

**Response to Dr. Gerhard Pfandl's
Evaluation of "The Mystery of 'The Daily'"
August 12, 2005**

Gerhard Pfandl concludes his evaluation by stating that Peters' view of *hattamid* (the daily) as the self-exalting character of paganism is linguistically, contextually, and exegetically not sustainable. However, Pfandl's rebuttal is less than convincing and his choice of selective evidence supporting his view while at the same time ignoring and excluding abundance other evidence makes his conclusions untenable. In fact a careful evaluation of Pfandl's critique produces further support of the view that "the daily" in Daniel 8; 11:31 and 12:11 is the principle of self-exaltation, the mystery of iniquity which vies for supremacy with the mystery of godliness in the great controversy.

Eight different issues are addressed in Pfandl's evaluation. This response will address each one in order.

Title Page

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary is listed on title page.

Response: No attempt was made to suggest that the paper was published by the Theological Seminary. In fact the name and address of the publisher is listed at the bottom of the title page. The manuscript was produced while the author was a M. Div. student at the Seminary and the substance of the manuscript was written while under the guidance and review of the chair of the Old Testament Department, Dr. Richard Davidson.

Jeffrey Ho: Pfandl's contention is that he "understands" that the Seminary wants its name to be removed from the manuscript. The question is: how accurate is his understanding? Is it true that the Seminary authorized this and when? Regardless, the fact of the matter is that Peters wrote his manuscript at the Seminary, and that's why the name of the Seminary is on the manuscript.

Page 3

"L. R. Conradi reinterpreted the "the daily" as referring to the true sanctuary service and Christ's high Priestly ministry in heaven."

Response: No attempt was made to give the impression in the manuscript that Conradi originated the so called "new view" as Pfandl asserts. It is well known that the Reformers in the 16th century and beyond adopted the view that "the daily" was Christ's ministry. The point of the above statement was to identify the change of emphasis in the view of the daily from that of Wm. Miller and the vast majority of the advent pioneers to that of Conradi in 1900.

Pages 3-4

"Desmond Ford was Adventism's most notable scholar to have followed Conradi's view of "the daily" [which may have been a significant contributing factor] resulting in his ultimate rejection of the sanctuary doctrine..."

Response: The addition in brackets above may have helped clarify the statement. Ford himself acknowledged that the church's official position that "the daily" represents the priestly ministry of Christ led to his rejection of the sanctuary doctrine. His argumentation in support of his position convinced numerous other scholarly pastors to follow in his path and ultimately to leave the SDA church. Ford could clearly see the internal inconsistencies within Daniel 8 suggesting that the 2300 days could not terminate in 1844 based on the 70 weeks of Daniel 9

commencing in 457 BC, if, in fact, Christ's "sanctuary" was cast down (8:11) and His "daily" priestly ministry was taken away by the papacy. He reasoned correctly that the earliest this could occur with the establishment of the papacy would be 200-300 AD which would cause the 2300 days to terminate well beyond 2500 AD. Ford could not harmonize the 70 weeks of Daniel 9 with the 2300 days of Daniel 8 terminating in 1844. At least he was intellectually honest with what he understood to be the Adventist position.

Pages 9-14

Is there any significance to the gender oscillations in Daniel 8:9-12? For Pfandl, the personage in 8:11 taking away "the daily" is the papacy. He therefore argues that the 4-fold gender oscillation in these four verses is of little significance and superfluous, and he attempts to support his conclusions based on Hebrew linguistic anomalies using several literature citations.

Response: According to Pfandl the 4-fold gender oscillation in these verses is a literary quirk of the Hebrew grammar or even perhaps a stylistic tool employed by the author, Daniel. He cites evidence from *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. It should be noted however that the gender transition in Daniel 8 is not confined to a single 2-fold instance. This 4-fold oscillation or any other gender oscillation of gender occurs nowhere else in the book of Daniel.

I do agree with Pfandl's observation that Hebrew gender mixing is evident elsewhere in the OT. However, the evidence cited from *Gesenius Hebrew Grammar* does not apply to the gender oscillations of 8:9-12. In this text masculine suffixes especially in the plural are not used to refer to feminine substantives. Moreover, the problem in 8:9-12 is not that of the "agreement between subject and predicate with respect to gender" which occurs elsewhere in the OT as Gesenius notes.

