

Evaluation of “The Mystery of ‘The Daily’” by John W. Peters

John W. Peters is to be commended for the time and effort he has invested in this topic. His manuscript is the best defense of the “old view” on “the daily” I have seen to date. While I disagree with some aspects of the methodology used and the conclusions reached in this study, I respect the conviction and the opinions expressed.

Title Page

At the bottom of the title page it says: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Comment: This gives the impression that the document was published by the Theological Seminary. At least, many lay persons will take it that way. Whether this was intended or not, it looks like a deliberate attempt to give the paper an official status. I understand that the Seminary is asking the publishers to remove the reference to the Seminary from the title page.

Page 3

“L. R. Conradi in Germany reinterpreted the ‘daily’ as referring to the true sanctuary service and Christ’s High Priestly ministry in heaven.”

Comment: Peters gives the impression that what came to be called “the new view” began with Conradi. This is historically incorrect. The “new view” did not originate with Conradi, though he was instrumental in bringing it to the forefront of the debate around the turn of the century. Nevertheless, the question of the meaning of the daily was not a new one in Adventist history in the time of Conradi. William Miller had taught that it referred to paganism, but even before the Disappointment, that view was questioned. The classic 1843 chart produced by Fitch, and used by all the Advent preachers, omitted reference to the meaning of the daily.

In 1847 O. R. L. Crosier taught that the daily refers to the Christian teaching of Christ crucified for us. When somebody challenged him on this point he responded by saying:

It is not, we think, a mere “supposition” that the Daily Sacrifice is a “Christian Institution.” When first mentioned in Daniel, ch. 8.11, it is so introduced as to make it positively certain that it belonged originally to Christ. No construction of the prepositions in that verse can, as we see, apply it to Rome. – This should be noticed. Again, it should be noticed that God’s people, under the Gospel dispensation were punished for their “transgression against the Daily Sacrifice,” v. 12 (margin) – The ancient Daily Sacrifice was a Jewish institution – this, its antitype, must be a Christian institution. . . The whole force of Br. J. Litch’s exposition of Dan 11:31, on the taking away of the Daily, supports the idea that it was a Christian institution. . . The suppression in the church of the doctrine that Christ “WAS CRUCIFIED FOR US.” This was the Daily Sacrifice they took away, Dan 11:31, and the direct object of it was, “to set up

the abomination that maketh desolate,” the Papacy, ch. 12.11, (margin) with its human merit, intercessions and institutions in place of Christ’s. Now we see plainly, that the Daily Sacrifice was taken from Christ by the little horn, ch. 8.11. (*The Day-Dawn*, vol. 2, # 1; March 19, 1847)

Uriah Smith in his book *Thoughts on the Book of Daniel* (1873 ed.,p. 163) accepted the view of William Miller. Smith's understanding became the accepted position in the Adventist Church until the turn of the century, and thus was known as the "old view." At the beginning of the 20th century W. W. Prescott, influenced by Conradi, advocated the view that “the daily” was Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. This was similar to Crosier's position, but nevertheless acquired the less-than-accurate designation as the "new view."

Pages 3-4

“Desmond Ford was Adventism’s most notable scholar to have followed Conradi’s view of the ‘daily’ resulting in his ultimate rejection of the sanctuary doctrine . . .”

Comment: Desmond Ford was not Adventism's most notable scholar, nor was he defrocked because of his view on the daily. Notable scholars who have held or are holding the same view on the daily are W. W. Prescott, G. M. Price, R. Dederen, G. F. Hasel, W. H. Shea, W. G. Johnsson, and a host of others. To claim that D. Ford rejected the sanctuary teaching because of his view on the daily is misleading.

Pages 9-14

On the basis of the gender oscillation in Daniel 8:9-12 the author attempts to establish that the power that exalts itself against the Prince of the host in verse 11 is pagan and not papal Rome. The conflict in these verses is seen as a conflict between pagan and papal Rome rather than between the Prince of the host and the papal Rome (the little horn). The following chart is taken from page 14.

