

**THIS IS A DOCUMENT IN PROGRESS! REVISIONS ARE BEING
MADE ON A REGULAR BASIS!! Latest Revision Monday, May 19, 2014**

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST
INTERPRETATION OF TWO TIME PROPHECIES IN THE BOOK
OF DANIEL - THE 2300 DAYS OF DANIEL 8 AND THE 70
WEEKS OF DANIEL 9.**

ASSUMPTION 2

**The meaning of “vision” in Dn 8:13
where it asks “How long shall be the
vision...?” means the *whole* vision in
vs2-12, and not just the activities of the
little horn in vs 9-12.**

**BY FRANK BASTEN
NOVEMBER, 1990**

copyright F.A.Basten, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Purpose of This Assumption.	2
The Method of This Assumption and the Associated Problems with it.	2
Conclusion regarding this Assumption.....	48
The Assumptions Used in This Assumption.....	60
Bibliography.....	60
Appendix.....	65

The Purpose of This Assumption.

The purpose of this assumption is to show that the word “vision” in Dn8:13 does *not* apply only to the activities of the little horn as referred to in the rest of the question in verse 13, but in fact, *to the whole vision* in Dn8. This is important since, in the absence of any other starting point for the 2300 days, it sets the stage for using the starting point for the seventy weeks as the starting point for the 2300 days as well.

This assumption looks at the way SDA scholarship attempts to explain both the syntax of the question in Dn8:13 and then the answer in verse 14. The intent of their argumentation is to buttress the argument that the time period of 2300 days covers the period of *whole vision* and not just *the activities of the little horn* as revealed in vs. 9-12. To justify such a link of the 2300 days with *the whole vision of Dn8*, the explanation is given that the question and the apposition in Dn8:13 refers us to the *entire* revelation in Dn8: 3-12 and not just the activities of the little horn in vs. 9-12. As we shall see, Dr. Shea is candid enough to admit, if the question of Dn8:13 applies to the activities of the little horn, then the start of the 2300 days *is given* in Dn8.¹ A corollary of this point is that if it can be proved that the 2300 days applies to the activities of the little horn rather than the time span of the whole vision, then the link between the 2300 days and the 70 weeks simply vanishes, and there is no need to look outside of Daniel 8 for the starting point for the 2300 days. The 2300 days would then begin when the little horn begins its activities – with its invasion into Palestine and the oppression of the people of God.

Previous to the introduction of this argument SDA historicists only had recourse to outright assertions to prove that the *whole vision* was being referred to in Dn8: 13, and 15. This involved two traditional methods of implied assumptions and we turn to examine these now.

The Method of This Assumption and the Associated Problems with it.

Perhaps the main assumption of both traditional and modern apologists for the orthodox Seventh-day Adventist historicist interpretation of the 2300 day prophecy of

¹ Shea (1981) points out, if the word “vision” can be applied to vs 10-12 then “the 2300 days should be represent the period of time during which his (the horn power) pollution of the temple in Jerusalem, or some similar action, was carried out. According to this kind of interpretation, the 2300 days were to begin when such pollution began.” (p.249)

Dn8:14 is that the 2300 day prophecy spans *the entire period covered by the vision of Dn 8:2-12* starting from some undisclosed point of history during the Persian empire continuing through time until “the sanctuary is cleansed” in the time of the horn power of Dan8: 9-11, which in the historicist’s view, is equated with both the former pagan Roman empire and then the papal Roman empire.

This means, more specifically, that the question of Dn8:13 – “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?” - concerns the “whole” vision in vs2-12, and not just a part of that vision. According to this view, the question is asking, in essence, “How long is the vision?”

A, Two Traditional Adventist Approaches

The application of the 2300 day prophecy to the whole vision of Dn8:2-12 in the traditional argument has been made using the year-day principle. Writers took two approaches.

1. The First Approach –assumes “vision” (v13) means the whole vision.

With the first approach, one would assume that “vision” in Dn8:13 in meant Dn 8:2-12, and then argue that 2300 literal solar days could not cover the time span which encompasses the Persian empire, let alone the Grecian and Roman empires as well. Thus they would conclude that the year-day principle is at work here.

The first approach could also be presented in reverse. One would assume that prophetic time is symbolic, and then on that basis, say that such a long period as 2,300 years could not possibly apply just to the activity of the horn power in vs 9-12, therefore the word “vision” must mean the whole vision of Dn 8:2-12.

2. The Second Approach – assumes 490 years is “cut off” from 2300 days.

The second approach argues that the year-day principle is operating in Dn8:14 because since the 70 weeks are cut off from the 2300 days and the 70 weeks are proved to equal 490 *years*, the 490 years have to be cut off from some *longer* period, and so the 2300 days must represent 2300 years. Therefore the year-day principle is operating as truly in Dn8 as it is in Dn9.

Both of these approaches run into difficulty when the validity of their basic assumptions are examined closely. And it will be noticed also that both of these arguments have failed to discuss the contextual constraints of verse 13.

B. Contemporary Attempts

In recent years, Shea and Hasel have attempted to redress this “oversight,” presenting contextual arguments that basically support the conclusions of these two traditional approaches.

a. William H. Shea

Shea was probably the first SDA to frankly acknowledge in print that the syntactic structure of Dn 8:13 is one of apposition (1982, p.80). He provides five reasons why he thinks that the phrases appositioned to the word ‘vision’ refers “to the entire vision seen by the prophet up to that point, the vision that is described in the text from v3 through v12” (p.80). He does acknowledge however, that another alternative view, albeit incorrect in his thinking, is to see the apposition as limiting the meaning of the word “vision” to the works of the horn power; that is vs 9-12 (*Ibid*).

b. Gerhard F. Hasel

Hasel (1981, 1986) taking a different line from Shea reviewed the syntactic, philological and grammatical issues in vs 9-14, including the question contained in v 13, and concluded like Shea, that “the time span covered by the hazôn – vision in the question of verse 13 includes the entire range of events the prophet was shown in verses 3–12. Contextually and terminologically, it is not limited to the ‘little horn’ period.” (1986, p.434) Hasel does not see the structure of the question displaying apposition, but rather sees three questions occurring in v 13 with the elision of the interrogative adverb (“ad–matay: until when, how long”) in the second and third part of the question. Hasel translates the verse as: “‘Until when the vision, [until when] the continuance and the transgression causing horror, [until when] to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?’” (p.435). In regard to the question dealing with the “vision”, he says that “the question itself (according to Hebrew syntax) comes to an end with the clause, until when [shall be] the vision?’” (Ibid, p.433-434)

So, even though Shea and Hasel see a different construction in the question of Dn 8:13, they both conclude that the word “vision” in v13 means vs3-12, and not vs9-12. This then allows them to find a starting point for the 2,300 day period in the Persian empire whenever “the vision” began, rather than starting the time period with the beginning of the desolating activities of the horn power in “the pleasant land” (vs 9-12). That then is the current state of affairs in this area in SDA publications. It reveals ultimately a confusion as to the precise syntactic structure which is present in Dan 8:13.

c. Other contemporary writers

A sample of other contemporary SDA writers will be examined to see their position in relation to these different methods.

2.

C. The Antiochus IV Epiphanes view

There has been, however, a persistent argument concerning another meaning of “vision” in Dn 8:13 milling about behind the center stage of SDA orthodoxy. It has as hoary a tradition as does that which is proposed by traditional historicism. (cf. Shea, 1986, pp.256-328). It is usually associated with those theorists who propose a fulfillment of the 2,300 day prophecy which identifies the horn power of vs 9-12 as referring to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, a king of Syria (175-164 BC), although an acceptance of this argument concerning the syntax of the question should not necessarily compel anyone to accept Antiochus Epiphanes as the power referred to in the symbolic horn of vs 9-12.

In essence, the argument associated with the Antiochus Epiphanes’ view, proposes that the syntax of the question appearing in Dn 8:13, makes “vision” refer only to verses 9-12. This paper supports this view and argues the 2,300 days can only be applied to the whole vision of vs. 2-12 if one ignores the syntax of verse 13. The syntax of verse 13 in this argument is seen as a deliberate effort by the author to qualify the word “vision” in a way that is different from his other usage of the same word elsewhere in his writings, where it is used without the syntax that appears in v13. The admission of the correctness of the exegesis of *the syntax* of Dn8:13 by those who endorse the Antiochus Epiphanes’ view, should not be taken to mean

however that I endorse the belief that the prophecy predicts, or is fulfilled in, the exploits of that ruler.

The remaining bulk of this section will examine the assumptions and associated arguments that are used to support the traditional Millerite and SDA starting time for the 2,300 day period of Dn 8:14. Then the recent work of Shea and Hasel will be examined.

D. Detailed Examination of the SDA Arguments which support this Assumption

a. The First Traditional Approach using two circular arguments.

Being a relic of the Second Advent movement, which had a historicist perspective on prophecy in common with many standard Protestant commentaries of the time, the SDA position in this question is identical to that of the forebears in the early nineteenth century.

Typical of those forebears who promoted this view was Thomas Newton (1704-1782) who said on the 2300 days:

The two thousand and three hundred days denote the whole time from the beginning of the vision to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The sanctuary is not yet cleansed, and consequently these years are not yet expired. When these years shall be expired, then their end will clearly show from whence their beginning is to be dated, whether from the vision or the ram, or of the he-goat, or of the little horn. It is difficult to fix the precise time, when the prophetic dates begin, and when they end, till the prophecies are fulfilled, and the event declares the certainty of them. [*Dissertations on the Prophecies*, (1796 ed.), pp. 157-195] ([Froom, 1948](#)

, p.685)

This approach to Dn 8:13,14, used by the Millerites and the SDA pioneers to argue for a starting date when the “vision” of vs 2-12 (or vs 2-14) began, had two variations:

- The first way to present this approach was to assume that the word “vision” in Dn 8:13 meant the whole vision starting from v3 and from there “proved” that the 2,300 prophetic days must mean 2,300 literal years.
- Or on the other hand, one could assume from the outset that the year-day principle was operating in Dn 8:14 and from there “proved” that the word “vision” meant the vision starting from v3. In most cases it is difficult to separate these, because they often intertwined these two approaches together.

i. Assumes from outset that “vision” means whole vision.

The basis of the assumption in this first approach, as has been noted before, is the premise that the vision referred to in vs 1,2 and v 13 is the same. The possibility of the construction of the question in v 13 changing the meaning of “the vision” to something different from “the vision” in vs 1,2 was just not raised. Early books and articles can be ransacked on this subject but the syntax of v 13 and its implications on the meaning of hehazôn is an area that never received any treatment at all in either Millerite or Seventh-day Adventist publications. In most cases, the mere occurrence of the same English word with the definite article—“the vision”—occurring in vs 1,2

and v13 was enough detail for these early Adventist writers to prove their argument. ([J White July 14 & 21, 1863](#)).

The question was, “How long the vision?” The question certainly covers almost the whole, if not the whole, duration of the vision; and that, as we have seen, extends over a period of over twenty-four hundred years. Now if, in reply, the angel singled out a period of only six and one third years in length, there is no correspondence either between this answer and the vision in connection with which it was given, or between the answer and the question which directly called it forth. These days, if taken literally, would be far from covering the duration of any one of the kingdoms of the prophecy taken singly, how much less of them all taken together.

This is symbolic prophecy; it would be natural therefore to conclude that the time introduced would be of a like nature. Twenty-three hundred days would not be out of proportion to the lives of the beasts shown in the vision, if all should be taken literally; but as these short-lived kingdoms, so the days are symbols representing the years of their continuance. ([Smith, 1898, p. 165](#))

It is a fact that 2300 literal days [not quite seven years] would not cover the duration of a single power in this prophecy, much less extend over them all. Therefore, the days must be symbols, even as the beast and horns are shown to be symbols. ([Andrews, 1852](#))

But before proceeding to an application of this prophecy, a word may be necessary relative to the nature of the time here introduced: is it literal or symbolic?

1 It is a fact that 2300 literal days [but little over six years] would not cover the duration of a single power in this prophecy, much less extend over them all. Therefore the days must be symbols, even as the beast and horns are shown to be symbols. ([J. White, 1863](#))

This same argument is used contemporaneously for the Hebrew word for vision in Dn8:1,2,2 and Dn8:13:

From Daniel 8 it is clear that the 2,300 days have to cover a long span of years. The question is asked, “How long will the vision be?” (Dan.8:13). The term “vision” is the same as used in verses 1, 2. ([Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1988, p.330](#)).

But without even considering the syntax of v13, the comparison of the same word in v13 and vs 1,2, whether it be quoted in Hebrew or English, does not prove that the question of v13 is referring to the full vision of vs 2-12.

Another curious twist in this approach is the “proof” that the year – day principle is operating in Dn 8:14. By assuming that “vision” in v13 refers to vs 3-12, it is then argued that the 2,300 days could not be literal days because 6.3 yrs could not cover the span of any one of the three powers represented in the vision, let alone all three combined. Thus this “cogent” detail has been presented both traditionally and contemporarily as “proof” that the year–day principle is both a biblical datum and that it is operating with the 2,300 day prophecy. Notice two quotation from pioneer and current sources:

The field of vision then is the empires of Persia, Greece and Rome: That part of the vision that now engages our attention is the time – the reckoning of the 2,300 days ...

It is a fact that 2,300 literal days [not quite seven years] would not cover the duration of single power in this prophecy, much less extend over as the beast and horns are shown to be symbols.

It is a fact that a symbolic or prophetic day is one year. Eze iv.5,6; Num. Xiv.34. Hence the period is 2,300 years.

It must begin with “the vision”; consequently it commences the height of the Medo-Persian power. (Andrews, 1852)

From Daniel 8 it is clear that the 2,300 days have to cover a long span of years. The question is asked, “How long will the vision be?” (Dan8:13). The term “vision” is the same as used in verses 1,2. So when the question “How long is the vision?” is raised by the heavenly angel, he is expecting an answer that covers the entire vision from the first animal symbol through the second animal symbol through the horn symbol to the end of time as indicated in verses 17 answers this question indicated rather clearly that they must cover the period from the Medo-Persian empire to (Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, 1988, pp 330 – 331.)

Though Andrews (1852) made no attempt to justify his assumption that “vision” in v13 means Dn8:3-12, the Ministerial Association (1988) have justified this assumption by saying “the term ‘vision’ is the same as used in verses 1,2.” They are saying that because Daniel called what was revealed to him in that year a hazôn, and because v13 used the word hazôn in the question, the question must, of necessity, refer to what was revealed to Daniel, viz., the vision in vs 3-12. Had the question only been “How long will the vision be?” I would have no argument with that position. But because the question has other details appositioned to it, details which I will argue, delimit the scope of meaning of hazôn and define it more precisely, I reject the validity of their justification for the assumption that “vision” in v13 refers to v 3-12.

And as I have shown previously in Assumption 1, hazôn in Dn8:1,2,2 can refer quite correctly to vs2-26, since Dn9:21 refers to Dn8:15-26 as being a hazôn, thus making Dn8:2-26 the hazôn that appeared to Daniel in that year. The other option is to say that Daniel saw two hazôns in that year; the first, being recorded in Dn8:3-14 (on the basis of hazôn in v15 referring to vs13,14 as well as vs 3-12); and the second being recorded in vs15-26. It would be interesting to see someone defend that position. The other option is to *deny* that hazôn in Dn9:21 refers to Dn8:15-26, an option which Shea has tried unsuccessfully when he asserted that it refers to Dn7:17 (1981, pp.237f).² Thus the Ministerial Association’s attempt to give some validity to their position is merely cosmetic, and just as fragile as Andrews’ (1852) outright assumption.

ii. Assumes from outset that year-day principle is operating with 2300 days.