Jeffrey Ho: The only masculine plural suffix here is in 8:9 "from them." I see no good reason to reject, as Pfandl has done, the work by Shea and Hasel in determining the feminine "from the one" and the masculine "from them" in 8:9 to refer to the feminine "the winds" and the masculine "of the heavens" in 8:8. Their work is firmly established. In Pfandl's book, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*, he relates "from them" to "the heavens" based only on grammatical nearness. However both gender matching and grammatical nearness should be used to show the true antecedent of "from them." I also agree that Pfandl is simply trying to downplay the significance of the genders in 8:9-12 so that the masculine does not refer to pagan Rome and the feminine to papal Rome. Pfandl is of the opinion that 8:9, 10 refer to pagan Rome and 8:11, 12 refer to papal Rome.

The uniqueness of the gender oscillations in 8:9-12 is related to the total transformation of the gender of the predicate and corresponding pronouns oscillating from masculine to feminine to masculine to feminine in 8:9, 10, 11, and 12 respectively. This phenomenon is not addressed in the Gesenius' citations. The repetitious oscillations seem to be purposeful to emphasize the uniquely distinctively behavior of the actors in this drama.

Pfandl cites Ezek. 23:49 as an example of gender oscillation. But here the gender oscillation is reasonable. "They shall repay you for your (fem.) lewdness and you (fem.) shall pay for your (fem.) idolatrous sins." The feminine suffix and feminine predicate refer to the two harlot sisters (Oholah, Samaria and Oholibah, Jerusalem). "Then you (masc., Israel as nation) shall know I am God." The masculine predicate simply refers to Israel as a nation. There is no gender mixing here.

In the second example of Nahum 3:15, Gesenius' observation seems to apply where masculine suffixes (in this case referring to Nineveh, a fem. substantive) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives (in this case referring to locust, fem.).

Jeffrey Ho: Ruth 1:8 is a good example where a masculine verb is used to refer to the two daughters of Naomi. Therefore the masculine plural verb in Eze 23:49 could still easily be referring to the two harlot daughters, and this would simply be the case where the masculine gender refers to feminine substantives. However, although the Hebrew word for Israel takes a masculine singular verb in the vast majority of its occurrences, it can at times take a masculine plural verb (e.g. 1Sam 17:3; 29:1; 1Kgs 12:19; 2Kgs 3:24; 2Chr 10:19; Eze 13:4; Hos 8:2; 9:7; Zeph 3:14). Therefore, it is not impossible for the masculine plural verb in Eze 23:49 to refer to Israel as Peters has suggested. Both interpretations are possible based on the linguistic evidence. In any case, since Peters agrees that gender mixing is evident elsewhere in the OT, to have Pfandl prove that gender mixing occurs in Eze 23:49 (with the result that it refers to the same two daughters, and not to a different entity such as the nation of Israel) does not at all disprove the two distinct powers (each identity signified by its grammatical gender) of the 4-fold gender oscillation (within four verses!) of Dan. 8:9-12 since 8:9-12 is in a class of its own, most likely unique in the OT. For Nah 3:15, both forms used for locusts (yeleq, arbeh) are actually masculine in gender, not feminine. Gesenius (p. 326) wrote, "In Na 3:15 the interchange of masc. and fem. serves to express totality (the nation in all its aspect)." Keil and Delitzsch also had something similar in mind when they wrote, "fire and sword will devour Nineveh and its inhabitants like the all-consuming locusts, even though the city itself, with its mass of houses and people, should resemble an enormous swarm of locusts. **הַתְּכַבֵּד** may be either an inf. abs. used instead of the imperative, or the imperative itself. The latter seems the more simple; and the use of the masculine may be explained on the assumption that the prophet had the people floating before his mind, whereas in **הַתְּכַבֵּדִי** he was thinking of the city." Another consideration is to refer to the male and female inhabitants of the city.

The other explanations cited by Pfandl for the gender oscillations of Daniel 8:9-12 seem to be desperately grasping at the wind. Pfandl also puts forth Martin Proebstle's suggestion that gender changes in 8:9-11 are used stylistically. Proebstle's stylistic argument is interesting, but is very weak at best with no obvious precedent in Daniel, and the argument certainly falls short in explaining the gender oscillating from masculine in 8:11 to feminine in 8:12.