V. 9	masc.	“he came”	PAGAN
V. 10	fem.	“it became great”	PAPAL
V. 11	masc.	“he exalted “from him”	PAGAN
V. 12	fem.	“it cast down” “it worked” “it prospered”	PAPAL

Comment: Peters relies heavily on this gender oscillation to establish his interpretation. In fact, it is one of the cornerstones of his whole argument. Unfortunately, some of our best interpreters have also relied heavily on the gender identification in verse 9 to establish the point that the little horn came out of one of the four winds, rather than from one of the four horns.

However, anyone familiar with the Hebrew text knows that gender difference or mixing is very common in the OT. Particularly frequent are the wrong suffixes. Gesenius Kautzsch states: "Through a weakening in the distinction of gender . . . which probably passed from the colloquial language into that of literature, masculine suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives." (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 135 o).

The same is true in regard to the agreement between subject and predicate in respect to gender and number. "As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number. There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule. These are due partly to the *constructio ad sensum* (where attention is paid to the meaning rather than the grammatical form), partly to the position of the predicate (regarded as being without gender) before the subject" (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 145 a). For example, in Isaiah 49:11 the subject is feminine, but the predicate is masculine: "I will make all My mountains a road, And My highways (**fem. pl.**) will be raised up" (**masc. pl.**).

Oscillation between feminine and masculine verbs is also found in other prophetic passages. For example:

Ezek 23:49 'They shall repay you for your lewdness, and you shall pay (**2 fem, pl.**) for your idolatrous sins. Then you shall know (**2 masc. pl**) that I *am* the Lord GOD.' "

Nah 3:15 There the fire will devour you, The sword will cut you off; It will eat you up like a locust. Make yourself many (**2 masc. s.**) -- like the locust! Make yourself many (**2 fem. s.**) -- like the *swarming* locusts!

As far as Daniel 8:11 is concerned, various explanations have been suggested. Some of them are: (a) Masculine verb forms are used because there is a tendency in the OT to ignore the feminine; (b) the different genders are indicators of weakness and greatness of the subject; (c) the irregular gender is used intentionally to heighten the reader's attention and to mark specific passages as climax; and (d) the masculine gender refers to the masculine reality behind the feminine symbols used in the text.

In addition, Martin Proebstle in his forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation on Daniel 8:9-14 has suggested that the gender in 8:9-12 is used stylistically. That Daniel consciously "played" with the opposition between masculine and feminine. He points out that there is the following gender balance in verses 9 -11.

9a	masc.	fem.	9b
10a	fem.	masc.	11a
10b	fem.	masc	11b
10c	fem.	masc	11c

This arrangement of opposite gender of verbal forms creates a coherence in verses 9-11, he says.

The point of all this is to show that Peters' foundation is not as solid as he thinks it is. If the difference in gender in Daniel 8 were the only place where it occurs, he would have a point, but since the mixing of genders appears frequently in the OT he cannot use it as the basis of his interpretation. Furthermore, satisfactory explanations can be found for this oscillation, as indicated above, without resorting to the idea that two phases of the little horn are described; something that would escape any reader not familiar with the original Hebrew text.

In any of the Bible translations, the plain reading of the text describes a battle between the little horn and the Prince of the host, not between two phases of the little horn. Furthermore, in Daniel 7, the parallel chapter to Daniel 8, the issue is clearly between the little horn/Satan and the people of God/Christ, not between two phases of the little horn.

Pages 15-16

Daniel 8:11 "It magnified itself, even up to the Prince of the host; and the continual burnt offering was taken away from him, and the place of his sanctuary was overthrown." (RSV)

Seventh-day Adventists generally teach that the little horn (papacy) took the *tamid* (intercessory ministry) away from the Prince of the host (Christ). Peters claims that on the basis of grammatical nearness "the antecedent of 'from him' is the one exalting himself or pagan Rome" (p. 15). After outlining the inverted syntax of verse 11 he concludes, "This internal reflection of the Hebrew syntax supports the contention that the 'daily' is lifted up 'from' the one exalting himself and not 'from' the Prince of the host" (p. 16). In other words the *tamid* is taken away from pagan Rome and not from Christ.