The second method of presenting this approach, which also argued for a starting date for the 2,300 days of Dn8:14 being located in the times of the Persian Empire, whenever the vision of vs3-12 began, assumed from the outset that the year-day principle was operating in Dn8:14, and from there “proved” that the word “vision” meant vs3-12. Notice this summary of Miller’s reasoning on Dan8:14 by E.G. White:

Following his rule of making Scripture its own interpreter, Miller learned that a day in symbolic prophecy represents a year (Numbers 14:34; Ezekiel 4:6); he saw that the period of 2,300 prophetic days, or literal years, would extend far beyond the close of the Jewish dispensation, hence it could not refer to the sanctuary of that dispensation. (E.White, 1950, p.324)

² See the discussion of this in [Assumption No.1](#), under the heading “Shea’s treatment of Chazon in Dn9:21”

White here shows Miller as assuming first that the 2,300 prophetic days is 2,300 literal years and from there, he tried to work out a solution to the time period. In his research, William Miller developed some “Rules of Interpretation,” the eighth of which said that:

Figures always have a figurative meaning, and are used much in prophecy to represent future things, times and events – such as mountains governments Dan2:35,44; beasts, meaning kingdoms Dan7:8-17; waters, meaning people Rev17:1,15; day, meaning year etc. Ezek 4:6. (Bliss,1853, p.71)

That Miller applied this rule to the 2,300 days of Dn8:14 is clear from the following:-

The time or length of the vision, the 2,300 days. What must we understand by days? In the prophecy of Daniel, it is invariably to be reckoned years: for God hath so ordered the prophets to reckon days. Numb xiv.34 ...Ezek.iv.5,6In these passages we prove the command of God. (Miller, 1836, pp.45-46).

And so by first of all assuming that the 2,300 days must be 2,300 years, then coupling it together with the assumption that the 2,300 day period begins with the 70 weeks prophecy, Miller naturally came up with a end-point “about the year A.D. 1843”:

We learn that this vision is two thousand three hundred days long, that days are reckoned to be years: 1st By command of God; 2nd By the example of Jacob; and 3rd By the fulfillment of the seventy weeks of this vision at the crucifixion of the Messiah. We learn by the instruction of Gabriel, that the seventy weeks were a part of the vision, and that Daniel was commanded to begin the seventy weeks at the going forth of the decree, to build the streets and walls of Jerusalem in troublous times, that this decree given to Ezra was exactly 490 years to a day before the crucifixion of Christ; and that there is no account, by bible or any historian, that there was any other decree to build the streets or walls of Jerusalem. We think the proof is strong that the vision of Daniel begins 457 years before Christ, when the vision must be finished. (Ibid, p.52)

One question that needs to be answered before we leave Wm. Miller’s research is whether he adopted the year-day principle for the 2,300 day prophecy before he worked out his time calculations which would yield the date 1843 A.D? Notice this excerpt from Wm. Miller’s Apology and Defence (1849) discussing the 2,300 days.

I therefore felt, that in endeavoring to comprehend what God had in his mercy seen fit to reveal to us, I had no right to pass over the prophetic periods. I saw that as the events predicted to be fulfilled in prophetic days had been extended over about as many literal years; as God in Num xiv.34, and Ezek iv. 4-6, had appointed each day for a year; as the seventy weeks to the Messiah were fulfilled in 490 years, and the 1260 prophetic days extending to the advent were given in connection with symbolic prophecy, I could only regard the time as symbolical, and as standing each day for a year, in accordance with the opinions of all the standard Protestant commentators. If then, we could obtain any clue to the time of their commencement, I conceived we should be guided to the probable time of their termination, and as God would not bestow upon us an useless revelation, I regarded them as conducting us to the time when we might confidently look for the coming of the Chiefest of ten thousand – One altogether lovely (pp 10,11).

Thus Miller himself clearly reveals that before he had arrived at the conclusion of study regarding the imminent return of Jesus in 1843, he had used the year-day principle to determine the length of the 2,300 days. Miller, though, didn’t argue that because the 2,300 day prophecy was 2,300 literal years in length, the meaning of “vision” in v.13 had to cover vs3-12. In addition, his concept of the word “vision” was

that it is comprised not only the vision of Dn8, but also that of Dn7, Dn2, and Dn9,10-12 (cf., 1836, pp.38-46)!!!:

We learn that the vision which Daniel saw was revealed at three separate times. 1st In Nebuchadnezzar's dream....The next vision Daniel saw was similar to this; he saw four great beasts representing four great kingdoms as before....In the third vision which Daniel has coupled with the former by saying that it was after (or like) the one which appeared unto him at the first....Daniel then, in the 26th verse couples the two visions, the one in the evening, 7th chapter, and the one in the morning, 8th chapter, and says "the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true."

We learn that this vision is two thousand three hundred days long, that days are to be reckoned years. (Miller, 1836, pp. 51f)

His "composite" vision began with the Babylonian Empire and continued through till the resurrection (Dn12:3). The principle for developing this notion is explained in his "Evidences...":

Let it be noticed that God has revealed to his prophets the same events in divers figures, and at different times, as he has to Daniel in the 2d, 7th, and 8th chapters concerning the four kingdoms; or to Peter, see Acts x. 16: also, Isa and John. Then to get the whole truth, all those visions or prophecies must be concentrated and brought together, that has reference to the subject we wish to investigate, and when combined let every word and sentence have its proper place and force in the grand whole, and the theory or system, as I have before shown, must be correct. (Ibid, pp.5-6)

This particular view of Millers died with him, and the general view espoused in Adventist publications after the early years was that the "vision" in Dn8:13 was Dn8:3-12.

The second method of presenting this approach however, which applied the year-day principle to the 2300 day prophecy to show to show that it refers not to vs9-12, but vs3-12, is fraught with the same problems as the first method, since it is based on the generalization that time given in a symbolic prophetic vision is also symbolic. This generalisation must then in turn be examined for its validity, and so the circle of assumptions continues. Suffice it to say that neither of these approaches have explicit evidence in themselves to prove either that the word "vision" in Dn8:13 refers to vs3-12, or that "vision" cannot refer to vs9-12.

These approaches may have been suitable a century and a half ago, but the advent of scientific exegesis has demanded a more rigorous presentation of the traditional arguments. What was acceptable to assume back then needs to be more clearly demonstrated today.

iii. The Antiochus Epiphanes argument.

Those who supported an exegesis of "vision" in v13 as referring to vs 9-12 in the days of the pioneers generally found its fulfillment in Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The approach of the early Adventist writer seemed to be that if it could be clearly demonstrated that the horn power of vs 9-12 clearly refers to Rome, and that there are difficulties in identifying the horn power with Antiochus IV Epiphanes, then that whole body of argument associated with the Antiochus IV Epiphanes exegesis would be shown to be invalid. Thus with one clean sweep, both exegesis and interpretation are discounted, and none of the other exegetical details are examined once this goal has been reached:

The prophecy cannot therefore apply to him [Antiochus IV Epiphanes]; for he does not fulfill the specifications in one single particular. The question may then be asked how any one has ever come to apply it to him. We answer, Romanists take that view, to avoid the application of the prophecy to themselves; and many Protestants follow them, in order to oppose the doctrine of the second advent.

It has been an easy matter to show that the little horn does not denote Antiochus. It will be just as easy to show that it does denote Rome. (Smith, 1870)

In the view of White, Smith and Andrews, the main reason for the existence of the Antiochus IV Epiphanes view was to shift focus away from the Papacy. Thus, once Rome is shown to be the power symbolized by the horn of Dn8, their argument is complete:

To avoid the application of this prophecy to the Roman power, Pagan and Papal, Papists have shifted it from Rome to Antiochus Epiphanes, a Syrian king who could not resist the mandates of Rome. See notes of the Douay [Romish] Bible on Dan. vii; viii; ix. This application is made by the Papists, to save their church from any share in the fulfillment of the prophecy; and in this they have been followed by the mass of opposers to the Advent faith. (J.N Andrews, 1852; J White, 1854)

The early Adventist writers then, did not even address the issue of the syntax of Dn 8:13 and its implications for the meaning of “the vision” in v13. They simply saw the Antiochus IV Epiphanes argument as a Papal decoy and as Adventist apologists, their task was simply to give the prophecy its proper signification. The possibility of any other detail in the prophecy needing attention (such as the syntax of verse 13) is not even hinted in the publications.

iv. The Misquotation of the Question in Verse 13.

Another frequent method of illustrating the “validity” of the first approach which assumed from the outset that “vision” in Dn8:13 meant vs2-12, was the misquotation of the question in Dn8:13, a practice which still persists even today:

James White, in the compilation “Bible Adventism” which contained ten of his standard sermons on this topic says:

How beautifully grand the scene! The Son of God and the angel Gabriel in conversation! One inquires of the other. “How long shall be the vision” concerning Persia, Greece and Rome? The other directs the answer to the prophet “Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed....”

The vision relates to what the prophet saw respecting Media and Persia, Grecia and Rome, as recorded in the eighth chapter of Daniel.... In these verses [vs1-3] the term “a vision” is mentioned three times. Referring to the same in verse 13, the question is asked, “How long shall be the vision?”.... This vision we will now consider. (White, 1972, p. 120f).

White then shows that the vision covers Media-Persia, Greece and also Rome. He concludes by saying “the field of vision then, is the empires of Persia, Greece, and Rome.” (Ibid, p.127) (Note, White does happen to quote in full the question of Dn8;13 on p.135. The point to be made though is that the quoting of “How long shall be the vision?” means the same as quoting the whole question.)

Uriah Smith commenting in this regard says:

The questions was, “How long the vision?” The question covers almost the whole, if not the whole, duration of the vision; and that, as we have seen, extends over a period of twenty-four hundred years. Now if, in reply, the angel singled out a period only six and on third years in

length, there is no correspondence either between his answer and the vision in connection with which it was given, or between the answer and the question which directly called it forth. These days, if taken literally, would be far from covering the duration of any one of the kingdoms of the prophecy taken singly, how much less of them all taken together! (1898, p.165)

In Smith's writings, the assumption is made that the "vision" of Dn8:13 is "whole" vision of Dn8. Similar examples could be taken from Andrews, Joseph Bates, Ellen White, Loughborough, Haskell and many others.

The same assumption of equating the abridged question ("How long shall be the vision?") with the unabridged question (the full verse of Dn8:13) is evident in current SDA literature. Notice this excerpt from the 1988 publication Seventh-day Adventists Believe...A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines :

From Daniel 8 it is clear that the 2300 days have to cover a long span of years. The question is asked, "How long will the vision be?" (Dan 8:13). The term "vision" is the same as used in verses 1,2. So when the question "How long is the vision?" is raised by the heavenly angel, he is expecting an answer that covers the entire vision from the first animal symbol through the second animal symbol through the horn symbol to the end of time as it is indicated in verses 17 and 19 of Daniel 8. That the 2300 evenings and mornings answers this question indicates rather clearly that they must cover the period from the Medo-Persian Empire to the end of time, implying that they represent years." (1988, note 43, pp.330f.)

Some awkward attempts of justifying the assumption that the abridged question is the same as the unabridged question in Dn8:13 have been made through the years. Desmond Ford, arguing for the traditional SDA position in his 1978 commentary on Daniel says:

Furthermore it should be noted carefully that the question is not merely "How long shall be the sanctuary be trodden underfoot?" but, "For how long is this vision that culminates in the terrible work of the little horn?" (p.188)

Although Ford includes the first half and the second half of the unabridged question in his appraisal his translation is incorrect. No justification is given by Ford as to why he thinks the syntax of Dn8:13 gives the sense of the words "that culminates in." Ford also quotes from Fenton and Leupold in his footnotes:

Leupold comments in verse 13: "How far does this vision reach?" And Farrar Fenton: "Can you say for how long the Vision is?" (The Complete Bible in Modern English). (*Ibid*, Note no.9 p.193)

Yet this information from Ford does nothing to explain the reasons for his interpretation of the syntax of Dn8:13. Had he quoted p.351f of Leupold's commentary, where the implication of the apposition Leupold sees in the question of Dn8:13 is discussed, an entirely different translation would have emerged.

To make his inquiry more specific the angel that asked the other angel adds several explanatory terms that are in apposition with the general term "vision." By these terms he indicates what portion of the vision is causing him trouble. And we dare not forget that Daniel's problem was exactly the same as the angel's. These appositional terms we have introduced by the phrase that is customarily used in English in such instances – "that is to say." Four things are in apposition to the word "vision." They are: a) "the regular daily offerings," b) "The crime causing horror," c) the giving over of the sanctuary to be trodden underfoot," and d) "the giving over of the host to be trodden underfoot." These last two could naturally be combined into one, and there might be three items in place of four.

That these four coincide and occur simultaneously, or nearly so is apparent to the questioner. Therefore he practically wants to know how long the suffering of the saints and the humiliation of the sanctuary will last. (1949, p.351f.)

Rodríguez makes a poor attempt of misquoting the question, thereby making it easier for him to answer in the way he is intending:

The Greek and Latin versions of the Bible have interpreted the 2300 evenings and mornings as “days.” They read: “Twenty-three hundred days, evenings and mornings.” [Footnotes: “See John Collins, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), pp. 326, 327. Goldingay takes the phrase “evenings and mornings” (p.213) to refer to days.”] This is understandable because the phrase “evenings and mornings” designates a full day in the Old Testament (see Gen. 1:5-31). That being the case, we have to take the 2300 days contextually a symbolic of years. As we have already indicated, the question was, When will the whole vision, which includes the daily and the rebellion of the little horn, be fulfilled? That vision goes back to the time of the Medo-Persian Empire and covers the Greek and Roman (pagan and papal) empires. Their history covers much more than 2,300 literal days. We are unquestionably dealing here with prophetic days used to designate years. (2002, p.55)

Spangler is another SDA writer who twists the question in Dn8: 13, without paying attention to the significance of the apposition:

The year-day principle is inherent to the thought and text of Daniel 8. The exegetical clue to this is found in the question, “For how long is the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, the transgression that makes desolate, and the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot?” (verse 13). First we note that in the Hebrew the question reads literally “until when ...,” which is more accurate meaning of the expression “for how long...” Second, we must focus on the significance of the word “vision.” This word appears six different times in the latter verses of Daniel 8 (according to K.J.V., or R.S.V.), and in all six cases it refers to the entire content of the vision described in verses 1-14, and not to the 2300 days in isolation. Included in the vision are the periods of domination of first the ram and second the he-goat, as well as that which follows. (1980, p.44)

In a paper composed for the Glacier View conference, Shea presents a different explanation of the question than the one examined next. In examining the concept of Ford’s apotelesmatic principle, Shea says:

The question there is not how long the daily will be taken away and the abomination be set up, as it is in Dan. 12:11 where 1290 days are mentioned, but “how long is the vision concerning (these things)?...” According to its context the antecedent of the word “vision” is everything described in Dan. 8:2-12. This vision not only includes the actions that the little horn perpetuated against God but also the Persian ram and the Greek goat, which are all part of the same vision. When the angel asked how long the vision was, therefore, the time period in the answer to his question should most naturally extend back to the Persian period with which the vision began. (1980b, p.16)

The most honest and frank paraphrase of the question in Dn8:13 in SDA literature to date comes from Shea (1982). He looked briefly at the grammatical arrangement of Dn8:13 and concludes thus:

By the process of elimination, the syntactic relationship present here should be interpreted as one of apposition. That gives the question the significance of, “How long is the vision, that is, the vision in which the four following works of the little horn are seen?” (p.180)

Hasel (1981) on the other hand gives a literal translation of the text: “Until when (is to be) the vision, (about) the continuance and the transgression causing horror, to make the sanctuary and host a trampling?” (p.198) He then later says:

The syntax of Dan8:13b does not allow an interpretation of “the vision” that limits it to the subsequent expressions. This leads to the suggestion from the point of view of Hebrew syntax

that the question “until when” (ad-matay) is omitted by ellipsis before the following expressions. The intent of the last part of Dan8:13 with the respective ellipsis may be understood as follows, indicating the ellipsis in parentheses: Until when the vision, (until when) the continuance and transgression causing horror, (until when) to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?” (p.189)

The problems with Hasel’s attempt in grappling with both the syntax and a translation will be highlighted soon, but the mere fact that no change is evident in his material between 1981 and 1986 on this point seems to indicate an entire ignorance on Hasel’s part of Shea’s discussion of the appositional nature of the question. At the very least, Hasel’s failure to mention this option is a major fault in his paper, given his willingness to roam the world for variant views on other trivia in his paper. The bottom line for Hasel in regard to the first part of v13 is that “the question itself (according to the Hebrew syntax) comes to an end with the clause, until when [shall be] the vision?” (1986, p.433f)

Thus current SDA publications support the tendency of early Adventist writers to abridge the question in Dn8:13, and assume that the abridged question is virtually equivalent to the unabridged one. In summary then, both the first and the second approaches to the meaning of the word “vision” in Dn8:13 as used by early Adventists – approaches which are still considered orthodox today – have as their premise, not explicit facts, but assumptions which in turn, need separate attention to ascertain their validity.

