

Contents

1. Introduction	1
The Passage	1
The Methodological Starting Point	2
2. Thematic Parallels Uniting Dan 2, 7, And 8	4
The Little Horn in Dan 7 and 8	4
Absence of the Terrible Fourth Beast from Dan 8	7
The Babylonian lion	8
The Roman beast	8
Summary	9
3. Literary Relationships Involving Dan 8:9	10
4. Literary Relationships Within Dan 8:10-12	13
Column A: Who the horn deals with	13
Column B: The context for the horn's dealings	14
Column C: The result of the horn's dealings	15
Column C, parts i and ii	16
Column C, part iii	16
Column C, part iv	17
5. Discussion of Selected Terms From the Passage	18
The Prince	18
Who the Prince is	18
Where and when the Prince is active in history	19
The Host	19
The Horn	19
What the horn represents	19
Where and when the horn is active in history	20
The "Daily"	20
6. Significance of the Passage	22
Opposition to the Work Christ Once Did on Earth	22
Opposition to the Work Christ Now Does in Heaven	22
The Parallel between Jewish and Christian Neglect of Christ's Priestly Ministry	23
Supporting Evidence	24
7. Conclusion	25
Notes	26
Bibliography	30

Daniel 8:9-12

Copyright (c) 2006 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

1. Introduction

The Passage

The passage to be discussed in the present paper is Dan 8:9-12, quoted below.¹

(9) Out of one of them came a little horn; it grew in power to the south and to the east and toward the Beautiful Land. (10) It grew until it reached the host of the heavens, and it threw some of the starry host down to the earth and trampled on them. (11) It set itself up to be as great as the Prince of the host; it took away the daily sacrifice from him, and the place of his sanctuary was brought low. (12) Because of rebellion, the host of the saints and the daily sacrifice were given over to it. It prospered in everything it did, and truth was thrown to the ground.

These verses represent one of four main sections in Daniel's vision of chap. 8. They must therefore be studied in light of the sections that come before (vss. 1-4, 5-8) and the one which comes after it (vss. 13-14). The relationship of vss. 8 and 9 is of particular importance and must be clearly understood. The significance of vss. 9-12, in turn, is that they provide the immediate context for vss. 13-14, from which Seventh-day Adventists draw a large part of their unique sense of mission and identity.² Dan 8:13-14 is now quoted.³

(13) Then I heard a holy one speaking, and another holy one said to him, "How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?"

(14) He said to me, "It will take 2,300 evenings and mornings [‘ereb-bøqer]; then the sanctuary will be reconsecrated [*w^enişdaq qôdeš*]."

Part of the problem of correctly relating Dan 8:1-4, 5-8, 9-12, and 13-14 to each other involves deciding when the events occur that each talks about. The earlier verses of the chapter have in view the period of ancient Persia (vss. 1-4) and Greece (vss. 5-8), respectively. The last two verses of the vision itself (vss. 13-14) are applied by historicist writers to events taking place during modern times. If both of these positions are correct then a historicist interpretation of vss. 9-12 will demand that they provide a gradual transition between vs. 8 on the one hand and vs. 13 on the other, i.e., that they deal with the era after Greece and before the mid-nineteenth century A.D. This is the period of Rome and the subsequent breakup of its empire which produced the several states of modern Europe. Preterist and futurist scholars generally apply Dan 8:9-12 within the second century B.C. If they are correct in doing so then historicists have a serious problem in vss. 13 and 14. The question in this case would be how vss. 13-14 can describe events in heaven after the cross when just previously vss. 9-12 refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes on earth before the cross. How could such an exegetical leap be possible? There are two points to make here. First, a leap of this sort is not possible. And second, it is not necessary. The symbols of Dan 8:9-12 do not at all require that this section be applied to

Antiochus. The "horn, which started small" (8:9) is Roman, not Greek; the "place of [the Prince's] sanctuary" (8:11) is in heaven, not on earth; and the time when the "daily sacrifice" (8:11) was taken away comes after the cross rather than before.⁴

At this point the original problem seems to have been merely shifted to another venue. Verse 13 is no longer the location of a major break between the distant past and the near future so vs. 9 must be, and the potential for a hiatus remains. In addition, the little horn that "grew in power to the south and to the east and toward the Beautiful Land" gives every appearance of growing up out of one part of Alexander's empire, which was eventually divided among his generals, and so a question that must be raised is how the little horn can itself be Roman if its point of origin is Greek. The force of these problems derives in part from the way they are stated. Both will be seen to have straightforward solutions.

On the matter of a possible historical gap at vs. 9, there is indeed a minor gap between vss. 8 and 9, but not of the proportions demanded elsewhere by the futurist model. As regards identifying the little horn, if this entity is shown on literary grounds to be Greek the meaning of the passage where he is mentioned will be far different from what it would be if that same little horn is shown on literary grounds to be Roman.

What the passage under review means cannot be separated from what it says. An important task in exegeting Dan 8:9-12, therefore, is to determine with precision what these verses do and do not say. At issue is one's interpretation of the 2300 day prophecy, which immediately follows in Dan 8:13-14. The nature of vs. 14 and the time period within it cannot be interpreted without reference to the structure of the passage it concludes.

The Methodological Starting Point

Answering the questions raised above is one purpose of the present study. More importantly, however, I hope to establish an exegetical framework from which my answers to those questions will be seen to follow naturally and which will make other insights available in related contexts. Thus, while one goal of the study is to establish certain positions, the other is to establish a firm basis for deriving them.

Reevaluating the contextual force of Dan 8:9-12 on Dan 8:13-14 is not approached below as a simple exercise in identifying the errors of writers who represent other points of view. Fine tuning, or even overhauling, a previous interpretation is not the task at hand. An entirely new orientation to the text is called for--the same orientation, it should be noted, as the one expected of the host in the narrative under review.

The host was eventually cast down and trampled underfoot in vs. 13 because in vs. 12 the people who composed it were led to shift their overall focus of attention and faith from the "Prince of the host" in heaven to a particular villain on earth, symbolized by "another horn, which started small" (vs. 9). As exegetes we should resist any temptation to repeat the host's mistake. Our own primary focus of attention in Dan 8--whether spiritually or exegetically--must be directed to the Prince instead of the villain. It is true that in one sense the prophecy is about the little horn--if the comparison is between that historical entity and others which preceded it. In another sense, however, the chapter is about the Prince of the host, through whom God works to keep the horn's harmful activity within bounds, and ultimately to bring it to an end.

When this broader context for the little horn's activity is kept in view, a context is provided for his violent opposition against the Prince. Until the work of the Prince is understood the opposing work of the little horn will remain a mystery--or, worse, it will appear to be understood when in fact it is not. The Prince must have our first, fullest, and best attention in Dan 8 or we will have the same success in understanding the horn's actions that the host had in resisting them.

The exegetical starting point for the above analysis is, therefore, that the "Prince of the host" in vs. 11 is Christ. The discussion of the host He is Prince of, the historical villain who opposes His work, the work that is opposed, and other related matters are all allowed to follow from this one starting point.

As Nebuchadnezzar came into contact with Daniel and the God he served, this pagan monarch was brought to realize that Yahweh ". . . is the God of gods and the Lord of kings and a revealer of mysteries, . . ." (Dan 2:47). If what Nebuchadnezzar said is true, we could expect God to foresee more than what merely would and would not happen on earth in the generations to come but the supremely important role of His Son in shaping the events He foresaw. Here is the methodological starting point of the model I propose. When we begin to understand Christ's place in the prophecies of Daniel we begin to understand the force of those prophecies.

In the discussion that follows, I first examine the thematic parallels that unite chaps. 2, 7, and 8. Next Dan 8:9 is considered in relation to the verses that lead up to it. Then the text of Dan 8:10-12 is discussed in detail.

2. Thematic Parallels Uniting Dan 2, 7, And 8

If the material in Dan 8 is to be understood well, it will have to be understood in the context of the thematic parallels that link it to the rest of the book. Two earlier chapters closely related to Dan 8 are Dan 2 and 7. It is of critical importance to take the evidence from chaps. 2, 7, and 8 as a unified whole. Chapter 11 also figures in this series of parallels, but will be dealt with separately in other papers.

The Little Horn in Dan 7 and 8

I submit that the little horn of Dan 7 and the little horn of Dan 8 are not different but the same. In both cases the world empire associated with the horn is the last in the series of four, which historicists have always applied to Rome. The position that the little horn of Dan 7 is associated with the fourth world empire, while that of Dan 8 is associated with the third, does not bear scrutiny.

In the first part of chap. 8 Daniel is shown a vision in which various nations are represented by symbolic animals. Thus, in vss. 1-4 he sees a ram which assumes international supremacy. Then in vss. 5-8 he sees a goat, which overcomes the ram and succeeds in replacing it as the predominant power in all those parts of the world known to God's people at the time. Both sections of the text are now quoted.