Comment: The grammatical argument on pages 15 and 16 looks very impressive and convincing, but is it correct? The syntax of verse 11 in Hebrew is as follows (pp = prepositional phrase; s = subject; v = verb):

- 11a Unto the Prince of the host (pp) he (s) exalted himself (v)
- 11b and from him (pp) was taken away (v) the continual (s)
- 11c and thrown down was (v) the place of his sanctuary (s).

The first two lines begin with the prepositional phrases: "unto the Prince" and "from him." This creates a syntactic-semantic correspondence between 11a and 11b: both clauses start with a prepositional phrase referring to the Prince of the host followed by a Hiphil verb form with the little horn as subject (In the second line the little horn is understood to be the one who takes away the daily).

As Proebstle has indicated, there are at least two arguments that the pronominal suffix in *mimennu* (from him) refers to the Prince of the host. First, both "unto the Prince of the host" and "from him" occupy the preverbal field of their respective clauses. The focus on the Prince of the host established in verse 11a is reaffirmed in verse 11b if the pronominal suffix in *mimennu* (from him) refers to the Prince. There is no apparent reason to switch the focus back to the horn. Indeed, "from him" is only then natural in the sentence-initial position when it emphasizes the previously mentioned "Prince of the host", which is also in the sentence-initial position.

Second, the next clause 11c has no explicit reference to the subject “horn,” the pronominal third person masculine suffix in “His sanctuary” also refers to the Prince of the host.

According to Peters’ interpretation of Daniel 12:9-12 the issue in these verses is not the great controversy between Christ/God’s people and Satan/little horn, but a battle between two phases of the little horn – pagan and papal Rome. Christ is only mentioned as an aside in verse 11. This is contrary to the thrust of the whole book of Daniel, which illustrates the great controversy in every chapter.

Pages 17-23

After a study of the word *rum* “exalt, raise, lift up” Peters concludes on page 23, “The accurate rendering of the second phrase of verse 11 in view of the evidence presented thus far, is: ‘and from him (Rome: masculine, pagan phase) the daily was lifted up.’ When ‘the daily’ represents the self-exalting behavior of pagan Rome, as it will be demonstrated, the text is self-consistent and becomes significant. In this case the little horn lifts up this self-exalting character.”

Comment: In these pages Peters tries to make a sharp distinction between the *rum* (Hiph. exalt, raise up or lift up”) and the word *sur* (turn aside, Hiph. remove, clear away). *Rum* in Daniel 8:11 should not be translated “take away,” he says, but “lift up.” However, on page 27, where he defines “the daily” as the self-exalting character of paganism and “the abomination of desolation” as the self-exalting character of nominal Christianity, he makes the following statement, “This character attribute was lifted up by the [sic] papal Rome from pagan Rome with the result that the false religious systems (paganism) were replaced or superseded (taken away or turned aside) by nominal Christianity, a new false religious system professing Christ, uncreated, in contrast to Arianism’s created christ [sic].”

The “new view” teaches that the papacy “took away” from Christ His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary by replacing it with the earthly ministry of the priests.

The “old view,” according to Peters, teaches that papal Rome lifted up “the daily” (the self-exalting character) from pagan Rome and replaced it with “the abomination of desolation” (the self-exalting character of nominal Christianity), “with the result that the false religious systems (paganism) were replaced or superseded (**taken away** or turned aside) by nominal Christianity, a new false religious system” (p. 27, emphasis mine).

In both views, something is taken away from somebody and replaced with something else. One wonders why Peters is so set against the translation of “the daily” being taken away when in his view too the false religious systems of paganism was taken away and replaced by nominal Christianity.

Peters is correct when he states that “in every instance where the Hebrew root *rum* is used in Daniel it is translated by its customary meaning of lift up or exalt” (p. 17) except in Daniel 8:11 where it is translated “taken away.”