George McCready Price

McCready Price is an enigma in approaching this question in that he did not wish to deny what is obvious in the question of Dn8:13 but he tried to argue his way around to the traditional SDA position:

How long shall be the vision? Some have made the mistake of limiting this question and its answer to the career of the little horn; that is, they assume that this question and answer specify the length of time during which the power symbolized by the little horn would carry on its nefarious work. But this assumption is unwarranted. In its simplified form the question really is: “How long shall the sanctuary and host be trodden underfoot?”

True, a superficial examination might seem to limit the question to the work of the little horn; for this power is the only one specifically mentioned in this vision as treading down the sanctuary and the host. But a more careful consideration of the subject will show how unreasonable it is thus to limit the question and answer to this one world power. By considering the background of this vision, or Daniel’s position and the situation of the Jewish nation at the time this vision was given, we shall gain a truer perspective. We need to remember that at the time this was written Babylon was still the ruler of the world.

Daniel himself and all his people were still in captivity; the temple or sanctuary at Jerusalem was in ruins, and had been in this condition for more than half a century. The prophet and his fellow believers were confident that the seventy years of predicted captivity were about ended; but the expected deliverance had not yet taken place, and the sanctuary and the host (or God’s people) were still being trodden down by the arrogant rulers of the nations.

Since this vision indicated that Babylon was to be followed by Medo-Persia, and this by Greece, then by four powers ruling contemporaneously, and finally by the power represented by the little horn, the question is manifestly equivalent to asking: How long shall these cruel world powers be allowed to tread underfoot both the temple (or sanctuary) and the host (the people of God)? It cannot be denied that this would be the meaning which Daniel would naturally attach to this question and its answer. Since Daniel knew that the sanctuary and the host were still being trodden underfoot by the great empire of Babylon, and he was now told that Babylon was not to be the last, but that still other empires would follow, the little horn

being worse than all preceding, he was not such a fool as to think that the 2300 days specified in the question and answer had to do only with the little horn, the last of the series. No, indeed. Common sense would tell him that the time specified dealt with the series as a whole: How long would this condition of affairs be permitted to last? From Daniel's point of view, it would be unthinkable that he would ask: How long is this little horn going to last? unless it would be for the purpose of asking about the termination of the whole thing, or, as the original Hebrew of the question reads: "Until when?" Thus it was to be expected that Daniel's unspoken question became formulated by the angel, asking in effect: How long will the sanctuary and the host be under the heel of the enemies of God and His people? Babylon was to have an end; but its end was to be succeeded by another world empire. This in turn was to be terminated in a similar way. But up to this stage of the prophecy not a word had been uttered about any end for the work of the little horn. The last statement immediately preceding the question and its answer was: "It did its pleasure and prospered." What is more natural than to ask in horrified amazement: "How long is this sort of thing going to last?"

It is true that at the end of this chapter, in the last of the explanations given by the angel, the statement is made that this little-horn power "shall be broken without hand," meaning that it will come to a supernatural end. But at the time of the question and its answer, not the slightest hint had been given that there would be any termination of this anti-religious power and its horrible work. Hence it was natural that the preceding series of powers should be passed over, and that attention should be centered on this little horn, as if it alone represented the enemies of God and His people, and the question should be asked: How long is this climactic horror going to continue? Various other reasons help to show that this question and its answer cannot be limited to the career of the little horn. For one thing, the length of time during which the papal power would prevail is given in some half-dozen places in Daniel and the Revelation as 1260 years. Of course, this papal phase would be only the second half of the total career of the little horn, for, as we have explained, the little horn represents both the imperial and the papal form of Roman rule. On this basis the 1260 years and the 2300 years should end together, or at AD 1798. This would make the 2300 years start in 502 BC, a date which has absolutely no significance whatever as a starting point for such a period. Nobody can make reasonable sense out of this 2300-years period by starting it in 502 BC and ending it AD 1798. Obviously this is not its meaning. As we all know, the "critics" interpret the little horn as meaning the Syrian kingdom of Antiochus Epiphanes, the most anti-Semitic of its two dozen rulers. Accordingly, they seek to show that these 2300 days refer to the period during which Epiphanes coerced and persecuted the Jews and desecrated the temple. As I have shown elsewhere in these studies, no period can be pointed out during the reign of this Syrian king which makes even a moderately good fit to the 2300 days of this prediction, when interpreted as critics wish it done.

If this prophetic question and its answer do not fit the career of Epiphanes, and indeed seem much longer than the duration of both pagan and papal Rome, we have to apply it to the trampling underfoot of God's sanctuary and His people by all the symbols here given, or during the careers of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, the work of the little horn being only the last of the long series of powers which were engaged in the nefarious work of treading underfoot both the sanctuary and the people of God. This was the great burden on Daniel's mind; and the angel framed his question and its answer as an echo of Daniel's unspoken anxiety. When will all this come to an end?

It will now be our task to study what the various parts of this question really mean, and thus to attempt to understand the divine significance of the question and its answer.

Two factors seem to be involved in the question. First, "the continual burnt offering." We have considered this expression above, and have found that it seems clearly to refer to the blasphemous substitution of an ecclesiastical invention to take the place of the "continual mediation" of the Savior of mankind, who continually mediates on behalf of sinful beings before the holy throne of a just and yet merciful God. This wicked substitution came into the professed Christian church at an early date, though it might be difficult to point out the exact time of its invasion of the church. Irrespective of when it began, the question now is, How long is this state of affairs to continue? The transgression that makes desolate. This part of the question is not so clear, for this expression is somewhat obscure. Of course, it is always sin of

some kind that separates between human beings and their God. Wright remarks: "Transgression in the midst of Israel was that 'which makes desolate.' Sin separates between God and His people. Isaiah 59:2." - Daniel and His Prophecies, page 181. But is it some specific sinful condition that is here referred to? Sin of a horrible nature and of most far reaching consequences is brought to view in this taking away of "the continual mediation" from man's merciful High Priest in heaven. As already explained above, we may understand it as meaning any dominant world power, like imperial Rome or papal Rome, which would arrogate to itself divine honors and demand to be worshiped by its people. Certainly when a blasphemous impostor comes as a "vicar" or a "vicegerent" and claims to have all the power of Christ, and thus comes between the sinner and his only means of salvation, it might suitably be spoken of as "the transgression that makes desolate," or the "desolating transgression." On this basis we might suppose that this phrase is only a sort of synonym or descriptive title of the world power which has been already named as the one that interferes with the "continual mediation."

This phrase, "the transgression that makes desolate" (or "the transgression that causes appallment," Jewish translation), or the "appalling sin," has a long and involved history among theologians and commentators; but the textual study of the term is aside from our present purpose, and is not necessary for an understanding of its meaning. When stripped of complications and technicalities, a common-sense view of the matter tells us that it must be a term covering both the pagan and the papal systems of arrogant, false religion in conflict with the religion of God, because it is used here as applying to the entire length of time from the rise of this little horn down to the establishment of Christ's eternal kingdom. This expression, "the transgression that makes desolate," occurs several times and under slightly varying forms in the book of Daniel, and seems always to refer to Rome in some form. Jesus quoted it in His Olivet discourse (Matthew 24:15), and applied it to a power which at that time was still in the future; and this is another and first-class evidence that the kingdom or power referred to cannot mean Antiochus Epiphanes. The parallel record in Luke of this same discourse makes the expression refer to the Roman armies (Luke 21:20), which is additional evidence, if more were needed, to prove that these symbolic terms in Daniel must refer to Rome and Rome only. Since Christ spoke of this "abomination of desolation" as still future in His day, and since his language identifies it with imperial Rome, how can Antiochus Epiphanes come into the picture at all? Recently the "critics" have been gleefully announcing what they regard as a great discovery, namely, that this term, "abomination of desolation," or "the horror that appalls," is in reality a substitute for or a pun upon a name which the Jews did not want to use, somewhat after the style of the near profanity of modern times. This forbidden name was "Baal Samen," meaning "Baal of Heaven," or "Lord of Heaven;" and the "critics" draw the curious conclusion from all this that Daniel, by the term "abomination of desolation," must have been slyly referring to the altar or image of Zeus, the supreme god of the Greeks. We may admit the facts about the original similarity of the Hebrew term to the other one without, however, being obliged to admit their final conclusion.

It will be remembered that. God gave very explicit prohibitions against using the names of heathen deities: "Make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth." Exodus 23:13. In harmony with this prohibition, the psalmist declared that he would never take the names of heathen deities upon his lips. Psalm 16:4. Accordingly, we are not surprised to learn that the Hebrews very early in their history had substitute words which they used instead of these forbidden names of heathen deities, just as they also invented substitute terms for the ineffable name of their own Jehovah. Thus the term "shame" was frequently used in this manner by Old Testament prophets. Hosea 9:10; Jeremiah 3:24, etc. This custom of using substitute terms for names which were considered unfit to speak, might very easily have given rise to the terms here used in Daniel (with slight variations), and translated in the A.V.: "The abomination of desolation." Since the substitute term here used sounded like "Baal of Heaven," it is obvious that it was no novelty or a term recently invented in the time of the Maccabees. For the connection of the Hebrews with the heathen Baal of Phoenicia dates away back almost to the Exodus itself; it had become an old and well established acquaintance centuries before the Captivity. Hence it is ridiculous to try to make it a newly coined phrase of the time of persecution under Epiphanes. To give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot. Doubtless Daniel and every other Jew of his time would understand "the sanctuary" to mean the temple which had stood on Mount Moriah but was at

this time in ruins. “The host,” as here used, obviously means the people of God—the Jewish nation during its time, and since that time the Christian church. If you are Christ’s, then are you Abraham’s seed.” Galatians 3:29. Since, as we have already intimated and shall see more clearly in the sequel, this entire prophecy extends for many centuries past the final desolation of the earthly sanctuary and the rejection of the Jewish people, we are led to the conclusion that this question, “How long shall be the vision?” must refer chiefly, or in its later phases, to something which might be termed the treading “underfoot” of the “host,” or the people of God, during the Christian dispensation. The similar work of treading underfoot the sanctuary must also refer to some perversion or desecration of the priestly work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary during the same period. It is evident that here we have problems of no small difficulty. And the difficulties are increased when we learn that the answer to the question of “How long?” gives us only a numerical answer couched in terms connected with the Jewish sanctuary service, and seems to ignore entirely that part of the question dealing with “the host,” or the people of God. We must not forget that the question of “How long?” was twofold in its make-up, and should have a twofold answer. The first part of the question dealt with the sanctuary and the “continual mediation,” while the second part was about the “host.” In other words, since there are two distinct parts to the question, it seems only natural to expect two distinct answers.

Let us state the case this way. If the numerical answer (to be presently given) fits both the sanctuary and the host, all right and good. We might then regard the question as a combined one, requiring only one and the same answer for both. But if, as we shall see in the sequel, only the “sanctuary” is mentioned in the answer here given, we shall then have a right to conclude that the answer is divinely meant to be twofold, and that the part of the answer concerning “the host” is in reality postponed until some later date. Yet the answer here given deals only with one part of the question; it says that the matter of the treading underfoot of the sanctuary will be adjusted at the end of a specified period. It says absolutely nothing about “the host,” or when the people of God will be delivered or have justice done them. We have a right to conclude, therefore, that the answer to the second part of the question, or when the host will be delivered, is postponed until some later period, when an answer to it may also be expected. As a matter of fact, the answer to this part of the question seems to be held over until almost the close of the entire book of Daniel. In chapter 12:1 the angel tells the prophet: “At that time thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book.” The time here specified is the standing up or reigning of Michael, “the great Prince who stands for the children of thy people.” And this standing up or reigning means the time when He (Christ) takes the kingdom of the universe, an event which occurs in heaven immediately before His return the second time to this earth. A further statement on this subject will be found in the note on chapter 12:7: “When they have made an end of breaking in pieces the power of the holy people.” This postponement of a part of the answer to the question is very important for a correct understanding of the subject here under consideration. (1955, pp.80-83)

b. The Second Traditional Approach using the 70 weeks to prove the 2300 days

The second traditional approach derives its proof from Daniel 9. The flow of the argument followed these lines, with variations of course:

- a. How do we know that the 2300 days in Dn8 represents 2300 years?
- b. The evidence comes from Daniel 9. How?
- c. The 490 days have been fulfilled already in history as 490 years. The vital points that confirm this are:
 - i. The time taken to rebuild Jerusalem, said to be 49 days or 49 years;

- ii. The time until the “anointing of the Messiah” in 27 AD, which was 69 weeks, or 483 years, fulfilled to the year;
 - iii. The crucifixion or “cutting off” of the Messiah, in 486.5 days or years, not only exactly to the year, but also to the month, day and hour;
 - iv. The ending of the 490 days or years with the stoning of Stephen.
- d. Since this is undeniably true, and Dn 9 says that this time is cut off from another time period, it is obvious that it is referring to the vision of Dn8:14 when it says in Dn9:23, “consider the vision;”
 - e. Since the 70 weeks are *proved* to be 490 years, and since it is cut from the 2300 days, the 2300 days cannot represent 6.3 years.
 - f. Therefore the 2300 days represent 2300 years.

Here is a sample of this reasoning from the pioneer of the American Advent movement, William Miller:

.../p.46

What must we understand by days? In the prophecy of Daniel, it is invariably to be reckoned to be years...

.../p.47

Now turn your attention to the ninth chapter of Daniel, and you will there learn that fifteen years after Daniel had his last vision, and sixty-five years after Daniel explained Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and 538B.C., Daniel set his face unto the Lord God by supplication and prayer, and by confession of his own sins, and the sins of the people of Israel, he sought God for mercy, for himself and all Israel. And while he was speaking and praying as he tells us, Daniel ix.21, “Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in *the vision* at the beginning, Daniel viii.16,17, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplication the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter and consider *the vision*. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy people, and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up *the vision* and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he...

.../p.48

shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week, (or last half, as it might have been rendered,) he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abomination he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”

What do we learn from the above passage? We learn our duty in prayer, and God's goodness in answering. We learn that the angel Gabriel was sent to instruct Daniel and make him understand *the vision*. You may inquire what vision? I answer the one Daniel had in the beginning, for he has had no other. We also learn that seventy weeks, which is 490 days (or years, as we shall shew,) from the going forth of a certain decree, to build the streets and walls of Jerusalem in troublous times, to the crucifixion of the Messiah should be accomplished. We also learn that this seventy weeks being employed in building the streets and walls in troublous times, which is forty-nine years sixty-two weeks, or hundred and thirty-four years, to the preaching of John in the wilderness; which two put together makes sixty-nine weeks for four hundred and eighty three years and one week the gospel was preached; John three and a half years and Christ three and a half years, which makes the seventy weeks, or four-hundred and ninety years; which when accomplished, would seal up the vision and make the prophecy true. We also learn that after the crucifixion of Christ the Romans would come and destroy the city and the sanctuary, and that wars will not cease until the consummation or end of the world. All that may be true, says the objector; but where have you proved that the seventy weeks were four hundred and ninety years? I agree I have not proved it, but will now do it.

We shall again turn your attention to the bible. Look at Ezra, vii. 11-13, "Now this is the copy of the letter that the King Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, a scribe of the law of God: perfect peace, and at such a time, I make a decree that all they of the people of Israel and of his priests and Levites in my realm, which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee." This is the decree given when the walls of Jerusalem were built in troublous times. See also Nehemiah iv.17-23. Ezra and Nehemiah being contemporary, see Nehemiah viii.1. The decree to Ezra was given...