Jeffrey Ho: As a correction, Pfandl uses those other vague masculine gender explanations only for 8:11. Now Pfandl says that the gender in 8:9-12 are used stylistically according to Proebstle, yet Proebstle only uses 8:9-11 to demonstrate this "gender balance." Why did Pfandl say 8:9-12 when he knew that it was only 8:9-11? Proebstle's exclusion of 8:12 from the "gender balance" of 8:9-11 is very telling to the fact that adding 8:12 to 8:9-11 would destroy this "gender balance" chart of his. Moreover whenever someone explains something as stylistic, often it is because he/she does not know how else to explain it. Whether it's Pfandl claiming 8:9-12 when it should have been 8:9-11, or Proebstle exegeting 8:9-11 when he should have used 8:9-12, no credence should be given to Proebstle's "stylistic gender balance" of 8:9-11 until he at least includes 8:12 into the discussion.

None of Pfandl's arguments satisfactorily explain the 4-fold gender oscillation of 8:9-12. The unique 4-fold gender oscillations similar to those of Daniel 8:9-12 appear no where else in the OT and appear to be an overt literary, linguistic device to distinguish between the two personifications of the little horn and their interplay with one another. Pagan Rome comes on the scene first growing horizontally in 8:9 followed by papal Rome growing great vertically and coexisting with pagan Rome in 8:10. In 8:11 Papal Rome co-mingles with pagan Rome and usurps its exalting authority assuming and displacing the location and occupancy of pagan Rome's sanctuary. Finally in 8:12 Papal Rome utilizes military alliances to root out opposing pagan/Arian forces.

The gender oscillation from masculine (pagan Rome, 8:9) to feminine (papal Rome, v. 10) to masculine (pagan Rome, v. 11) to feminine (papal Rome, v. 12) helps identify the actor from whom “the daily” is taken away in v. 11 as pagan Rome; and the personage who takes away “the daily” is understood to be the feminine actor (papal Rome) of v. 10 and 12. The real problem in interpreting 8:9-12 revolves around identifying personages associated with confusing array of pronouns in the passage, especially 8:11. Gender oscillations are one of the keys that help unlock that mystery.

Jeffrey Ho: Pfandl tries to downplay any significance of the interaction between the two phases of Rome in Daniel 8:11. But both powers are evidently displayed in Dan. 7, where papal Rome as a little horn comes up after pagan Rome as the terrible beast has split, resulting in the uprooting of three horns before papal Rome, which is described more fully in 8:12. Pfandl's book (p. 82) has no mention of the first half of 8:12. If he had known that it spoke of papal military alliances against pagan/Arian forces, it would not have been impossible for him to state that there is a connection between pagan and papal Rome in 8:11. Pfandl seems desperate when he starts using the “plain reading” argument, which too often has been abused. I could equally say that the English of 8:9-12 “plainly” refers to two Roman powers in competition as part of my argument. However real exegesis results not from a superficial reading of the English, but from a sound analysis of the Hebrew to explain the English of 8:9-12. The only comment I have regarding Peters's statement is that, while 8:9 precedes 8:10 and 8:11 precedes 8:12 in sequence of time, does the entirety of 8:10 precede 8:11? If, among other things, the trampling activity of 8:10 includes persecution (as it does in Dan. 7), then certainly the timeframe of 8:10 extends well beyond the events of 8:11, aligning itself with the later portions of 8:12, both exhibiting the entire career of the papacy during its union of church and state.

Pages 15-16

The crux issue in 8:11, probably the most difficult text in the entire passage, is the following question: From whom is “the daily” taken away? Is “the daily” taken away from 1) the Prince of host, 2) the papal horn power, or 3) the pagan horn power? Who or what is the antecedent of the various masculine pronouns in 8:11? Is the antecedent 1) the Prince of the host, 2) the papal horn power, or 3) the pagan horn power? Finally whose sanctuary is being cast down? All these questions hinge on the answer to the identity of the antecedent of the masculine pronouns in 8:11. Pfandl asserts based on the syntactic-semantic correspondence of prepositional phrases (“Unto the prince ...” corresponding to “and from him...”) in 11a and 11b respectively, that the antecedent of the pronoun should be the Prince of the host. But is this assertion correct?