Dan 5:19 “whom he would he set up [*rum*];”

Dan 5:20 “But when his heart was lifted up [*rum*]”

- Dan 5:23 “And you have lifted yourself up [*rum*] against the Lord”
 Dan 11:12 “his heart will be lifted up [*rum*]”
 Dan 11:36 “he shall exalt [*rum*] and magnify himself”
 Dan 12:7 “he held up [*rum*] his right hand”
- Dan 8:11 “and by him the daily *sacrifices* were taken away [*rum*]”

Peters, therefore, argues that in Daniel 8:11 it should also be translated “lifted up” (see above). However, there is a reason for this exception in Daniel 8:11. The verbal root *rum* in Hiphil/Hophal, the basic meaning of which is “bring aloft, raise up, lift up” (HALOT, 3:1204), takes on a specific meaning in clauses with the preposition *min* (from) and a direct or prepositional object. Proebstle has made a study of the twenty-three passages where *rum* appears with the preposition *min* and direct or prepositional objects (Lev 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19; 6:8; Num 17:2; 18:26, 28, 29, 30, 32; 31:28, 52; 1 Sam 2:8; 1 Kgs 14:7; 16:2; Isa 14:13; 57:14; Ezek 45:1; Ps 75:7; 89:20; 113:7; Dan 8:11; all references are according to the Hebrew Bible) and has come to the following conclusions:

1. If the object is not personal, i.e., a physical object or part of a (dead) animal, *rum* designates the activity of removing or setting aside something from a larger group of which that object was a part (See Lev 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19; 6:8; Num 17:2; 18:26, 28, 29, 30, 32; 31:28, 52; Isa 14:13; 57:14; Ezek 45:1). To illustrate this point I will quote a few texts:
 - Lev 2:9 “the priest shall take [*rum*] from [*min*] the grain offering”
 - Num 17:2 “Tell Eleazar . . . to pick up [*rum*] the censers out of [*min*] the blaze”
 - Ezek 45:1 “when you divide the land by lot into inheritance, you shall set apart [*rum*] a district for the LORD, a holy section of [*min*] the land”
2. If the object is a person, the activity of separation or removal expressed by *rum* takes on the additional notion of exaltation. A person is separated from a group to a higher status, usually by God Himself (See 1 Sam 2:8; 1 Kgs 14:7; 16:2; Ps 75:7; 89:20; 113:7)
 - 1 Sam 2:8 “[God] lifts [*rum*] the beggar from [*min*] the ash heap, To set *them* among princes”
 - Ps 113:7 “I have exalted [*rum*] one chosen from [*min*] the people.

In other word, in a cultic context *rum* in Hiphil/Hophal means “to set aside” or “to remove,” whereas when the context refers to social status it means “to exalt.” Parallel expressions to *rum*, e. g., *sur* “remove” (Lev 4:9, 31, 35; Ezek 21:31; 45:9) and *badal* in Niphal “separate [oneself]” (Num 8:14; 16:21) provide clear support for the conclusion that *rum* in a cultic context always means “to set apart, remove.”

Applying what we have just learned to Daniel 8:11b we come to the following conclusions:

1. In Daniel 8:11, in a cultic context, the object is impersonal. The word *rum*, therefore, designates the activity of removing or setting aside the *tamid*.
2. The preposition *min* indicates from whom the *tamid* is removed. And as indicated above, the person from whom the *tamid* is removed is the Prince of the Host and not the little horn.

Pages 23-30

"It is suggested that 'the daily,' must be carefully defined as a principle, namely the self exalting character of paganism, inherent in mankind, of which Arianism became integrated" (p. 27). Peters attempts to prove this with the following OT texts:

Ps 74:23 "The tumult of those [God's enemies] who rise up against You increases continually [tamid]."

Isa 52:5 "Those who rule over them Make them wail," says the LORD, "And My name *is* blasphemed continually [tamid] every day."