.../p.49

in the seventh year of Artaxerxes' reign, Ezra vii. 7, and that to Nehemiah in the twentieth year Neh. ii. 1 Let anyone examine the chronology as given by Robin or Josephus, from the seventh year of Artaxerxes to the twenty-second year of Tiberias Caesar, which was the year our Lord was crucified, and he will still find it was four hundred and ninety years. The bible chronology says that Ezra started to go up to Jerusalem on the 12th day of the first month, see Ezra viii.31, 457 years before the birth of Christ; he being 33 when he died; added up to 457, will make 490 years. Three of the evangelists tell us he was betrayed two days before the feast of the Passover, and of course was the same day crucified. The Passover was always kept on the 14th day of the first month forever, and Christ being crucified two days before, would make it on the 12th day, 490 years from the time Ezra left the river Ahava to go unto Jerusalem.

If this calculation is correct, and I think no one can doubt it, then the seventy weeks was fulfilled to day when our Saviour suffered on the cross. Is not the seventy weeks fairly proved to have been fulfilled by years? And does not this prove that our vision and the 2300 days ought to be so reckoned? Yes, if these seventy weeks are a part of *the vision*. Does not the angel say plainly, I have come to shew thee, therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision? Yes. Well, what can a man ask for more than plain positive testimony, and a cloud of circumstances agreeing with it? (Miller, 1836, pp46-49.)

The reader can see intertwined here the presence of both of these assumptions linked together to support each other.

1. That time periods in prophecy use a day for a year principle
2. That the year-day principle is operating in Daniel 9;
3. The seventy weeks are a part of the 2300 days;

Miller is representative of most of the apologists who would write on this topic after him. The logic was the same, although the style of presentation and some of the minor points varied. Some of the quirks in Miller's ideas also were dropped out by

his successors, such as his definition of the vision – that it was expressed in different ways (and in degree of completeness) on different occasions, but it was still *the* vision he saw on all occasions.

Here is another sample from James White on the matter taken from the *Review and Herald*, July, 1863:

Seventy weeks contain 490 days. But before proceeding to an application of this prophecy, a word may be necessary relative to the nature of the time here introduced: is it literal or symbolic?

1. It is a fact that 2300 literal days (but little over six years) would not cover the duration of a single power in this prophecy, much less extend over them all. Therefore, the days must be symbols, even as the beasts and horns are shown to be symbols.

2. It is a fact that a symbolic or prophetic day, is one year. Eze iv,5, 6; Num xiv.34. Hence the 2300 days denote 2300 years; and the seventy weeks, or 490 days, 490 years.

3. The fact that the seventy weeks as all admit, were fulfilled in 490 years, is a demonstration of this theory.

As can be readily seen by a quick comparison between the list of assumptions addressed by this paper and the assumptions implied in Miller's writings, one can see that the entire list is virtually used by Miller. The assumptions implicit in Miller's presentation include the following from the assumption list examined in this paper:

2. The meaning of "vision" in Dn8:13, where it asks "How long shall be the vision...?" refers specifically to vs 2-12 and not to vs 9-11.
3. The starting point for the 2300 days is not declared in Dn8.
4. The instruction of Gabriel to Daniel in ch8 is incomplete.
5. Daniel was sick before the instruction of Daniel was finished.
6. Daniel's statement in Dn8:27 that he didn't understand the mar'ê meant that he didn't understand the 2300 days .
7. Daniel's statement in Dn8:27 on the lack of the understanding is due to the fact that the information hadn't been given.
9. The time of the end began in 1798.
13. The command of Gabriel in Dn9:23 for Daniel to "understand the vision (mar'ê)" specifically meant the vision of Dn8:13,14.
14. The meaning of htk is best translated as "cut off".
15. The 70 week period is "cut off" from another prophetic period, namely the 2300 days of Dn8.
16. The 2300 days is a longer time period than the 70 weeks, and thus the latter period is "cut off" from the former period.
17. The 70 week period is "cut off" from the beginning of the 2300 days, and not any other section of that time period.
22. The same angel that explained the vision of Dn8 is the one who returns in Dn9, thus proving that Dn9 is a continuation of the explanation which was begun in Dn 8.

I do not intend to cover all these points in this paper, but it does illustrate the foundation upon which Miller argued and the plethora of assumptions used to arrive at the conclusions he made.

c. Contemporary Attempts

Having examined the two approaches traditionally used in Adventist interpretations of Dn8:13, I wish to consider contemporary contributions by Adventist scholars, G. Hasel and W. Shea who have advanced some technical arguments in support of the traditional position. As Hasel's material is easiest to address, I will examine that first.

(1). Hasel's Attempt to Explain the syntax of Dn8:13

Starting and Ending Points of the 2300 Evenings-Mornings

We return now to our earlier discussions of the phrase, "Until when will be the vision?" We emphasize again that the expression "until when" ('*ad-matay*') does not emphasize duration of time. Duration of time would be the focus of the question, "how long?" The question, "until when?" has its focus on the termination point of the time period indicated. This is contextually stressed in the answer, "until... then ('*ad...w*')" in verse 14. When the termination point has been reached, something related to the sanctuary shall take place.

When the end of a time period is stressed, the inevitable matter of its *beginning* comes to view. In other words, beginning and end belong together- and implicitly also what takes place during the vision. This raises some important questions. For example, Does the time period span the entire vision (the ram, he-goat, and "little horn" periods)? Or is the time span of the vision limited to only the "little horn" period? Fortunately, the text provides an answer to these questions.

It has been pointed out that the question itself (according to Hebrew syntax) comes to an end with the clause, "until when [shall be] the

.../p.434

vision?"³ Those who would limit the intent of the question to the period of the "little horn"⁴ are insensitive to the Hebrew of the book of Daniel (cf. 9:21;10:14) reveals that it is distinguished from the word *mar'eh*, a word which carries the meaning of "appearance" but, at times, is also translated as "vision."

The word *hazôn* ("vision") in verse 13 contextually refers to the vision of the ram, he-goat, and the "little horn" as its usages in verses 1-2 clearly indicate. The *mar'eh* ("appearance") more narrowly refers to the "appearance" of the heavenly beings who engage in conversation regarding the trampling of the sanctuary and its restoration (cf. 8:16, 26a-27).

The textual evidence of this technical vocabulary is pivotal for answering the question of the time span covered by the vision. In short, the time span covered by the *hazôn*-vision in the question of verse 13: "the continuance and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling." (It should be noted that the word "concerning," written in some translations like the KJV, and RSV is a supplied word which is not found in the Hebrew text). The syntax and pointing of the Hebrew text do not allow these expressions to be taken as an extended genitival construct chain (to be read as, "the vision of the continuance, etc."). Such a construct would naturally limit "the vision" (*hehazôn*) in verse 13 to the expressions following it in the sentence.

³ Montgomery, p.341

⁴ Charles, p. 210; H.C. Leupold *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, 1969), p. 351; Young, p.173; Hartman and Di Lella, p. 226.

Let us take a brief look at the syntax and what Hebrew grammar would require if the word “vision” were in a genitival construct relationship to

.../p.435

what follows. If the noun *hazôn* (“vision”) were in construct, (1) it would not have the definite article (however, the noun is written with a definite article as (“*the vision*”) were in construct, (1) it would not have the definite article (however, the noun is written with a definite article as “*the vision*” [hehazôn]). (2) it would have shown a reduction of the vowels (that is, the Masoretes who added the vowel points to the consonantal text would have pointed *hazôn* with a *Pathah* instead of a *Qamets*).

The fact that the consonantal text has the text has the definite article rules out a genitival construct relationship. As it stands in the Hebrew text, *hehazôn* (“the vision”) is in the absolute state. While it is possible for the *second* element in a construct arrangement to be a noun clause, the first substantive or noun in the chain must be in the construct state. Thus the syntax of verse 13b does not permit “the vision” to be regarded as part of a construct arrangement in that verse.

This leads to the suggestion (from the point of view of Hebrew syntax) that the question “until when?” has been omitted by ellipsis before the subsequent expressions in that verse. The intended thrust of the question may be understood as, “Until when the vision, [until when] the continuance causing horror, [until when] to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?”

However that may be, the description of verse 13 covers the entire vision of verses 3-12, indicating thereby, that the 2300 evenings (and) mornings cover the period all the way from the ram, and he-goat, through the activities of the “little horn,” to the end of time (vss.17,19).

Thus, it is clear beyond a shadow of doubt that the year-day principle is functioning in chapter 8. The 2300 evenings (and) mornings must cover the period of the events symbolized, beginning at some point during the ram period. An understanding of the 2300 evenings-mornings as literal days does not fit the context of the question. Thus the prophet demonstrated that this unusual expression – which has no article, no plural, and no conjunction – stands symbolically for “years.” The prophet himself provides the key to the year-day principle which functions on the basis of contextual, linguistic, philological, and syntactical relationships in 8:12-14.

This conclusion is of pivotal importance with respect to the entire meaning of chapter 8. If it is correct that the “vision” mentioned in verse

.../p.436

13 refers to the entire vision – first referred to in verses 1-2, described in verses 2-14, and referred to again in verse 15 – then chapter 8 can never conclude or terminate with Antiochus IV Epiphanes. This is because the time element goes far beyond this man’s own day. This recognition that the *hazôn*-vision covers the whole sweep of the total vision-experience (vss.2-14) – including the “appearance” (*mar’eh*) of verses 13,14, a smaller segment of the whole – rings a death knell to the Antiochus interpretation.

It is worth noting that the term *hazôn* (“vision”) both introduces (vss. 1-2) the “vision-audition” (vss. 2-14) and concludes it (v.15). Thus it functions as an “inclusio” device to encircle the whole of the “vision-audition” itself. This is an additional indicator that *hazôn* (“vision”) in verse 13 refers to the whole “vision-audition” sequence.

The *terminus a quo* (“starting point”) and the *terminus ad quem* (“concluding point”) of the time span of the 2300 “evenings-mornings” in terms of a particular year is not provided in chapter 8. Emphasis is placed primarily upon what takes place at the end of the time span and beyond in verses 13-14.

The clue to the time aspect is found in the action that takes place at the end-time. In other words, in chapter 8 the focus is placed upon the point of time at the end of the 2300 “evenings-mornings,” not the whole time span or its beginning. Accordingly, the expectation that the starting point of the entire time span is to be found elsewhere is sound. This expectation finds its contextual support in verse 26 where the angel interpreter comes to the time element of the 2300 “evenings-mornings,” but does not attempt at that point to explain the matter.

On pp.434 and 435 of Hasel’s 1986 paper (virtually identical to his 1981 paper p.199), he presents his argument as to why hehazôn (the vision) cannot be limited to the activities of the little horn, but rather must be applied to the whole vision in vs 3-12. His whole argument says in effect that hehazôn in v13 is not limited or narrowed in meaning by the grammatical force brought to bear on the word by the expressions which follow hehazôn (ie., “the continuance and the transgression causing horror”).

a. The construct chain argument.

His solitary evidence for this conclusion, which he spends an inordinate amount of time on, is that hehazôn is not in “an extended genitival construct chain.” (p.434) This is such an obvious point, even to the novice Hebräicist, that one is left asking the question why does he spend so much time on the obvious? Does he want to appear as though he is trying to grapple with the “difficult” issues while at the same time he is refusing to commit himself to debating other more vital questions in his paper that he has chosen not to raise? To the untrained mind they have no idea as to what other arguments there are on this topic. Shea dismisses the issue of a genitival construction in Dn8:13 in a terse two line comment:

They do not stand in an adjectival relationship, and the presence of a construct chain is ruled out by the use of the article with the last word of the opening clause and the first noun of the succeeding phrases (“how long *the* vision *the* daily....”) (1982, p.80)

b. Hasel’s failure to examine competing theories.

Two more failings of Hasel’s paper at this point are firstly, his implied assumption that having ruled out the possibility of an extended genitival construction being the syntactic nature of the question in Dn8:13, there are no other options needing to be ruled out. Therefore his only task is to propose his idiosyncratic and highly novel description of the construction. His second failing is his choice not to include in his 1986 paper, any discussion of Shea’s 1982 work, where the possibility of the structure of the question included apposition is promoted. Given Hasel’s avoidance of the topic in his former paper, it is not unusual that he displayed the same reluctance in his 1986 paper.⁵

Shea’s clear argument that the syntactic construction of the question in Dn8:13 is one of apposition is not even mentioned, let alone considered, even though four years elapsed between the printing of Shea’s book in 1982 and Hasel’s 1986 paper. To be candid though, Hasel need not have read Shea’s work to be aware of the appositional explanation of the syntax in the question of Dn8:13. The very references which Hasel had in his library and was intimately familiar with to be able to use them deftly in the crafting of his papers supported the same point as Shea. In the nineteenth

⁵ Perhaps we should assume here that like us, Hasel saw the hopelessness of Shea’s ideas and distanced himself from such a poor theory. The concept of Dn9:21 referring to Daniel 7 is totally beyond plausibility.

century, C.F. Keil, a German commentator quoted by Hasel in both his 1981 and his 1986 papers as well said:

The question [v13] condenses the contents of vers.10-12: “Till how long is the vision etc.?” hehazôn is not the action but the contents of the vision, the thing seen. The contents of the vision are arranged in the form of appositions: that which is continual and the desolating wickedness, for: the vision of that which is continual and of the desolation. The meaning of this apposition is more particularly defined by the further passage following asyndetos: to give up the sanctuary as well as the host to destruction. (1978, p.301)

In 1949, H.C. Leupold (also quoted by Hasel in both papers) said concerning the syntactic construction of Dn8:13:

To make his inquiry more specific the angel that asked the other angel adds several explanatory terms that are in apposition with the general term “vision.” By these terms he indicates what portion of the vision is causing him trouble. And we dare not forget that Daniel’s problem was exactly the same as the angel’s. These appositional terms we have introduced by the phrase that is customarily used in English in such instances – “that is to say.” Four things are in apposition to the word “vision.” They are: a) “the regular daily offerings,” b) “The crime causing horror,” c) the giving over of the sanctuary to be trodden underfoot,” and d) “the giving over of the host to be trodden underfoot.” These last two could naturally be combined into one, and there might be three items in place of four.

That these four coincide and occur simultaneously, or nearly so is apparent to the questioner. Therefore he practically wants to know how long the suffering of the saints and the humiliation of the sanctuary will last. (1949, p.351f)

These two quotes will suffice to illustrate the point that the description of the syntactic construction of Dn8:13 as one of apposition is an explanation that has been around for well over a century and a half, yet Hasel, ever so willing to roam the world for theoretical alternatives on other points in his paper has strangely overlooked this alternative, and on such a point which he sees as being so crucial – an alternative discussed by his colleague and one that repeatedly appears in the references he himself uses!! Notice that Hasel’s reference to Leupold’s writings is from the self-same page that I have just quoted which argues that the structure is one of apposition. Strange that he should overlook that and pretend that the concept of apposition has not been advanced to explain the structure of Dn8:13!! This is the clearest evidence that what we are reading in Hasel’s work is far from honest scholarship. Like so many other SDA publications, it is driven by the SDA mission – a conclusion desperate looking for some supporting argument.

After looking at the option of describing the syntax of the question in Dn8:13 as one of a genitival construct relationship, Hasel then proposes another option (presumably his own, due to the lack of any references):

This leads to the suggestion (from the viewpoint of Hebrew syntax) that the question “until when?” has been omitted by ellipsis before the subsequent expressions in the verse. The intended thrust of the question may be understood as, “Until when the vision, [until when] the continuance and the transgression causing horror, [until when] to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?” (Ibid, p.189)

No explanation is given as to why the viewpoint of the Hebrew syntax suggests this very awkward syntactic construction. No defence is offered for the suggestion. It is left at that. And we could just as easily discount it, since the Hebrew syntax does not suggest such an “intended thrust of the question.” It seems that Hasel himself does not want to support such a position as is indicated by his next statement –

“however that may be...” The rest of his sentence is so remarkable it needs some attention to grasp the significance of his point:

However that may be, the description of verse 13 covers the entire vision of verses 3-12, indicating thereby, that the 2300 evening (and) mornings cover the period all the way from the ram, and the he-goat, through the activities of the “little horn,” to the end of time (vs17,19). Thus it is clear, beyond a shadow of doubt that the year day principle is functioning in chapter8. (*Ibid*, p.435)

In effect Hasel is saying, “There is no genitival construct chain in v13, and the syntax of the question may be expressed in another way, but regardless of the construction of the question and whether my explanation of the syntax is right or wrong, the question covers the full vision of vs 3-12!!” Put differently, “Although the construction of the question is pivotal for determining whether the question is asking concerning vs9-12 or vs3-12, regardless of the construction of the question (“however that may be”), the question must refer to vs 3-12 and definitely not to vs9-12!!” Hasel has proposed an indefensible syntactic construction for the question of Dn8:13; he has not committed himself to supporting it, and yet he comes up with the assertive conclusion which is “clear beyond a shadow of doubt.”⁶

Commenting briefly on Hasel’s suggestion as to the construction of the question, the first two phrases could be accepted as orthodox grammar:

1. “Until when the vision?”
2. “[Until when] the continuance and the transgression causing horror?”