Jeffrey Ho: In Pfandl's book, p. 77, he explains that in 8:9 the antecedent of “one of them” is the four winds of the heavens in 8:8 due to its immediate antecedent, or grammatical nearness. He uses Martin Proebstle's 2003 unpublished Ph.D dissertation (called “A Text-Oriented Study of Daniel 8:9-14,” written at Andrews University) for this conclusion [Note: It is possible that Proebstle was still writing his dissertation in 2003 when Pfandl referenced it, since Pfandl's response to Peters in 2005 mentions that the dissertation was still forthcoming]. If Pfandl accepts grammatical nearness for “from them” in 8:9, why totally disallow it for “from him” in 8:11? At the very least, if he were to be honest, he would have to say that grammatical nearness for “from him” in 8:11 is a possibility, since he allows it just two verses prior! Pfandl's insistence, through Proebstle, that the syntactic-semantic correspondence of the prepositional phrases (PP) refers to the same person because they are both preverbal would still be “true” and even stronger if the first two clauses were in their normal word order of verb first then prepositional phrase second, thus postverbal (cf. “He magnified himself up to the Prince of the host, and the continuity was lifted up from him”). Daniel could have written both PP

as postverbal. Since it is nothing special as “postverbal” if both PP refer to Christ, why should it be special as “preverbal”? But, as Peters has noted, both clauses in 11a and 11b are inverted from their normal word order. The question is why? This inverted word order of both 11a and 11b is special because it is the strongest way to indicate that Daniel intended “the continuity” to be lifted up from the one exalting himself, by the principle of grammatical nearness. The postverbal order would not have conveyed this, or at most it would have been a weak argument to suggest that “from him” refers to pagan Rome, since then grammatical nearness would state that “from him” refers to Christ (as shown above).

Response: The author of *The Mystery of ‘The Daily’* contends, based on grammatical nearness, that “the antecedent of ‘from him’ is the one exalting himself or pagan Rome. The internal reflection of the inverted Hebrew syntax is illustrated below where the one exalting himself is identical to the one from

(“...unto the Prince of the host he exalted himself :: and from him the daily is taken away....”)

whom “the daily” is taken away. This supports the contention that “the daily” is taken away or lifted up from pagan Rome, based on the gender oscillations and identification previously specified.

Both Pfandl and the author agree that the Hebrew preposition, *mimmennu*, should be translated “from him” and not “by him” and that this same personage (either the Prince of the host or the little horn power) is the one whose sanctuary is cast down.

The final resolution of the question of whether it is the Prince of the host or the little horn power from whom “the daily” is taken away and his sanctuary is cast down centers on whose sanctuary (*miqdash*) is cast down in 8:11. The Hebrew word *miqdash* is consistently used in the OT to refer to earthly sanctuaries, either those of God for the benefit of the Israelites or those of a pagan origin. On the other hand, *qodesh* is used consistently for sanctuaries of a holy nature associated with YAHWEH, either God’s earthly or His heavenly sanctuary. However, *miqdash* not *qodesh* is used in 8:11 specifying an earthly sanctuary therefore excluding the possibility that the phrase in 8:11 (“the place of his sanctuary was cast down”) pertains to Christ’s heavenly sanctuary. *Miqdash* is a cultic term used in a counterfeit cultic setting in the passage in Daniel 8.

Pfandl conveniently ignores this weighty evidence previously specified in the manuscript in setting forth his rebuttal. With this evidence it becomes clear that indeed the one who has “the place of his sanctuary is cast down” and the one from whom “the daily’ is taken away” cannot be the Prince of the host but must be the pagan Rome power.

Jeffrey Ho: The two strongest pieces of evidence that the focus is on pagan Rome in 8:11 is grammatical nearness and the fact that *miqdash* refers to the earthly sanctuary in Rome.

The center of focus in 8:9-12 is on play and counter-play of the little horn power. He exalts geographically in 8:9; she exalts vertically to heaven in 8:10; he exalts unto the Prince of the host in 8:11 but yields his supremacy to papal Rome; and she is given an army in 8:12. It is true that the over-arching theme in Daniel 8 is the great controversy between God’s people and pagan/horn powers of Satan; nevertheless there is a competition between the two phases of Rome for supremacy all within the context of the great controversy between Christ and Satan.

