lev. 8:25-28). It is noted that the detailed description of the burnt offering in Lev. 6:8-13 suggests that the burnt offering commenced in the evening. “This is the law of the burnt offering; it is the burnt offering on the hearth on the altar **all the night until the morning** and the fire is kept burning on it” (6:9). In the morning the ashes were removed and the fire was kept burning with new wood every morning followed by a new burnt offering in the morning (6:12). In Ex. 29:39 and Num. 28:4, it is simply stated that one lamb is offered in the morning and the other lamb offered in the evening which does not necessarily imply a commencing-ending sequence. Conversely, the description of the evening-morning sequence is a prominent feature in Lev. 6:9-12. The importance of the evening-morning sequence will be discussed in Section 8.2, “The Cultic Significance of 2300 evening-morning.” The third description of the daily burnt offering appears in Num. 28:3-8 which is nearly identical to that in Ex. 29:38-46. Again the burning of the continual (*tamid*) burnt offering along with the food offering results in a sweet aroma to Jehovah (Num. 28:6).

### [7.1.2 The Grain Offering](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 7.1.2 The Grain Offering

The grain offering (*minchah*) represented a gift to God which expressed submission and dependence. Originally signifying a gift to any superior, “at the time of Sinai *minchah* became the official designation for a gift to God, a gift of homage, an acknowledgment of the superiority of the One to whom the gift was given.” Thus, man showed himself to be a steward of the things entrusted him.[78](#)

The grain offerings could be either private, voluntary offerings of individuals (see Lev. 2) or the continual grain offering, a public offering made before Jehovah (Lev. 6:14-23) in the same way that the burnt offering could be private or public (Lev. 6:8-13; Num. 28:3-8). For the public grain offering (Lev. 6:14-23), the priest lifted up a handful of fine flour from the grain offering with its oil and frankincense which was burned on the altar as a sweet aroma to Jehovah. The private, individual grain offering was offered by the priest in a similar manner and for the same purpose (Lev. 2:2, 9).

The law of the grain offering (*minchah*) in Lev. 6:14-23 consisted of a tenth of an ephah of flour as a continual (*tamid*) grain offering, half in the morning and half at night for a sweet aroma to Jehovah. Again it may be observed that the flour as a daily (*tamid*) grain offering is connected with the sweet aroma to Jehovah (6:20-21).

Finally the burnt offering was combined most frequently with the grain offering as a sweet aroma to Jehovah.[79](#) The two male lambs as a *tamid* (daily) burnt offering were always combined with the flour as a daily grain offering for a sweet aroma to Jehovah (Num. 28:4-8; 29:6). Again the connection of the *tamid* (daily) is observed.

### [7.1.3 Hattamid / Sweet Aroma Connection](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## **7.1.3 *Hattamid* /Sweet Aroma Connection**

The Hebrew word *hattamid* (the daily) never occurs in the OT as an isolated substantive without adjectival designation except for the five occurrences in Daniel (8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11). *Hattamid* appears sixteen times in the book of Numbers and twice in Nehemiah but always with adjectival designation in three configurations: the daily burnt offering (15 times); the daily grain offering (2 times); and the continual bread (1 time).[80](#)

### **[7.1.3.1 \*Hattamid\* Burnt Offering](#)**

[Index of This Study](#)

## 7.1.3.1 *Hattamid* Burnt Offering

In the cultic worship symbolism of Numbers, *hattamid* is most frequently connected with the daily burnt offering (14 of 16 occurrences which all appear in Num. 28 & 29. As previously described, two male lambs were offered as a *tamid* (daily) burnt offering which were a sweet aroma to Jehovah (Num. 28:1-8). Although the adjective *tamid* is used, the context of Num. 28 & 29 where *hattamid* is specifically used 14 times make it clearly understood that this represented the daily (*hattamid*) burnt offering. In Num. 29:6 *hattamid* is directly connected with the sweet aroma of the daily burnt offering.

### [7.1.3.2 \*Hattamid\* Grain Offering](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 7.1.3.2 *Hattamid* Grain Offering

The grain offering is directly connected with *hattamid* only in Num. 4:16; but it is linked with the daily (*hattamid*) burnt offering in eleven (11) occurrences in Num. 28 & 29.<sup>81</sup> Specifically in Num. 29:6 the daily (*hattamid*) burnt offering is combined with the grain offering (*hattamid* grain offering is implied) which are both linked in the offering as a sweet aroma to Jehovah.

### [7.1.3.3 \*Hattamid\* Bread](#)

[Index of This Study](#)




### 7.1.3.3 *Hattamid* Bread

*Hattamid* is used only once in adjectival designation of the bread (continual bread) or bread of presence or shewbread in Num 4:7. However the preparation of the bread of the tabernacle, described in Lev. 24:5-9, included frankincense which was placed on the bread for a memorial offering made by fire to Jehovah. The bread was set before Jehovah continually (*tamid*) every Sabbath with the frankincense which was burned as an offering to Jehovah. The burning of the frankincense (sweet aroma implied) in effect made the continual bread an offering made by fire to Jehovah (24:7-9).

The foregoing discussion establishes the linkage of *hattamid* with the sweet aroma in the cultic worship setting of Leviticus and Numbers. The linkage is established without exception in all 16 occurrences of *hattamid* whether it is the burnt offering (14 times), the grain offering (1 time) or the continual bread offering (1 time). Furthermore, the use of *tamid* with the continual burnt offering in Num. 28:3, 6 & 23 and the grain offering in Lev. 6:20 also establishes the linkage of *tamid* with sweet aroma of these offerings. Moreover, it has been established that the sweet aroma is also linked with the fat lifted up from the cultic beast offerings which was always burned as incense to Jehovah on the altar of burnt offering. A similar linkage of the sweet aroma with the grain offerings was also established. Thus it is seen that the memorial portion (fat or fine flour) lifted up from the cultic offering may be equated to *hattamid* which is also associated with the cultic offerings by the connecting link of the sweet aroma illustrated in the diagram below.

The cultic beast sacrifice in Leviticus has its counterfeit parallel with the cultic beast symbolized by the horn in Daniel 8. Likewise, the fat lifted up from the cultic sacrifice in Leviticus and burned as a sweet aroma has its counterfeit parallel with the cultic *hattamid* lifted up from the counterfeit cultic beast power (horn from littleness).



It now has been established that the cultic *hattamid* in Leviticus and Numbers is always linked with the sweet aroma associated with the cultic sacrifice made by fire to Jehovah. Hence, it appears that it can be concluded with certainty that the link which connects the fat lifted up from the cultic beast sacrifice in Leviticus with *hattamid* lifted up from the counterfeit cultic beast power (horn) in Dn. 8:11 is the sweet aroma. Thus, the counterfeit cultic *hattamid* in Dn. 8 is identified as a counterfeit sweet aroma. Moreover, the identification of a counterfeit *hattamid* in Dn. 8:11 as being equivalent to

a counterfeit sweet aroma confirms that the antecedent *mimmennu* (from him) in Dn. 8:11 is not the Prince of the host but is none other than the horn exalting himself against the Prince of the host.

## [7.2 Counterfeit \*Hattamid\* /Sweet Aroma](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 7.2 Counterfeit *Hattamid* /Sweet Aroma

When the Jewish mind heard the word *hattamid*, he certainly associated it with the sweet aroma to Jehovah resulting from a spirit of self-sacrifice, full consecration, and constant dependence upon the atoning blood of Christ, which is acceptable to God. The words “sweet aroma” express in characteristic human language the thought that God was well pleased with the offering and accepted the one presenting it.[82](#)

The substantive *hattamid* used in the cultic setting of Numbers was principally associated with the cultic burnt offering and corresponding sweet aroma (14 of 16 occurrences). The sweet aroma of the burnt offering which was ordained at Sinai (Num. 28:6) was a continual reminder that Jehovah brought the Israelites out of the land of Egypt to dwell among them (Ex. 29:46). As they identified in heart and spirit with the purpose of the corporate daily burnt offering, a humble and contrite response of thankfulness rang through their hearts.

The counterfeit cultic symbolism in Dn. 8 confirms a counterfeit cultic *hattamid* in 8:11 which is linked with a counterfeit sweet aroma both of which are derived from the cultic language of Leviticus and Numbers. The counterfeit “daily” (*hattamid*) is characterized by a repugnant aroma, not a sweet aroma, resulting from self-exalting rebellion against God which the Bible calls the “mystery of iniquity” (2 Thes. 2:7). The contrasting characteristics of the genuine and counterfeit *hattamid* are summarized in the following table.

### [CHARACTERISTICS OF HATTAMID](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

# CHARACTERISTICS OF HA TAMID

## Genuine

## Counterfeit

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Sweet Aroma <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ burnt offering</li><li>○ food offering</li><li>○ fat burned</li></ul> | 1. Repugnant Aroma <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ false sacrifice</li><li>○ Baal worship</li><li>○ as incense</li></ul> |
| 2. Contrite Heart <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ humility Ex.29:46</li></ul>  | 2. Self Exaltation <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Dn. 8:11</li></ul>  |
| 3. Pure Offering <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ no blemish Lv.1:10, 13</li></ul>                                    | 3. Blemished Offering <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Mal.1:13-14</li></ul>  |
| 4. Pure Incense <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ continual incense Ex. 30:8</li></ul>                                 | 4. False Incense <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ false incense Is.65:3; Jer.32:29</li><li>○ Baal Worship</li></ul>       |
| 5. “Agape” Motivation Flowing From Slain Lamb  | 5. Motivation: Hope of Reward & Exaltation   |

Rebellion against God manifested by disobedience and false worship practices results in Jehovah’s refusal to condone the incense altars and to smell the “sweet aroma” of false worship (Lev. 26:30-31). Through Isaiah, Jehovah cautioned Judah: “I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of cattle. Bring no more futile sacrifices; incense is an abomination to Me” (Is. 1:11, 13; see also Amos 5:21-22).

Jehovah abhors attempts to offer sweet incense to idols (Baal worship) declaring He will lay waste the altars, break the idols, and cut down the high places (Eze. 6: 4-6, 13; see also Hos. 11:2). Baal worship is repeatedly associated with burning incense<sup>83</sup> to Baal in Jeremiah upon which Jehovah pronounces doom.<sup>84</sup> Finally, the contrast between genuine worship of a contrite spirit and false worship with counterfeit sacrifices and incense is set forth in Is. 66:2-3, “But on this one I will look; on him who is poor and of a contrite spirit, and who trembles at My word. He who kills a bull is as if he slays a man; he who sacrifices a lamb, as if he breaks a dog’s neck; he who offers a grain offering as if he offers swine’s blood; he who burns incense, as if he blesses the idol. They did evil before My eyes, and chose that in which I do not delight.” The continual (tamid) persistence in counterfeit worship of Baal by those who sacrifice in gardens and burn incense on altars of brick, and who represent themselves as holier than their neighbor is condemned by Jehovah in Is. 65:3-6 where tamid is linked directly with counterfeit incense.

The scriptural evidence supports the conclusion that the counterfeit cultic *hattamid* or sweet aroma in Dn. 8:11 is intimately associated with Baal worship of pagan and papal Rome in which the latter lifts

up *hattamid* from the former.