(1) "In the third year of King Belshazzar's reign, I, Daniel, had a vision, after the one that had already appeared to me. (2) In my vision I saw myself in the citadel of Susa in the province of Elam; in the vision I was beside the Ulai Canal. (3) I looked up, and there before me was a ram with two horns, standing beside the canal, and the horns were long. One of the horns was longer than the other but grew up later. (4) I watched the ram as he charged toward the west and the north and the south. No animal could stand against him, and none could rescue from his power. He did as he pleased and became great.

(5) "As I was thinking about this, suddenly a goat with a prominent horn between his eyes came from the west, crossing the whole earth without touching the ground. (6) He came toward the two-horned ram I had seen standing beside the canal and charged at him in great rage. (7) I saw him attack the ram furiously, striking the ram and shattering his two horns. The ram was powerless to stand against him; the goat knocked him to the ground and trampled on him, and none could rescue the ram from his power. (8) The goat became very great, but at the height of his power his large horn was broken off, and in its place four prominent horns grew up toward the four winds of heaven."

The angel speaking with Daniel later explains the meaning of the symbols he has used. The ram represents Medo-Persia⁵ and the goat represents Greece.⁶ The identity of the power that comes next, however, is not given and we must make a choice in regard to it. Either the parallel with Dan 7 breaks down or the description of the terrible fourth power that follows Greece is incompletely represented in Dan 8. In the earlier chapter we find a lion, a bear, a leopard, a nondescript beast with ten horns, and then "another horn, a little one" that eventually

displaced three of its fellows. In the later one we find only a ram, a goat, and "another horn, which started small." There is nothing that corresponds to the terrible fourth beast.

It might seem attractive to hypothesize that the absence of any intermediate symbol separating the Greek goat from the little horn in Dan 8 requires the horn to be Greek. In Dan 7 it is clearly Roman. If the little horn is associated with two different world empires in chaps. 7 and 8, then we are dealing with two little horns and the relationships in table 1 would obtain. If, on the other hand, there is one little horn associated with the fourth world empire in both chapters, then the horn is simply mentioned without the beast that supports it in chap. 8 and the relationships in table 2 obtain. I submit that the little horn is Roman in both chapters, that the parallel between the two chapters is very close, and that the correct set of relationships is found in table 2.

Table 1
Relationships Between Dan 7 and 8:
Two Little Horns

Empire	Dan 7	Dan 8
#3a	leopard	goat
#3b	...	horn
#4a	beast	...
#4b	horn	...

Table 2
Relationships Between Dan 7 and 8:
One Little Horn

Empire	Dan 7	Dan 8
#3	leopard	goat
#4a	beast	...
#4b	horn	horn

Problems with table 1 fall into two main categories--some having to do with economy of means and others with parallels between related prophecies.

To illustrate what I mean by "economy of means" consider the second world empire in the series, not mentioned in table 1 or 2. Instead of having to find two world empires approximately the same length of time before Christ and coming to power in similar ways, one of which could be described by the bear of Dan 7 that had unequal sides and the other by the ram of Dan 8 that had unequal horns, it would be more economical--and therefore more desirable exegetically--to find one power that fits both descriptions. As regards the third world empire, instead of having to find two major political entities that rose to power in an extraordinarily rapid manner, both following the same predecessor and both coming up at about the same time in history, it would again be preferable to look for one power that fits both descriptions.

When we come to the little horn the same principles apply. One should first look for a single explanation that fits both horns and then only if none is available begin to examine seriously the possibility that two unrelated horns are referred to.

The strength of the parallels that unite Daniel's four main prophecies (chaps. 2, 7, 8-9, 10-12) must be constantly borne in mind. In chaps. 2 and 7 Babylon is represented by symbols that connote excellence (gold among metals, the lion among beasts). In chap. 7 and 8 Medo-Persia is represented by a symbol that has mismatched parts (two unequal sides of the bear, two unequal horns of the ram). Next Greece is symbolized as coming to power very rapidly (the leopard of chap. 7 has four wings, the goat of chap. 8 doesn't touch the ground), and following Greece there is an empire symbolized in part by a little horn that persecutes God's people. See tables 3 and 4. The relationships summarized in table 3 correspond to and augment those in table 1, and those in table 4 correspond to table 2.

Table 3
All Four World Empires:
Two Little Horns

Empire	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8
#1	gold	lion	---
#2	silver	bear	ram
#3a	bronze	leopard	goat
#3b	---	---	horn
#4a	iron	beast	---
#4b	iron/clay	horn	---

Table 4
All Four World Empires:
One Little Horn

Empire	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8
#1	gold	lion	---
#2	silver	bear	ram
#3	bronze	leopard	goat
#4a	iron	beast	---
#4b	iron/clay	horn	horn

The last in the series of world empires is singled out for special attention in each chapter where it appears. In Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan 2, the king's role as the golden head of the metal image he has seen occupies two verses (2:37-38), and the next two world empires share one verse between them (2:39), but the explanation of the fourth kingdom occupies four verses by itself (2:40-43). The proportions of emphasis in Dan 7 and 8 are no different. See table 5.

Table 5
Verses in Which Each of the World
Empires Is Described

Empire	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8
#1	2:37-38	7:4	---
#2	2:39	7:5	8:3-4,20
#3	2:39	7:6	8:5-8,21-22
#4a	2:40	7:7,19,23	---
#4b	2:41-43	7:8,11,20-22,24-26	8:9-12,23-25

Table 5 shows a number of consistent patterns in Daniel's treatment of the four world empires. First, as noted above, the fourth empire gets more attention than any of the three which precede it. In two cases it gets more attention than the other three combined. Thus, in the interpretation section of Dan 2 the first three empires are discussed in a total of three verses and the fourth empire has four; in Dan 7 the first three empires are discussed in a total of three verses and the fourth has eleven; in Dan 8 the second and third empires have eight verses between them and the fourth by itself has seven.

Second, in each chapter the fourth world empire is subdivided into two separate parts. This is an extremely important consideration. Thus, in chap. 2 there is iron first and then iron mixed with clay; in chap. 7 there is a nondescript beast first and then a little horn; in chap. 8 the reference is only to the horn and not at all to the beast that was associated with it earlier in chap. 7. If one historical entity is referred to by the little horn in both chapters this fact would be consistent with the claim that two distinct phases of Roman power are in evidence. Otherwise it would not be possible to speak of the second phase by itself without mentioning the first.

Third, of the two parts into which the fourth world empire is divided, the second receives a disproportionate amount of attention. It has already been stated that the fourth empire gets more emphasis than the other three. That is one claim; this is another. The last empire in the series is divided into two parts and the second consistently gets more emphasis than the first. The one claim has to do with the fourth empire's relationship to its fellow empires; the other has to do with the fourth empire alone and its constituent parts. Thus, in chap. 2, where the fourth empire is discussed in four verses, iron is mentioned in only one verse and the mixture of iron with clay that follows it is dealt with in three. In chap. 7, where the fourth empire occupies a total of eleven verses, the little horn has eight of them. The fact that our attention in chap. 8 is directed exclusively to the second phase of the terrible fourth beast's power is again consistent with this broader pattern.

Absence of the Terrible Fourth Beast from Dan 8

It is not enough to point out that the fourth empire comes in two parts, that the second receives more attention than the first, and that this is especially the case in Dan 8. These observations are correct, but do not explain why the first phase of the last empire's influence should be passed over completely in chap. 8. It would seem possible for the nondescript beast to have been mentioned along with the little horn, with perhaps less emphasis. In the actual event, however, it does not appear at all. If the absence of the fourth beast does not signify a difference in the series of powers it may be that there was a special reason for the prophet's

silence regarding this particular beast. We now examine what that reason might be, taking the vision as a whole.

The Babylonian lion. The absence of the terrible fourth beast must be taken in context. Two items from chap. 7 are missing in chap. 8, one of which is the beast that represents Rome, but another is the lion that represents Babylon. Thus, the first world empire is left out as well as a part of the last. It will be seen that one explanation accounts for both facts.

The absence of the lion power, or Babylon, from chap. 8 is sometimes explained by reference to the time when this vision was given.⁷ The vision of Dan 8 was recorded in the third year of Belshazzar (Dan 8:1), which, as Gerhard F. Hasel has pointed out, was 548/547 B.C.⁸ That was fifty-seven years after Nebuchadnezzar led the first siege of Jerusalem and one could argue that Babylon as a force in world politics had almost finished its course. Notice, however, that the vision of chap. 7 was given in the first year of Belshazzar (Dan 7:1), only two years earlier, and Babylon was included at that time. So a different explanation is needed to account for the later silence concerning Babylon in chap. 8. William H. Shea makes the following suggestion:

Instead of deleting Babylon from the vision because it was passing off the scene of action, it could equally well have been deleted because there was no further need to elaborate on the prophetic imagery used for Babylon in the first place.⁹

If the argument from time could account adequately for the missing Babylonian lion in Dan 8, a different and unrelated reason would have to be found for the missing fourth beast. Rome was still far in the future when that prophecy was given. But if the lion was absent because what it symbolized was already clear, a new approach to the problem is indicated.