The third construction though, is agrammatical, that is to say, nonsense:

3. [Until when] to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?”

You could include the copula (the verb “to be”) in No.1 and 2 above and they would at least make sense:

1. “Until when [shall be] the vision.”
2. “[Until when] [shall be] the continuance and the transgression causing horror?”

But when it is added to No.3 you get the nonsensical:

- 3.”[Until when] [shall be] to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?”

There is no subject in this clause and that is crucial to give any sense to the infinitive “to make.” If Hasel were to say that the word “vision” is ellided here because that is really the subject of the third phrase, then he has defeated the whole point of his exercise, because that would align the word “vision” to “the trampling of the sanctuary” rather than the whole vision of vs2-12; a position that would support my argument.

A further complication Hasel faces with this construction of the question is that he has the one answer of v14 addressing three separate questions. He takes the answer of v14 as only applying to the first of the three questions. Someone else might just as rightfully apply the answer to the second question and not to

⁶ I have read this type of hollow rhetoric somewhere else. Cf. Shea 1981.p. 238 “The attendant who came to Daniel’s aid in that case (ie., Dn7:16), although he is not named there, must have been Gabriel, according to this reference to him in 9:21.” This is the pivot of Shea’s theory and it is based on a hollow “must.” It seems to occur in “pivotal” areas.

either the second or the third. Then again, another person might say that the answer of v14 applies to question one and two but not to question three etc.

There is no guide to indicate that the 2300 days need to be applied only to the first question. If anything, the common subject of the “sanctuary” in both question three and the answer in v14 argues strongly in favour of applying the 2300 days not to the “vision,” nor to the “continuance and the transgression causing horror,” but to “making of both the sanctuary and the host a trampling!”

Furthermore, if as Hasel suggests, the 2300 days applies only to the first phrase, does the man Gabriel leave unanswered the other sections? SDAs assert that everything in the vision was explained by the end of the chapter except the starting point of the 2300 days. So where is the explanation regarding the cessation of the daily sacrifice and the institution of a transgression causing horror? When will it begin? How long will it continue? Certainly there is no explanation in Dn8! Shea clearly admits that this item was explained in Dn12:12 with the 1290 day period being revealed:

In other words, the holy one did not inquire how long would the little horn take away the *tamîd*, etc.; instead he inquired as to how long a period of time would be covered by the vision including this subject. The lesser period involved here is referred to in more chronological detail in Dan12:12, where it is stated that the time of the taking away of the *tamîd*, etc., would be 1290 days. (1981, p.250)

What? Is the assertion that all has been explained except the starting point for the 2300 days incorrect? Additionally, if the answer applies only to the first one of Hasel’s phrases- the “vision,” then there really is no answer to the third item – the phrase “to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?” But apart from these considerations, Hasel’s attempted explanation of the syntactic construction is without any ground for support and is best left floundering where he left it – without any defence or argument!

Other contemporary SDA historicist writers who use the same argument as Hasel are Pfandl and Rodríguez:

Having observed the activities of the little horn, Daniel then hears two heavenly beings speaking with each other. One asks the other, “How long will the vision be, concerning the daily sacrifices and the host to be trampled underfoot?” And the other being replies, “For two thousand three hundred days, then the sanctuary shall be cleansed” (Dan. 8:13, 14). Some have made the mistake of limiting the question and answer to the activities of the little horn. They interpret the time period of 2300 days as referring only to the devastation caused by the little-horn power. But the question applies to the whole vision, which began in the time of the Persians, symbolized by the ram at its beginning (verse 3). Literally the question begins with the words “Until when the vision?” Although the question lists some of the terrible activities of the little horn, things that obviously shocked the prophet, “*the question is not about how long the little horn is going to profane the sanctuary but about when the content of the whole vision will be fulfilled.*” The answer indicates that the fulfillment of the *whole* vision will take 2300 day/years. At the end of this period the little horn’s usurpation of the priestly work of the Messiah will come to an end through the eschatological day of atonement.” [Inserts footnote: “A. Rodríguez, *Future Glory*, p.54”] (Pfandl, 2004b, pp.87f)

(2). Shea’s Attempt to explain the syntax of Dn8:13

Leaving Hasel’s efforts in this regard, we turn to Shea’s attempts and consider his contribution. In the opinion of this author, Shea’s material on this

matter is far superior to Hasel's presentation, even though I do not agree with Shea's conclusions. Shea has presented a description of Dn8:13's syntax:

The first clause of the compound question is, "how long is the vision?" The question is then qualified by four more phrases which relate to the work of the little horn. These involve: (1) the tamîd or "daily/continual," (2) the transgression that makes desolate, (3) the trampling of the sanctuary, and (4) the trampling of the host.

The syntax of the question is somewhat unusual in that there is no direct grammatical link between the opening clause and the four succeeding phrases. There is no verb, preposition, or object marker between them. They do not stand in an adverbial relationship, and the presence of a construct chain here is ruled out by the use of the article with the last word of the opening clause and the first noun of the succeeding phrases ("how long the vision the daily....").

By process of elimination the syntactical relationship present here should be interpreted here as one of apposition. That gives the question the significance of, "How long is the vision, that is, the vision in which the four following works of the little horn are seen?"

It is important to decide just what vision is referred to in the initial clause of this question, since it is the length of that vision which is measured off by the time period given in the answer to this question in Dan8:14. There are two alternatives here: Either the vision in question is the whole vision that the prophet has seen up to that point (vs3-12), or it is only that portion of the vision which has to do with the little horn (vs9-12).

The interpretation adopted here is that the word "vision" in the question of v13 refers to the entire vision seen by the prophet up to that point, the vision that is described in the text from v3 through v12. (1982, p.80)

Thus far Shea has done well. He has closely examined the syntax, eliminating unsatisfactory options. In the three pages following this statement, Shea offers five arguments in support of the interpretation adopted by him. They include the following:

- 1) The Reversal of Items in the Question of Dn8:13 to the order that they appear in the vision infers that the question is referring to the whole vision;
- 2) If the word "Vision" in v13 refers to vs9-12, then Daniel saw 2 Visions in Dn8;
- 3) The meaning of *hazôn* and *mar'e* **within** Daniel 8 supports the view that "vision" in Dn8:13 means vs 3-12;
- 4) The meaning of *hazôn* and *mar'e* **without** Daniel 8 supports the view that "vision" in Dn8:13 means vs 3-12;
- 5) The Comparative Difference between Dn8:13 and Dn12:11 indicates that the word "vision" in Dn8:13 is for a period longer than the 1290 days of Dn12:11 and so it must refer to the 2300 days;

It is in the detail of these supporting arguments that he loses his way.

a. 1st Reason- The Reversal of Items in the Question Infers the Whole Vision.

Looking at his first reason, he says the following:

The elements in the question are recited in an order that is the reverse of what is found in the preceding description. The order in Dn8:13 is: (1) tamîd + description, (2) sanctuary, and (3) host. In the description of the vision in vs10-12 the order is: (1) host, (2) sanctuary, and (3) tamîd + desolation. The reverse order of these elements cited in the question leads naturally

back into those elements of the vision which were not explicitly cited in the question, and in its present position the word for vision becomes a summary for all of them. (1982, p.80)

Assuming for now that the question does indeed reverse the order in which the elements of the question are found in the description of the vision (vs9-12), it is far from clear why “the reverse order of these elements cited in the question leads naturally back into those elements of the vision which were not explicitly cited in the question.” (ibid) Why would the reverse itemisation of three details mean that the “natural” intention of this reverse itemisation is to imply everything else that occurs before it?

This argument can be expressed conversely: a listing of three items in correct order would “naturally” imply that everything which occurs after those items are being referred to as well. So if I have a list of 10 people and I quote the name of the 5th, 6th and 7th person in the list in reverse order, that would “naturally” mean that I was also referring to the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th person as well as the 5th, 6th and 7th person. And conversely if I listed the 5th, 6th and 7th person in that order, I would be “naturally” referring to the 8th, 9th and 10th persons as well! Does anyone see the logic of this argument? His argument defeats the whole grammatical value of using words to single out items from a group of items. In effect everything in the group can, according to this “natural” principle of Shea’s, refer to just about everything else, depending upon whether you cite them in reverse or forward order!! Thus the grammatical purpose of itemising is futile.

It is quite clear that the only evidence that Shea can proffer in support of his argument is the hollow assumption that it is “natural.” He has cited no examples where this is the case. It is assumed, “naturally!”

The reverse order of these elements cited in the question does not naturally lead “back into those elements which were not explicitly cited in the question,” and he still has to prove that “the word for vision in v.13 becomes a summary for all of them.” The “reverse” order for those elements starts and finishes with activities involving the horn power of vs9-12. If one of those elements cited in the question went back into the activities or the ram, or the four horns that came out of the goat, then Shea may have had something to argue. But the limits of the items listed in Dn8:13 are clearly defined as being activities of the little horn and these form an unambiguous parenthesis around the details being sought in the question of vs13, thus giving clear indication that the apposition is delimiting the word “vision” to those activities described in vs9-12.

If the questioner wanted to say, “How long is the vision?” and mean vs3-12, he did not need to add an apposition. There is no ambiguity in the question “How long is the vision?” The answer to that question would clearly be referring to vs3-12. It is because he wanted to say something different than just “How long is the vision?” that the apposition is added. It is because he wanted to refer specifically to the elements cited in the apposition that he qualified the word “vision” with a list of activities about which he wanted more information. Thus it is not that the meaning of the word “vision” is changed, it is just that it is in a grammatical context which restricts its meaning to those aspects of the vision which are referred to by the elements cited in the apposition. SDA historicists are trying as hard as they can to make the question of v.13 say just, “How long is the vision?” by any means possible.

The relationship of the “reversal” of the order of the elements cited in the question compared to the description in the vision may be expressed in a tabular form familiar to Shea. Here I list Dn8:9-12 in the first column with the elements in the question that appears in the answer of v14 in **bold type** ; and in the second column I have listed them and classified them A..B..C..D.. according to the order that they first appear in the vision. In the text for verse 12, the order they appear is given the classification A1..B1..C1..D1.. to try and differentiate between the item in the vision and the corresponding item in the question. In the case of the daily sacrifice and the host which are mentioned twice in the vision, I give them the classification they received with their first appearance.

Dn8:9-11	Item in Dn8:13
9 And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.	
10 And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.	The host The stars
11 Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host , and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down	The prince of the host The daily Sacrifice The Sanctuary
12 And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression , and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered	The host Daily (sacrifice) D. Transgression
13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice , and the transgression of desolation , to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot	B1: Daily Sacrifice D1: Transgression of desolation C1: Sanctuary: A1: The Host

The Vision (vs10-12)

- A. Host of Heaven trampled down (v10)
 - a. Including the prince of the Host (v11)
- B. Daily (Sacrifice) Taken Away (v11)
- C. Sanctuary Cast Down (v11)
- D. Transgression caused against the Daily (v12)

The Question (v13)

B1: The Daily (Sacrifice)

D1: Transgression causing Desolation

C1: Sanctuary trampled underfoot

A1 Host trampled underfoot

Since v12 mentions both the transgression, the host and the daily I have included D with subparts from A and B, and similarly in “The Question” section the daily refers back to both B and D, and the Host refers back to A and D.

It becomes apparent very quickly by a glance over the order in which the items in the vision and the question occur that any hint of a reversal order of the items in the question when compared to the vision is a mere figment of a hopeful imagination. In doing a comparative lineal sequence we get the following sequence:

<u>Vision:</u>	A	B	C	D
<u>Question:</u>	B	D	C	A

As can be clearly seen, Shea must have been enjoying a good red while he was penning this idea!! There is no reversal of sequence at all.

It is interesting to note in one part of p.80 in Shea’s work (1982), he lists the items under consideration as being four: “These involve: (1) the tamid or “daily/continual,” (2) the transgression that makes desolate, (3) the trampling of the sanctuary, and (4) the trampling of the host.” On the very same page he then lists the items as three: “The order in Dan8:13 is: (1) tamid + desolation, (2) sanctuary, and (3) host. In the description of the vision in vs10-12 the order is: (1) host, (2) sanctuary, and (3) tamid + desolation.” (1982)

Now the question must be raised why Shea would want to change his story about how many elements there are in the question twice on the same page? Does the concept of reversal of items fit if we only choose three items: tamid + desolation, sanctuary, and host?

The sequence in which they occur in the text as shown in the table above are as follows:

Vision of verses 9-12:

A. Host v.10

B. Tamid (“Daily”)v.11

C. Sanctuary v.11

A. Host v.12

B. Tamid (“Daily”)+ Transgression v.12

Question of verse 13:

B. Tamid (“Daily”)+Transgression of Desolation v.13a;

C. Sanctuary v.13b;

A. Host v13c.

So we have:

Vision:	A	B	C	A	B
---------	---	---	---	---	---

Question: B C A

We asked the question whether the concept of reversal of items would fit if we only choose three items: tamîd + desolation, sanctuary, and host. We can now answer that it does not. Do we find the reversal sequence: host, sanctuary and tamîd + desolation starting from the end of the vision in v12 and looking back through to the beginning of v10? The last item of the question is tamîd + desolation; the penultimate item could be either “host” (12) or “sanctuary” (v11); the next item would be “tamîd”; and the previous item to that would be the “host of heaven” (comprising both the “prince of the host” and “the stars”). Even if we ignore “the host” in v12, we still have the tamîd in v11 upsetting Shea’s schema. The conclusion can only be that his “reversal” is contrived and is incorrect. The order of details cannot be reversed in the way he wants them.

If we chose four items as the count in the question at v13: “tamîd,” “transgression + desolation,” “sanctuary” and “host,” the same conclusion is reached: they are not a “reversal” of the items in vs9-12. The reversal of those items are: “tamîd + desolation,” “host,” “sanctuary,” “tamîd,” “host.” Shea would not like the occurrence of “host” in v12 nor the occurrence of “tamîd” in v11 because it upsets his theory. But the occurrence of two out of five words (or one out of three in his three-item schema) that do not fit the scheme are large enough to dismiss his theory. And that is without asking the question why he wanted to choose three items rather than the four that actually appear in the question, a fact that he acknowledges on the same page.

A point worth noting is that Shea combines not the “host” and the “sanctuary” as does v13 into one element (cf. [Leupold, 1949](#), p.352), but strangely the tamîd and the desolation. Yet even the combination of these two do not yield a “reversal” of items. But even the combination of both the tamîd and the desolation into one element cannot be justified according to the text. Their first occurrence doesn’t even occur in the same verse in the vision. Tamîd occurs first in v11 without “desolation” and it is only when the reason for the “giving” of the “host” to be cast down that the mention of desolation with tamîd occurs on its second occurrence.

The question needs to be asked concerning the comparative order in which the question is asked when compared to the order of the items as they appeared in the vision. The most noticeable aspect of the question in v13 is that the inquiry is asked in two sets of couplets. The inquiring holy one has taken the second last couplet of the vision “against the *daily* (sacrifice) by reason of *transgression*”(v12) and asked concerning that. He then asks concerning the couplet before that: “the place of his *sanctuary* was cast down and a *host* was given him...” (vs11,12)

By looking at the couplets of items in the question of v13 and the substantives involved, we ask whether there is a clear reversal of order, but the answer must be that there is not. In the table below there is laid out the order of the items in the couplets in the way they appear in vs11-13.