Obad 16 "For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually [tamid],

Nah 3:19 "For upon whom has not your wickedness passed continually [tamid]?"

Hab 1:17 "Shall they therefore empty their net, And continue [tamid] to slay nations without pity?

Isa 65:2-3 "A people who provoke Me to anger continually [tamid] to My face."

Peters argues that in each of these texts the pagan enemies of God in the OT rise up or exalt themselves against God continually (tamid). This proves, he claims, that in Daniel 8:11 it is pagan Rome that exalts itself against the Prince of the host and that from him (pagan Rome) the daily was lifted up or taken away by papal Rome (p. 23). He says:

The "abomination (transgression) which desolates" in Daniel 8, 11 and 12, which supersedes and replaces "the daily," may be defined as *the self exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head*. The essence of "the daily" is "the mystery of iniquity" which seeks to become like God (Is. 14:12-14; 2 Thess. 2:3-7). The point of commonality between "the daily" and the "abomination which desolates" is the "mystery of iniquity." This character attribute was lifted up by the papal Rome from pagan Rome with the result that the false religious systems (paganism) were replaced or superseded (taken away or turned aside) by nominal Christianity, a new false religious system professing Christ, uncreated, in contrast to Arianism's created christ. This process commenced in AD 508 when Arian powers under Theodoric made peace with Clovis and the resistance of the Arian powers began to come to an end.(p. 27).

Comment: This is a rather ingenious way of explaining the word *tamid*. It seems that Peters took the following statement from U. Smith, "'By him [papal form] the daily [the pagan form] was taken away.' Pagan Rome was remodeled into papal Rome" (*Daniel and Revelation*, 1944 ed. , p. 161) and tried to find biblical support for this view. However, for the following reasons this explanation is not acceptable:

1. In each of the texts quoted by Peters the word *tamid* is used as an adverb explaining that an action is going on continually or all the time. There is no indication in any of these texts that *tamid* is a principle of self-exaltation or a character attribute as Peters claims.
2. The Hebrew word *tamid* occurs 104 times in the OT. 67 times *tamid* is used adverbially (48 times in religious and cultic contexts). 37 times it is used nominally (24 times with the article). Every time the word is used with the article (*hatamid*) it is in a cultic context.
3. In the book of Daniel, where *tamid* occurs five times (8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11) it is always used as an adjectival noun with the Hebrew article – *hatamid*. Since the context in Daniel 8 is also cultic (“sanctuary”) *hatamid* should also be understood to have a cultic meaning.
4. In Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, the *tamid* is replaced by “the abomination of desolation” (*hashiqqutz meshomem*). The noun *sheqetz* refers to something cultically unclean such as animals prohibited for food (Lev 7:21; 11:10-13, 20, 23, 41-42, etc.), and the noun *shiqutz* refers to abominable idols (1 Kings 11:5; 2 Kings 23:24) and their worship. This is further evidence that the *tamid* refers to a cultic practice since it is replaced by another, an abominable, cultic practice.
5. There is no explanation of *hatamid* in the text. This shows that it must have been a well-known term that was easily understood in biblical times. That it must be interpreted against the cultic background of the OT is clear for the following reasons:
 - a. *Hatamid* is used 24 times in the OT, 17 times in the Pentateuch (Num 4:7, 16; 28:10, 15, 23, 24, 31; 29:6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38), twice in Neh 10:34 which refers back to the Pentateuch, and five times in Daniel 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11. In the Pentateuch and in Nehemiah it always refers to something in connection with the sanctuary service.
 - b. In Daniel 8:11-13 it appears together with several unambiguous cultic terms (*herim* - to remove; *miqdash* - sanctuary; *qodesh* - holy). To deny *hatamid* its cultic meaning in this passage and by extension also in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11 seems contrary to common sense and all the rules of hermeneutics.
 - c. In each passage outside of the book of Daniel *hatamid* is the responsibility of the priests. In Daniel, therefore, it seems logical that it also refers to the ministry of the Prince of the host rather than to a characteristic of paganism.

