

## LESSON 11

In his Introduction, our author kindly sets forth his agenda for this week's lesson, which will often glance back to former studies, especially on Dan. 8, for its basis:

This week we're going to look even more closely at the little horn, focusing specifically on its attack against the "prince of the host," the "daily," and "the place of his sanctuary."

We're going to see, too, *how central the idea of the heavenly sanctuary is to the chapter, for it's only in the context of the heavenly sanctuary and its services that we can get a better understanding of the little horn's assault.* [stress supplied]

### Our Author's Polemic

For study on **Sunday**, 3<sup>rd</sup> September, our author claims to have verified, in Lesson 5, that Dan. 8:9-12 "showed the two phases of Rome, first pagan, then papal." In reviewing his study, though, I have refuted this view enough for us to move on here, albeit with this robust recommendation. My readers would be very well advised indeed to refresh themselves on my unequivocal rebuttal that *Roman Catholicism entered ecclesial history far too late ever to have graced Daniel's predictive blueprint.* For, as detailed in reviewing Lesson 3, *this scheduled the Eschaton in Christ's day.*

Our author next invites us to ponder these prime words detailing the *religious/spiritual* objects of the Little Horn's attack: host; heaven; prince; daily; sanctuary; truth.

[More] than anything else, it's the *religious* attack by the little horn that plays great prominence here, and that's the focus of the vision. The Lord wants us to see the *religious* dimension of the little horn and that its activities are in a *religious* sphere. This activity is seen again in the explanation in Daniel 8:23-25, in which the little horn specifically is said to persecute "the mighty and the holy people," as well as to stand up against "the Prince of princes." [stress supplied]

Credit where credit is due! I am happy to concur *in general* here, although this by no means implies that I equally accept any of our author's *detailed* interpretations.

For study on **Monday**, 4<sup>th</sup> September, our author parades what he claims as "the first link" of the prophecy of Dan. 8 "to the book of Leviticus, which spends more time dealing with the sanctuary service than any other book in the Old Testament":

Not only are the beasts in Daniel 8 sanctuary animals, they are among the animals used on the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16).

This detail may be despatched immediately as *trite* and wholly *inconclusive*. For sacrificial animals which feature *repeatedly* in both the tabernacle ordination and rituals most definitely do not invite *any* attention whatever to its Day of Atonement! Meticulous exegesis gleans *no* more in Dan. 8 than a *general* sanctuary reference.

We now observe the centre of the Little Horn's attack – the *sanctuary* – in Dan. 8:10-12:

First, the little horn takes away the "daily." The Hebrew word translated "daily" (*tamid*) also means "continual" or "perpetual," and it is used numerous times in direct reference to the day-by-day ministry of the priests in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary service. This, then, is an unmistakable reference, not only to the sanctuary service but to the *daily* ministry in that service [stress supplied]. (see *Exod. 27:20, 29:42, Num. 4:7, 28:6*).

In Daniel 8:11... the "place" or the "foundation" of His sanctuary was cast down. That word place is found in numerous texts, all in reference to the sanctuary, or to God's dwelling place, which also has a link to the sanctuary (*Exod. 15:17, 1 Kings 8:13, 2 Chron. 6:2, Isa. 18:4*).

Then there are, of course, the references to the "sanctuary" itself, found not only in verse 11 but also in verses 13 and 14. These verses alone show clearly how the sanctuary, which was the earthly model of the plan of salvation, was under attack.

This is a rather mixed bag. On one hand, I accept *much* of what our author says about God's sanctuary. Indeed, so specific is the Hebrew noun *tāmîd* that I have emphasised, in reviewing Lesson 9, that it offers *evenings-mornings*, the key temporal expression of Dan. 8:14, the sense (2,300) *days*, not *sacrifices* over 1,150 days.

Yet on the other, I *categorically* reject his omitting all reference to the Day of Atonement from *tāmîd*. Of course such minutiae as tending the lamps, Lev. 24:1-4, were *not* neglected on this solitary day of the year! But specifically, Nu. 29:7-11 details the *tāmîd* offerings for this Day of Atonement, all "in *addition* to... the *regular* (*tāmîd*) burnt offering", 11. However, his detailed polemics, scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, certainly warrant the greater attention which my evaluation can provide.