Pages 17-23

The question here revolves around the exchange of *rum* (to lift up) in 8:11 for *sur* (to take away or to turn aside) in 11:31 and 12:11. Pfandl contends that *rum* should be translated as “take away” in 8:11.

Response: The author’s conclusions do not stand or fall on the translation of the Hebrew word, *rum* whether it is “lift up” or “take away.” Either translation harmonizes sufficiently with author’s thesis. Therefore no dispute is necessary on this point. However, the cognitive sense and distinction of the two words (*rum*: lift up, raise up, exalt; *sur*: remove, turn aside, take away) and their application in Daniel and Leviticus demands some clarification.

Pfandl contends based on Martin Proebstle’s forthcoming Ph.D. thesis that in cultic passages *rum* is always translated as “take away” especially when used in connection with the Hebrew preposition *min*. Pfandl refers to numerous passages cited by Proebstle to support this thesis. However, just a cursory survey of other texts, for example, Numbers 15:19-20, suggests this is not an iron-clad rule. This passage is in a cultic setting within the context of a heave offering which demands that *rum* must be translated as “lift up” and not “set aside.” “...then it shall be that when you eat the bread of the land, you shall lift up (not set aside) a heave offering to Jehovah. You shall lift up (not take away) a cake of the first of your dough as a heave offering...” The same observation applies to the three occurrences of *rum* with *min* in Numbers 18:28, 29 and 30. The cited passage in Isaiah 14:13 appears also to be an anomaly to the rule.

Jeffrey Ho: In Isa 14:13, the translation is certainly, “I will exalt/raise up (*rum*) my throne above (*mimma’al*) the stars of God.” It is certainly not “I will remove/take away my throne from...” as Proebstle would have it. The semantics of the syntactic construction *min ... le* varies depending on what preposition *min* attaches to, and *min* in this usage simply signifies location. Therefore *min* and *le* are often untranslatable in these constructions. I think Pfandl’s contention is that *rum* plus *min* for impersonal objects always means “take away.” I don’t think he is suggesting that *rum* plus impersonal object always means “take away,” because that is definitely not true. In Num 15:19-20, there is no *rum* plus *min* construction, only a *rum* plus impersonal object. There is a *min* in 15:19, but that *min* is linked with *akhal* (to eat). But perhaps Peters was attempting to link Num 15:19-20 directly with Num 18:28-30, since Num 15:19-20 contains *rum* with *terumah* (offering), while Num 18:28-29 contains *rum* with *terumah* and *min*, with the result that if *rum* with *terumah* in Num 15 is translated as “offer up,” then *rum* with *terumah* in Num 18 should also be translated as “offer up.” Now after examining all the uses of *rum* and *min* with an impersonal object in Proebstle’s list to signify “take away,” I agree with Peters that at the very least it is definitely not a firm rule; it is not even a general rule. Actually, I found that, in agreement with Peters’s manuscript, that it makes perfect sense (even better sense) to translate *rum* naturally as “lift up, offer up” in many, if not all, of these passages. This is especially true for the cultic settings (where the vast majority of this syntactic construction occurs in Leviticus and Numbers) where one lifts up/offers up something to God in order to please him. Here are some interesting facts to consider: After examining all occurrences of *sur* in the hiphil and hophal, *sur* in a cultic context is never used to “take away, set aside” something to God (that is to say, there is no occurrence where the preposition *le* directly modifies the verb *sur*). However *rum* and *le* (where *le* directly modifies *rum*) is naturally used to offer up something to God or to man (cf. Lev 22:15; Num 15:19; 18:19, 24; 31:28, 52; 2Chr 30:24; 35:7-9; Eze 45:1; 48:9). Moreover, *sur* in a cultic context is only used to remove fat and certain innards from an animal to be burned on the altar (cf. Lev 3:4, 9, 10; 4:9, 31, 35; 7:4; 2Chr 35:12); *sur* is never used to remove non-animal offerings to be burned on the altar; only *rum* is used to “lift up, offer up” non-animal offerings to be burned on the altar. All this is to say that *rum* and *sur* should not be taken as synonyms in cultic contexts.