### **7.3 Counterfeit Priesthood**

#### **Index of This Study**


## 7.3 Counterfeit Priesthood

The cultic language parallels in Leviticus 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19; and 6:15 with Dn. 8:11 reveal that the priest lifts up (*rum*) from the cultic sacrifice a memorial portion (fat or fine flour) to be burned as incense for a sweet aroma before Jehovah. The parallel cultic language in Dn. 8:11 reveal that a counterfeit *hattamid*, or sweet aroma of Baal worship, is lifted up from a counterfeit beast/power sacrifice. The cultic language in the five texts in Leviticus clearly identifies the priest who lifts up (*rum*) the fat or handful of flour from the cultic offering. The existence of a counterfeit cultic priest is apparent in Dn. 8:11 by both cultic language parallels with Leviticus and also by the passive voice of *rum* (*huraym*) which implies an active voice counterpart of a priest. Thus the phrase, “from him was lifted up the daily,” implies three counterfeit cultic significations: 1) a cultic sacrifice (from him), 2) a cultic memorial portion of the sacrifice burned as incense for a sweet aroma (*hattamid*) and 3) a cultic priest who lifts up *hattamid* (active voice subject of *rum*). The chart below summarizes the cultic parallel of Leviticus and Dn. 8:11.

### [Cultic Parallels](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# Cultic Parallels



It may be recalled that the cultic beast power/sacrifice is represented by the horn from littleness or Rome in its pagan phase who exalts himself against the Prince of the host. The historical record shows that with the first Caesar, Octavian (Augustus; 31 BC-AD 14), the emperor cult began in Rome.<sup>85</sup> Octavian's position was strengthened by the elevation of his adoptive father Caesar, at the Senate's decree, to a place among the deities. "Thus Octavian called himself son of the divine Caesar, imperator Caesar *divi filius*." Octavian added to his name the one of "Augustus," emphasizing the unique dignity of his position. Until that time this designation (meaning "the exalted one"; see also Dn. 8:11, "he exalted himself") had been employed only as surname of deities.

He thus conveyed the impression that his position of power was of incomparable loftiness. "The highest priestly office of the *pontifex maximus* was transferred to Augustus in 12 BC by popular referendum, and in 2 BC the list of honorary titles was expanded when Augustus was designated by the Senate as *pater patriae*" (father of fathers).<sup>86</sup> The title of *pontifex maximus* was carried by Roman Caesars including emperor Constantine, as chief priest of the pagan state religion, while still professing Christianity and setting apart the day of the sun (Sunday) as a day of rest and worship.<sup>87</sup>

From the historical record and the scriptural evidence, it may be concluded that the daily (*hattamid*) which was lifted up by the counterfeit priest (papal Rome) from the counterfeit cultic beast/sacrifice (pagan Rome) included not only self-exalting counterfeit worship, (false sweet aroma) but also included the priestly ministry of pagan Rome. Indeed, the pagan title *pontifex maximus* was formally assumed by papal Rome from the fifteenth century onwards from its forbearer pagan Rome which inherited the priesthood from all previous pagan societies. Although used by both bishops and popes, today it is confined to the Roman pontiff.<sup>88</sup>

Although the substantive *hattamid* with the adjectival designation is never used as a direct modifier of

the cultic priestly ministry in the OT, the adjective *tamid* is used in an indirect association with the high priestly ministry of Aaron in Ex. 28:29-30 in bearing the names of the sons of Israel on the breastplate before Jehovah continually. In Ex. 28:39 the high priest, while ministering, wore a gold headband continually, engraved with “Holiness to Jehovah”. Further associations of *tamid* with the ministry of the priests and the Levites are found in 1 Chron. 16:37, 40; 23:31; 2 Chron. 24:14. Thus, it may be inferred that the counterfeit *hattamid* lifted up from the counterfeit beast/sacrifice or pagan Rome included not only a counterfeit sweet aroma of self-exalting false worship but also a counterfeit self-exalting priesthood lifted by papal Rome from pagan Rome’s priesthood (*pontifex maximus*).

Since the counterfeit beast sacrifice symbolized by the horn or pagan Rome exhibits a self-proclaimed priesthood (*pontifex maximus*), it becomes readily apparent that the “place of his sanctuary” (*miqdash*) in Dn. 8:11 is in reality the *pontifex maximus*’ (pagan Rome’s) counterfeit sanctuary located in Rome (place or habitation). The habitation (*makon*) of his (pagan Rome’s) sanctuary was displaced from Rome to Constantinople in AD 330.

## **8.0 THE AUDITION ABOUT THE SANCTUARY**

### **Index of This Study**



# 8.0 THE AUDITION ABOUT THE SANCTUARY

## Exegesis of Daniel 8:13-14

In these verses Daniel's attention is directed to a conversation between two holy beings in the heavenly realms. "They speak about the vision, particularly about the horn's attack upon the sanctuary" (both earthly and heavenly) "and God's people."<sup>89</sup> A brief exegetical synopsis will be presented on verse 13 which will be followed by an explanation of the audition in the context of the cultic language used throughout the vision. The exposition will conclude with the "thesis-antithesis" arrangement of verses 13 and 14 related to the trampling and the cleansing or "putting right" (*sadaq*) the sanctuary.

## 8.1 VERSE 13: THE DAILY AND THE TRANSGRESSION

### [Index of This Study](#)

## **8.1 VERSE 13:**

# **THE DAILY AND THE TRANSGRESSION**

The time element of the vision (*chazon*) encompasses the entire vision beginning in 8:1-3 with the historical period of the ram representing Media-Persia (v. 20) including the goat or Greece, the 4-horn powers and the career of the horn from littleness (both phases). The vision extends to end of the 2300 years at time of the end (Dn. 8:17).

### **[8.1.1 The Daily](#)**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

## 8.1.1 The Daily

Although Hasel acknowledges the duration of the vision, he stresses that the phrase, “until when”, places emphasis not on the duration (how long) but on termination of the vision.<sup>90</sup> Since Hasel’s interpretation of the “daily” (Christ’s high priestly ministry) cannot encompass the entire length of the vision, the emphasis on the terminus of the vision becomes a natural consequence. However, it should be recognized that the emphasis on duration in 8:13 comes from the phrase describing the on-going activity in the vision, namely, “making” (to give) both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled.” This clearly implies duration, not termination. It is acknowledged that *`ad* (until) designates termination but only in the context of terminating the 2300 years (duration) of the trampling activity.

Hasel correctly points out that the construction of Hebrew noun *chazon* (vision) precludes a literal genitival relationship such as “the vision of the daily and...”.<sup>91</sup> However, Shea suggests<sup>92</sup> that the syntactical relationship should be one of apposition giving the question the significance of “how long the vision, that is the vision in which the four following works of the little horn are seen?” Moreover, it is suggested that the four nouns (“the daily”, “the transgression”, “the sanctuary” and “the host”) following the phrase: “until when the vision” circumscribe the entire length of the vision which is also inherently implied in the question itself. More importantly the exegesis has demonstrated that the “daily” (*hattamid*) is not represented by Christ’s priestly ministry but by the self-exalting character of the pagan nations.

In the vision of Daniel 8, this self-magnifying behavior (*gadal*) begins with the ram (Media-Persia) and continues with each successive world power concluding with Rome.

## [8.1.2 The Transgression](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## **8.1.2 The Transgression**

“The transgression” refers back to the transgression in verse 12 whereby, as was demonstrated earlier, papal Rome united with the converted pagan forces of Clovis against the pagan and Arian forces which opposed the papacy. This joint activity resulted in a union of church and state claiming to act in behalf of God. Thus, it is seen that “the daily” and “the transgression” span the entire length of the vision. Together they form a compound subject in verse 13 representing the identical behavioral characteristic of two phases, pagan and papal, of a single entity exalting against God.

### **8.1.3 Causing Desolation**

**[Index of This Study](#)**

## 8.1.3 Causing Desolation

“The daily and the transgression”, a compound subject, represents a singular behavior pattern which causes desolation. The Hebrew participle, *shomem*, means “causing desolation” or “which desolates” and is in the singular construction and modifies, in an attributive manner, the entire compound subject. The desolating activity of each successive world power is clearly portrayed in the vision of Daniel 8. This is manifested first in “the continual” self-exalting character of pagan nations and second in “the transgression” (union of church and state claiming to act in behalf of God) throughout history. Evidence of both pagan and papal behavior causing desolation is found in Dn. 9:26 where “desolations (plural) are determined until an end of war”. This phrase will be discussed further under Section 9.0: “External Evidence of Daniel 9.”

Hasel argues, based solely on the Greek Theodotian and Mt. 24:15, that there is no parallel linkage of “the transgression which desolates” in 8:13 with the “the abomination which desolates” in 11:31 and 12:11.<sup>93</sup> The “abomination which desolates” is generally accepted among Adventist theologians<sup>94</sup> as representing the character of papal Rome. This is in harmony with our exegesis of 8:9-14 which demonstrates a direct, parallel linkage of “the transgression which desolates” in 8:13 with the accepted view of “the abomination which desolates” in 11:31 and 12:11.

### [8.1.4 Qodesh](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 8.1.4 *Qodesh*

The nature of the desolating activity involves “making” or “giving” the sanctuary (*qodesh*) and the host to be trampled. *Qodesh* always connotes the sense of holiness and may either apply to God’s earthly or heavenly sanctuary as was previously discussed. It is suggested that *qodesh* in verse 13 applies both to the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary. The vision (*chazon*) in v. 13 refers to the entire vision extending from Media-Persia to both phases of Rome.

The sanctuary (*qodesh*) at the commencement of the vision in the third year of Belshazzar (BC 553-552) lay in ruins following the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar. Thus, the question, “until when the vision: the daily...making both the sanctuary.... to be trampled” includes the “continual” exalting behavior activity (“the daily”) associated with pagan power resulting in the trampling of God’s earthly sanctuary. The earthly sanctuary (*qodesh*) was again trampled in AD 70 following the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary (*qodesh*) in AD 31 (Dn. 9:24).

Any attempt to suggest that *hattamid* (“the daily”) is trampled in verse 13 and restored in verse 14 would require, by the Hebrew syntactical relation, that the “the transgression which desolates” must be also be trampled and restored in the answer of verse 14; however, this is a non sequitur. The sanctuary and the host are trampled in v. 13 and “the daily” (*hattamid*) and “the transgression desolating” cause (*tet* is the infinitive construct, “giving” or “making,” of *natan*, “to give” or “to make”) the trampling of the sanctuary and the host. The infinitive construct, *tet* (making) requires both a receiver of the action, namely the sanctuary and the host, and an initiator of the action, namely *hattamid* and the transgression which desolates. The vision (*chazon*) cannot be responsible for initiating or “making” the sanctuary to be trampled. If “the daily” and “the transgression which desolates” are responsible for “making...the sanctuary...to be trampled” as the syntax would suggest, then *hattamid* of Daniel 8 must be of counterfeit origin which is exactly what the context of 8:1-14 suggests. The sanctuary cultic terminology related to the ram, the goat, and the horn are all counterfeit symbols pointing to a counterfeit *hattamid* which was demonstrated in Sections 6.0 & 7.0.

While the trampling of the *qodesh* includes the earthly sanctuary, the primary application and emphasis is on the terminus of the vision and concerns the trampling of the heavenly sanctuary. The trampling of the heavenly sanctuary is directly associated with the casting down of truth by papal Rome in v. 12. The trampling of the host or saints in v. 13 is also alluded to in v. 10 and is carried out by the feminine or papal phase of the horn from littleness as discussed earlier. The 2300-year trampling of the sanctuary will be examined in greater depth in the cultic context of the 2300 Evening-Morning in the following Section.