Dn 8:11-13	Couplet Item
11 Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host , and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down	2 nd Couplet: The host (and its prince) 1 st Couplet: The Daily sacrifice

Dn 8:11-13	Couplet Item
	2 nd Couplet: a. The Sanctuary
12 And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression , and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered	2 nd Couplet: b. The host 1 st Couplet: a. Daily (sacrifice) 1 st Couplet: b. Transgression
13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice , and the transgression of desolation , to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot	1 st Couplet: a. Daily sacrifice 1 st Couplet: b. Transgression of desolation 2 nd Couplet: a. Sanctuary: 2 nd Couplet: b. The Host

Representing the answer in a lineal sequence we have the following items by couplet:

Question of verse 13:	1	1	2	2		
Detail in vs11-12	2	1	2	2	1	1

The detail in vs11-12 included “the prince of the host” and I have included this as a part of the first couplet, since this prince is associated here with “the host” – an item in the first couplet. Thus the items are not in the same sequence in the question of v13 as they are in the vision nor are they in reverse sequence, and the *couplets* that occur in the question *are also not* in reverse order when compared to the vision. Therefore, the assumption that a reversal of the couplets “naturally” implies a lead back into all the other phrases and substantives used in the vision, is thereby dismissed. Additionally, the very fact that the holy one never asked concerning the casting of the truth to the ground (v12) as well as the practising and prospering of the horn (v12) shows clearly that it was a very selective group of items that were chosen for further clarification.

Before I leave this, I wish to address a statement made by Shea in 1980, which has a bearing on one of my rejoinders to Shea’s 1982 material. He says:

This vision is identified in the question with a reference to several works performed by the little horn but this does not provide grounds for attributing the period of this “vision” to that of the little horn only for several reasons. In the first place, even for the little horn there are other aspects of its works that are omitted from the question. In the second place, the designation for the vision was changed again by the end of the chapter where it was called the “vision of the evening and the morning.” Just as this does not limit the contents of the vision to v14, which is the only place where the evenings and mornings are referred to, just so references to the activities of the little horn do not restrict the period of the “vision” to its time only to the exclusion of those of the Persian ram and the Grecian goat. (1980, p.336)

Shea is saying in the above quote:

- (1) v9-11 identifies several but not all the works of the little horn;
- (2) This is no evidence for saying that the mention of the vision in v13 applies only to vs9-11;

- (3) How can that be proved?
- (4) Here is the proof: the designation for the vision changes again in v26 to call it the “vision of the evening and the morning;”
- (5) This title in v26 is not limited to just v14 of the vision but could refer to more of the vision (i.e., presumably vs3-14);
- (6) Just so, references to the activities of the little horn does not mean that only the activities of the little horn are implied (on the contrary it could presumably imply the activities in the whole vision).

This statement appeared in one of many papers that was used at a SDA conference, at Glacier View Ranch, Colorado, USA to judge the position of Dr Desmond Ford, an SDA lecturer. Interestingly, these statements do not appear again in print, even though Shea wrote extensively on this topic after 1980. Perhaps they are expedient enough to judge a “deviant,” but not true enough to be committed to book form!! The statement quoted above flies in the face of every endeavour Shea attempts to argue that mar’ê and hazôn have discrete meanings.

What is laughable in this statement is that he is saying that the mar’ê of the evening and the morning (v26) is not limited to v14 but could refer back to other parts of the hazôn. Thus he is saying that v26 is evidence to show that the word mar’ê is being used to refer to the hazôn!! For him to support the argument he has just stated, in the above quote, he would, in effect, be saying that mar’ê and hazôn are synonymous, since the mar’ê in v26 refers to vs13,14 and can also refer to more in the hazôn of vs3-12. One can understand why this line of argument is not taken up again by Shea in his publications. There is enough embarrassment in them already without these other glitches!! These types of arguments are only useful when there is a headhunt in progress. Talk about scholarship on the run!!

But looking past Shea’s position on mar’ê and hazôn and assuming that mar’ê and hazôn may have overlap in meaning, what is the value of the argument Shea has raised? Is it a valid objection? His first point is that the question doesn’t even list all the aspects of the little horn’s work. Thus, it is evident that elision is present in the question, and this elision could include the works of the Persian ram and the Grecian goat as well.

This point highlights some important details to consider. The horn’s activities that are mentioned in the question are only those that he performs in the “pleasant land.” The term “pleasant land” refers “esp. of Jerusalem and the temple” (Brown, Driver & Briggs, 1983, p.840a). The SDA Bible Commentary says: “either Jerusalem or the land of Palestine is here referred to” (Nichol, 1976, p.842a). Thus only those activities that are directed against the people of God (from a Jewish view of God) are referred to in the question. The only details which are omitted in the question are the following:

- A. The stars cast down. V.10
- B. The little horn magnified even up to the host’s prince. v.11
- C. He cast the truth to the ground and practised and prospered. v12

Yet even here items A and B can be seen included under the general term “host” in v13; and item C can be seen in the verbal adjective (shômêm) “desolating” in the question. Thus the question is not focusing on all of the horn’s activities but

only on those that directly involve God's land, His people, His temple, His worship and His truth. This selective focus doesn't mean that the enquirer wanted to know about all the activities of the little horn. The selective nature of the items referred to in the question quite clearly and unambiguously indicate that the question is focusing only on the horn's activity in the "pleasant land," that is, vs9-12.

Contrary to Shea's suggestion, this does not give any licence to include vs3-9a in the intention of the question, and thus to the scope of the answer. Rather, the answer in v14 only addresses one aspect of v11: "the place of his sanctuary was cast down." The reasons for this need to be addressed in length elsewhere. Suffice it to say here that in the restoration of the sanctuary to its pre-invasion privileges is encapsulated the restoration of those other aspects of the "pleasant land" which were affected by the work of the horn power.

Shea's second reason for not "attributing the period of the 'vision' to that of the little horn only," is that the title for vs3-12 was changed from that given in v13 to the "vision of the evening and the morning," (v26) thus indicating that since this reference (v26) is not limited to v14 but rather to vs 3-14 presumably, so the title in v13 doesn't refer only to vs9-12 (or vs10-12) but rather to vs3-12. Apart from the dilemma of definitions that he has thrown himself into, Shea gives evidence here of hasty thinking and expedient scholarship.

The title "vision of the evening and the morning" is not a different title than that given by the enquirer in v13. The very fact that the answer in v14 addressed the vision in the question by only referring to evenings-mornings of the sanctuary's desolation gives the lead to Daniel that the four items in the apposition in vs13 can be summarised in the evenings-mornings of sanctuary desolation referred to in v14. Thus the term "vision of the evening and the morning" is synonymous with the "vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot." This in turn refers to the activities of the horn power which he perpetrated in the "glorious land" of the "host of heaven," i.e., Palestine.

These then constitute my arguments against Shea's first point being examined: that the sequence of the items in the question of v13 are a reversal of the items in vs10-12 and "naturally" refer back to the whole vision. As has been shown, there is no validity in his position whatsoever.

b. 2nd Reason – If Vision in v13 is vs9-12, then there are 2 Visions in Dn8

Turning now to his second reason, Shea says the following:

If one applies the word "vision" in Dn8:13 only to the activities of the little horn described beginning with v9, then one really has two visions: one about the ram, the goat and the four horns, and another vision about the little horn. Since no demarcators to support such a division appear in the middle of this vision's description, and since the vision is described in continuous fashion from vs3-12, there are no grounds in the text for making such an arbitrary division. (1982,p.81)

As will become plain shortly this is such a poor statement by Shea, he really does himself an injustice in making that statement. In essence he is saying that because no "markers" such as "and I saw another vision, and behold..." occur between vs8 and 9, but rather the whole description of the vision recorded in vs3-12 is written as one block of material, there is really no way that one could say that the word "vision" could apply to vs9-12 alone, because then there would be more than

one “vision” in ch 8. Before addressing this we should look at additional comments on this topic from his unpublished 1980 paper, as it highlights his argument clearly:

In the third place, the visual unity of this vision is far more emphatic in the form that it was recorded than, for example, the vision of chapter 7 was. There are nine different places in the record of the vision in chapter seven that the prophet employs terminology which imply some kind of change in the prophet’s view. Phrases which mention that “as I looked...,” etc. appear there in vs. 4,6,7,8,9,11(2x), and 13. By way of contrast only three such references appear in the record of the vision of chapter 8 (vs.4,5,7) after the opening reference to the commencement of the vision in verse 3. These are not as specific in transitional terminology as those used in Dan 7, and none of them appear after the description of the clash of the ram with the goat (v7). Even if one were going to use the “I saw” in verse 7 to make a distinction between the two visions here in terms of the prophet’s technical terminology, therefore the latter vision would still have to include the time back to this clash i.e., in 331 B.C. historically. The unified nature of the description of this scene that passed before the prophet makes it difficult to divide it up into halves or parts and thus the word vision in the question of verse 13 should be taken as referring to the whole vision back to the beginning, to the Persian ram. (1980, p.336f)

Shea has missed the argument of those who argue that the apposition of Dn8:13 constrains the meaning of “vision” to include only vs9-12. The point they (and I) emphasise is that the vision is indeed a unity, and that there are no markers to indicate that vs3-8 is one vision and that vs9-12 is another vision. It is *because* the vision *is* a unit that the enquiring holy one cannot just ask “How long is this vision?” In order to give the other holy one as well as his one-man audience a clear understanding of what the enquiring holy one wishes to have clarified, he uses the only “markers” available for him to use as identifying cues. These details are not phrases such as “and I saw...” as Shea so naively discusses, but rather the markers are the details of the actual vision itself: the daily, the desolating transgression, the host and the sanctuary.

It is the apposition that provides the “markers” for the constricted meaning of “vision” as referring only to vs9-12 (or vs10-12) and not some phrase in the actual description itself. The argument supporting the scope of “vision” in Dn8:13 as only vs9-12 is thus not creating some arbitrary division, but rather is guided by the explicit markers given by the apposition in v13.

It is unfortunate that Shea has not been able to see this and do his best to provide rebuttals that address the issue where the issue really lies.

Imagine, for example, I were to describe a street parade of entrants in a sporting event, and I described in my narrative as they went the parade by, a basketball team, a football team, an athletic team and a swimming team. The parade as a whole is a unit, but within the parade, there are certain sections, different from the others. But to ask the question, “How many were the paraders, the footballers and the basketballers?” If I were to take the first part of the question, “how many were the paraders,” I would have to give an answer including a total of all paraders. Just so, if the question in Dn8:13 was, “How long the vision?” the answer would encompass the entire vision. But the question I asked, did not ask just for the total of the paraders. It asked for the total of the paraders for the footballers and the basketballers. That is an entirely different question. The correct answer must limit itself to those sporting persons, rather than to the whole group of sportspersons. Just so for Dn8:13. The scope of the meaning of “vision” has been limited to those aspects of the vision that deal with the events appositioned in the question; i.e., the vision of vs9-12.

c. 3rd and 4th Reason- The Meaning of hazôn and mar’e *within* (3rd) and *without*

(4th) Daniel 8

Turning now to Shea's third and fourth reasons why the question in v13 must refer to vs3-12 and not vs9-12, the third argument looks at the meaning of those words within Dn8, whereas in his fourth reason, he looks at the meaning of these words outside Dn8. His conclusion is that:

...all six of the occurrences of this word [hazôn] in Dan 8 and all five of the occurrences outside of that chapter support interpreting it in 8:13 in an inclusive manner that takes in the whole of the preceding vision of 8:3-12. (1982, p.82)

The following extract presents his third and fourth reasons:

C. The use of the word "vision" (hazôn) elsewhere in Dan8 supports the idea that this occurrence in v13 refers to the whole vision of v3-12. This word occurs three times in the introduction of this vision in vs1-2. It is obvious in all three instances that it refers to the whole vision that was seen thereafter. This word occurs next in v13; and in conjunction with the three opening occurrences, its location there forms an inclusion around the body of the vision proper. The prophet then reacted to the scenes that had passed before him by stating, "When I, Daniel, had seen the vision, I sought to understand it"(v15). The whole vision appears to be in view here since, in response to Daniel's search for understanding, Gabriel's explanation began with the Persian ram (v20). In his further references to understanding the vision (v17) and sealing it up (v26) Gabriel also appears to be referring to the whole vision of vs3-12.

The word "vision" or hazôn occurs seven times in Dan 8: three times before the question of v13 (vs1-2) and three times after it (vs15, 17, 26). In all six of these occurrences the reference seems most likely to be to the whole vision of vs3-12. Since that is the case with all the other occurrences of this word in this narrative, that is the way it should also be interpreted in the question of v13.

This point is further emphasized by the use of the article with hazôn in the question (the vision). The article is also prefixed to the last three occurrences of the word in this chapter, in vs15, 17, and 26, and it has been pointed with the prepositions in v2. It is "the" (whole) vision that is in view here, not just a part of the vision.

Elsewhere I have discussed the use of *mar'eh*, another word also translated "vision" in Dan8:16,26,27. [Shea footnotes here: Arnold Wallenkampf, W. Richard Leshner, eds., "The Relationship Between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9," *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, (Washington, 1981), pp.235-239.]

My conclusion from that discussion is that the word *mar'eh* meant something like "appearance," that is, the appearance of the angel messenger, or the appearance and conversation of holy personages; whereas hazôn is used particularly for the symbolic vision which the prophet viewed. This distinction is especially important in establishing the link between the prophecies of Dan 8 and 9 on the basis of the use of *mar'eh* in Dan 9:23.

Whatever the shade of meaning of the word *mar'eh*, it does not materially affect the interpretation of hazôn in Dan 8, where that term is applied to the whole of what the prophet saw as described in vs3-12.

.../p.82

This use of the word for vision may also be compared with its use outside of Dan 8. In two passages in the Hebrew sections of Daniel it occurs as a broadly inclusive collective for prophetic experiences: once in Daniel's case (1:17), and once in the case of later prophets (9:24). In three other instances it refers back to visions previously seen by Daniel: the occurrence in 9:21 refers back to the vision of ch 7 while the occurrences in 10:14 and 11:14 probably refer back to the vision of ch 8. All five of the occurrences of this word in the Hebrew of Daniel outside of ch 8 are also inclusive with regard to the vision or visions to

which they refer. None of them provides any support for interpreting this word in 8:13 in such a way as to fractionate the preceding vision of 8:3-12 and apply it only to vs9-12.

Thus all six of the occurrences of this word in Dan 8 and all five of its occurrences outside of that chapter support interpreting it in 8:13 in an inclusive manner that takes in the whole of the preceding vision of 8:3-12. (1982, p.81f)

In summary, his argument for the use of hazôn *within* of Dn8 runs thus:

- A. The 3 occurrences of hazôn in the beginning refer to the vision as a whole;
- B. The next occurrence in v13 refers back to the vision, therefore the vision had finished by then;
- C. The occurrence in v15 refers to the whole vision probably vs3-12;
- D. The other occurrences in v17 and v26 also probably refer to vs 3-12 as well.
- E. In vs 2, 13, 15, 17 and 26 the definite article occurs with hazôn sometimes with a preposition as well. This means that it refers to the whole vision, not a part of it.

His argument for the use of hazôn *outside* of Dn8 runs thus:

- A. The word is used twice (1:17 and 9:24) to refer to prophetic experiences generally;
- B. In three other instances (9:21; 10:14 and 11:14) they refer to visions previously seen by Daniel;
- C. In all of these instances they refer to visions generally and not to parts of a vision;
- D. Thus usage of hazôn outside Dn8 support the point that it is never used to refer to a part of a vision.

Without covering all the same material covered above when dealing with Shea's arguments. I would like to highlight the shortcomings of Shea's reasoning with regard to these points.