The Roman beast. The fourth world empire is not excluded from Dan 8, but only the first phase of its power. Indeed, explaining the influence of this fourth empire in greater detail is one of the primary reasons why the prophecy was given. Just as Dan 9 explains certain aspects of Dan 8, so Dan 8 explains certain aspects of Dan 7. The explanation did not have to include a complete repetition of all the material given earlier. It was selective. Only certain points required further elaboration. This is not to say that everything had been said, but that each vision had a purpose and the purpose of the vision in Dan 8 was best served by limiting the number of actors to those which actually appear. When this concept is understood the already strong relationship among the prophecies of chaps. 2, 7, 8-9, and 10-12 takes on new significance. God is not merely repeating Himself four times here. The visions form a connected series, with points of special importance singled out for special attention.

In the case of the fourth world empire, a good deal of information had already been given about the first of its two phases in chap. 7--the one that corresponds to iron in chap. 2. Although more would be said about this power in chap. 11 it had been adequately described for the present. But Daniel's great interest in the little horn in the earlier chapter deserved further comment, and in particular the relationship of the little horn to the session of the heavenly court which was to meet and take away its power in final judgment. So the necessary context is sketched (Dan 8:1-8), with a few added details, and then without any further delay the second phase of the fourth empire is brought back into view--the one that corresponds to iron mixed with clay in chap. 2. The relationship between the judgment and the little horn is now described by the angel in terms of the sanctuary and a prophetic time period of 2300 evening-mornings, or

days, is given which was to run its course and thus mark the beginning of the end for the horn power.

Obviously there is a lot that could be said along these lines. What, for example, is the relationship between final judgment and the symbolism of the sanctuary's ancient cultus? When would the unusual time period of 2300 evening-mornings begin and end? What does it mean for the sanctuary to be "cleansed," if this is the best translation for the word?¹⁰ And what does its cleansing have to do with the little horn?¹¹ This is one of two major reasons why the angel loses no time on the first phase of the fourth world empire in Dan 8; what he says has a purpose and that purpose would not be served by merely repeating everything that had been said before. Daniel's attention is to be focused on the issues that would come from the events he sees; the recital of historical facts was not an end in itself.

Summary

The separate treatment of beast and little horn in Dan 7 and the exclusive emphasis on the little horn in Dan 8 is neither a careless omission nor evidence that one series of powers differs from the other. There is only one series of world empires in Daniel,¹² but the first beast and the fourth are not represented in both chapters. Including them would not have served the narrative purposes of chap. 8. This is one reason for omitting the nondescript beast.

Notice further that the beasts of Dan 7 are wild, while those in Dan 8 are domesticated. More than this, the beasts of Dan 8 are ones used as sacrifices in the ancient sanctuary. So a second reason for excluding the terrible fourth beast is that it would be out of place alongside the ram and the goat. This transition from wild to domesticated beasts is not an isolated fact within Daniel. There is an animacy hierarchy governing the choice of symbols that spans the entire book. Thus, in Dan 2 we have inanimate metals, in Dan 7 wild beasts, in Dan 8 domesticated beasts, and in Dan 11 people. The above relationships could be represented by a series of three distinctive features--[+animate], [+domesticated], and [+human].¹³ See fig. 1.

Table 6
Animacy Hierarchy for Symbols Used
in Daniel's Four Main Visions

	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8	Dan 11
[animate]	-	+	+	+
[domesticated]	-	-	+	+
[human]	-	-	-	+

In Dan 2 the iron of the image's feet is a metal like the gold, silver, and bronze¹⁴ that goes before, but the clay it is mixed with is a mineral like the stone that would come after. The metals of Nebuchadnezzar's image represent secular national entities while the stone represents the kingdom of God. The mixture of a metal and a mineral in the second phase of the fourth power would therefore indicate, or be consistent with, a combination of secular or national interests and those of religion. In Dan 8 as well, the terrible beast that supports the little horn in Dan 7 is omitted because it would have been out of place in the context of the sanctuary, while the little horn itself is equally at home in either chapter. From this use of symbols I draw that the second phase of Daniel's fourth world empire unites government and religion, church and state, in a way that the first phase does not.

3. *Literary Relationships* *Involving Dan 8:9*

Daniel 8:9 and 8:10-12 are dealt with separately below. The discussion of vs. 9 is introduced by a review of the immediate context provided by Dan 8:1-8. With the above background in place we turn to Dan 8:9. The verse is now quoted.

Out of one of them came another horn, which started small but grew in power to the south and to the east and toward the Beautiful Land.

In Dan 8:9 the verb is *yāšā'* "go out, come forth." The most natural interpretation of this verb's meaning is that it refers to horizontal motion. Thus, if the "horn, which started small," is an outgrowth from one the Greek goat's horns, it is a horizontal outgrowth. If it were visualized as representing a secondary growth from one of the Greek goat's previously broken horns, however, the natural inference would be that it came up vertically and not horizontally. There is a certain tension, therefore, between the natural force of the verb *yasa'* and the customary view as to its antecedent in the phrase "Out of one of them." Of these two factors it will be easier and more reasonable to change the customary view than the force of the verb.

Consider the phrases now brought together in table 7, which shows how the words and phrases of Dan 8:8-9 would have to be interpreted under the erroneous assumption that the "horn, which started small," comes up vertically from a previous horn.

Table 7
Comparison of Phrases Under the View That
The Horn of Dan 8:9 Comes From
a Horn in Dan 8:8

Verses	Feminine	Masculine	Gloss
Vs. 8	<i>ḥāzūt ʿarbaʿ</i>	. . .	"four prominent [horns]"
Vs. 9	<i>ūmin-ḥāʾaḥat</i>	<i>mēhem</i>	"and from one of them"

In table 7 both *ʾaḥat* "one" (fem.) and *mēhem* "of them"¹⁵ (masc.) must refer to *ḥāzūt ʿarbaʿ* "four prominent [horns]" (fem.). In this case the masculine gender of "them" is unaccounted for and becomes subject to textual emendation.¹⁶ Since the word is not feminine in form, applying it to a feminine antecedent raises the question of whether it might be a scribal error for *mēhen* (fem.) or whether it might illustrate a late mixing of genders such that the word was feminine despite the fact that it is masculine in form, as is known to have occurred in Biblical Hebrew during and after the exile. Robert Polzin holds the latter view.¹⁷

It would not be phonologically or orthographically impossible for *mēhem* in Dan 8:9 to reference a feminine object such as a horn, as Polzin suggests, but it is not necessary to assume that it does. In the time of the exile, the third person feminine plural possessive pronoun *-hen* started dropping out of common use and was gradually replaced by the masculine possessive pronoun *-hem*. This fact, however, should not be taken to imply that all masculine

plural possessive pronouns should be understood as feminines. This is not the case, nor does Polzin claim this is what happened. The claim is that *mehem* does refer to a feminine word ("horns"), not that it would have to. If the pronoun in Dan 8:9 were feminine in form it would be unequivocally feminine in meaning, but since it is masculine in form the meaning could be either feminine or masculine.

Because the pronoun - *hem* in Dan 8:9 cannot be assigned a gender on the basis of form alone one must ask why Polzin calls it feminine. The most obvious reason for such an assignment is context. Polzin held that the intended antecedent of *mehem* was the feminine word "horns." This assumption introduced an incongruity in pronoun gender, which he then proceeded to explain. He correctly points out that, if such an incongruity did indeed exist, it could be accounted for in a principled way in terms of the language's known development. But Polzin would have no way of asserting, other than from context, that there is any mismatch of genders in the first place. Such an assertion would go beyond the available evidence. If the form *mehem* should be interpreted as feminine then the verse illustrate the principle of grammar he is discussing. If it should not be interpreted as feminine, we are back where we started. There is no way to tell on the basis of grammatical factors alone. In the absence of definite information to the contrary I take the text as it reads and leave the burden of proof on any who would change either its consonant letters or its obvious sense. Thus, *mēhem* should be considered masculine in meaning as well as form.

As it happens no change is necessary. A gender mismatch is not the only available interpretation of the verse, or the most reasonable one, and context would appear to argue against Polzin's otherwise reasonable suggestion rather than for it. Shea's line of argument in *Selected Studies*¹⁸ is the correct one--not because the assumption that all pronouns with masculine form in Late Biblical Hebrew have masculine meaning is the only possible hypothesis but because it is the most reasonable and economical hypothesis. The gender reference of *mehem* in Biblical Hebrew during and after the exile was not absolutely invariable.

Table 8 now presents the alternative view that the horn goes out from one of the four winds of heaven, i.e., from one of the four points of the compass.