## [8.2 2300 Evening-Morning: Cultic Significance](#)

## [Index of This Study](#)

## 8.2 2300 Evening-Morning: Cultic Significance

Even among Seventh-day Adventist scholars disagreement exists concerning the cultic significance of the expression “evening-morning” in Dn. 8:14, “until 2300 evening-morning, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” For example, S. J. Schwantes contends that the expression *`ereb-boqer* (evening-morning) is not derived from the language of cultic worship wherein he asserts “the order ‘morning-evening’ is the standard one at all times.” Schwantes concludes that *`ereb-boqer* was most likely a time unit modeled after the phraseology of Genesis 1.<sup>95</sup> In contrast W. H. Shea contends that “aside from the specifically chronological use of the evening and the morning to demarcate the days of the creation week in Genesis, the evening and the morning” time unit was exceptional and “it must have been chosen for a special reason” because it “had a special connection with sanctuary.” Shea here links the expression “evening-morning” with the Hebrew Cultus. However, rather than directly connecting it with the “daily burnt offering” on the altar in the court where two lambs were offered, one in the morning and the other in the evening (Ex. 29:39; Num. 28:4), Shea sees a more direct connection of the expression, “evening-morning” in Dn. 8:14, with the lighting of the lamps in the holy place of the sanctuary in the evening and the trimming of the lamps in the morning. These functions were to take place “continually” (*tamid*) “from evening until morning” (Ex. 27:20-21; Lev. 24:2-3). At the same time the priest was to burn incense on the golden altar in the holy place. This was also a “continual” practice (Ex. 30:6-7).<sup>96</sup> Here is seen the linkage of the expression “from evening until morning” with both the “continual” tending of the lamps (Ex. 27:20-21; Lev. 24:2-4) and the “continual incense” (Ex. 30:7-8).

### 8.2.1 The Daily Burnt Offering

#### [Index of This Study](#)



## 8.2.1 The Daily Burnt Offering

Shea, Schwantes and Hasel<sup>97</sup> find difficulty in linking the “evening-morning” (*`ereb-boqer*) of Dn. 8:14 with the daily burnt offering associated with the sanctuary service in Leviticus and Numbers. They seem to agree that “the biblical references to that practice always refer to it as taking place in the morning and the evening, never in the evening and the morning.”<sup>98</sup> The following discussion will demonstrate that the specific “evening-morning” sequence, not a morning-evening sequence, applies to “the continual (*hattamid*) burnt offering.”

The biblical evidence is clear that the “daily burnt offering” consisted of two male lambs, one to be offered in the morning and the other lamp to be offered “between the evenings” or twilight (Ex. 29:39; Num. 28:4).<sup>99</sup> The phraseology employed always mentions the morning before the evening offering. A cursory survey of the pertinent texts concerning the daily burnt offering **appear** to suggest that the morning offering preceded the evening offering<sup>100</sup> (“one lamb you shall offer in the morning, and the other lamb you shall offer between the evenings; Num. 29:39). However it should be observed that the singular nature of the expression in Dn. 8:14, “evening-morning,” contravenes the key texts describing the “law of the burnt offering” in Ex. 29:38-46 and Num. 28:1-8 in which *boqer* (morning) is singular but *`ereb* is in the dual state (*ha`arbayim*), the evenings. The linguistic analogy to *`ereb-boqer* in Dn. 8:14 is not exact.

Moreover, as Shea has correctly observed, the singular and unique expression “evening-morning” in Dn. 8:14 exhibits a near perfect analogy to Jehovah’s command to tend the lampstand “from evening to morning” continually (*tamid*) in Ex. 27:21 and Lev. 24:3-4. The unique expression “from evening until morning” (*me`ereb `ad-boqer*) strongly suggests a complete worship cycle or sequence which commenced at evening and continued until morning through the day. For example, Aaron was instructed to set up or initiate (*`ala*) the lamps and burn incense on the golden altar at evening and every morning he again was to burn incense on the altar while he tended the lamps (Ex. 30:7-8). Thus, worship was continuous, commencing at evening, continuing through the rest of the night with the burning lamps, and it was reinvigorated by tending the lamps and burning incense in the morning for the remainder of the day until evening when it commenced again with the lighting of the golden lampstand.

Furthermore, this same evening-morning sequence or cycle of worship is also exhibited with “the daily burnt offering.” The very first instruction of the law of the burnt offering Jehovah gave to Moses specifically directed that the burnt offering, a male lamb, was to be on the hearth or consuming fire “all night until the morning” (*kal-halaylah `ad-habboqer*) and the fire was to be kept burning (Lev. 6:9). The phrase, “**all night until morning**” is essentially equivalent to the phrase “from evening until morning” in terms of a cyclic sequence with a definitive initiation point. Thus, a clear signal is given at the beginning of the instructions in Lev. 6:9 concerning the law of the burnt offering that the daily burnt offering cycle commenced at evening with the offering of the first of the two

lambs (one in the morning and another lamb in between the evenings as stated in Ex. 29:39 and Num. 28:4). The relation of the commencement (evening) and re-initiation (morning) sequence to the “evening-morning” sequence is reinforced in the subsequent instructions of the law of the burnt offering. Thus in the morning (*boqer*) the priest was to lift up the ashes of the burnt offering which the fire consumed and place them beside the altar and then carry them outside the camp (6:10-11). The priest was to keep the fire burning by adding wood on the altar morning by morning which was followed by laying the **second** male lamb on it in the morning to burn as incense with the fat of the peace offering during the day (6:12). A continual (*tamid*) fire burned on the altar yielding a sweet aroma during the worship cycle (“evening-morning”) of the daily burnt offering.

Shea, Hasel and Schwantes seemingly overlook the “evening-morning” commencement/ re-initiation sequence of the daily burnt offering articulated in Lev. 6:8-13 and focus on the two offerings, one in the morning and the other lamb in the evening.<sup>101</sup> “The universal preference for the formula day and night reflects” as Schwantes quotes J. B. Segal’s remarks “the ordinary course of human behavior. It is at dawn that man begins the active work of the day, and, for that reason, a phrase current in man’s mouth is day and night.”<sup>102</sup> The “natural” listing of the two sacrifices (morning and evening) which is in harmony with natural human daily behavior is misinterpreted as an explanation of the biblical worship cycle of commencement and re-initiation (evening-morning) repeatedly stated in Leviticus and Numbers.<sup>103</sup> It should be noted that the same apparent anomaly exists with the lighting of the lampstand. The “evening-morning” cyclic sequence is specified in Ex. 27:31 & Lev. 24:1-4, but the common behavioral language of “morning and evening” is used in Ex. 30:7-8.

The preceding discussion clearly establishes the linkage of the expression “evening-morning” with the Hebrew cultus of the daily burnt offering and in particular with *hattamid* in Dn. 8:14 both of which are linked with a “sweet aroma” to Jehovah. The daily burnt offering is described repeatedly in the cultic worship setting of Leviticus and Numbers. Since the activity of the 2300 year vision including *hattamid* of Dn. 8:13 is of counterfeit origin (“until when the vision: the daily and the transgression which desolates to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled”), it may be concluded that the answer in Dn. 8:14 encompassing the 2300 “evening-morning” is likewise of a counterfeit nature. Therefore, the 2300 “evening-morning” constitute 2300 prophetic days of counterfeit worship cycles resulting in a continuous counterfeit sweet aroma to Jehovah.

## [8.2.2 The Continually Burning Lamps](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 8.2.2 The Continually Burning Lamps

The expression “evening-morning” is directly connected with the cultic sanctuary activity or worship as the previous discussion confirms. Shea has specifically connected the expression “evening-morning” with the sanctuary service in which the priest lights the lamps in the holy place at evening and trims the lamps in the morning (Ex. 27:20-21; 30:7-8; Lev. 24:1-4). At the same time the priest was to burn incense on the golden altar when the lamps were set up in the morning and trimmed in the evening.[104](#)

The expression “from evening until morning” (evening-morning) consistently refers to the worship cycle and all its aspects in the cultic sanctuary setting of Leviticus and Numbers. The various aspects of the “evening-morning” worship cycle include the daily burnt offering, the daily grain offering (both for a sweet aroma), the lighting of the lamps filled with oil to give light within the holy place (Ex. 25:37) illuminating the shewbread which typified the Word of God (Jn. 6:51, 63). The light from the burning oil in the lamps thus represented the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit (Zech. 4:4, 6).

The counterfeit cultic “evening-morning” expression in Dn. 8:14 would thereby encompass not only a counterfeit worship associated with the daily burnt offering (sweet aroma) but also counterfeit light from the lampstand associated with a counterfeit holy spirit. Since the burning of incense on the golden altar is integral to the “evening-morning” cultic worship sequence of lighting the lamps in Ex. 30:7-8, the counterfeit “evening-morning” sequence in Dn. 8:14 also implies a counterfeit incense aroma to Jehovah which was previously established from independent factors based on the cultic language in Dn. 8:11 and cultic parallels in Leviticus.

### [8.2.3 The Continual Cloud](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## 8.2.3 The Continual Cloud

The “evening-morning” sequence is also specifically linked with the continual pillar of cloud above the wilderness tabernacle (Num. 9:15-16, 21). “On the day the tabernacle was raised up, the cloud covered the tabernacle, the tent of testimony; and at **evening** there was above the tabernacle the appearance of fire **until morning**. So it was continually; the cloud covered it, and the appearance of fire by night” (Num. 9:15-16). The description commences with the pillar of fire at night “from evening till morning it was above the tabernacle” like fire (9:15) and concludes with the cloud by day (9:16). Quoting W. H. Shea, “during the wilderness wandering the time to carry out the various sanctuary activities of the “evening-morning” sequence was marked off by God Himself. At evening the cloud turned to a pillar of fire. In the morning the fire turned into a pillar of cloud (Num. 9:15-16, 21). This language in the Pentateuch sounds very much like the background for these “sanctuary days” in Daniel 8:14.”<sup>105</sup> The sanctuary day or “evening-morning” cycle was superintended by Jehovah Himself, symbolized by the cloud during the day and changing to the appearance of fire at night (1 Cor. 10:1-4). The counterfeit cultic “evening-morning” expression in Dn. 8:14 would thus include a counterfeit christ.

The horn from littleness in its papal form counterfeits all aspects of true worship by setting before the saints 1) a false worship system associated with the self exalting character of a counterfeit *hattamid* or sweet aroma; 2) a false Holy Spirit with counterfeit light and truth and 3) a false christ, a savior who is not nigh at hand to help in every time of need but who is replaced by a counterfeit human priest. A summary of the genuine and counterfeit elements of the “evening-morning” worship cycle is illustrated in the following table.

### [Evening-Morning Worship Elements](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# Evening-Morning Worship Elements

## Genuine

## Text

## Counterfeit 2300 Evening-Morning

---

1. Hattamid Burnt Offering Sweet Aroma True Worship	Lv. 6:8-13 (Ex.29:38-46) Num. 28-29	Counterfeit Hattamid Repugnant Aroma False Worship
2. Continual Light True Holy Spirit Truth	Ex. 27:20-21 Lv. 24:1-4	Counterfeit Light False holy spirit Error
3. Incense Sweet Aroma Contrite Spirit	Ex. 30:7-8	Counterfeit Incense Repugnant Aroma Self Righteous
4. Pillar of Cloud Jehovah Christ	Num.9:15-16, 21	Counterfeit Cloud False christ

---

## [8.3 Sanctuary Trampled 2300 Evening-Morning & Cleansed: Thesis-Antithesis](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 8.3 Sanctuary Trampled 2300 Evening-Morning & Cleansed: Thesis-Antithesis

The question asked in Daniel 8:13, “until when the vision,” pertains to the whole vision (*chazon*), which began in 8:1 while Daniel was in Shushan by the river Ulai, and which encompasses the activity of the ram, the goat and the horn from littleness in both its pagan and papal phases. More specifically, the activity within the entire vision results in giving or making (*natan*) both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled down. The Hebrew root *ramas* and its derivative *mirmas* both connote the sense of “trampling”[106](#) and when connected with God’s sanctuary (Is. 1:12), *ramas* conveys the sense of trampling the sanctuary in terms of hypocritical and false worship in Is. 1:11-13. The sanctuary in 8:13 (*qodesh*) is Jehovah’s, both His earthly and heavenly sanctuary. The question in 8:13 concerns the limit of time (time of the end; 8:17) when the activity within the vision, which results in trampling the sanctuary and the host, will be exposed in order that the sanctuary (exclusively heavenly at the time of the end) will be put right (*nisdaq*), restored, vindicated from error and cleansed. The Hebrew root (*sadaq*) embraces all of these concepts.[107](#) *Nisdaq* (to put right) in Daniel 8:14 is the corrective response to the trampling (*mirmas*) in Daniel 8:13 revolving around the sanctuary. The focus in 8:13 is on the duration of the trampling down the sanctuary; the focus in 8:14 is on up-righting the sanctuary at the termination of the vision. It should be re-emphasized that the emphasis on duration in 8:13 comes from the phrase describing the on-going activity in the vision, namely, “to give (make) both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled.” This clearly implies duration, not termination. It is acknowledged that `ad (until) designates termination[108](#) but only in the context of terminating the 2300 years (duration) of trampling activity. A summary of lexical evidence for “trampling down” and “putting right” the sanctuary is shown in the following chart.