Our author now *speculates* on this sanctuary's identity in light of the Little Horn's purported dual identity. Having totally rejected such duality as eisegetical, I likewise reject *much* of what follows. So I will treat outstanding detail alone in my evaluation.

Because the earthly sanctuary had been destroyed in A.D. 70, this was an attack on the *heavenly* sanctuary. The little horn... would not get into heaven, so this, instead, would have been an attack on all that was *symbolized* by the sanctuary, which is the plan of salvation... [Monday, stress supplied]

Daniel, more than five hundred years before Christ, is shown in vision the essence of Rome's later attack on "the truth," which it cast "to the ground" (*Dan. 8:12*). Among other things, the little horn waxes great, even against the "Prince of the host," Jesus.

It's very important to keep in mind that Christ, "the Prince of the host," is now ministering for us in the *heavenly* sanctuary, which is under attack by the little horn. Again, the language was *symbolic*; the little horn didn't actually get into heaven, any more than it physically cast the "truth" or the "place of his sanctuary" to the ground. [Tuesday, stress supplied]

For study on **Wednesday** and **Thursday**, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September, our author returns to offer us his more detailed explanation of the Little Horn's attack on God's *tāmîd*:

[T]hough the *tamid* included the sacrifices, it included the day-by-day ministrations of the priesthood, which, according to the book of Hebrews, was just an "example and shadow of heavenly things" (*Heb. 8:5*). Those *heavenly* things, of course, were the spiritual realities of Christ's high-priestly ministry; all these earthly activities, these shadows, were simply symbols of Christ ministering in the *heavenly* sanctuary in our behalf. Again, this is what has come under attack by the little horn. [stress supplied]

Also notice, too [*sic*], that these activities centered around the *first* apartment of the earthly sanctuary. The bread, the lampstand, and the incense were all in the *first* apartment; the sacrifice, of course, was at the altar outside it. [stress supplied]

The important point... is that *none of the activities had anything to do with the Most Holy Place*, the second apartment [*sic*], which the high priest entered only once a year, when the sanctuary was cleansed. [Wednesday, stress supplied]

The earthly sanctuary service was a model of the heavenly; the sacrifices and the ministry of the priesthood were types, figures, mini-prophecies, as it were, of the death and high-priestly ministry of Jesus.

[B]esides the daily ministration in the first apartment, once a year the high priest entered into the Most Holy Place to perform the "cleansing of the sanctuary" (*see Leviticus 16*). Because this happened only once a year, it's often called "the yearly," to contrast it with "the daily." Hence, the entire sanctuary service could be placed broadly in two categories: the daily, first-apartment ministry, and the yearly, second-apartment ministry, during which the sanctuary was cleansed.

Now, an important question: Why was just the *daily* service, the *tamid*, specified as the object of the little horn's attack? Why did the vision emphasize only one aspect of the sanctuary service, as opposed to both? [stress supplied]

The little horn was able to attack only the "daily" because the "yearly," the second-apartment ministry, which occurred when the sanctuary was cleansed, wasn't in operation then. Not until the end of the 2,300 years, 1844, was the sanctuary to be cleansed and the "yearly" began.

Thus, in Daniel 8, both phases of Christ's high-priestly ministry appear: "the daily," which comes under attack by the little horn, and "the yearly," which commences at the end of the 2,300 days. Both are brought to view in this chapter. [Thursday]

For study on **Friday**, 8<sup>th</sup> September, however, our author returns to some of Tuesday's material to justify an ecclesial interpretation dear the Seventh-day Adventists:

We've seen... that the little horn attacks the *heavenly* sanctuary, which was an attack on the plan of salvation itself. This, we believe, refers to *the entire Roman Catholic system*, which has usurped the role and prerogatives of God and Christ in the plan of salvation... [stress supplied]

Christ is now our High Priest, interceding for us in the *heavenly* sanctuary. A careful study of the *Roman* system shows how the entire structure of the church, with its priesthood, mediation, and mass, usurps everything that Christ has done for us or is doing for us now. Everything that we as believers would attribute directly to God and Christ has been commandeered by the *Roman Church* itself, which... "magnified itself" (*Dan. 8:11, RSV*), even to Christ Himself... [Tuesday, stress supplied]