It is no wonder, therefore, that most Bible translations supply the word sacrifice or similar terms. The context strongly suggests a cultic meaning for the term *hatamid*.

Pages 97-99

“The strongest confirmatory evidence supporting the view that “the daily” is the self-exalting behavior (*gadal*) of paganism and not Christ’s High Priestly ministry is the time prophecy of Dn. 12:11.” (p.97). Peters then argues that only the old view fits historically as the beginning of the 1290 day prophecy in AD 508. On page 99 he says, “The ‘new view’ proponents of ‘the daily’ are unable to exegete this verse, leaving Daniel to self-

extinguish in meaningless speculation. Any attempt to suggest that Christ's High Priestly ministry was taken away in 508 either by the institution of penance or the mass cannot be supported."

Comment: The "new view" of Daniel 8:11 teaches that "the daily" refers to Christ's intercessory ministry which was usurped by the work of the priests through the mass and the confessional. By sacrificing Christ anew in every mass, the papacy has removed Christ's heavenly ministry in the thinking of men. How long has this been going on?

In May 1998, Pope John Paul II issued his pastoral letter *Dies Domini* in which he challenged Christians "to ensure that civil legislation respects their duty to keep Sunday holy" (*Dies Domini*, May 31, 1998, section 67). In the same letter he speaks about the attendance at Sunday mass. Early in the history of the Christianity, he says, people had to be reminded to attend mass. Sometimes the Church had to resort to specific canonical precepts: "This was the case in a number of local Councils from the fourth century onwards (as at the Council of Elvira of 300, which speaks not of an obligation but of penalties after three absences) and most especially from the sixth century onwards (as at the Council of Agde in 506). These decrees of local Councils led to a universal practice, the obligatory character of which was taken as something quite normal" (Ibid., section 47).

Here the pope says that particularly from the beginning of the sixth century on there were universal statutes which made it obligatory for people to attend mass. As Seventh-day Adventists we say that in the sixth century the daily was taken away and the abomination of desolation was established. We begin the 1290 years with 508. Why? Primarily, because deducting 1290 from 1798, which is understood to be the end of the 1260 and 1290 years, brings us to 508.

What happened in 508? As Peters correctly pointed out, in 496 Clovis, king of the Franks became a Roman Catholic. All the other Germanic tribes who had dismantled the Roman Empire were Arians and therefore in opposition to the pope in Rome. Clovis defeated the Visigoths and became the first civil power to join up with the rising Church of Rome. France, therefore, is called the oldest daughter of the Roman Catholic Church.

"After his great victory over the Goths in 507 . . . together with his Burgundian allies, Clovis came to Tours, probably in the middle of 508, to hold a victory celebration. There he met Byzantine envoys who presented to him the decree naming him an honorary consul [of Rome]" (Herwig Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples*, p. 222). The joining of the civil and the religious powers (Franks and papacy) at that time was an important step in "setting up the abomination of desolation," which refers to the unscriptural teachings of the papacy and their enforcement through the union of church and state. It is one of the ironies of history that France, the power that helped the papacy at the beginning of the 1290 years, was the same power that brought about its demise at the end of this time period, when Napoleon in 1798 had Pope Pius VI taken prisoner.

Peters is correct in stating that penance and the mass appeared before the sixth century, but it was the enforcement of these practices at the beginning of the sixth century that obscured the ministry of Christ in the minds of the worshipers.

Conclusion

Many other points in this 121 page paper could be investigated, but the issue should be clear by now. Peter's view of *hatamid* (the daily) as the self-exalting character of paganism is linguistically and exegetically not sustainable. This paper is a brave attempt to provide exegetical support for what came to be known as the "old view." Peters recognized that Uriah Smith's interpretation that the "the daily" is pagan Rome is contextually not possible, he, therefore, identified "the daily" with the self-exalting character of paganism, but this too is exegetically and contextually not viable.

Gerhard Pfandl
Associate Director
Biblical Research Institute

July 2005