If a passage with *rum* and *min* demands some sort of notion of “take away, remove” it should only be accepted if the notion of lifting up is applied first. In one of the semantic entries in BDB, it has “lift up and take away, remove.” Even in BDB, they realized that if a passage (to their understanding) required the notion of remove, there was a two-step process: First to lift up, and then to take away. The root meaning of lifting up was still there. Therefore to say that *rum* and *min* only means “take away” with no connotation of lifting up first for impersonal objects is not accurate at all. Even in Pfandl's choice of examples, he has used the translation of Num 17:2 correctly as: “Tell Eleazar ... to pick up (*rum*) the censurers out of (*min*) the blaze.” If *rum* with *min* means only “take away” with impersonal objects, what is “pick up” doing there as part of that group? It is clear that the root and primary meaning is the lifting up of the censor. Then, if the context demands it, logically one would take away, remove the censor away from the blaze, not leave the censurers above the blaze. Nevertheless the root meaning of “lifting up” is the one to be emphasized in translation. Therefore, there is no good reason to completely bypass the root meaning of *rum* as “lift up/offer up” and to force an extended meaning of *rum* only as “take away” in cultic contexts.

Moreover the passage in Daniel *is not* set forth in a cultic setting; it is set forth primarily in a counterfeit cultic setting, precluding the adherence to Proebstle's rule for the translation of *rum* as “take away.”

In addition, it should be noted that the passages cited in Leviticus repeatedly employ the words *rum* and *sur* in a consecutive manner confined within three verses dealing with the manipulation of the sacrificial animal. The obvious conclusion is that the two words are employed to specify two distinct activities. Namely, the priest was to first remove the fat from the entrails and liver, and second he was to lift up the separated fat from the animal to the altar of burnt offering for consumption. The evidence suggests that the words, *rum* and *sur*, are not to be used interchangeably even in a cultic setting.

Pages 23-30

The issue addressed here is the identification of *hattamid* (the daily or the continual). Pfandl contends that because the passage in Daniel 8 is in a cultic setting especially 8:11 where the sanctuary (*miqdash*) is cast down and since *hattamid* is also a cultic term, therefore “the daily” should correspond to its cultic applications elsewhere in the OT. Pfandl disparages the author's conclusion that “the daily” revolves around the principle of self-exaltation which is the mystery of iniquity.

Response: Pfandl selectively cites one piece of evidence presented by the author that the adjective *tamid* (daily or continual) is employed numerous times in the OT in the context of pagan nations continually exalting against God. He asserts that this observation “is no indication...that *tamid* is a principle of self-exaltation.” However, Pfandl conveniently omits an abundance of other evidence presented by the author that substantiates the identification of “the daily” as the principle of self-exaltation.

For example, five (5) consecutive times the Hebrew word *gadal* (to exalt, to become great) is used in Daniel 8 --- *gadal, gadal, gadal, gadal, gadal*. First, the ram became great (8:4), second, the goat grew very great (8:8), third, the horn (masc.) grew exceedingly great (8:9), fourth, the horn (fem.) exalted to heaven (8:9) and fifth, the horn (masc.) even exalted himself to the Prince of the host (8:11). The principle of exaltation is a paramount theme in Daniel 8. Moreover there is a continual competition among powers to exalt above one another for supremacy and even above God.

Furthermore, *hattamid* identifies itself with this exalting principle in 8:11. Notice the close association of fifth occurrence of *gadal* with *hattamid* by virtue of the internal reflection of the Hebrew syntax in the illustration from 8:11 below.

*“Even unto the Prince of the Host **he exalted himself** :: and from him **the daily** was taken away...”*

Above and beyond this evidence is the undeniable fact concerning the abundance of cultic terminology in Daniel 8 as Pfandl rightly points out. However, this terminology is entirely counterfeit cultic activity. The ram and the goat are not a cultic sacrifices but pagan nations exalting themselves. The horn is not part of the cultic altar of burnt incense; it is a counterfeit symbol of pagan national exaltation. This evidence alone should be sufficient to convince the casual reader that the cultic term, “the daily” in 8:11, must also be a counterfeit cultic symbol or term.