---

### 2300 EVENING-MORNING EFFECT ON THE SANCTUARY

**2300 Year Duration** (8:13)  
(Trampled Down)

*mirmas* (root: *ramas*)

**2300 Year Conclusion** (8:14)  
(Put Right)

*nisdaq* (root: *sadaq*)

1. Basic Meaning:
  - Tread down
  - Stamp down
  - Trample down
  - Walk over
2. Result:
  - Downward crushing

1. Basic Meaning:
  - Put right
  - Be straight
  - Justify
  - Vindicate
  - Make upright
2. Result:
  - Upward restoration

Although this exposition has established that *hattamid* (the daily) is the negative, self-exalting character of paganism and not the positive, beneficial high priestly ministry of Christ, the question in 8:13 confirms this conclusion. The question deals exclusively with negative consequences resulting from the activity of the ram, the goat and horn to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled down. Both “*hattamid* (the daily)” and “the transgression which desolates,” which appositionally modifies “the vision” in 8:13, are set forth in the context of negative consequences which permeate the entire vision. The interpretation that “the daily” is the positive, beneficial high priestly of Christ contravenes the context and leads to a oxymoron. That “the daily” is indeed associated with both paganism and the trampling of the sanctuary will be demonstrated in the following discussion.

### [8.3.1 The Daily and the Trampling of the Sanctuary](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)



## 8.3.1 The Daily and the Trampling of the Sanctuary

The question in 8:13 implies that the sanctuary (*qodesh*), both earthy and heavenly, continued to be trampled down for 2300 years following the return of the exiles from Babylon. The commencement of the 2300 year prophecy in 457 BC to restore and build Jerusalem at the command of Artaxerxes (Dn. 9:25; Ezra 7) has been well established elsewhere.<sup>109</sup> If the sanctuary was trampled down in the early post-exilic period of the 2300 years, biblical evidence must exist to support this assertion which is implied in 8:13. The post-exilic prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi as well as the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, in fact, provide evidence of the continual trampling down of Jehovah's earthly sanctuary in Jerusalem, following its reconstruction, by pagan elements and practices. For example in Haggai where the people delayed rebuilding the temple to pursue their own pleasure, Jehovah announced the work of their hands and their offerings as unclean (2:10-14). Zechariah called the returned exiles to repentance (1:2-4). In Malachi the priests are rebuked for lack of reverence for Jehovah and despising His name ((1:6); for offering defiled food (1:7); for offering blemished (lame/blind) sacrifices; for vain worship (1:10) similar to the trampling or vain worship in Is. 1:11-13; for departing from and corrupting the covenant of Levi (2:7-8); and Judah is rebuked for profaning the sanctuary of Jehovah by ecumenical mingling with the daughters of a pagan god (2:11). Ezra mourned, following his return to Jerusalem in 457 BC, when he discovered that not only the people but the priests and Levites had taken pagan wives causing trampling of the sanctuary.<sup>110</sup>

However, the clearest and most explicit statement of the trampling of the sanctuary by pagan elements is in Nehemiah. Eliashib the high priest who had authority over the storerooms in the sanctuary allied himself with Tobiah, the pagan Ammonite official (13:4; 2:19). Through this alliance the sanctuary was profaned and trampled down by the pagan official Tobiah who, through the auspices of Eliashib, was permitted to have a private large room in the court of the temple which had previously been used exclusively for storage of holy articles for the sanctuary including the grain offering, the frankincense, the tithe of grain, the new wine and oil (13:5). Nehemiah, after returning to Jerusalem, following his recall by Artaxerxes (13:6), expelled the household goods of Tobiah and commanded the rooms of the court of the sanctuary to be cleansed (*taher*; 13:9). Furthermore the priesthood had again been defiled by marriage to pagan women (13:27-29). In response to the pagan trampling down of the sanctuary and priesthood, Nehemiah cleansed (*taher*) the priesthood from everything pagan in order to restore the sanctuary to its rightful function (13:30-31). It should be emphasized that both the sanctuary and the priesthood were cleansed by Nehemiah.

Thus, clear evidence is provided that the self-exalting character of paganism (*hattamid*), symbolized by the ram in Daniel 8 and represented by Media-Persia to whom Tobiah, the Ammonite official reported, infiltrated and trampled the earthly sanctuary (*qodesh*) in the early stages of the 2300 year time prophecy.



With the rise of the Grecian and Roman empires, Israel and Judah remained in subjection to pagan domination. Due to the iniquity of the profane wicked prince of Israel, Jehovah’s indignation would rest on Israel commencing with Babylon, who removed the crown, followed by Media-Persia, Greece and Rome symbolized by the triple imperative, “overturn, overturn, overturn, I will set it” (see Eze. 21:24-27). Thus, the latter time of the indignation (Dn. 8:19) would continue until the time of the end with Rome. Pagan Rome through the office of *pontifex maximus* trampled down the sanctuary and ultimately the physical destruction of the sanctuary in AD 70 by Titus was consummated who became Roman emperor.

Papal Rome’s trampling down of the heavenly sanctuary continued with the human priestcraft of the Roman church under the guise of professed Christianity. Thus a continuous progression of trampling down the sanctuary commenced in the post-exilic period with the earthly sanctuary (*qodesh*) under Media-Persia and continued with Greece and pagan Roman. Papal Rome lifted up the self exalting character of pagan Rome’s *pontifex maximus* function and continued to trample down the heavenly sanctuary (*qodesh*) which at the conclusion of the 2300-year period was to be exposed and put right (*sadaq*).

It seems clear that attempts to symbolize the beneficial heavenly high priestly ministry of Christ by “the daily” which is “taken away” by the papacy to initiate the trampling of the sanctuary cannot fulfill the requirements of the 2300 years which commenced in 457 BC. The continuous trampling of Jehovah’s sanctuary, both earthly and heavenly during the 2300 evening-morning time prophecy is summarized in the following table.

<b>2300 YEAR TRAMPLING OF THE SANCTUARY</b>				
<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Agent</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Qodesh</b>	<b>Activity</b>
Ram	M/P	538-331BC	Earthly	Pagan Wives of priesthood
Goat	Greece	331-168BC	Earthly	Pagan influences on worship
Horn	Rome	168BC-AD476	Earthly	Destroy sanctuary <i>pontifex maximus</i>
Horn	Papal Rome	AD300-1844	Heavenly	Priestcraft

### [8.3.2 “The Daily” & the Integrity of the 2300 Evening-Morning](#)

[Index of This Study](#)



## 8.3.2 “The Daily” & the Integrity of the 2300 Evening-Morning

By “exegetically” forcing “the daily” in Daniel 8:11 to be the positive, beneficial high priestly ministry of Christ, Adventist scholars have recreated a framework in which Daniel 8:11 and Daniel 8:14 must be seen in a **thesis-antithesis** relationship. That which is positive and good is taken away and cast down in 8:11 and restored and made right in 8:14. This is the same framework in which all pre-Millerite views were set-forth where “the daily” represented the positive Jewish temple sacrifices which were restored at a later date in 8:14. Following the disappointment of 1844, the “time setting” effort of one group, similar to others, which tried to re-establish the date for second coming of Christ, was intimately linked with the identification of “the daily” as the positive Jewish altar of “daily sacrifice” which was taken away in 446 BC. This was used as a starting point for a new 2300-year time span to end in 1854. The Cummings 1854 “prophetic chart”, “published at Concord, New Hampshire, in 1853, was typical of charts that commenced the 2300 days with what was said to be the taking away of the `daily sacrifice.’”[111](#)

All efforts to identify “the daily” as a positive and beneficial substantive immediately create a thesis-antithesis relationship between 8:11 and 8:14 and destroy the integrity of the 2300 evening-morning time prophecy with a commencement date of 457 BC.[112](#) For example, this anomaly is exposed by forcing “the daily” to be the heavenly ministry of Christ and the *miqdash* 8:11 to be His heavenly sanctuary. If the foundation of Christ’s heavenly sanctuary (*miqdash*) was cast down by the papacy in Daniel 8:11, this would require a “putting right”, restoration and vindication after the 2300 year time span described in 8:13-14. This would mandate a commencement date of the time prophecy no earlier than AD 300-538 when popery began to blossom leading to the papal usurpation of Christ’s heavenly high priestly function. This would force the termination of the of the 2300 years to conclude no earlier than AD 2600. By identifying “the daily” to be a positive and beneficial substantive, the integrity of the 2300-year time prophecy commencing in 457 BC, which is internally confirmed from Daniel 9:24-27, becomes utterly decimated by the thesis-antithesis relationship created between Daniel 8:11 and Daniel 8:14. Alternatively if the negative, self exalting character associated with paganism is assigned as an interpretation of “the daily” in 8:11 which exhibits itself by the trampling down of the sanctuary, (both earthly and heavenly) through all the activity of Media-Persia, Greece and Rome, the 2300-year time prophecy retains its integrity with a commencement date of 457 BC. The correct assignment of “the daily” as a negative substantive precludes the creation of a thesis-antithesis relationship between Daniel 8:11 and Daniel 8:14, and the 2300 evening-morning time prophecy with a commencement date of 457 BC becomes confirmed and self-consistent with the activity of “the daily”, and AD 1844 now becomes firmly anchored.

Although a counterfeit “thesis-antithesis” relationship exists between Daniel 8:11 and Daniel 8:14, the genuine “thesis-antithesis” relationship exists between Daniel 8:13 and Daniel 8:14. The positive and beneficial function of the sanctuary (*qodesh*) of Jehovah is trampled in 8:13, which is a summary

statement for the continuing trampling caused by “the daily” and “the transgression which desolates” described throughout the vision (8:1-13). The function of the sanctuary which has been trampled and despised is “put right” (*sadaq*) in Daniel 8:14. A summary of the genuine and counterfeit thesis-antithesis relationships in Daniel 8 is presented in the following chart.