Firstly, it is *not* obvious that the first occurrences of hazôn in vs1-2 "refer to the whole vision that was seen thereafter," (p.81) that is "the whole vision of vs3-12 (ibid). It is only by inference that these occurrences can be defined as referring to vs 3-12. And this erroneous inference in turn can only be made by ignoring the implications of hazôn in Dn9:21. Dn9:21 refers to Dn8:15-26 as a hazôn, a point supported by Hasel and a cloud of other commentators, contrary to Shea. Thus Dn8:3-26 is one continuous hazôn, since Dn8:15 refers to vs3-14 as a hazôn (a point acknowledged by Shea (cf. 1981, p.235)), and Dn9:21 refers to Dn8:15-26 as a hazôn.

Thus the three first occurrences of hazôn in Dn8:1,2,2 can be equally seen to refer to vs3-26, not just vs3-12. (It is quite probable that hazôn in Dn9:21 refers also not just to vs15-26, but to the whole hazôn experienced, that is, vs3-26.)

Shea's argument regarding the occurrence of hazôn in v13 and 15 can be turned on its head and support what Shea denies. Given that Dn9:21 defines vs15-26 as a hazôn and that Dn8:15,17 defines vs3-14 as a hazôn, then either there are two hazôns that Daniel saw that year and are recorded in Dn 8, or Daniel saw only one.

The scriptural record says that Daniel only saw one (v1,2). Was it vs 3-14 or was it vs15-26? Or was it vs3-26? If one says it was only vs3-14, then it needs to be proved that Dn9:21 doesn't refer to Dn8:15-26 (which Shea has so dismally attempted to do and failed). If one says it was only vs15-26, then somehow vs3-14 needs to be discounted as a hazôn, an impossibility considering vs13,15,17. The only reasonable conclusion is that the hazôn which Daniel saw that year was vs3-26.

Thus if vs1,2,2, refer to vs3-26, then hazôn (as in the case of vs13,15,17) can refer to a part of a bigger hazôn. That is to say, the same word can be used for both the whole visionary experience (i.e., vs3-26) or a part of that visionary experience (i.e., vs3-14, vs15-26 or even vs9-12!) Thus by applying hazôn to vs3-12, Shea is thereby supporting the argument that hazôn can refer to both the whole or a part of a vision (hazôn).

A further corollary of this argument is that since Dn8:1,2 clearly uses hazôn to refer to the whole vision (vs3-26) or in vs15,17 to only a part of it (vs3-12), the use of hazôn in v13 in referring only to a part of a vision – that part defined by the apposition – is not a usage which is foreign to the book of Daniel.

Another point raised by Shea is “the use of the article with hazôn in the question (the vision).... It is the whole vision that is in view here, not just a part of the vision.” (p.81) As I have said before, if there was no apposition following “the vision,” then I would have no argument, since the word “vision” in v13 would clearly refer to vs3-12. but the apposition in v13 qualifies the definite article which occurs before hazôn, thus restricting “the vision” to “the vision in which the four following works of the little horn are seen” – that is vs9-12. Thus the article can quite clearly be seen to support the argument defending “vision” in v13 as referring to vs9-12.

In Shea's fourth reason, he continues his third reason by looking for evidence regarding the usage of hazôn outside of Dn8. He correctly regards hazôn in Dn1:17 and 9:24 as “a broadly inclusive collective for prophetic experiences” (p.82) contrary to J.N.Andrews (1852) and J.White (1854) and a host of other early SDA writers. He then briefly comments on the other three occurrences of hazôn in Dn9:21, 10:14; and 11:14: “the occurrences in Dn9:21 refer back to the vision of ch7 while the occurrences in 10:14 and 11:14 probably refer back to the vision of ch8.” (1982, p.82) I refer my readers back to my earlier comments on this for a rebuttal of his statement here, and to my discussion of hazôn in Dn10:14 and 11:14 for my rebuttal of Shea's position on these two texts.

Shea is correct when he says that none of the five “occurrences of this word in the Hebrew of Daniel outside of ch8” “provides any support for interpreting this word in 8:13 in such a way as to fractionate the preceding vision of 8:3-12 and apply it only to vs9-12.” (Ibid, p.82) The reason is obvious. None of the occurrences of hazôn outside of Dn8:13 are associated with any type of apposition. Again, it needs to be said that apart from Shea's dubious information regarding the meaning and scope of hazôn in Dn8 and 9, he has missed the point again. Shea acknowledged on p.80 the presence of the apposition in Dn8:13. He supposed to be giving evidence as to why the apposition gives us a sense to the meaning of “vision” in v13 so as to include vs3-12, and not just vs9-12.

In his discussion on hazôn he has not considered the apposition at all. He has merely argued for a certain meaning of hazôn that in all cases only means vs3-12. He has not addressed the fact that the effect of the apposition on the word “vision” is able to alter its scope from the general use of the word to a specific meaning defined, not

by the general usage of the word, but by the meaning of the apposition. Therefore his efforts in the third and fourth reasons to try and apply the “vision” in v13 to vs3-12 instead of vs 9-12 has floundered again.

d. 5th Reason- The Comparative Difference between Dn8:13 and Dn12:11

The fifth and final reason Shea offers to convince us of his argument uses Dn8:13 with Dn12:11:

This inclusive significance of the word “vision” in Dn8:13 is also supported by the contrast between the way this question was asked and the way a related answer was given in 12:11.

The first phrase following the opening question of 8:13 involves the daily and the transgression that makes desolate. If one wished to inquire how long the abomination of desolation was to be set up and the daily taken away, one could have inquired directly about these points without using the term “vision” as a qualifying word. For example, a statement is made about these points in 12:11 in which 1290 days were allotted for this, but the qualifying term for “vision” is absent.

Since the qualifying word, “vision,” is the principle difference between these two statements about the daily, that qualification appears to provide the explanation for the difference between these two time periods. The larger overall total of 2300 days is more for the vision, while the smaller figure of 1290 days is more specifically for the daily and the abomination of desolation. The latter which is shorter should be subsumed under the former which is longer and more inclusive. (1982, p.82)

Shea’s argument flows like this:

- a. The fact that “vision” in Dn8:13 includes vs3-12 is proved by a comparison of this question with the question in Dn12:11;
- b. Like as was done in 12:11, if information was sought concerning the daily and the transgression that makes desolate, it could have been done without using the word “vision.”
- c. Since the word “vision” is the only difference between Dn12:11 and Dn8:13, this “appears to provide the explanation for the difference” between the time for the “vision,” and the 1290 days for the transgression that causes desolation.
- d. Thus this smaller time should be subsumed under the larger period of 2300 days that was for the “vision.”

Before I examine Shea’s line of reasoning here, I present a comparison between Dn8:13,14 and Dn12:8-13:

DANIEL 8:13-14
13. Then I heard one saint speaking and another saint said unto that saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled underfoot?
14. And he said to me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.
DANIEL 12:8-13

DANIEL 8:13-14
8. And I heard, but I understood not: then said I O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?
9. And he said Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.
10. Many shall be purified and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand.
11. And from the time that the daily sacrifice is taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate is set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.
12. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.
13. But go thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and shall stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

I THINK YOU HAVE STUFF MISSING HERE

In this fifth reason presented by Shea, we get another example of how he misquotes the plainest statements of Scripture to support his arguments. The substance of his argument here is that since Dn8:13 and 12:11 are virtually identical, the word “vision” in Dn8:13 excepted, the 2300 days must apply to the word “vision,” since Dn12:11 applies the 1290 days to the abomination of desolation and the taking away of the daily.

First it needs to be acknowledged that “the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation” in Dn8:13 is the same as “the daily sacrifice [which is] taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate” which is set up as described in Dn12:11 and that the prophetic period which apply to them is 1290 days in both cases.

Second, it needs to be acknowledged that the trampling down of the host in Dn8:13 and the scattering of the “power of the holy people” in Dn12:7 are one and the same event as well, and the prophetic period which applies to this event is the “time, times and a half” of Dn 12:7.

Three of the four items of the question in Dn8:13 are thus attached to a time period in Dn12: the abolition of the daily; the establishment of the desolating transgression; and the trampling down of the host. It is in regard to the fourth item of the question—the giving of the sanctuary to be trodden underfoot—where Shea’s fifth reason comes unstuck.

It will be noticed, as I have highlighted above, that the question of Dn8:13 is really a summary of the details recorded in vs9-12. In reply to this question, the holy one addresses only one of these four items – the treading down of the sanctuary. Thus the question of v13 is answered in v14, not by answering all four items in the question, but by only addressing one item. And Shea is correct in asserting that the time period given in the answer in v14 subsumes the smaller time periods which relate

to the taking away of the daily and the setting up of the abominable desolation, and also to the treading down of the host (cf Shea, 1982, p.82; 1981, p.250).

What Shea is wrong in asserting is that “the qualifying word ‘vision’” in the question of Dn8:13 is the principle difference between the two statements in Dn8:13 and 12:11, leading him to conclude that the 2300 days must apply to the “vision.” His first mistake is evident in his statement which asserts that the word “vision” qualifies the apposition which follows it in 8:13. This is incorrect. He has the concept of apposition totally confused. It is the apposition that qualifies the nominal antecedent, *not visa versa*. The apposition: “the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot” is the qualifier in the question, not the nominal subject “vision!” Consider the statement, “Three fruits, lemons, oranges and mandarins, are all citrus.” In this statement I am using the apposition “lemons, oranges and mandarins” to qualify the antecedent “three fruits.” The apposition is definitely not being qualified by the antecedent “three fruits.”

His second mistake is that the answer of v14 clearly indicates that the time period given—the 2300 evening-mornings—are in respect, not of the “vision” but of the sanctuary. The larger overall total of 2300 days is *not* for the vision while the 1290 days is more specifically for the daily and the abomination of desolation. Scripture clearly says that the larger overall total of 2300 days is for the treading down of the sanctuary, while the smaller time periods are for either the treading down of the host (1260 days; time, times and a half – Dn12:7) or the replacement of the daily with the abominable desolation (1290 days – Dn12:11).

Shea has totally ignored the fact that in comparing Dn12:11 with Dn8:13, Dn 8:13 also mentions the sanctuary, whereas this detail is omitted in ch12. And while 12:7 mentions the host and indicates the period of their oppression, no verse in ch 12 mentions the treading down of the sanctuary. Yet it is this factor that is used in giving the answer to the question of Dn8:13. Thus it is *the treading down of the sanctuary* which is the salient difference between Dn8:13 and Dn12, and it is the treading down of the sanctuary, not the “vision” which was to continue up to the 2300 evening-mornings.

I could agree with his argument and still argue that the “vision” applies to vs9-12 and it would still harmonise with his assertions. The treading down of the sanctuary begins when that activity begins and continues until the sanctuary is restored 2300 days later. During this time, the daily sacrifice would be replaced by the transgression of desolation for 1290 days. Thus the longer period of 2300 days would subsume the smaller period of 1290 days, and still fit well with the position that the word “vision” applies to vs9-12. Similarly, the 1260 days would fit within the 2300 days, and would begin when the little horn begins to cast the host to the ground. This would finish however before the daily is restored, and both would terminate long before the sanctuary is restored—approximately 1,000 days later.

The upshot of this is that Shea’s fifth argument is just as erroneous as the other arguments that have been refuted. The 2300 evening-mornings of Dn8 apply to the treading down of the sanctuary, an oppression which is first referred to in Dn8:11. There is absolutely no evidence in Dn8 that the sanctuary is under discussion before the entrance of the horn power into the “pleasant land.” Thus the 2300 days of verse 14 refers to events beginning in Dn8:11 where the sanctuary is first mentioned, and it doesn’t cover the length of the full vision beginning at 8:3.

Another point on this matter was raised by Shea in his 1981 paper which needs to be addressed:

It is commonly suggested by commentators on Dan 8, who take the little horn to represent Antiochus Epiphanes, that the 2300 days should represent the period of time during which his pollution of the temple in Jerusalem, or some such similar action, was carried out. According to this kind of interpretation, the 2300 days were to begin when such pollution began, and the time period involved was to expire when the temple was cleansed of such pollution by the victorious Jews. Unfortunately, however, interpreters have never been able to fit the 2300 days of this prophecy into such a course of events in the history of Palestine in the second century B.C.

The reason why this interpretive endeavor has failed is that the text of the prophecy itself applies the 2300 days in a different way. The school of interpretation just described has overlooked one significant word in the question of the first holy one in Dn8:13. The question he asked was, “How long [or until when] shall the *hazôn* [vision] concerning the *tamîd*?” The word commonly overlooked here is *vision*. To what does this apply? If one answers that it applies only to the actions of the little horn, just described from v9 through v12, then we are left with two preceding visions in ch 8, one concerning the ram and the he-goat, and the other taken up with the actions of the little horn.

The word *vision* used here, however, makes no such distinction. All that precedes this inquiry must be included in the reference to this (single) vision. Thus the 2300-day period must include both the prophecies about the Persian ram and the Grecian he-goat as well as the description of the actions of the little horn. If this is not the case, then the inquiring holy one should have distinguished between two preceding visions, which he did not do. In other words, the holy one did not inquire how long would the little horn take away the *tamîd*, etc.; instead he inquired as to how long a period of time would be covered by the vision including this subject. The lesser period involved here is referred to in more chronological detail in Dan12:12, where it is stated that the time of the taking away of the *tamîd*, etc., would be 1290 days. The only logical way in which to relate these two time elements is that the actual time of taking away of the *tamîd*, the 1290 days of Dan 12:12, must be fitted into the longer period of the “vision” under the umbrella of the 2300 days.

The only logical conclusion I can come to from the use of the word *vision* in the query of the holy one in Dan 8:13 is, therefore, that he included the whole procession of events viewed by the prophet, beginning his question with the Persian ram at the beginning of the 2300days should be dated historically sometime during the period of the supremacy of the Persian ram. But when during that period? When Cyrus conquered the Medes? When the Medes and the Persians conquered Babylon? When Alexander defeated the Persians? The point in the Persian period from which the 2300 days were to commence is not clarified in ch 8.

It should next be noted that the 70 weeks of the prophecy in Dan9: 24-27 clearly begin during the same Persian period, at the time when the decree for the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem was to go forth. Since the prophetic time periods referred to in Dan 8 and 9 both were to begin during the same Persian period of history in the ancient Near East, it seems reasonable, in view of the connection between these two prophecies discussed above, to take the precise chronological point of commencement for the time period of the second of these two prophecies (the 70 weeks of ch 9) and employ it as the starting point for the time period referred to in the first of these two prophecies (the 2300 days of ch 8). (p.249f.)

As can be seen from the above statement, Shea asserts that if the word “vision” is applied only to vs9-12, then there are really two visions in vs 3-12. The first being the visions of the ram and the he-goat, and the second being the vision of the little horn. And all this even though vs1,2 categorically state that only one vision appeared to Daniel in that year. As has been shown before, it is not the word *hazôn* that these commentators say applies to vs9-12, but rather it is the apposition which delimits the meaning of the word to that part of the vision defined by the apposition. Shea says “the word *vision* used here however makes no distinction. All that precedes this

inquiry [viz., vs3-12] must be included to this (single) vision.” (*Ibid*, p. 249) Again Shea has overlooked the significance of the apposition.

The next statement of Shea’s illustrates the questionable thinking that we have seen at work throughout his writing on this subject:

Thus the 2300 day period must include both the prophecies about the Persian ram and the Grecian he-goat as well as the description of the actions of the little horn. If this is not the case, then the inquiring holy one should have distinguished between two preceding visions, which he did not do. In other words, the holy one did not inquire how long would the little horn take away the tamid, etc.; instead he inquired as to how long a period of time would be covered by the vision including this subject. (*Ibid*, p. 249f)

In saying that “the inquiring holy one should have distinguished between two preceding visions which he did not do” Shea is displaying his willing blindness to the plainest, most explicit facts before his eyes. Had the inquiring holy one wanted to know the length of the full vision in vs 3-12, he need only ask “How long shall be the vision?” and the intent of the question would have been plain as the nose on Shea’s face. As I have argued before, it is because the inquiring holy one wanted to ask something different that he qualified the word “vision” by using an appositional construction which thereby limited the meaning of the appositional antecedent—“the vision”—to that part of the overall vision of vs3-12, namely, vs9-12.