In the process, he parades ten citations from the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) as proof positive of this striking assertion. The quite *decisive* problem, however, even with this procedure *per se*, is that any individual or organisation can readily make staggering claims. Yet *mere profession has never guaranteed practice!* For example, how many of the pitiful people who claim to be Jesus Christ really are our Lord!? Likewise, whatever Roman Catholicism's *claims* and even earthly *rituals*, it is utterly ludicrous to view these as fulfilling the *details* of *Dan. 8:10-12* – **ACTUAL curtailment of the ENTIRE cultus!** For *never has any foe actually reached heaven to effect the utter demolition of God's ethereal sanctuary!!*

## Evaluation

My purpose in evaluating this week's lesson may be facilitated if we first spend a moment or two seeking the important perspective of our author's apologetic effort to justify his Church's crucial, sectarian dogma of a pre-Advent judgment of all who have ever professed faith in God and/or Jesus Christ, beginning with Adam in 1844.

Having argued that the Book of Daniel stretches the 2,300 "evenings-mornings" of Dan. 8:14 to 1844, via the earthly ministry of Christ, our author has also contended that the *cleansing* of God's sanctuary, *ibid.*, KJV, equates with this pre-Advent judgment. In Lesson 12 he will investigate this cleansing. This will involve some of the typology of the Book of Hebrews, although this is really a subject in its own right.

Our author's primary objective this week, then, is merely to demonstrate that this sanctuary is the real one *in heaven*, not the shadowy one *on earth*. He therefore contends that the Little Horn is Roman Catholicism, *symbolically* attacking God's ethereal Temple via its pervasive heresies because it cannot *literally* reach heaven. However, that attack, he insists, is on its *daily* service, not its pre-Advent judgment.

Having rejected the notion that Roman Catholicism *ever* had *any* place in Daniel's prophetic *blueprint*, which was intended for *replete* fulfilment by the time of Christ, as well as extracting from Dan 7:21f., 25-27 the significant fact that the Little Horn's persecution of God's faithful followers continues quite unabated until the *Eschaton*, it remains for me, as fully as possible, to identify the two major characters in this great conflict: the Prince of princes and that Little Horn. In light of the specific details of the latter's attack upon the former, along with God's sanctuary, I will likewise identify the tabernacle in question, keeping in mind the manifest meaning of *tāmîd*. *And this*, I will repeat confidently, *was by no means limited to its mere daily cultus*.

### The Major Characters in Dan. 8

#### The Prince of Princes

Our author simply *assumes* that the heavenly prince, Dan. 8:11a, 25b, is Jesus Christ. However, the Hebrew noun *śar* may be equally relevant in 10:13, 21; 12:1, where he is identified as *Michael*. Although many a lay person accepts him as Jesus Christ, in Jude 9 he is merely an *archangel*, an office never ascribed unequivocally to our Lord. Even in 1 Thess. 4:16 he neither speaks with the archangel's voice nor blows the trumpet at his climactic Parousia. Regardless, Daniel's transparent references to *his tāmîd* and *his* sanctuary imply an ethereal rôle surpassing that which anywhere he ascribes to Michael. And further afield, Isa 9:6 (Heb., 5), *śar* appears in a *divine* context. Whatever, there is absolutely no need to read any *NT* realities, even those in the Book of Hebrews, back into the *OT*, especially in view of the unambiguous temporal context of Daniel's *blueprint* for the Little Horn, both broad and proximate, within the precise boundaries, naturally, of the book's overall temporal horizons.

#### That Little Horn

Whether or not Daniel's Little Horn of both 7 and 8 equates with Antiochus IV Epiphanes, as our guest interpreter argued for us in reviewing Lesson 10, the decisive fact remains that this fiend would be a *single individual*, not a *corporate organisation*. For one thing, this is the clear inference of 8:23-25. For another, more clearly still, whatever the precise import of the dynamics of Daniel's final vision, both its King of the North and its King of the South are *individuals*, even if in progression. And at least in 11:31, a reference to which we will return in evaluating Lesson 12 – with quite *devastating* results for Seventh-day Adventism's unique interpretation of 8:14! – *the King of the North is manifestly this Little Horn*, desecrating God's temple, abolishing his *tāmîd* and there establishing its idolatrous, desolating abomination.