Table 8
Comparison of Phrases Under the View that
The Horn of Dan 8:9 Goes Out From One
of the Four Winds in Dan 8:8

Verses	Feminine	Masculine	Gloss
Vs. 8	<i>ʿarbaʿ rūḥôt</i>	<i>haššāmáyim</i>	"four winds (fem.) of heaven (masc.)"
Vs. 9	<i>ûmin-hāʾaḥat</i>	<i>mēhem</i>	"and from one (fem.) of them (masc.)"

In table 8, instead of "one" and "them" both referring to the same antecedent, the word translated "one" (fem.) refers to "winds" (fem.) while the word "them" (masc.) refers to "heaven[s]" (masc.).¹⁹

In this way the seemingly unrelated problems of the gender of "them" and the semantic force of *yasa'* are addressed simultaneously. If a point of the compass is what the horn goes forth from, it may be assumed to do so horizontally. One result of this interpretation is that the

horn of vs. 9 and the Greek goat of vs. 8 are dissociated from each other. The horn is shown not to be Greek.

But if the horn is not Greek, there is a question what it is. Since in the proposed interpretation the "horn, which started small," does not appear in relation with any of the four divisions of the Greek goat's large horn, it does not appear to be attached to anything. Although it is reasonable enough to symbolize a power that sallies forth from one of the four points of the compass by means of a horn which comes from one of the four winds of heaven, the nature of the symbol still demands that the horn be attached to something. And it is, but the beast supporting it is not described in chap. 8. See table 9.

Table 9
Comparison of World Powers in Dan 8

Nation	Beast	Horn(s)	Direction(s)
Medo-Persia (8:20)	Ram (8:4)	Two long horns (8:4)	To: west, north
Greece (8:21)	Goat (8:5)	A prominent horn (8:5)	From: west (8:5)
Composite beast, nondescript (8:23)	[No direct mention]	Another horn (8:9)	From: an unspecified direction (8:8-9)

There is a reason for this. Daniel 7 speaks of wild beasts, while Dan 8 speaks of domestic beasts, and more particularly of beasts used for worship in the sanctuary. The so-called little horn is the same in both chapters, but the wild beast which gave rise to it historically in Dan 7 would be out of place in Dan 8. The issues there have to do with worship in the later parts of the narrative,²⁰ and particularly worship in the sanctuary. The fact that the beast was described only in chap. 7, while the little horn was mentioned both there and in chap. 8, implies that this horn combines the attributes of both a secular and a religious power.

As regards the appropriateness of mentioning the horn without its associated beast, consider a similar usage from more modern times. When driving at night it would not be unusual for one to speak of seeing headlights approach, without implying that there is no vehicle to support them or account for their movement. The situation is such that only the headlights capture one's attention. In the same way, the predominantly religious horn in Dan 8 is the only part of the beast next after Greece that captures Daniel's attention in vss. 9-12. That horn comes out horizontally from one of the four points of the compass firmly attached to the secular fourth beast of Dan 7.²¹ The fourth beast of Dan 7 is Rome.

4. *Literary Relationships* *Within Dan 8:10-12*

In the section which follows, my remarks are confined to Dan 8:10-12. These verses read:

(10) It grew until it reached the host of the heavens, and it threw some of the starry host down to the earth and trampled on them. (11) It set itself up to be as great as the Prince of the host; it took away the daily sacrifice from him, and the place of his sanctuary was brought low. (12) Because of rebellion, the host of the saints and the daily sacrifice were given over to it. It prospered in everything it did, and truth was thrown to the ground.

In vss. 10-12 the horn--introduced above in vs. 9--is said to deal with the host in vs. 10, the Prince in vs. 11, and the host again in vs. 12. The host, Prince, host (*ṣābāʿ*, *śar*, *ṣābāʿ*) pattern spanning vss. 10-12 forms an ABA chiasm, stated below as the first of three columns (A) in a larger matrix of phrases (A, B, C) that go to make up the verses under consideration. See table 10.

Table 10
The Phrases Of Dan 8:10-12 Separated
Into Three Main Columns

Verses	A	B	C
Vs. 10	Host	. . .	X down to earth (<i>ʿārṣāʾ</i>)
Vs. 11	Prince	Daily sacrifice	X brought low
Vs. 12	Host	Daily sacrifice	X cast to the ground (<i>ʿārṣāʾ</i>)

In table 10, column A shows who the horn deals with, column B establishes a context for those dealings, and column C gives an indication of the results. The horn deals with both Prince and host (i.e., host, Prince, host) (A), in regard to the "daily sacrifice" (B), with the result that something is cast down to the ground in each case (C). The three columns of phrases in table 10 are now considered individually.

Column A: Who the horn deals with

The first group of phrases in 8:10-12 is stated more fully below, in English (text exhibit (1)) and in Hebrew (table 11).

(1) Dan 8:10-12, Column A

Vs. 10	It grew until it reached the host of the heavens,
Vs. 11	It set itself up to be as great as the Prince of the host;
Vs. 12	. . . the host of the saints . . . [was] given over to it.

Table 11
The Hebrew of Dan 8:10-12, Column A

Verses	i	ii	iii	iv
Vs. 10	<i>wattigdal</i>	<i>ʿad</i>	<i>š^ebāʾ haššāmáyim</i>	...
Vs. 11	...	<i>w^eʿad</i>	<i>śar haššābāʾ</i>	<i>higdîl</i>
Vs. 12	<i>w^ešābāʾ</i>	<i>tinnātēn</i>

Notice in table 11 that where column i contains material column iv does not, and vice versa. Also, both columns contain similar material--a verbal form. These two columns are in what linguists would call complementary distribution.²² As such they can be collapsed. See table 12 where the previous columns i and iv appear together as column iii.

Table 12
The Hebrew Of Dan 8:10-12, Column A
(Restatement)

Verses	i	ii	iii
Vs. 10	<i>ʿad</i>	<i>š^ebāʾ haššāmáyim</i>	<i>wattigdal</i>
Vs. 11	<i>w^eʿad</i>	<i>śar haššābāʾ</i>	<i>higdîl</i>
Vs. 12	...	<i>w^ešābāʾ</i>	<i>tinnātēn</i>

The actual differences between vss. 10 and 11 are not so marked as the English translation in exhibit (1) would imply. The same preposition (*ʿad* "to") is used in both verses, and the same verb root (*gd* "become great") is used as well. The root in vs. 12 clarifies that in vss. 10-12, since the giving over of the host results from the host's being taken over by the horn as part of an over-all pattern of self-aggrandizement.

Notice that the verb root (*gd* "become great"), used in vss. 10-11, has more to do with activity for self than against others. The basic idea conveyed by this root is not so much one of overt physical violence as of pride, although the former is not excluded.

Column B: The context for
the horn's dealings

The second group of phrases in Dan 8:10-12 is now stated, in both English (text exhibit (2)) and Hebrew (table 13).

(2) Dan 8:10-12, Column B

Vs. 10 ...

Vs. 11 it took away the daily sacrifice from him,

Vs. 12 Because of rebellion, . . . the daily sacrifice

Table 13
The Hebrew of Dan 8:10-12, Column B

Verses	Words
Vs. 10	. . .
Vs. 11	<i>ûmimmennû hûram hattâmîd</i>
Vs. 12	<i>ʿal hattâmîd b^cpāšāʾ</i>

*Qere *hûram*; Kethib *hērîm*. The one vocalization of the consonant letters is passive ("was taken away"), the other active ("he took away"). Note that passive *hušlak* ("was cast [down]") occurs in the same verse.

The "daily sacrifice" is not mentioned in vs. 10. In vss. 11-12 the word used is *tamîd*, which literally means "continual"; "sacrifice" is not stated in the text but supplied. And in fact more than sacrifice is involved. The allusion is to the entire round of sanctuary activity during the course of the ceremonial year, leading up to the day of atonement at its close. So if any word must be added a better choice would be "service"--thus, "daily service" rather than "daily sacrifice."

It is important to notice that the horn of Dan 8:10-12 does not exercise pride in the abstract while taking over the host to itself, but acts with special reference to the daily in doing so. Verse 12a reads, "Because of rebellion, the host of the saints and the daily sacrifice were given over to it." Note in passing that the phrase "and the daily sacrifice" is translated from Hebrew *ʿal hattâmîd*. But *ʿal* does not mean "and," nor is the verb *tinnātēn* plural.²³ In this particular clause, only the host is given over. The daily is given over in vs. 11, but in vs. 12 what is given over to the little horn is the host--with particular reference to (*ʿal*, literally "upon") the daily.

Column C: The results of
the horn's dealings

The third group of phrases in Dan 8:10-12 is now stated, in English (text exhibit (3)) and in Hebrew (table 14).

(3) Dan 8:10-12, Column C

Vs. 10	and it threw some of the starry host down to the earth and trampled on them.
Vs. 11	and the place of his sanctuary was brought low.
Vs. 12	It prospered in everything it did, and truth was thrown to the ground.