---

### THESIS-ANTITHESIS Daniel 8

Counterfeit	Genuine
A. Thesis Dn. 8:11	A. Thesis Dn. 8:13
Heavenly ministry removed	Sanctuary trampled
1. daily taken away 2. sanctuary found. cast down	1. by “the daily” 2. by trangr. desol.
B. Antithesis Dn. 8:14	B. Antithesis Dn. 8:14
Sanctuary put right after 2300 years	Sanctuary put right after 2300 years
C. Effect on 2300 Eve-Morn	C. Effect 2300 Eve-Morn
1. Commencement AD 300 2. Conclusion AD 2600 3. Result: 1844 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ destroyed</li><li>○ anomalous</li></ul>	1. Commence 457 BC 2. Conclude AD 1844 3. Result: 1844 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ integrity</li><li>○ self-consistent</li></ul>

### [8.3.3 The Termination of the 2300 Evening-Morning](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 8.3.3 The Termination of the 2300 Evening-Morning

From the discussion of the 2300 year trampling of the sanctuary and the host in Daniel 8:13, it is evident that the phrase, “the sanctuary shall be put right (*nisdaq*),” includes not only the cleansing (*taher*), as implied in *nisdaq*, and the rectification (putting right) of the sanctuary itself, but also the cleansing and putting right (rectification) of God’s people, the temple of the Holy Spirit. *Sadaq* includes the concept of cleansing (*taher*) of the sanctuary from confessed sins as set forth in Leviticus 16, but the trampling of both the sanctuary and the host (*saba’*) in Daniel 8:13 caused by “the daily and the transgression which desolates” requires a “putting right” or rectification of both God’s heavenly temple and the temple of the Holy Spirit, His people (*saba’* or host). The “putting right” or rectification conveyed by *sadaq* transcends the cleansing described by *taher* and effectively describes God’s intended action both with His sanctuary and His people.

Just as Nehemiah cleansed the priesthood of everything pagan (Neh. 13:30), he also cleansed the sanctuary court rooms from the trampling caused by the pagan Ammonite official, Tobiah (13:9). Likewise God will purify (*taher*) the sons of Levi (Mal. 3:3), His royal priesthood today (1 Peter 2:9), that they may offer to Jehovah an offering in righteousness (*sedaqa*). The promise and the power of the gospel is to make His faithful people, who walk after the Spirit (Rom. 8:4), righteous through the obedience of Christ (Rom. 5:19). Consequently, the sanctuary shall be cleansed and “put right” at the time of the end (Dn. 8:17) following the continuous trampling associated with the 2300 “evening-morning” time prophecy. The antitypical day of atonement and cleansing or “putting right” of the heavenly sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 is intimately connected in a parallel manner with the typical day of atonement and cleansing (*taher*) of the earthly sanctuary in which both the people (Lev. 16:30) and the sanctuary (Lev. 16:19) were cleansed which was followed by the feast of tabernacles typifying the second coming of Christ and the heavenly Canaan.

### [9.0 EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FROM DANIEL 9:23-27](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

# 9.0 EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FROM DANIEL 9:23-27

The 70-week prophecy of Dn. 9:24-27 is presented within the overall context of the vision (*mare`h*) of the “2300 evening-morning” of Daniel 8. The Hebrew term, *mare`h*, for vision is specifically associated with the 2300 evening-morning in Dn. 8:26 and Gabriel uses *mare`h*, not *chazon*, for vision in 9:23 when he comes to help Daniel understand the vision (*mare`h*). The explanation encompasses the 70-week (490-year) commencement of the 2300 years and would logically include the entire contextual framework of the 2300 years, especially the events revolving around the end of the 2300 years. Thus, Gabriel exhorts Daniel in 9:23 to “pay attention” and “understand the vision (*mare`h*)”.

Shea’s exegesis of Dn. 9:24-27 limits the entire passage to the unfolding events associated with the Messiah until the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.<sup>113</sup> All the concluding events associated with the “utter end” (*kalah*), “end” (*qes*), “desolations” (*shomem*) and “abominations” (*shiqqus*) are attributed to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. It is suggested that these terms are directly related to similar ones used in Dn. 8, 11 & 12. An exegesis of 9:24-27 limited to the 70 weeks in contrast to the 2300 year vision (*mare`h*) is inconsistent with Daniel’s other over-arching visions of world kingdoms and powers presented in Dn. 2, 7, 8 and the vision of chapters 10-12. Each one covers the full expanse of time to the utter consummation of all things.

It is suggested that the explanation of the 2300-year vision given in 9:24-27 follows this same pattern and encompasses the closing events of earth’s history. This view is supported based on the following linguistic and contextual evidence of pertinent passages within 9:26 & 27.

## [9.1 Verse 26 & 27: Translation and Explanation](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 9.1 Verse 26 & 27:

### Translation and Explanation

“And after the 62 weeks Messiah shall be cut off, but no one for Him. And the people of the coming Prince shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end (shall be) with a flood. **And until an end of war, desolations are decreed (lit: that which is decreed, desolations)**. And He shall confirm the covenant with the many (for) one week. And in the middle of the week, he shall make cease sacrifice and offering. **And upon a wing of abominations, (is) that which desolates even until an utter end. And that which was decreed shall pour out on that which desolates.**”

Attention will be focused on the highlighted portions of the translation of verse 26 & 27. Shea<sup>114</sup> connects the first phrase, “until an end of war...”, with the destruction of Jerusalem by translating the previous phrase: “at the end of the war desolations are decreed”. This alters the intended meaning by incorrectly translating the preposition, `ad, which means “unto” or “until” as “at”. The two definite articles “the”, associated with “end” and “war”, do not exist. The net effect of these linguistic alterations imply a reference to the preceding action associated with the destruction of Jerusalem. Such unjustified modifications and additions change the intended meaning of text.

It is suggested that a simple, unaltered literal translation is preferred. “Until an end of war” refers to the continual conflict between religio-pagan forces throughout history exalting against God. This conflict (war) is described in each of the world-kingdom visions of Dn. 2 (verses 44-45), Dn. 7 (verses 21-22, 25-26), and Dn. 8 (verses 10-12, 24-25) and throughout Daniel 11. The world conflict in 9:26 is alluded to after the full destruction of Jerusalem “with a flood” in the preceding phrase. The next phrase is not repetitious of the preceding one as implied by Shea’s translation, but, with the correct translation, places the focus on the overall context of the 2300-year vision at the time of end.

The plural participle translated as “desolations” (*shomemoth*) in 9:26, which includes the destruction of Jerusalem, is in the context of the conflict between the kingdoms of this world with God continuing until the end of history, and is also directly related to the same participle (*shomem*) in the singular state in 8:13. In Dn. 8:13 the singular participle, “causing desolation”, is attributed to the compound subject representing the singular activity of self-exaltation against God, namely “the daily” and “the transgression” which desolates. This desolation also covers the entire expanse of time of the 2300-year prophecy until the end of time. Thus, the desolating activity of 9:26 is directly related with 8:13 in a continual historical

setting but with an end-time emphasis in the context of the 2300-year prophecy.

In verse 27, Shea adds the definite article “the” in the phrase “upon a wing of abominations” which conveys the sense that the phrase alludes to the previous activity associated with the Messiah in Jerusalem. He also emends the text by adding the phrase “shall come”: “and upon the wing of abominations shall come a desolator.” By these emendations Shea implies that the abominations were to come first and the desolator was to follow thereafter in terms of time.<sup>115</sup> Furthermore, Shea proceeds again to redefine the meaning of the preposition ,`ad, in the next phrase from the correct meaning of “until an end” or “unto an end” to the incorrect translation, “at the end”. This creates a new thought pattern rather than continuing the thought pattern associated with the “wing of abominations”. The thrust of Shea’s emendations and arguments focuses entirely on the destruction of Jerusalem. These emendations are linguistically unacceptable and lead to a false understanding.

It is suggested that literal simplicity has the advantage. “Upon a wing of abominations (is) that which desolates even until an utter end”. This phrase is parallel to the earlier phrase in verse 26 concerning “an end of war” and is in the context of the “utter end” or “consummation” of earth’s history. Unmistakable evidence for this view in verse 27 is provided by the use of the word *kalah* which from lexical evidences means “utter end”, “full end” or “destructions resolved especially by God”.<sup>116</sup> This is also the sense ascertained for every usage of *kalah* in the OT.<sup>117</sup> For example, in Is. 28:22, God has determined a destruction upon the whole earth; and in Jer. 30:11 God will “make a full end of all nations” (see also Is. 10:23; Nah.1:8-9; Eze. 11:13, etc.).

The desolator or “that which desolates” in v. 27 (singular participle *shomem*) accompanies and does not follow the abominations upon a wing. These abominations are wrought by the desolating force or activity and continue throughout earth’s history. The desolating activity is identical to the “the continual” and “the transgression” which desolates in 8:13.

The final thought of verse 27 begins with the conjunction (*waw*): “and that which was decreed shall pour out on that which desolates”. (The Hebrew conjunction “*waw*” in the phrase, “even until an end” is not a connecting but an intensifying conjunction emphasizing the duration of the desolating activity.) This describes the final fate of the desolator or desolating activity which was previously decreed in v. 26. This decree is an allusion to the final decree on the horn or king in Dn. 8:25, “but he shall be broken without hand”. The same final decree is repeated in Dn. 2:44-45 and Dn 7:11 & 26 (v. 26, “the judgement shall sit, and they shall take away his rulership, to cut-off and destroy until the end”), and finally in Dn. 11:45, the king of the north “shall come to his end and no one will help him”.

## 9.2 Summary



## **Index of This Study**

## 9.2 Summary

The evidence suggests that Dn. 9:23-27 not only explains the beginning date of the 2300 year prophecy, but also gives a snapshot overview from the beginning to the end of the entire 2300 year period and the final conclusion of earth's history. This comprehensive chronology is inherent in all the world-kingdom prophecies of Daniel including 9:24-27.

The evidence also strongly suggests a direct linkage of Dn. 8:13 with 9:26-27 by the use of the participle "that which desolates" (*shomem*). The same linkage exists with 11:31 and 12:11. In Dn. 9:26-27 desolations (*shomemoth*) and abominations (*shiqqusim*) are both plural, suggesting the compound two-phase character of Rome. This two-phase character is represented by "the continual" self-exalting of pagan Rome, lifted up by papal Rome, which manifests itself ultimately in the second phase by the "transgression" of claiming to act in behalf of God through the union of church and state.

### [10.0 EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF DANIEL 11:31](#)

#### [Index of This Study](#)

# 10.0 External Evidence of Daniel 11:31

The context of Daniel 11 portrays a continuing conflict of the king of the north and the king of the south. This conflict exhibits both a military nature and a religio-political nature. Shea rightly acknowledges the direct linkage of Dn. 11:31 with 8:11-13 and suggests “these passages should be interpreted as referring to the same action of the same power at the same time”.<sup>118</sup> In verse 31, “forces will stand from him and they shall profane the sanctuary (*miqdash*), the fortress (*maoz*), and they shall turn aside or remove (*sur* not *rum*) the continual (*hattamid*) and they shall place the abomination that desolates.

*Miqdash* (sanctuary) is clearly used in the context of a military setting. Forces or arms (*zeroa`*) and fortress (*ma`oz*) are repeatedly used in Daniel 11 in a pagan military context.<sup>119</sup> Although *ma`oz* (fortress or strength) sometimes is used figuratively of Jehovah,<sup>120</sup> it is employed exclusively in Daniel 11 with the meaning of military fortress of political fortifying; in 11:1 *ma`oz* refers to Gabriel fortifying Darius the Mede; the other applications Daniel 11 deal with military-political fortifications. Daniel’s application of counterfeit cultic language, employing *hattamid* (“the daily”) and *miqdash* (sanctuary) in 8:11, is reapplied 11:31 with the same counterfeit cultic meaning. The pagan military contextual setting of conflict in Dn. 11:20-31 reinforces and demands the counterfeit cultic application of *hattamid* and *miqdash* in 11:31. The use of *miqdash* in association with *hattamid* in Dn. 11:31 as a fortress of paganism defines its use in Dn. 8:11. It cannot fit the heavenly sanctuary.