Pfandl cites the passage in Daniel 11:31 in support of his contention that “the daily” should be aligned with the cultic sanctuary service. *Forces shall be mustered from him and they will profane the sanctuary (miqdash), the fortress. And they shall remove the daily; and they shall place the desolating abomination.* The sanctuary specified in 11:31 is equated with a fortress. No where in the OT is the heavenly sanctuary associated with *ma’oz* (a fortress). The sanctuary (*miqdash*) in 11:31 is clearly used in the context of a military setting along with *ma’oz* pertaining to pagan military activity. It has been shown that *miqdash* applies only to earthly sanctuaries of either a pagan or holy variety. Since its use in Daniel 8 is in a counterfeit cultic setting and in 11:31 *miqdash* is used in a military context along with *ma’oz*, we may conclude that the sanctuary in 11:31 is a counterfeit pagan sanctuary fortress.

Daniel’s application of the counterfeit cultic language, employing *hattamid* and *miqdash* in 8:11 is reapplied in 11:31 with the same counterfeit cultic meaning. The pagan military contextual setting of conflict in Daniel 11:20-31 reinforces and demands the counterfeit cultic application of *hattamid* and *miqdash* in 11:31. The use of *miqdash* in association with *hattamid* in 11:31 as a fortress of paganism defines its use in 8:11. It cannot apply to the heavenly sanctuary.

Pfandl rightly says that “the daily’ is replaced by “abomination of desolation.” But it is not a cultic practice that is being “replaced by another, an abominable, cultic practice. It is a counterfeit cultic practice (self-exalting paganism) that being replaced by another, an abominable, counterfeit cultic practice (self-exalting papal Rome).

Jeffrey Ho: Peters's statement about the increasing competition between the world powers should be noted. Persia becomes great. Greece becomes very great. Pagan Rome becomes exceedingly great. Finally papal Rome becomes great up to the host of the heavens. Each successive power boasts greater power than the previous, ending with the worst of them all, papal Rome, the union of church and state. Therefore it is not “unacceptable” that there is competition between pagan and papal Rome. If Pfandl had read Peters's manuscript carefully, he would have realized that none of the cultic terms in 8:3-12 are cultic in reality, but rather counterfeit cultic. Counterfeit cultic application is the key to exegeting Dan 8:3-12 properly.

Page 97-99

Pfandl contends that the passage in Daniel 12:11 harmonizes with his identification of “the daily” of the heavenly ministry of Christ. *From the time that the daily shall be taken away and the abomination of desolation set up shall be 1290 days.*

Response: Pfandl cites evidence from Pope John Paul II encyclical, *Dies Domini* that church councils in 300 AD and 506 AD made it obligatory to attend mass. After citing specific evidence that the papacy was firmly established in 508 AD by the associated actions of emperor Clovis whereby the abomination of desolation was set up, Pfandl surprisingly implies

that it was at this same point in time when the priesthood of Christ was taken away. But Pfandl previously acknowledged that the mass and penance and confessional existed as early as 300 AD. Pfandl's evidence does not support the view that the Priesthood of Christ was taken away in 508 AD. Nothing was enforced in 508 AD that was not previously enforced by earlier decrees of the church in 300 AD.

The definitive act of taking away of "the daily" in 508 AD was the submission of the last of the three horns, the Visigoths, opposing the supremacy of the papacy. The opposition came to an end when Theodoric made peace with Clovis in 508 AD. "The daily" was turned aside and the abomination of desolation was set up.

Jeffrey Ho: The identities of the three horns which were plucked up before the papacy is not important for me to comment fully on at the moment due to the topic of this paper. However I will re-examine the identities of the Vandal and Ostrogothic powers to see whether they are still to be included as two of the three uprooted horns, both of which occurred after 508 AD, and whether the Heruli or the Visigoths is the other uprooted horn.

Conclusion

Pfandl's evaluation of *The Mystery of 'The Daily'* has provided an opportunity to set forth an even stronger case for the conclusion that "the daily" represents the principle of self-exaltation. He selectively cited some evidence from the manuscript but he omitted an abundance of stronger evidence. The repetition of *gadal* 5 times in Daniel 8 and its close association with *hattamid* was ignored. The counterfeit cultic context of the passage in Daniel 8 was swept aside. The exclusive use, except in the audition of 8:13-14, of *miqdash* pertaining only to earthly sanctuaries was ignored. This evidence combined with remaining linguistic, exegetical, and contextual evidence in the manuscript remains untarnished and supports the view that "the daily" represents the principle of self-exaltation in mankind which is to be rectified by God with those willing to cooperate with Him in the cleansing of the sanctuary.

John W. Peters
Pastor
Pennsylvania Conference

August 2005