Table 14
The Hebrew of Dan 8:10-12, Column C

Verses	i	ii	iii	iv	v
Vs. 10	<i>wattappēl</i>	<i>ʾārṣâ</i>	<i>min haṣṣābāʾ[?]</i> <i>wattirm^esēm</i>	...	<i>ûmin hakkōkâbîm</i>
Vs. 11	<i>w^ehušlak</i>	...	<i>m^ekôn miqdāšô</i>
Vs. 12	<i>w^etašlêk</i>	...	<i>^emet</i>	<i>ʾārṣâ</i>	<i>w^ehišlîhâ</i> <i>w^eaš^etâ</i>

Notice that in table 14, as in table 11 above, two of the columns of data are in complementary distribution. Columns ii and iv of table 14 both contain only the word 'arsâ "to the earth/ground." In table 15 they are collapsed and shown together as column ii.

Table 15
The Hebrew of Dan 8:10-12, Column C
(Restatement)

Verses	i	ii	iii	iv
Vs. 10	<i>wattappēl</i>	<i>ʾārṣâ</i>	<i>min haṣṣābāʾ[?]</i> <i>wattirm^esēm</i>	<i>ûmin hakkōkâbîm</i>
Vs. 11	<i>w^ehušlak</i>	...	<i>m^ekôn miqdāšô</i>	...
Vs. 12	<i>w^etašlêk</i>	<i>ʾārṣâ</i>	<i>^emet</i>	<i>w^ehišlîhâ</i> <i>w^eaš^etâ</i>

Column C, parts i and ii. Within column i of table 15, vss. 11 and 12, the same verb root (*šlk* "cast") is used. In column ii, vss. 10 and 12, the same adverbial expression *ʾārṣâ* "to the earth/ground" occurs. From this I draw that columns of phrases and their respective subdivisions within Dan 8:10-12 bring together materials that can be directly and profitably compared. Thus, in column i, whether something is caused to fall (*npl*, vs. 10) or cast down (*šlk*, vss. 11-12) the result is all the same. And, in column ii, the expressions "to the earth" (vs. 10) and "to the ground" (vs. 12) represent identically the same Hebrew word *ʾārṣâ*.

Column C, part iii. Applying the above principle of comparability to material from columns iii and iv yields insights of special value in both cases. Taking the items in column iii together first, it becomes clear that the "truth" which was "thrown to the ground" (vs. 12) is the truth about "the place of his sanctuary" (vs. 11). It is not "the place of his sanctuary" itself that is cast down, but the truth about the place His sanctuary (comparing vs. 11 with vs. 12).

The casting down of the host can also be drawn into the parallel (comparing vss. 11-12 with vs. 13). What links the casting down of both sanctuary and host is not physical in nature but epistemological. The "place of his sanctuary" may be presumed to have an independent physical existence, but the truth about that sanctuary must necessarily involve a human perception of it. The word "truth" implies an intelligent awareness of facts in addition to the validity the facts have when taken independently. Thus, as regards the sanctuary itself the host's perceptions are called "truth," while as regards the host those same perceptions would be

called "belief." On the one hand we have an objective reality, on the other a perception and acceptance of that reality. In the present context, to cast down the truth about the sanctuary is to cast down the belief of the host in regard to the sanctuary.

It should be carefully noted that the above interpretation of column iii in table 15 does not exchange a more desirable literal interpretation for a less desirable metaphorical one. It could not, because no literal interpretation for the casting down of the "place of his sanctuary" is available.²⁴ When Antiochus, for example, confronted the Jews in the second century B.C. the physical structure of the second temple was firmly in place. To cast this structure down literally would imply destroying it--something Antiochus never did or attempted to do. Thus, for preterists and futurists--who apply the present passage in the second century--as well as for historicists, metaphor is required in order to interpret the clause under discussion. The question is not whether metaphor should be used, but what form it will take.

The specific metaphor that I propose using involves two considerations. First, we take vs. 11 ("sanctuary") in the context of vs. 12 ("truth") and suggest that the "place of his sanctuary" was cast down in the sense that the truth about it was cast down. Second, I suggest that the horn's casting the truth about the sanctuary "down to the ground" (column C, vs. 12) must be seen in the broader context of the horn's growing "until it reached the host of the heavens" (column A, vs. 10).²⁵ Both expressions illustrate a spatial symbolism whose two poles are respectively earth and heaven. Such symbolism is pervasive not only in Dan 8:10-12 but throughout the book and in apocalyptic generally.²⁶ Omitting the concept of heaven/earth symbolism from columns i-iii is what would require special explanation.

Thus, in column C there is not just metaphor alone ("cast down" = "defile"), but metaphor contextually defined as being ideological in nature ("cast down the sanctuary" = "cast down the truth about the sanctuary") and spatial symbolism contextually defined as being cosmic in scope ("cast down the truth about the sanctuary to earth" = "cast down the truth about the sanctuary from heaven to earth"). Now the truth about the sanctuary is that we have a High Priest there who in every way and for all time meets our need.²⁷ Christ and His personal ministry in heaven cannot be excluded from the symbolism of the passage.

Column C, part iv. I now suggest that columns i-iii are related to column iv as cause and effect. Thus, the great harm inflicted on the host in the verb *wattirm^esem* "and it trampled them" (vs. 10, column iv) is the natural result of that host's attention being diverted from heaven to earth (vs. 10, columns i-iii), and not a separate action. Similarly the great success that accrues to the horn (vs. 12, column iv) is the natural result of its displacing the attentions of the host from heaven to earth in regard to the truth about the sanctuary (vs. 12, columns i-iii). It is not that the horn's pride leads it to cast down the truth about the sanctuary. Instead the issues are such that the horn's pride in regard to the daily is itself the casting down of the truth about the sanctuary.

Only one historical process is described in the entire section of three verses found in Dan 8:10-12. That process consists only and exclusively of the horn's drawing off to itself the host's attentions with regard to the daily. This act is described as constituting aggression against both the Prince²⁸ and the host,²⁹ the downfall of the latter,³⁰ and the downfall of the truth about the sanctuary.³¹ The horn's activity may be assumed from Daniel's choice of verbs (*gd* "become great")³² to have been motivated primarily in favor of self rather than in opposition to others, but it had enormous implications that were indeed harmful. Whatever the actual intentions of the horn may have been, therefore, the results of this sustained concession to human pride and the desire for corporate self-aggrandizement are shown in our passage to have been utterly disastrous.

5. Discussion of Selected Terms From the Passage

In defining the main terms used in Dan 8:10-12 the Prince must be taken prominently into consideration. In fact there is good reason to insist on considering Him first, because there are more potential villains than there are potential princes of the sort demanded by the passage. Only one Person qualifies as *šar hassaba'* ("prince of the host")³³ in light of the Scriptural parallels to this important title, but the number of individuals, institutions, or whatever, that have been at once evil enough and powerful enough to qualify as villains on a large scale over the past two and a half thousand years is much less restricted. This does not mean that any or all of them fulfill the prophecy, but merely that there are more to choose from than is the case with the "Prince of the host." H. C. Leupold indirectly supports this claim in the following quotation:

Is there not an appalling sameness about this business of leagues and pacts between rival nations, of disagreements, of wars, of alliances, of political marriages, of recriminations, of treachery, of temporary ascendancy, of defeat and utter downfall, of recovery through some aggressive leader; and then the same thing all over again with a slightly different sequence of events? From this point of view there is a drab sameness about history which allows us to say that, in addition to being a prophecy of a particular period of Syrian and Egyptian history, this may be regarded as a panoramic view of all history in a picture that is idealized, at least to some extent.³⁴

If someone were to argue that a villain other than Antiochus Epiphanes is described in Dan 8, Leupold would not be able to counter that argument successfully on the basis of the statement just quoted. To the extent that his argument here is strong the corresponding argument for Antiochus Epiphanes becomes weak. Correctly identifying the Prince in Dan 8 establishes important controls on who or what the corresponding villain power might be. As a result it is necessary not only to consider the Prince carefully, but to consider Him first. This is now done.

The Prince

Who the Prince is

If the "Prince of the host" is not the second Member of the Godhead, as I suggest, one would have to apply the Prince figure either to an angel or to an ordinary man--neither of which satisfies the requirements of the close parallel between *šar haššābā'* ("prince of the host") in Dan 8:11 and *šar-š^ebā'-YHWH* (commander of the army of the Lord") in Josh 5:14. Just as any definition of the "horn" must take the "prince of the host" into account, any definition of the "prince of the host" must take the meaning and parallel uses of *šar haššābā'* into account. When the latter comparison is made, the "Prince of the host" (Dan 8), or "commander of the army" (Josh 5), can only be Christ.