In harmony with the preceding analysis, U. Smith has suggested that the profaning of the sanctuary refers to “the rulers of the empire who were working in behalf of the papacy against the pagan and all opposing religions” which signified “the removal of the seat of the empire from Rome to Constantinople” in AD 330 and “which contributed its measure of influence to the downfall of Rome. This passage would then be parallel to Dn. 8:11 and Rev. 13:2.”<sup>121</sup> An alternative view expressed by Smith is that the passage applied to the sacking of Rome by the Goths and Vandals resulting in the cessation of the imperial power of the West through the conquest of Rome by Odoacer.<sup>122</sup>

The root meaning of the verb *sur* is “to turn aside”, “to go away”, or “to depart.”<sup>123</sup> That which is turned aside still exists but not in its original mooring, setting, or form. For example, garments are laid aside (Gen. 38:14); the covering of a ship is turned aside (Gen. 8:13); a person who departs from the law (Deut. 17:20) still exists. The verb *sur* (turn aside or remove) in Dn. 11:31 refers to the turning aside of “the daily” by political and military forces (*zeroa`*) in behalf of the papacy; its incorporation spiritually into the papacy is denoted by the verb *rum* in Dn. 8:11. “The daily” has been previously identified as the self-exalting behavior of paganism inherent in mankind of which Arianism became integrated. Although “the continual” (*hattamid*) self-exalting behavior of pagan Rome was lifted up by papal Rome with the casting down of the habitation of pagan Rome’s

sanctuary in the city of Rome in AD 330, yet the two competing powers co-existed, since the papacy had not yet transcended the dominance and splendor of Rome's empire, both in the East and the West. Upon the conversion of Clovis in AD 496 and his military conquests in behalf of Rome, culminating in AD 508, the "turning aside" (*sur*) of the "daily" was finally complete. The self-exalting character of the papacy would now surpass, supersede and transcend that same character previously manifested by avowed pagan forces which would continue to exist but in a diminished role compared the transcending character of the papacy. Papal Rome was to become an acknowledged "religio-political" power.

"When the prominent powers of Europe gave up their attachment to paganism, it was only to perpetuate its abominations in another form, for Christianity as exhibited in the Roman Catholic church was, and is, only paganism rebaptized."<sup>124</sup> Thus, between AD 508-538, the setting up of the abomination that desolates commenced. A religious power of pagan origins now became a religious-political power exhibiting all the self-exalting (*gadal*) behavior of paganism. The joint action of church and state, first with Clovis between AD 496-508 and again with Justinian from AD 533 to 538 is represented by the "transgression" in Dn. 8:12-13 which resulted in the placing of the abomination that desolates. Thus, "the abomination which desolates" may be identified as the self exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head. Nominal Christianity surpasses, supersedes, and transcends all other false religious systems of the world. It is the principal force and the largest religious bloc in the world today constituting 33% of the world's population, twice the size of the second largest bloc, the Muslims at 17%.<sup>125</sup> "The abomination which desolates" is the character of paganism with a nominal Christian face.

## [11.0 EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF DANIEL 12:11](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# 11.0 External Evidence of Daniel 12:11

The strongest confirmatory evidence supporting the view that “the daily” is the self-exalting behavior (*gadal*) of paganism and not Christ’s High Priestly ministry is the time prophecy of Dn. 12:11. Hasel ignores “the daily” in 12:11 in totality.<sup>126</sup> A definite time is specified for the turning aside or removal (*sur*) of “the daily” either militarily or politically in order to set up the papacy. The 1290 days are essential to the true identification of *hattamid*.

Adventist expositors over 150 years still see AD 508-AD 1798 as the 1290 day application. Shea is unequivocal in establishing the connection of the 1290 day/year time period of Dn. 12:11 directly with Dn. 11:31. He establishes the linkage through linguistic terminology common to both passages.<sup>127</sup> Shea maintains that the 1290 days supplied by Dn. 12:11 should be applied to 11:31 and should be used to date the taking away of the “daily” or “continual” and the setting up of the abomination that desolates in both 12:11 and 11:31.

Shea’s analysis is correct. The dramatic events leading up to the turning aside or removal of the “daily” commenced with the conversion of Clovis, King of the Franks, in AD 496 following which the titles of “Most Christian Majesty” and Eldest Son of the Church” were bestowed on him. Thereupon, Clovis attacked and defeated the Arian Visigoths in AD 507 gaining the favor of the Catholic bishops and Roman officials in governing his country. In AD 508 the Emperor Anastasius I conferred on Clovis the title of “Proconsul” becoming a fellow emperor.<sup>128</sup> In the same year, AD 508, a league of Arian powers under “Theodoric came against Clovis and gained a victory, after which he unaccountably made peace with him” (Clovis), “and the resistance of the Arian powers was at end.” The significance of the victories of Clovis in behalf of the Roman Church led to the decision “that the Franks, and not the Goths, were to direct the future destinies of Gaul and Germany, and that the Catholic faith, and not Arianism, was to be the religion of these great realms.”<sup>129</sup> Clovis thus prepared the way for the full unopposed establishment of the papacy in AD 538. The activity of Clovis does not refer to the *rum* activity (lift up, incorporate) of the little horn in Dn. 8:11, but to the military activity of removing (*sur*) the self exalting character of paganism inherent in mankind of which Arianism became integrated and replacing it with the self exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head. Thus, “the daily” was turned aside or removed and “the abomination which desolates” was set up (Dn. 11:31). The full establishment of the papacy occurred following the decree of Justinian in AD 533 and the retreat and abandonment of the Ostrogoth siege of Rome in March AD 538. This Gothic horn, the last of the three, was thus plucked up before the little horn of Daniel 7. The pope was now free to exercise the power conferred on him five years earlier by Justinian.

The “new view” proponents of “the daily” are unable to exegete this verse, leaving Daniel to self-

extinguish in meaningless speculation. Any attempt to suggest that Christ's High Priestly ministry was taken away in AD 508 either by the institution of penance or the mass cannot be supported. Evidence for the mass appeared as early as the fourth century but the doctrine of transubstantiation was argued and not fully affirmed until AD 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council.<sup>[130](#)</sup> Evidence for public confession and penance appeared as early as the third century, but private penance also received its charter at the Fourth Lateran Council in AD 1215 where every Christian was required to confess his sins in penance at least once a year.<sup>[131](#)</sup> Daniel's application of *hattamid* in both Dn. 11:31 and 12:11 strongly support the view that the "daily" in Dn. 8:11-13 is the self-exalting character of paganism, lifted up and ultimately replaced with the self-exalting character of papal Rome's nominal Christianity identified in 12:11 as the abomination which desolates.

While the "continual" self-exalting behavior of paganism was "taken up" (*rum*) into the papacy and "turned aside" or "removed" (*sur*) politically and militarily, there could never be an actual or literal removal of the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. The papacy could only attempt to usurp Christ's ministry; but Daniel states that the "daily" was removed or turned aside (Dn. 11:31; 12:11). Elsewhere Daniel speaks of the papacy changing God's law but explicitly states it was only an attempted action: "he shall think to change times and laws (Dn. 7:25). No power can ever remove or turn aside Christ's High Priestly ministry (Heb. 4:14-16; 5:6; 6:19,20; 7:24,25; 8:1). The papacy never removed or turned aside Christ's ministry from the minds of true Christians.<sup>[132](#)</sup>

The unique perspectives of our exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14 including our identification of "the daily," which is diametrically opposed to current Adventist scholarship, does not in any way restrict the spiritual significance of the sanctuary. On the contrary, it establishes 1844 and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary as the only possible understanding of Daniel 8:14.

## [12.0 CONCLUSION](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

## 12.0 Conclusion

The key which unlocks the door to the mystery of “the daily” is Daniel’s application of counterfeit cultic language in chapter 8. The ram, the goat, the horn, the daily (*hattamid*), the sanctuary (*miqdash*) are representative cultic symbols taken from Leviticus and Numbers but which have counterfeit cultic significance in Daniel 8. Verification of the counterfeit significance comes from the initial clue that the ram and the goat represent pagan world powers. Furthermore, the cultic language of the phrase, “from him the daily was lifted up” in Daniel 8, in conjunction with similar and parallel cultic phraseology in Leviticus defines a counterfeit priest, a counterfeit sacrifice, and a counterfeit *hattamid* in Daniel 8.

The identification of “the daily” (*hattamid*) depends on the answer to the pivotal question upon which the exegesis of Daniel 8:11 revolves: “What is the antecedent of the pronoun ‘him’ in the phrase ‘from him the daily was lifted up?’” Is the antecedent “the Prince of the host” or “the one exalting himself.” A definitive answer to this pivotal question comes from the cultic language parallels in Leviticus where the priest lifts up the fat from the cultic beast sacrifice. The cultic-counterfeit cultic parallel of Leviticus with Daniel 8, respectively, demands that “the daily” be lifted up from the cultic horn/beast power (the one exalting himself in 8:11), since the prince of the host intrinsically manifests no cultic significance.

The *hattamid* lifted up from the cultic horn in Daniel 8 and the fat lifted up from the cultic sacrifice in Leviticus are linked together by the sweet aroma associated with burning of the fat of the cultic sacrifice and the sweet aroma of the daily (*hattamid*) burnt offering. “The daily” (*hattamid*) and the sweet aroma are consistently linked together in Leviticus by “the daily” burnt offering, “the daily” grain offering, “the continual” bread, and “the perpetual” incense all of which are associated with the daily worship cycle. The counterfeit sweet aroma of *hattamid* is the self-exalting character associated with all pagan worship practices.

Moreover, the incorrect identification of “the daily” as the positive, beneficial high priestly ministry of Christ creates a counterfeit thesis-antithesis between Daniel 8:11 and Daniel 8:14. That which is good is taken away in 8:11 (thesis) and restored in 8:14 (antithesis). This would necessitate a commencement date of the 2300 years no earlier than AD 300 with a termination in AD 2600. This conclusion decimates the “putting right” and the cleansing of the sanctuary commencing in 1844, the foundational pillar of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The correct identification of “the daily” as the negative self-exalting character of paganism inherent in mankind precludes a counterfeit thesis-antithesis between Daniel 8:11 and 8:14. The genuine thesis-antithesis exists between Daniel 8:13 and Daniel 8:14 where the positive and beneficial sanctuary (*qodesh*) is trampled for 2300 evening-morning (years) commencing in 457 BC and “put right,” restored and cleansed commencing in 1844 with the termination of the 2300 years. With both the genuine thesis-antithesis and the correct view of “the daily,” the 2300 years of Daniel 8, commensurate with the activity of the horn associated with

“the daily,” become self-consistent with the 70 weeks of Daniel 9 and 457 BC.

This exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14 has established multiple lines of self-consistent evidence demonstrating that “the daily” is the self-magnifying character of Satan and the world kingdoms under his banner. This contravenes the current position of Adventist scholars that the “daily” is Christ’s high-priestly ministry. A summary of specific evidence supporting this conclusion includes:

[\*\*A Summary of Specific Evidence\*\*](#)

[\*\*Index of This Study\*\*](#)



# A Summary of Specific Evidence

1. The thematic parallelism of oscillating gender in verses 9-12 following the pattern A:B::A':B' was identified. This established the roles of pagan and papal Rome in verses 9 and 10 (masculine/feminine) respectively which is repeated in verses 11 and 12. This laid the initial foundation for identifying “the daily”. Confirmation of significance of the initial pagan/papal identification by gender distinction was established by evidence derived from the counterfeit cultic symbols and language of Daniel 8 summarized above.
2. One of the pivotal issues in identifying “the daily” involved the determination the antecedent of *mimmennu* (from him) in verse 11: “and from him the daily was lifted up”. The unusual inverted sentence structure of v.11 and the internal reflection following the pattern: A:B::B':C in which *mimmennu* reflects *gadal* (the one exalting himself) demonstrated the direct linkage of the antecedent with the “one exalting himself”. This eliminated the alternative choice of “the Prince of the host” as the antecedent. The antecedent of *mimmennu* was also confirmed with counterfeit cultic language of Daniel 8:11 and its parallel with the cultic language of Leviticus.
3. The integrity of the cognitive quality of *rum*, meaning to lift up or exalt, was established in Dn. 8:11 as well as Leviticus and the entire OT. The contrasting meanings of *rum* and *sur* (“to take away” or “remove”) were demonstrated not only in Leviticus but also in Daniel 8, 11 & 12. The correct use of *rum* argues against the “new view” of the “daily”.
4. Daniel’s repeated characterization of the world powers in Dn. 8 with the term *gadal* meaning “to exalt oneself” and its linkage with the “daily” (*hattamid*) in v. 11 resulted in the identification of *hattamid* with the self-exalting behavior against God by all pagan nations.
5. It was established that *tamid* is used in a pagan context in the OT associated with the “continual” rising up against God by pagan nations. This supports its similar application in Daniel 8.
6. It was demonstrated that *miqdash*, with high degree of probability, may refer exclusively to an earthly sanctuary which may be holy or pagan in nature. Irrespective of whether *miqdash* refers exclusively to an earthly sanctuary, the transcendent issue demonstrated is that *miqdash* often designates a pagan, unholy earthly sanctuary. *Qodesh*, on the other hand, always represents holiness and may be associated with the heavenly sanctuary or God’s earthly sanctuary. *Miqdash* in Dn. 8:11 represents the sanctuary of the pagan Roman power, located in the city of Rome.
7. In Dn. 8:11, *makon* connotes the sense of habitation or dwelling (of his sanctuary in the city of Rome) which was also demonstrated for all its other uses in the OT. In 8:11 the habitation or

place (city of Rome) of his sanctuary was cast down or removed to Constantinople.

8. It was demonstrated that a host or army was given to the papal power in v. 12 “by transgression” which represented a union of church and state. Thus, Clovis with his army acted in behalf of the papacy who was claiming to act for God.
9. The compound subject in v. 13 of “the daily and the transgression” represent two phases of a single entity exhibiting a singular behavioral characteristic of self-exaltation (*gadal*). The “daily and the transgression which desolates” span the entire length of the vision of Daniel 8.
10. The singular participle *shomem* (“which desolates”) modifies the compound subject of v. 13. The desolating activity of “the daily and the transgression” results from the self-exalting behavior of the religio-pagan powers in Daniel 8.
11. It was demonstrated that the cultic language of Dn. 8:9-14 possesses counterfeit cultic significance. The key which unlocks the door to this issue is the cultic symbol of the ram representing counterfeit cultic activity. The cultic term, “evening-morning” was shown to have counterfeit cultic significance in Daniel 8:14 implying 2300 years of counterfeit worship exhibiting counterfeit light or truth, a counterfeit christ, and counterfeit incense or humility.
12. It was demonstrated by linguistic and contextual evidence that the explanation of the vision (*mare`h*) in Dn. 9:24-27 encompassed not only the commencement of the 2300-year period with the 70-week prophecy but also the “utter end” of earth’s history analogous to the world-kingdom visions of Dn. 2, 7, 8, and 10-12. The continuity of “desolations” (v. 26) span the entire length of the vision including the 70 weeks “even until an end of war” which is equivalent to the “desolating” activity continuing until the utter end in v. 27. The desolating activity (*shomem*) is parallel to that of Dn. 8:13 with “the daily and the transgression”.
13. In Dn. 11:31 the military aspect of *miqdash* as a fortress of paganism is readily apparent in contrast to God’s sanctuary. The “taking away” (*sur*) of the “daily” is associated with the action of Clovis in behalf of the papacy. Thus, the action in 11:31 is linked with the host or army given to the papacy against the “daily” in 8:12.
14. The 1290 year (AD 508-1798) time prophecy for the commencement of the taking away of “the daily” provides the lock-tight evidence that “the daily” (*hattamid*) cannot pertain to Christ’s high-priestly ministry. No significant event associated with the heavenly ministration of Christ occurred in AD 508. Only the action of Clovis in behalf of the papacy against the “continual” self-exalting behavior of pagan and Arian forces occurred in AD 508.
15. In summary, based on the evidence of this exegesis, “the daily” may be defined as a principle manifested in the self-exalting character of paganism inherent in mankind of which Arianism became integrated. “The abomination which desolates” may be defined as the self-exalting character of nominal Christianity of which papal Rome became the fountain head. Nominal Christianity surpasses, supersedes and transcends all other false religious systems of the world. It is the principal religious force and the largest religious block in the world today constituting

33% of the world's population, twice the size of the second largest bloc, the Muslims at 17%.[133](#) “The abomination which desolates” is paganism with a nominal Christian face.

Our exegesis of the “daily” in Daniel is diametrically opposed to current Adventist scholarship which destroys the integrity of the 2300 years terminating in 1844. In a like manner, current Adventist scholarship destroys the integrity of “the daily” in Daniel 8 interconnected with the 1290-year time prophecy of 12:11. The self-consistent methodology of this exegesis resolves the linguistic and contextual anomalies associated with “the daily” in Dn. 8:9-14 and retains the original pristine beauty of the 2300-year vision of Daniel 8 pointing to 1844 and the “cleansing of the sanctuary” in order to prepare and “put right” (*sadaq*) a remnant people for translation at the second coming of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world.

## **APPENDIX**

### **“THE DAILY” AND “THE RESTRAINER”**

#### **Index of This Study**

# THE MYSTERY OF THE "DAILY"

John W. Peters  
*An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*

## APPENDIX

### “THE DAILY” AND “THE RESTRAINER” 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The pioneer reformer of the “Great Advent Awakening,” William Miller interpreted the time prophecies of Dn. 8:14 and Dn. 12:11 by connecting the “daily” (or the continuance) of Daniel with the restrainer in Paul’s second epistle to the Thessalonians.[134](#) He identified the man of lawlessness as papal Rome, while the restraining power in the development of the papacy was interpreted as paganism. Through analogous reasoning Miller concluded that the “daily” also signified paganism which gave way to papal Rome. “The daily” was interpreted as the “daily abomination” or the first abomination and was represented as paganism in general, or Rome more specifically. The “abomination that makes desolate” was identified as papal Rome. Thus in Dn. 12:11 the Roman empire would be taken away and papal Rome would be set up.[135](#)

Historically, “the daily” has been identified interchangeably as paganism or pagan Rome. U. Smith identified “the daily” in Daniel 8:11 as pagan Rome,[136](#) but in Daniel 8:13 and 11:31 he identified “the daily” as paganism.[137](#) Similarly, William Miller linked “the daily” of Daniel 8:11 with “the restrainer” in 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7, identifying both as paganism which was interchangeable with pagan Rome.[138](#)

### [1.1 The Man of Sin](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

# Appendix 1.1 The Man of Sin

Some Bible expositors have taken the view that the man of sin is a contemporary figure appearing in an eschatological setting just prior to the second coming, thus ignoring the papacy.[139](#) Some of these expositors equate the man of sin to: 1) the antichrist referred to in the first and second epistles of John; 2) the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8; 3) the beast of Revelation 13 (but these expositors such as Ryrie ignore the papacy and also place the occurrence in an eschatological setting).[140](#) Both G. Kittel[141](#) and S. S. Smalley[142](#) associate Paul's man of lawlessness with the antichrist. Moreover, F. F. Bruce cites evidence that the man of lawlessness would begin to appear after the fall of Rome which also identifies the restraining power preventing the appearance as pagan Rome. He also cites evidence that the antichrist, the man of lawlessness and beast of Rev. 13 are all linked as one.[143](#)

While Bible expositors may disagree with one another, the Bible alone interprets itself. Paul's man of lawlessness who opposes and exalts himself above God, making himself equal with God, is parallel with both the description of the little horn in Dn. 7:8, 25; 8:11 who opposes God and changes times and laws, and also with the picture of the beast in Rev. 13 who with a "mouth" speaks great pompous words and "blasphemies" (Rev. 13:5). The evidence is unequivocal that the beast, the little horn and the man of sin, all refer to the papacy. Seventh-day Adventist expositors have taken this view consistently[144](#) as well as the early Protestant reformers.[145](#)

## [1.2 The Restrainer and the Daily](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# Appendix 1.2 The Restrainer and the Daily

Paul reminded the Thessalonians that he had told them earlier about both the man of sin and the one who was restraining the appearance of the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:5,6). The man of sin was to be revealed only when the “one restraining” was taken out of the way. Divergent views are taken by different expositors concerning the “restrainer”.[146](#) The fundamentalists identify the restrainer as God holding the man of lawlessness.[147](#) But God Himself is not the restrainer, for the restrainer is to be taken out of the way.[148](#) Some commentators hold that the restrainer is any institution of authority or government maintaining law and order.[149](#) The view that the restrainer represents pagan Rome holding back the appearance of the antichrist or the man of sin was held by Tertullian: “What is this but the Roman state, whose removal when it has been divided among ten kings will bring on antichrist”. Chrysostom’s view was nearly identical.[150](#)

It is commonly acknowledged by many Bible expositors that Rome, the fourth beast of Daniel 7, consists of two phases: pagan and papal Rome. The view that pagan Rome restrained the appearance of papal Rome until pagan Rome was taken out of the way will be examined in the following exposition.

## [2.0 TRANSLATION OF 2 THESSALONIANS 2:3-9](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)

# Appendix 2.0 TRANSLATION OF 2 THESSALONIANS 2:3-9

To establish the contextual framework of 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7, the following literal translation of verses 3-9 is set forth.

vs. 3 Let not anyone deceive you, in no way, because unless the falling away comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition,

vs. 4 the one who exalts himself over everything called God, or the object of worship, so as he sits in the temple of God as God, showing himself that he is God.

vs. 5 Do you not remember, that yet being with you, I told you these things?

vs. 6 And now the thing restraining you know, in order that he might be revealed in his time.

vs. 7 For the mystery of lawlessness now works. Only he who restrains now, until he comes into existence out from the midst.

vs. 8 And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and make ineffective with the brightness of His coming,

vs. 9 of whom, the coming is according to the working of Satan in all power, signs and wonders of a lie,

vs. 10 and in all deceit of unrighteousness in those being lost, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order that they might be saved.

## [3.0 Exposition of 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

# Appendix 3.0 Exposition of 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7

Any interpretation of 2 Thessalonians 2:3-10 which suggests that the man of sin is represented by a supernatural being such as Satan requires that “the restrainer” holding him back must be a supernatural power, namely, God Himself. However, such a view overlooks the inherent description of the man of sin. First, he is a “man,” (*anthropos*) of human origin. No where in scripture is Satan referred to as a man (*anthropos* or *aner* in Greek and *adam, enosh, geber* or *met* in Hebrew). Satan is a supernatural, angelic being of heavenly origin in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28. Second, the man of sin is described as the “son of perdition.”

This descriptive phrase is used in only one other instance in scripture in John 17:12 referring to Judas who allowed himself to be actuated by Satan. Finally, the phrase, “the son of perdition” implies a “father of perdition.” In fact Satan is referred to as the “father” of those who refuse to listen to the words of Jesus. “You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do” (Jn. 8:44). It seems clear from this preliminary internal exegetical evidence that Satan is not the “man of sin,” a phrase which historically has been associated with the papacy, a religious system with human (*anthropos*), organizational characteristics.