Moreover, there is not even one single, solitary hint *anywhere* in Daniel's tome that Yahweh's paramount human foe ever *once* professed faith in him. And this exegetical expulsion is also *devastating* for Seventh-day Adventism's primary dogma! *For that completely excludes him from its unique model of pre-Advent judgment!*

## God's Sanctuary, Heavenly or Earthly?

In one sense it is completely *irrelevant* whether Daniel observes the Little Horn symbolically attacking God's heavenly sanctuary or literally his earthly tabernacle. For our prophet's entire repertoire of visions was scheduled for replete fulfilment by the era of Christ. Never once did even the shadow of 1844 cross his inspired mind!

To give credit where credit is due, though, at first sight our author's overall thesis gains credence because the Little Horn "reached the host of the heavens, and it threw some of the starry host down to the earth and trampled on them", Dan. 8:10.

In all due humility, this is rather enigmatic! At very least, then, it ill behoves anyone to appeal here for blind support for any stance on God's sanctuary. Yet some sense can be made of the relevant Hebrew noun *ṣābāʾ*, especially in close context with *kôkâb*, behind *starry*. This may anticipate the greater outrage of the master fiend, Rev. 12:4a. Yet a more mundane meaning seems preferable. For *ṣābāʾ* often denotes God's *servants*, especially in warfare, as in Nu. 31:3-6. And his servants are portrayed in Dan. 12:3 as shining "like the stars (*kôkâb*) for ever and ever." Moreover, these servants of God, specifically identified as wise teachers, appear in 11:33, too, where their short term of *persecution* and even *defection* is also prophesied, 33-35.

I therefore submit that this most likely parallels the trampling of the *ṣābāʾ* in 8:10, especially when the pollution of God's sanctum in 11:31 parallels its trampling in 8:13. This fortifies in the mere *humanity* of those whom the Little Horn persecutes in 24b. Whatever, to repeat my salient caveat, the symbolic element of the former treading is too minuscule to influence interpreting the latter. Just as the Little Horn stamps on God's *literal* servants on *earth*, so also he stomps all over his *real*, **earthly** sanctum.

*This answers our question!* Yet Daniel places it beyond all cogent doubt by providing abundant information to deduce the location of God's sanctuary with *certainty*. In the process, furthermore, the entire credibility of our author's repeated insistence that the Little Horn wages war on nothing more than its *day-by-day* rituals – "none of the activities had anything to do with the Most Holy Place" – will be manifest.

At very least, although our author is quite correct that the Little Horn's "activities are in a religious sphere", he is entirely astray in stating that he mounted "an attack on all that was *symbolized* by the sanctuary," stress supplied. For to curtail its *tāmîd*, 8:11b, 12a, is tantamount to *preventing its very operation!* Indeed, God's sanctuary is thus *trodden under foot*, 13b, the response of thorough contempt. To anticipate next week's review in passing, in 11:31 Daniel's tutor summarises this as **pollution!**

Now, while God's *earthly* tabernacle was often *destroyed*, as by Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Chr. 36:17-19, or at least *defiled* in sheer neglect, as by Ahaz, 28:24, never **once** was his *ethereal* temple *fouled* let alone *curtailed* by any apostate person or power. It follows as the night the day that *it is God's earthly sanctuary, not his heavenly, which the Little Horn assaults, resulting not only in its contamination but even its utter demolition.* Therefore, our author's question whether or not the climactic cultus of its *Day of Atonement* is subject to these assaults simply does not arise! God's earthly sanctuary ceases to function *in entirety*, Holy and Most Holy Place **alike.**

Moreover, this is verified in Dan. 9:24-27. As I deduced in reviewing Lesson 8, far from being Messianic, *it predicts the definitive solution to the worst crisis in Daniel's entire book: the Little Horn's ruinous attack on God via his earthly, temple cultus!*

## Summary

In his sectarian quest to defend his Church's prime dogma of a pre-Advent judgment of all who have ever professed faith in God and/or Jesus Christ, starting with Adam in 1844, this week our author has done his very best to verify that it is God's **heavenly** sanctum that the Little Horn attacks in Dan. 8 – *exclusively Jesus Christ's first-apartment ministry.* Sadly, however, this objective is well beyond him. For our prophet repeatedly affirms that it is God's **earthly** sanctuary which this fiend first **pollutes** then **destroys**, aborting **every** priestly duty – even on its Day of Atonement.