Where and when the Prince is active in history

If the Prince in Dan 8:11 is Christ then in that verse He is depicted as being either on earth or in heaven as regards space, either before the cross or after the cross as regards time. In addressing these two related issues one must bear in mind that any attempt to take the daily away could be made only at a time when it would otherwise be available. Thus, if Christ is the Prince who ministers the daily, it follows that the time referred to is after the cross. And a time for the daily after the cross demands a place for it other than earth. Christ presents the merits of His blood, not on earth, but in heaven before the Father. I therefore submit that the reference in Dan 8 to a "Prince of the host" in association with the daily is a prophetic look forward to Christ's priestly ministry in heaven after the cross, as documented elsewhere in Heb 7-9.

The Host

With regard to the "starry host" of Dan 8:10, consider the parallel in Dan 12:3, which says, "Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever." The "wise" of 12:3a are the same as those who "lead many to righteousness" in 12:3b. Thus, there may be a distinction in 8:10 between "the host" (*haṣṣābāʾ*) and "the stars" (*hakkôkâbîm*), such that the stars are those who lead many to righteousness and the host are the many they have led. Stars in this case would be human leaders and the host would consist of their human followers. If this is the case then both the leaders and those they have led are alike cast down in Dan 8.

The spatial symbolism that relates the Prince to the host in column A involves a contrast between heaven and earth, and the same is true with regard to the relationship between the sanctuary and the host in column C. Being cast down to the ground in this context doesn't refer to being forced from a vertical position such as standing to a horizontal position such as lying prostrate. Such is not the nature of the imagery found here. Instead heaven is contrasted with earth in a consistent manner throughout. If this fact is not given due emphasis, something of the apocalyptic nature of the passage is lost. But if the contrast between heaven and earth is maintained in column A and in column C, the two groups of clauses are shown to harmonize both with each other and with the rest of the book as regards the use of apocalyptic spatial symbolism.

The implications of the point just made are extremely significant. If the host is to be cast down from heaven to earth in some way--something that would be clearly impossible in a literal or physical sense since the host is not in heaven--it follows that the issues involved must be understood as being spiritual in nature.³⁵

The Horn

What the horn represents

Identifying the horn power of Dan 8:9 depends crucially on a correct identification of the beast with which it is associated. This is not the Greek goat of Dan 8 but rather the Roman

fourth beast of Dan 7. Context does not demand that the horn be Greek; entirely to the contrary, it is context that precludes such a possibility. The horn is Roman.

Where and when the horn
is active in history

The "horn, which started small," is introduced in Dan 8:9 as going out horizontally from one of the four points of the compass. The text does not specify which one, but the fact that direction again becomes the subject of comment is in itself preliminary evidence that a third power is introduced in the narrative.³⁶

The question of when the horn goes forth has been addressed already in connection with the Prince. The Prince and the villain must be active at the same time in history or they could not come into conflict with each other. Since the Prince's activity in connection with the daily has already been assigned to a period after the cross the villain's activity must be placed in the same timeframe as well. More than this, the absence of any reference to the purely secular beast associated with the religious horn which grows out of it narrows the timeframe to those centuries after the horn had emerged and was already active in history. The emphasis is on Rome in its second or primarily religious phase and not on the empire which preceded and gave rise to it. In history there is a Roman empire first and then a Roman church. The emphasis in Dan 8 is on the latter.

The "Daily"

Defining what was taken away and cast down is almost as important for a correct understanding of the passage as was identifying the Prince it was to be taken away from. The daily and the sanctuary in which it is ministered have been dealt with in terms of truth rather than earthly blood, stones, and mortar. The entity the horn would cast down is not just the "place of [the Prince's] sanctuary," but the truth about the place of His sanctuary. The point at issue is a spiritual one that concerns the maintaining of a right relationship between worshipers on earth and Christ as High Priest in heaven.

When the daily has been properly defined in each of the passages where it is referred to, the task of the exegete is still not over. The term "daily" is a subject of discussion in vss. 11-12 and of inquiry in vs. 13; it would be reasonable to expect a response in vs. 14. But "daily" (*tam d*) does not appear there. What does appear is the expression "evenings and mornings" (*'éreb-bôqer*, lit. "evening-mornings"). Thus, the daily of vss. 11-13 and evening-mornings of vs. 14 must be taken together in order for either to be understood in its proper context. The two terms correspond to each other.³⁷ It was pointed out earlier that a better word than "sacrifice" to supply after "daily" would be "service." Thus, in both 8:11-13 ("daily") and 8:14 ("evening-mornings") the reference is not only to the sanctuary but to the liturgical calendar of the sanctuary, and within that calendar to the daily service in particular.

Note that it is the daily service, and not the yearly, that is taken away from the Prince of the host in Dan 8 at a time some 500 years after the cross. Only in vs. 14, in the phrase *w^enišdaq qódeš*, do we find a reference to the corresponding yearly service. Thus, even though the term "daily" in vss. 11-13 is not a literal translation of *tāmîd*, it does refer to an antitypical daily service as opposed to yearly service. In the same way, even though the KJV translation "then shall the

sanctuary be cleansed" has no verbal link with Lev 16, the phrase does refer to an antitypical yearly service and the most obvious Scriptural parallel would indeed be found in Lev 16, where its ancient counterpart is described.³⁸

To say this much is merely to affirm that the ancient types typified something; there was to be a counterpart in heaven for the symbols on earth. These symbols portrayed an antitypical daily ministry of Christ distinct in time from His later yearly ministry, and throughout the long period of 2300 evening-mornings the attention of the prophet is directed to the daily.

6. *Significance of the Passage*

I now suggest a parallel between the way Christ's preaching was received by the Jews before the antitypical daily service began and the way that daily ministry in heaven came to be received later by Christians. Both groups, at different times, are God's people in Scripture and so are comparable at least in this one sense.

Opposition to the Work Christ Once Did on Earth

Throughout much of Christ's earthly ministry He was opposed. Thus, Heb 12:3 says, "Consider him who endured such opposition from sinful men, so that you will not grow weary and lose heart." The Jews did not rise up against Christ's preaching immediately after His baptism; their resistance began later and only became intense gradually over time. The question to raise here is whether Jewish opposition to Christ's work on earth was what eventually caused that work to end on the cross. In a sense this may be, but the issues go infinitely far beyond such matters. The Savior's death involved much more than the fact that His personal enemies attempted to end His life through an isolated act of judicially disguised murder.

Opposition to the Work Christ Now Does in Heaven

In Dan 8:9-12 opposition against Christ's daily ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is predicted. This opposition to His work in heaven, like that which preceded it during His time on earth, did not begin immediately but gradually, and with time it also became intense.

In both cases those who opposed Christ's activity--on earth first and later in heaven--thought they were consulting God's wishes, not to mention contributing to the practical success of His cause on earth, by what they did. Jewish pride led the one group to reject Christ altogether, while later Christian pride led the other group to accept not only His person but His rightful responsibilities and prerogatives. This was especially the case in regard to the sacrifice of the cross³⁹--something that only Christ could provide initially and which He had done so completely as to remove any need for its repetition. Forgiving the sins that other sinners commit against God falls in the same category.⁴⁰

To forgive one person of an offense against another makes claims about the relationship between the offended party and the one doing the forgiving, and between the forgiver and the one who initially committed the wrong. The one who forgives assumes in some sense the role of the one who was offended and the distinction between the two is rendered unclear. When ceremonies are created in which a human priest commemorates by imitation an act that only Christ Himself can actually perform--whether in the past as regards sacrifice, or in the present as regards the forgiveness made available by that sacrifice--the uniqueness of the original act is obscured and Christ's own priestly role is less distinct. Gradually, over the centuries, the priestly function of Christ was eclipsed entirely from view in this way and only that of His human representatives remained in the mind of the common people.

No malice or evil intent is required on the part of those perpetrating such errors for the positions they eventually espoused to be wrong or for their net effect to be harmful. Whatever the reasoning may have been at first, the practical results were all the same.

The Parallel between Jewish and Christian Neglect of Christ's Priestly Role

The natural human pride of God's professed people in two different ages--before and after the cross--resulted in stiff opposition to the very work that He was trying to do through His Son. In one age of history Jews refused to accept what God was doing through Christ as He lived out the perfect life which was a necessary prerequisite for His sacrifice. Then in a later age Christians refused to accept what God was doing through Christ as He ministered the benefits of that one unique sacrifice before the Father. They did this, first, by commemorating His sacrifice in such a way as to create the impression of imitating it, and second, by attempting to minister its cleansing benefits to each other. Christ alone could offer to God an effective sacrifice for human sin and He alone could offer forgiveness on that basis.

Despite what has been said above, there is a legitimate priestly role for Christians here on earth, referred to by Paul in Rom 15:15-16.

(15) I have written you quite boldly on some points, as if to remind you of them again, because of the grace God gave me (16) to be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles with the priestly duty of proclaiming the gospel of God, so that the Gentiles might become an offering acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

The sole purpose of the Christian's priestly role on earth is to call attention to Christ's high priestly role in heaven. Every person that is born into the world needs to know that he or she has an Advocate with the Father. It is the job of human beings to minister this knowledge. But every person also needs to know that his or her Advocate is "Jesus Christ, the Righteous One," as stated in 1 John 2:1. For many centuries during the Middle Ages sincere Christians were left in doubt on this point.