If the man of sin is an earthly religious system with human leadership, this precludes the necessity of a supernatural restrainer. The view that the restrainer exhibits evil characteristics and is symbolic of Rome receives support from the following internal linguistics considerations of 2 Thess. 2:6-7.

## [3.1 Linguistic Evidence of Concurrent Time](#)

### [Index of This Study](#)



# Appendix 3.1

## Linguistic Evidence of Concurrent Time

The key which unlocks the door to the mystery of the “restrainer” is Paul’s unique linguistic application of three Greek adverbs all of which convey the basic sense of meaning of time in the present or the “here and now.” Paul tells the Thessalonians that “the thing that restrains” (*to katechon*) the man of sin is doing so “now” (*nun*) at the present time (2 Thess. 2:6). Furthermore, the mystery of lawlessness “now” (*tes*) works at the present time. The strong implication is that “the thing restraining” at the present time (“now”) exhibits the character attributes associated with the mystery of lawlessness, which also works “now” at the present time. This identical character attribute now working in “the thing restraining” will also be exhibited in the man of sin who will be revealed in his time.

Moreover, Paul reinforces the linkage of the mystery of lawlessness with the restraining activity by immediately repeating in the next phrase (2:7) the “here and now” activity of “the one who restrains,” clearly linking it with the mystery of lawlessness. “For the mystery of lawlessness now (*tes*) works. Only he who restrains now (*arti*), until he comes into existence out from the midst.” The impersonal restrainer (*to katechon*) in verse 6 and the related personal restrainer (*ho katechon*) in verse 7 work as a unit to restrain the man of sin, concurrently in time, with and through the working of the mystery of lawlessness. The mystery of lawlessness describes the evil character attributes of both the current restraining activity and the man of sin who is to be revealed in the future.

The three Greek adverbs used in succession in 2 Thess. 2:6-7, *nun*, *tes*, and *arti* all convey the sense of current, present time in contrast to past or future activity.<sup>151</sup> Each adverb is synonymous with the other. More specifically, *arti* seems to mark a “precise time” (he restrains now in verse 6); *nun* marks a point or a period of time (“now restraining” in verse 6); and *tes* conveys current time in reference to the future (“mystery of lawlessness now/already works” in verse 7).<sup>152</sup> Concurrent time connected with present is the key supplied by the sequential application of the three Greek adverbs, *nun*, *tes* and *arti* which links the mystery of lawlessness with “the restrainer.” The mystery of lawlessness which works in “the restrainer” is to be revealed in the man of sin when the restrainer comes into existence out from the midst.

The following chart summarizes the relationship of the restrainer and the mystery of lawlessness in the context of concurrent time.

**The Relationship of  
“The Restrainer”  
and  
“The Mystery of Lawlessness”  
in Concurrent Time**

<b>Adverb</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Identity</b>
<i>nun</i>	Now	Thing Restraining	Evil	Pagan Rome
<i>ede</i>	Now/ Already	Mystery of Lawlessness	Evil	Character of Paganism
<i>arti</i>	Now	Person Restraining	Evil	Emperor of Rome

[3.2 Linguistic Evidence from \*ginomai\*](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## Appendix 3.2

### Linguistic Evidence from *ginomai*

The restrainer continues to restrain “until he comes into existence out from the midst” (2:7). The verb, *ginomai*, has the basic sense of meaning of “to become” with respect to origin (to come into existence, to begin to be, to receive being, be made).[153](#)

In the NT when *ginomai* is used with reference to God, God is always the source of the action. For example in Jn. 1:3, “all things came into being (*ginomai*) through Him.” God is never the receiver of the action in connection with *ginomai*. In 2 Thess. 2:7 the restrainer is the receiver of the action associated with *ginomai* and the restrainer begins to have a new existence distinct and separate from his previous existence in which he functioned as a restraining force. “The restrainer’s” identity becomes increasingly clear from both the linguistic evidence and the historical record when it is recognized that pagan Rome, the impersonal system (*to katechon*), and the emperor of Rome, a personal being (*ho katechon*), restrained the rise of the man of sin until the emperor of Rome voluntarily moved his capitol from Rome to Constantinople in AD 330 thereby relinquishing his restraining function. No longer the restrainer, the emperor received (began to have) a new existence out from the city of Rome (the midst of 2:7). The papacy was free to take on the full manifestation of the mystery of lawlessness and function in a religio-political manner in the Roman’s emperor’s former capitol.

From the evidence of linkage by concurrent time with “the mystery of iniquity” and the receipt of a new existence outside of Rome, “the restrainer” may be identified as the impersonal system of pagan Rome (*to katechon*) and its personal emperor (*ho katechon*). “The restrainer” is equivalent to the horn from littleness in its pagan phase (masculine) in Daniel 8:9 & 11.


### [3.3 The Mystery of Lawlessness and “The Daily”](#)

[Index of This Study](#)

## Appendix 3.3 The Mystery of Lawlessness and “The Daily”

The character attribute described by the phrase “the mystery of lawlessness” is defined in 2 Thess. 2:4 as exalting oneself above and opposing all that is called God, showing oneself to be God. This self-exalting character attribute was shown to be described by the terms, “the daily” and “the transgression which desolates” in Dn. 8:11-13 in which the later term is equivalent to the “desolating abomination,” in 11:31 and 12:11. These terms were directly linked with pagan and papal Rome, respectively, in the exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14.

The evidence from 2 Thessalonians 2 and Daniel 8 leads to the conclusion that “the restrainer” is not directly equivalent to “the daily.” However, the two terms are indirectly related. “The restrainer” is pagan Rome symbolized by the horn from littleness in Daniel 8; “the daily” is the mystery of lawlessness which is the character attribute of pagan Rome. The mystery of lawlessness is the all inclusive descriptive term for both “the daily” and “the desolating abomination”.



The mystery of lawlessness is the outworking principle of Satan which works in all those who refuse to believe the truth, but believe the lie and have pleasure in unrighteousness (2 Thess.2:12). This principle is described by “the daily” and “the desolating abomination,” both of which may now be defined with further clarity. **“The daily” is mystery of lawlessness manifested in the self-exalting character of paganism inherent in mankind of which Arianism became integrated. “The desolating abomination” is the mystery of lawlessness manifested in the self-exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head.**

Although William Miller in his day did not grasp the full significance of the relationship between “the daily” as the outworking of the principle of the mystery of iniquity in connection with “the restrainer” of 2 Thessalonians 2 in which this principle was embodied, we must credit him with a remarkable break-through in understanding. He was the first to discern clearly that “the daily” was an evil thing. For a layman to breakthrough the scholastic confusion of many centuries and take a position as he did in the face of widespread ridicule and opposition was a major accomplishment. This perception enabled him to resist the almost overmastering pressure from his contemporaries who insisted that the “little horn” of Daniel 8 was Antiochus Epiphanes and that the 2300 days were literal and were

fulfilled far in the past. Had it not been for his view of “the daily” it is doubtful that the 1844 Movement could have gained the momentum that it did.

Thus his view that “the daily” is paganism was a key element in forming the convictions of those who took part in the Advent Movement. That contribution should be recognized today for what it was—as evidence of the solid leading of the Holy Spirit. This exegesis of “the daily” confirms a conviction that should grow among Seventh-day Adventists world-wide—that God led our pioneers in building a foundation of truth better than they realized.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

### **Index of This Study**

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Striking parallels to the eschatological truths of Daniel 8 are set forth 2 Thessalonians 2 related to the man of sin, the restrainer, the mystery of iniquity, and the parousia (the second coming of Christ; 2 Thess. 2:8). These are summarized in the following table.

### Eschatological Parallels of Daniel 8 and 2 Thessalonians 2

---

2 Thessalonians 2	Daniel 8
1. Man of Sin <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Papal Rome</li></ul>	1. Horn (feminine) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o papal phase</li></ul>
2. The Restrainer <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Pagan Rome</li></ul>	2. Horn (masculine) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o pagan phase</li></ul>
3. Mystery of lawlessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Self Exaltation</li></ul>	3. “The Daily” & <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o “The Transgression Desolating”</li></ul>
4. <i>Parousia</i> (2nd Coming Christ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Sanctification by Spirit</li><li>o Belief in the Truth</li></ul>	4. Sanctuary put right <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o (cleansed)</li></ul>

The eschatological parallel of urgent significance is the relationship of the cleansing of the sanctuary to the *parousia*. Those who stand at the second coming of Christ, with their hopes fulfilled, will have received the love of the truth of righteousness by faith through the sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:12-13). In order to bear witness to this truth, Christ, the Author of truth, was born of a woman and came into this world that He might be the King of righteousness (Jn. 18:36-37), righteousness which comes from God by faith. Belief in the truth encompasses the point-counterpoint parallel of 1) the sanctuary, both the heavenly and the human heart, being put right and cleansed, and 2) sanctification by the Spirit in 2 Thessalonians 2 of those who at the *parousia* believe the truth which was witnessed by the King of Righteousness, the Savior of all men especially those who believe.

[Index of This Study](#)

# THE MYSTERY OF THE "DAILY"

John W. Peters  
*An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*  
Bibliography

Aus, R. D., *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, (4, '77) 537-553.

Barrett, D., Ed., *World Christian Encyclopedia*, Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Bruce, F.F., *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 78-96, 1984.

Bruce, F.F., *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 45, Waco: Word Book, 1982.

Cairns, E.E., *Christianity Through the Centuries*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.

[*The*] *Complete Biblical Library*, Vol. 8, Springfield: The Complete Biblical Library, 1989.

Cross, F.L. and E.A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford: Oxford Press, 1983.

["The] Daily," *Midnight Cry*, Vol.5, No. 7, p. 52-53, Oct. 5, 1843.

Damsteegt, P.G., *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1977.

Davidson, R.M., *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 2/1 (1991): 105.

Farrow, D., *Crux*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 23-26, 1989.

Gesenius, H.W.F., *Gesenius's Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Gundry, R.H., *A Survey of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.

Holbrook, F.B., Ed., *Symposium of Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 2, Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-

day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1986. (See also Volumes 1 & 3-6)

Holladay, W. L., *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

*Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 11, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955.

Kittel G., and G. Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, (Abridged in One Volume), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

Lohse, E., *The New Testament Environment*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.

Martin, F., *Est. Ecl.*, Vol. 54, No. 211, pp. 527-537, 1979.

*New International Commentary of the New Testament*, Vol. 13, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

Schwarz, R.W., *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, Boise: Pacific Press 1979.

*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, F.D., Nichol, Ed., Washington, DC: Review & Herald, (1978).

*Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1976.

[*The*] *Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1986.

Shea, W.H., *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 1, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1982.

Smalley, S.S., *Word Book Commentary*, Vol. 51, Waco: Word Book, 1982.

*Symposium on Daniel*, F.B. Holbrook, Ed., Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 2, Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1986.

*Symposium on Revelation: Book 1*, F.B. Holbrook, Ed., Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Vol. 6, Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference



of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, DC, 1992.

Smith, U., *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1944.

Thayer, J.H., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.

White, A.L., *The Ellen G. White Biography*, Vol. 6, *The Later Elmshaven Years*, Washington DC: Review & Herald, 1981.

White, E.G., *In Heavenly Places*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1967;  
also E. G. White, Letter #1, 1904.

White, E.G., *Patriarchs & Prophets*, Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958.

White, E.G., *The Great Controversy*, Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1950.

Wigram, G.V., *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance*, Peabody:  
Hendrickson Publishers, 1984.

Young, E.J., *A Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

[Index of This Study](#)