The Protestant Reformation counteracted the above situation in a measure, as Christ predicted in Matt 24:22. One of Martin Luther's primary accomplishments was that of restoring a right focus of faith--one directed entirely to Christ. He called attention away from human works of merit, which would compete with Christ's sacrifice, and from the pretensions of any fellow sinner that would stand in the way of Christ's ministry of forgiveness. To deny that the deplorable state of affairs existed which Luther was forced to address, described in Dan 8:9-12, is to deny the need for the Reformation and to call into question its historical credentials. Reform was clearly needed in the medieval church. The only possible novelty in the present discussion is my suggestion that Dan 8:9-12 is a prophetic description of this fact.

It is an irony for Protestants to speak out strongly in praise of the Reformation in terms of history and yet to avoid identifying any need for it in terms of prophecy. The need for reform existed, God realized ahead of time that it would exist, and in His wisdom gave predictions to this effect in Scripture. It is true that God loves the church despite any faults it may have. But He does not love the faults themselves and must be taken seriously when He says, "Those whom I love I rebuke and discipline."⁴¹

We now return to the original question and ask whether the opposition of the horn in Dan 8 was what caused Christ's mission in heaven to end with a setting right of the sanctuary. There might be a limited sense in which this is true, just as one could argue that Christ's enemies caused His crucifixion. The issues involved, however, go infinitely far beyond such matters. In both situations Christ's work was destined for completion regardless of anything His enemies or friends might do to hinder or help. In this context I submit that the evening-mornings of Dan 8:14a would have been followed by a vindication of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14b whether or not the little horn had ever existed.

Supporting Evidence

Christ's work has been opposed by two groups of His own people at different times in history. That work, however, was not materially hindered by the opposition brought against it in either case. In particular, the work of the little horn cannot be said to have created the need for a yearly service in Dan 8:14b. In symbolism deriving from the sanctuary a yearly service always followed the daily, regardless of anything Israel or its enemies were doing at the time. The sanctuary's liturgical calendar, then, is one factor that shows there was no relationship between other events and the time when the day of atonement occurred. There is another dimension to consider as well.

In the ancient type, the yearly service was not an artifact of the sanctuary's liturgical calendar only, but also of the nation's cycle of annual feasts.⁴² As one in a series of annual feasts the day of atonement came as surely and as punctually every year as the month in which it occurred. Neither the month Tishri nor the day of atonement within it came any sooner or later, any more or less surely, because of human attitudes regarding it. In the type it was inevitable that the daily service should be followed by a yearly service and, more than this, that it occur at a set time. In the antitype also there was a set time for the yearly service to begin, specified in a straightforward manner as follows: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."⁴³

7. Conclusion

If the above argument is valid, a question remains as to what effect the blandishments of the horn have had on the antitypical sanctuary historically. What the horn did wrong was to divert attention to itself--i.e., away from a divine tam^hd in heaven to a human tam^hd on earth. If the wrong focus of faith that resulted from such a diversion was the problem initially, then the solution would clearly be to transfer the focus of faith back to Christ and His priestly office in heaven. This was done to an extent in the Reformation and was an object of special emphasis at a still later time during the broadly inter-denominational Great Second-Advent Movement in the nineteenth century. Seventh-day Adventists, as the primary spiritual heirs of that movement, have in fact initiated an overt discussion of Christ's priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary--a discussion which still continues at the present time.⁴⁴

Corrective measures such as the above, however, do not constitute a setting right of the sanctuary. In the type it was not the attention of the worshipers waiting outside the tabernacle or temple on the day of atonement that cleansed the second apartment, but rather the work of the high priest inside it. In the same way, undoing the work of the horn by restoring a right focus of faith on Christ does not set the sanctuary right any more than the work of the horn in detracting attention from Christ caused the sanctuary to require cleansing initially. The issues are broader than this. While I am not in a position to say what every aspect of restoring, cleansing, or vindicating the sanctuary in heaven might be, it is clear that any genuine advance in our understanding of the process will come from comparing the antitype in heaven with the type on earth which prefigured it.

Until the end of the 2300 evening-mornings Christ ministered a daily service in "the sanctuary, the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man" (Heb 8:2) It was this daily service, and not the yearly, that was in progress during all the time that the medieval horn was busy diverting attention from it. It is crucial to remember that the daily was taken away, not the yearly. At a later time, however, when the 2300 evening-mornings finally came to an end, a yearly service was indeed to be instituted. One result of that second phase of Christ's high priestly ministry is the setting right of the sanctuary. In light of what He is doing for us, and where He does it, our modern focus of attention on Christ's work in heaven should be no different now from what was expected of the host during an earlier age. Their attention was diverted from Christ at great cost; ours must not be.⁴⁵

Notes

¹The present study is based on the Appendix to Frank W. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983), pp. 270-98. All Scripture quotations are from *The Holy Bible: New International Version* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1978), unless stated otherwise.

²For discussion see P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 16-46, 78-100, 104-135. See also Gottfried Oosterwal, *Mission: Possible* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1972), pp. 23-41.

³The term here rendered "be reconsecrated" is the topic for Hardy, "*w^enişdaq* in Dan 8:14, Part 1: How Should the Word be Translated," *Historicism* No. 3/Jul 85, pp. 16-35.

⁴"Daily sacrifice" would be better translated as "daily service." This term is discussed below and in William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1982), pp. 34-43. See also Shea's earlier manuscript entitled "Daniel and the Judgement" (mimeographed), pp. 63-66, 388-90.

⁵"The two-horned ram that you saw represents the kings of Media and Persia" (Dan 8:20).

⁶"The shaggy goat is the king of Greece, and the large horn between his eyes is the first king" (Dan 8:21).

⁷Stephen N. Haskell, for example, in *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, Heritage Library (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1901; reprint ed., Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1977), pp. 104-5, writes: "If Babylon was not already undergoing a siege at the hands of Cyrus and Darius, her downfall was so imminent that in this vision the history of nations begins with the rising kingdom of the Medes and Persians." Roy Allan Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1975), p. 89, holds the same view: "The kingdom of Babylon was not to endure for long, for another kingdom, represented by a bear, was soon to arise." For a contrasting position see Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978), p. 161: "The Babylonian empire is disregarded and no mention is made of the kingdom of God." For Baldwin the kingdom of Babylon is omitted in Dan 8 because the author chose to omit it and not because of external considerations such as the time when the vision was written down.

⁸"The First and Third Years of Belshazzar," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977):153-68, "In short, the book of Daniel dates chaps. 7 and 8 to 550/549 and 548/547 B.C. respectively, or about eleven and nine years before the fateful night in which Belshazzar lost his life (Dan 5:30) and when Babylon fell (middle of October, 539)."

⁹Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel & Revelation Committee Series, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), p. 32.

¹⁰See Hardy, "*w^enişdaq* in Dan 8:14," pp. 16-35.

¹¹A related question is what the defilement of the sanctuary has to do with the little horn.

¹²I would go farther and say that there is only one series of world empires in Scripture. The four-part list found in Daniel, with its treatment of Rome in two phases, is compared with the seven-part list of Rev 17 in the next issue of *Historicism*. My approach is to take the second phase of Rome's power as having a hiatus in mid course. Thus, one can speak of Rome first as an empire (#4) and then of Rome as a mixed political-religious power--before the deadly wound

(#5), during the deadly wound (#6), and after the deadly wound (#7). Problems encountered by this model are discussed in the forthcoming paper.

¹³For a commonly available introduction to the way linguists use distinctive features see Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle, *The Sound Pattern of English* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 64-66. My use of distinctive feature notation here is not linguistic in nature, but is adapted from such usage.

¹⁴As regards the composition of the third metal in Nebuchadnezzar's image consider the following: "The bronze (Gr. *chalcos*, Lat. *aes*) of classical antiquity consisted chiefly of copper, alloyed with one or more of the metals, zinc, tin, lead and silver, in proportions that varied as times changed, or according to the purposes for which the alloy was required. Among bronze remains, the copper is found to vary from 67% to 95%. . . . Originally, no doubt, *chalcos* was the name for pure copper" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964 ed., s.v. "Bronze"). If the "bronze" of the image were copper then each of the metals would be basic elements chemically. As it is, bronze is the only compound among the four.

¹⁵Literally "from them."

¹⁶In the apparatus of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* there is a note at this point which reads, "nonn Mss Edd ," i.e., a number of Hebrew manuscripts and editions other than BHS have the feminine form *mēhen*.

¹⁷Polzin, in *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 12 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), p. 53, points out that the feminine plural possessive form in *nun* had already fallen into disuse in spoken Hebrew by the time of Ezekiel: "It is well known that in Ezekiel there is a fluctuation of final *mem/nun* in the 3 f pl suffixes, and Kropat is correct in stating: '*Das Nebeneinander von maskulinem und femininem Suffix in den älteren Schriften bis Ezechiel, das vollständige Fehlen des femininen Suffixes 3. pers. plur. in den jüngeren Schriften zeigt deutlich, dass dieses schon in der Zeit nach Ezechiel nicht mehr gebraucht wurde.*' We find this feature also in Dn 1.5, 8.9, and in Ruth 1.8ff.22."

¹⁸Shea, "Selected Studies," pp. 43-44.

¹⁹Both pairs of words seem to offer a potential for contradiction as regards grammatical number. Appearances, however, can be misleading. Only one (*ʾaḥat*) of the winds is referred to and the Hebrew word for "heaven" (*haššāmāyim*) is actually "heavens."

²⁰The concept of a gradual shift from secular to religious interests in Dan 11 is discussed in Hardy, "Historicist Perspective," pp. 264-65. Here we have a similar shift in Dan 8.

²¹See Shea, "Daniel and the Judgement," p. 390.

²²For discussion, in a commonly available and entertainingly written source, see Victoria Fromkin and Robert Rodman, *An Introduction to Language*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), pp. 108-10.

²³The unprefixal verbal form *tinnātēn* would normally mean "it will be given over." Notice the unusual use of tenses.

²⁴See Shea, *Selected Studies*, p. 38.

²⁵Note the juxtaposition of "host" and "heavens." The host is clearly on earth but is spoken of in connection with heaven, thus the expression "the host of the heavens." This presents a difficulty only when the connection is made in a physical sense. The issues here are spiritual as well.

²⁶John G. Gammie, "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974):356-85, especially p. 367.

²⁷Heb 7:23-28; 8:1-6.

²⁸Column A, vs. 11.

²⁹Column A, vss. 10, 12.

³⁰Column C, part iii, vs. 10.

³¹Column C, part iii, vss. 11-12.

³²Column A, vss. 10-11.

³³Column A, vs. 11.

³⁴Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), pp. 475-76.

³⁵This concept is implicit within such expressions as "starry host" (*min-haššābā' ūmin-hakkôkâbîm*, lit. "from the host and from the stars"), "host of heaven," and so on. A relationship between heaven and earth is indicated by the words chosen to talk about the host in this passage, but it could not be a bodily relationship. The "starry host" consists of the body of believers here on earth. The host pertains to heaven only in the sense that its commitments and loyalties are there.

³⁶See table 9, above.

³⁷This is not to say, however, that they are identical. In Dan 8:13 the NIV translates, "'How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled--the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?'" The Hebrew at this point says *ʿad-māṭay heḥāzôn hattāmîd wʿhappéša' šômēm tēt wʿqôdeš wʿšābā' mirmās*, which is more literally rendered, "Until when [will be] the vision, the daily, and the desolating rebellion making both sanctuary and host a trampling ground?" There are two points to notice. First, in the phrase *heḥāzôn hattāmîd wʿhappéša' šômēm* there are no construct forms, and so it is really not possible to translate "the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, . . ." and so on, as in NIV. If *heḥāzôn* were in construct with *hattāmîd* ["the vision of (i.e., concerning) the daily"] the former would not be able to retain the definite article. Because of the definite article *ha(C)-*, which is a feature of the consonantal text, the phrase must be interpreted as containing three separate and co-equal items--all of them in *status absolutus*. A correct translation would be "the vision, the daily, and the desolating rebellion."

The three terms refer to three distinct series of events. They end together but do not begin together. Notice that in Dan 8:13 the angel's question places emphasis specifically on the end of the vision (*ʿad-māṭay* "until when?"), not its beginning ("from when?") or general duration ("how long?"). In fact there are three different beginnings in 8:13 and that of the 2300 days in 8:14 does not correspond to any of them. The "vision" starts when the Persian ram is introduced more than 500 years before Christ in VI B.C. (8:3-4, 20); the "daily" starts at the time of Christ's ascension to heaven in I A.D. (9:24 [event #6], 27); and the "desolating rebellion" starts--in a prophetically significant sense--more than 500 years after Christ in VI A.D. (12:7, 11). All three series of events, however, come to an end at substantially the same time in XVIII-XIX A.D., together with the 2300 days of vs. 14.

³⁸See Hardy, "Historicist Perspective," p. 205, n. 1.

³⁹The Mass, which is the central act of religion, is the realization by the Church of the unique and primordial sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; it is this redemptive act accomplished once for all in the centre of history that the Mass makes present in the course of time. . . . Not that the death with the shedding of His Blood is repeated; Christ, for ever in glory, dies no more. But the Mass is a sacrament which makes present what happened on the Cross; the separation of the Body and Blood of Jesus, represented by the separate bread and wine, is effected anew by means of the transubstantiation--the whole substance of the bread is changed into that of His Body, the whole substance of the wine into that of His Blood. It is therefore indeed the divine Victim Himself that the Mass makes present among us, in His immolated state. The worship of infinite adoration, thanksgiving, expiation and intercessions which Christ gave to His Father on the Cross, He gives to Him afresh on the altar whenever Mass is celebrated" (Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, et al., *Saint Andrew Daily Missal* [Bruges, Belgium: Biblica, 1962], pp. 775-76). There is a question how much help such an explanation makes available. If the host is "indeed the divine Victim Himself" then offering the one means offering the Other, and the sacrifice of the cross is verily repeated in the mass. If, on the other hand, the host is a symbol of the divine

Victim the problem disappears; one legitimate function of a symbol is to make present a past reality. But this is not the claim made for the mass by those who argue in favor of it.

⁴⁰If confession to a human priest were approached by both parties as a form of psychotherapy only, there would be no great harm in the practice. Psychotherapy is not immoral. But again, this is not the claim. See Anthony Wilhelm, *Christ Among Us: A Modern Presentation of the Catholic Faith*, 3rd ed. (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), p. 319.

⁴¹Rev 3:19; see also Heb 12:4-12. God loves people no matter what they do, but condemns sin no matter who commits it. On the one hand we have the "whom I love" clause, on the other the "rebuke and discipline" clause. Neither should be allowed to negate or weaken its counterpart.

⁴²See Stephen N. Haskell, *The Cross and Its Shadow* (South Lancaster: Bible Training School, 1914; reprint ed., Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1970), pp. 93-120, 201-44; M. L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1947), pp. 170-87, 211-23; Salim Japas, *Cristo en el santuario* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1980), pp. 73-79.

⁴³Dan 8:14, KJV. On this translation of nisdaq see Frank Zimmermann, "The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8-12," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938):261-62.

⁴⁴See Ellen G. White, *Christ in His Sanctuary* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1969); Wallenkampf and Leshner, eds., *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*.

⁴⁵Similarly, of the things written here about Prince and villain, the reader's greatest attention should be directed primarily to what has been written about the Prince. In evaluating the thrust of the present study, then, as well as the passage of Scripture it was written to explain, the discussion should be made to revolve around Christ.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Roy Allan. *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*. Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1975.
- Andreasen, M. L. *The Sanctuary Service*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1947.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Halle, Morris. *The Sound Pattern of English* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Damsteegt, P. Gerard Damsteegt. *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Elliger, K., and Rudolph, W., eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976/77.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964 ed. S.v. "Bronze".
- Fromkin, Victoria, and Rodman, Robert. *An Introduction to Language*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
- Gammie, John G. "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974):356-85.
- Hardy, Frank W. "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983.
- . "w^enišdaq in Dan 8:14, Part 1: How Should the Word be Translated." *Historicism* No. 3/Jul 85, pp. 16-35.
- . "The Seven World Empires of Rev 17." To appear in *Historicism* No. 4/Oct 85.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "The First and Third Years of Belshazzar." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977):153-68.
- Haskell, Stephen N. Haskell. *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*. Heritage Library Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1901; reprint ed., Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1977.
- . *The Cross and Its Shadow*. South Lancaster: Bible Training School, 1914; reprint ed., Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1970.
- The Holy Bible: New International Version*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1978.
- Japas, Salim. *Cristo en el santuario* Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1980.
- Lefebvre, Dom Gaspar, et al. *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*. Bruges, Belgium: Biblica, 1962.

Leupold, H. C. *Esposition of Daniel* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949, pp. 475-76.

Oosterwal, Gottfried. *Mission: Possible*. Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1972.

Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Monographs. No. 12. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

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

----- "Daniel and the Judgement." Andrews University, 1980. (Mimeographed.)

Wallenkampf, Arnold V., and Leshner, W. Richard, eds. *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1981.

White, Ellen G. *Christ in His Sanctuary*. Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1969.

Wilhelm, Anthony. *Christ Among Us: A Modern Presentation of the Catholic Faith*. 3rd ed. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.

Zimmermann, Frank. "The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8-12." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938):255-72.