Thus by using the apposition, the holy one did distinguish between what part of the vision he did want more information, and what part of the vision he did not want more information. In the last sentence of this excerpt under discussion we receive another display of Shea’s faulty reasoning:

In other words the holy one did not inquire how long would the little horn take away the tamid, etc.; instead he inquired as to how long a period of time would be covered by the vision including this subject. (*Ibid*, p.250)

By a complete misunderstanding or a misstatement as to the meaning and implications of the apposition in Dan 8:13 Shea misleads his readers. He has made no attempt to justify his position as to the meaning of the apposition as implied in the word “including.” He wants us to believe that the question of Dan 8:13 does not qualify and limit the meaning of the “vision” to that part of the overall vision specified by the apposition. He wants us to believe that by specifying just a portion of the vision, the questioner really wants to imply *all* of the details of the vision. That is to say, by naming just the daily, the transgression of desolation, the treading down of the sanctuary and the host, he is also implying the ram, the he-goat, the war between the two animals, the four horns of the he-goat, the first large horn of the goat, and the rise of the horn power!!!

To give an English illustration: by saying “Adventist authors Hasel and Shea present theories that should not be trusted,” Shea would want us to believe that this means “*All* Adventist authors, including Hasel and Shea, present theories that should not be trusted.” But the apposition in this example is saying exactly the opposite. The effect of the apposition conveys the sense that: “Two Adventist authors, namely (*and only*) Hasel and Shea, present theories that should not be trusted.” That is to say, the apposition “Hasel and Shea” reduces the scope of the antecedent “Adventist authors” to just two Adventist authors; specifically, those named in the appositional phrase—“Hasel and Shea.”

Just so, the appositional phrase and the following clause: “the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?” reduces the scope of meaning of the word “vision” to that portion of the vision which contains the items listed in the question.

The reason the inquiring holy one used the noun “vision” to refer to the details of vs 10-12 about which he wanted more information, is because there are four details involved in the question: the daily, the treading down of the sanctuary and the treading down of the host, not just “the taking away of the tamîd” as Shea incorrectly states. These were a part of the “vision” and it is quite proper for the angel to refer to a part of the vision as “the vision” and then apposition those parts being specifically referred to.

By giving the longest period in the answer of v14, the holy one automatically covers any smaller time period related to the other items in the question. That is to say, given that the treading down of the host is a “time, times and a half” (Dn12:7) or 1260 days; the taking away of the daily and the setting up of the abomination of desolation is 1290 days (Dn12:11); and the treading down of the sanctuary is 2300 days; to ask, How long will be the vision which covers these things, an answer of 1260 or 1290 days would not suffice. The period given in the answer must cover all the periods involved in the question, and since the longest period—the 2300 days—covers all the details in the question, the answer of v14 is saying in effect, “when the sanctuary is restored to its rightful state after 2300 evening-mornings, all these other things – the taking away of the daily; the setting up of the abomination of desolation; and the treading down of the host – all these things will have been finished too.”

Thus the 2300 days acts as an overriding period when compared to the other lesser periods, not because it is the length of the vision of vs3-12, but because it is the length of the vision of vs9-12, since the treading down of the sanctuary is the oppression which is the last to be rectified and this is the longest period involved in the details specified in the question of Dn8:13. In addition, there is implied in the restoration of the sanctuary, not only the cessation of evil, as the others imply, but also the rebuilding of the sanctuary, and its rededication. This would undoubtedly take a longer time to complete.

It is clear then, from the use of the apposition associated with the word “vision” in Dn8:13, that the 2300 days starts with the beginning of the treading down of the sanctuary, which occurs in the vision at v11. It is also clear that there is no evidence to support the theory that the 2300 is the length of the vision starting with the Persian ram.

One of the objections to the position that the question of Dn8:13 clearly applies only to vs9-12 and not vs3-12 says that you simply cannot have the same word (hazôn) being applied both to the full vision between vs3-12 and at the same time being applied to only a section of that vision, that is, vs9-12.

Apart from the evidence in the question which shows that it is not the word which is being applied differently than elsewhere in the chapter, but rather that it is the apposition which is placing a constrained meaning on the word, there is other evidence in the book of Daniel which clearly shows that the same word for a vision can be applied to either the whole vision or only to a part of it.

The relevant material comes from Daniel 7. It should be said here that Daniel 2-7 is written in Aramaic (B.A), whereas Dn8-12 is written in Hebrew (B.H). Thus

there is a language difference that one needs to be cognizant of. In spite of the differences between the two languages, the evidence of a unity of thought typical in different documents written by the same should be evident. An example of this in point is the synonymous use of B.H. hazôn and B.A. hezv. In Dn1:17 Daniel summarises his visionary experiences – experiences later recorded both in Hebrew and Aramaic using two words – “visions (hazôn) and dreams (h^alômôt).” Here Daniel uses hazôn as the Hebrew synonym of hezv. This virtual synonymous relationship between hazôn and hezv is also acknowledged by Shea (1981, p.238) where he says,

“therefore, when referring back to the ‘Aramaic vision, it would have been natural for Daniel as a fluent bilingual speaker to refer to that appearance of Gabriel as having occurred in a hazôn, a cognate with Aramaic hezv, which occurs six times in Dan 7 (vs 1, 2, 7, 13, 15, and 20).”

In Dan 7:1,2 we read:

In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream (helem) and visions (hezvê – plural) of his head upon his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters (millîm).

Daniel spake and said, ‘I saw in my vision (b^ehezvî) by night and behold ...

The first thing we notice in this verse is that Daniel calls his experience in ch 7 a dream – a helem in the singular. In the next phrase, he calls this experience “visions of my head.” Though some may wish to argue that one part of Dn 7 is a dream and another part is “visions of” Daniel’s “head,”—a line of argument hard to defend—it is much more consistent to read this statement in v1 as saying that the visions of Daniel’s head were the dream of Dn7. Thus “visions” and “dream” are synonymous in this chapter since the same material is involved in either the “dream” or the “visions of” Daniel’s “head.”

Evidence from Dan 2 supports this conclusion. In ch2, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream that he couldn’t remember upon awakening but Daniel was shown the dream in a night vision. Thus “dream” is equivalent to “vision.” This is reinforced by 2:28 that says, “thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy head are these.” Thus the “vision” that Daniel saw in the night was a dream – Nebuchadnezzar’s dream. (Note also Dn4:9 “the visions of my dream”)

Hasel has argued differently for the relationship between “dream” and “vision.” He says:

Thus there seems to be two major modes of revelation in the book of Daniel. There is the “dream” that comes with its visions to both the pagan king and the godly servant, and the “vision” which in this book comes only to Daniel himself. (1974, p.20)

It is strange to see this type of conclusion proposed by Hasel, given that he acknowledges that dreams “consisted of visions.” Notice in Dn2:19 that a vision can also consist of a dream (“then was the secret [the dream and its interpretation v16] revealed unto Daniel in a night vision”). This effectively means that dream and vision can be synonymous, since each can consist of the other. It would have been sounder for Hasel to argue that “there seems to be two major modes of revelation in the book of Daniel. There is the night “dream” that comes with its visions to both pagan king and godly servant, and the “vision” by day which in this book comes only to Daniel.” A statement in this vein would highlight the two basic features recorded in the book of Daniel that are clearly evident. Dn2, 4, and 7 are dreams which were given in the

night, and Dn8 –12 are visions which were given during Daniel’s waking moments. Hasel’s argument for a difference between “dream” which consists of visions, and “visions” which are given by day focuses on an ambiguous and highly tenuous dichotomy.

The relationship between the plural word “hezvê” (visions of the) in ch7:1, and the singular word “hezvî” (my vision) needs to be considered. Dn7:2 says:

Daniel spake and said “I saw in my vision by night and behold four winds of the heavens strove upon the great sea.

Here “vision” (hezvî; with suffix hezvî) occurs in the singular and it is used to describe what v1 calls “visions” (hezvî) of his head.” It needs to be asked however, whether the phrase “in my vision by night” in v2 should be included in the text. Biblia Hebräica Stuttgartensia (BHS) adds this comment to this phrase: “>T,9’*, prb add.” (Elliger and Rudolf, 1984). This cryptic note reads: “This phrase does not occur in Theodotian’s Greek translation of the O.T. The form of the word/phrase is a probable conjecture, and has probably been added to the text along the way during transmission.” One has to consider the weight of evidence before making a decision to include it or exclude it from the discussion. That is not to be undertaken here. I will take the lead of Rahlfs’ edition of the LXX and include it. Returning to the BHS text of Dn7:2, we notice that whereas v2 uses the singular form of hezvî to describe the revelatory experience, v1 uses the plural to describe the same experience. This grammatical phenomenon is also found in v7 where we see the plural being used: “I saw in the night visions” and in v13 as well. In these cases the use of the plural indicates that the “seeing” was done in a series of “visions,” and that the one revelatory experience of Dn7 comprised a series of hezvî. The same phenomenon occurs in Dn4:13. Thus these occurrences of hezvî (B.H. hazôn) clearly show that this word is used by Daniel to refer to parts of a vision. Additionally, the prophet may have seen the same scene more than once during his sleep of the night—it may have been a fitful sleep he had; or it might be that he awoke and slept again to see the next section of the vision; or he may have just seen this vision as one among many things he dreamed of that night. And so in the visions of the night, he saw this revelation. It was one among many things that passed through his sub-consciousness during his sleeping moments.

In conclusion, regardless of how one finally decides as to whether hezvî in Dn7:2 should be included in the text or not, it is clear that Dn7 uses “vision” for subparts of the revelatory experience. Daniel 2 also supports this conclusion as does Daniel 4. Evidence from Dn8:1,2; 9:21; 2:19 and possibly ch1:17 clearly use hazôn for the entire revelatory experience, thus proving that it is entirely regular to consider that hazôn in Dn8:13 can refer to vs9-12. But as has been said earlier, it is not the meaning and usage of the word in other places in Daniel which gives meaning to the usage of hazôn in Dn8:13, but rather it is the apposition, the construction of the question, which unambiguously refers hazôn to vs9-12 only and not to the full hazôn of vs3-12.

(3)Mansell

(4). Clifford Goldstein.

Goldstein is an example of a contemporary SDA writer who just regurgitates the standard arguments on this issue:

The same principle is seen in Daniel 8. No question, there is a focus on the activity of the little-horn power; and there's no question, too, that the cleansing of the sanctuary brings about its demise. But that's only because on the antitypical day of atonement, judgment is given "to" or "in favor of" God's people (see Daniel 7:22). After all, they get the eternal kingdom.

This point can be seen especially in the question that is asked in verse 13: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision *concerning* the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?"

What's crucial is that the word "concerning" does not appear in the Hebrew, nor does the Hebrew grammar allow for it.⁷ Thus the question isn't just about the activity of the little horn. Instead, the question is about everything depicted in the chapter, which includes the vision about the ram and the goat (Media-Persia and Greece) as well as the activity of the little horn (pagan and papal Rome). A literal translation would read, "How long the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling?" In other words, the question lists the things that happened in the vision. In fact, the word for "vision" in verse 13 is *hazōn*, which deals with the ram and the goat, that is, Media-Persia and Greece....

The question, then, should be paraphrased like this, How long will all these things, from the rise of the Media-Persia, the rise of Greece, and finally to Rome's attack on Christ's heavenly ministry, be allowed to go on?

The answer then, is that the sanctuary in heaven will be cleansed (or that the judgment in heaven will sit) at the end of the 2,300 years. And, of course, as a result of that judgment, the saints receive the kingdom (Daniel 7:26-28), and the little horn is judged and destroyed. The crucial point to see is that prophecy covers all the events of the chapter, which, deal with the history of God's people from Media-Persia until the end of the age. (2003, p.65)

On the next page he reiterates:

These facts then, virtually refute the so-called "context problem" of Daniel 7 and 8 (another retreaded Des Ford argument in Brother Dale's book [he inserts footnote: "CDSDA, p.174, 175."]), which argues that the issue, especially in Daniel 8, deals only with the little horn, which didn't arise on the scene until long after the beginning of the 2,300 years, and thus Daniel 7 and 8 have nothing to do with some sort of heavenly pre-Advent judgment. The framing of the question in verse 13 shows that it's dealing with events that, though certainly including the little horn and its work of usurpation and persecution, also precede it, covering the whole scope of human history, starting with Media-Persia and culminating in the end of the world. (*Ibid*, p.66)

That Goldstein has just assumed the grammar of the question, does not seem to bother him in the least. He makes no attempt even to broach the issue. He takes occasion of the word "concerning" inserted by the translators of the King James Version of the Bible and then argues that if this word is not included in the verse, the question does not refer to the activities of the little horn but rather, the whole vision, even though the verse, without the word "concerning" still only refers to the activities of the little horn. On the contrary, the word "concerning" is entirely appropriate as it indicates the sense of the presence of the apposition in the grammar. Another way of understanding the meaning of "concerning" is "about" or even the genitive "of." We would thus have:

"How long shall be the vision about the" or

⁷ There is no explanation why this translation by the KJV is not allowed by the grammar. Goldstein just asserts this and moves on. Absolutely no discussion of the grammar at all!!

“How long shall be the vision of the” or even,

“How long shall be the vision, the vision about the...”

The Hebrew in the text allows “concerning” since it conveys the sense of the apposition. As we shortly see, apparently Goldstein is not even prepared to acknowledge the research of Shea, as he does not see any apposition present in the text. Goldstein gives us a literal translation:

““How long the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling?”

And then he makes this incredible statement:

“In other words, the question lists the things that happened in the vision. In fact, the word for “vision” in verse 13 is *hazôn*, which deals with the ram and the goat, that is, Media-Persia and Greece....”

Does he want us to believe that in listing “the daily, and the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling,” that “the question lists the things that happened in the vision?” Or does he want us to believe that in listing “the vision, the daily and the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling,” the question lists the things that happened in the vision?”

If it is the former, then one must ask the question, How does he get the concept of vs.3-12 from the mention of those only elements mentioned from vs9-12? If it is the latter, it is just as problematic for him since now he is saying the questioner not only asked about the vision, but after asking about the full vision, then adds the other elements as well, as though these events are going to occur *twice*, or need to be added to the total *twice*. Look at the implications of this second option. He is saying in effect, “How long shall be the vision, AND the daily, AND the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling?” Is this the structure he is suggesting? Why would the questioner ask about the daily and the transgression of desolation etc twice? He has already queried about them in asking about “the vision.” Goldstein can only argue along these lines if he believes the grammatical structure demands it. He places a comma between “the vision,” “the daily” and links the last element “the transgression of desolation” by inserting “and.” If he sees this as just a mere string of nominative elements, then he shows not only an absolute disregard for or ignorance of the structure, but also an absolute disregard for the accumulated scholarship on the topic. I cannot think of a scholar who suggests the structure of the question is just a string of nominative elements. He has ignored Hasel’s ideas, flawed though they are; he has ignored Shea’s contribution as well. He has not even suggested and then discounted any other options at all.

He then progresses to make the question refer to everything in the vision by asserting the Hebrew word *hazôn* automatically refers to the empires of Persia and Rome, and the activities of the little horn that occur at the end of the *hazôn* (an argument I have dealt with in [Assumption No.1](#)).

Goldstein shows his ignorance, and the lack of breadth in his reading when intimating that the context issue is just a “Des Ford argument.” As has been shown in the references in this paper, the context of the question has been long a problem of exegesis of Dn8, with authors such as Leupold, Keil and others quoted further below also attempting to wrestle with it. Apparently, it is much easier for Goldstein to

dismiss the arguments using the sociological stigma of Glacier View to colour the prejudices of the reader when he looks at this topic.

Later in the same book, Goldstein quotes the material he wrote on page 65 and then basically reiterates those traditional arguments used by the pioneers:

The point should be obvious: The 2,300 days must cover all the events depicted in the vision of Daniel 8, that is, Media-Persia, Greece, Rome, and the sanctuary cleansed. A literal 2,300 days doesn't begin to cover one of those kingdoms, much less all. On the other hand, with the day-year principle, the problem is instantly solved. Twenty-three hundred years, not a little more than six years, cover the events in question. In short, the prophecy itself demands the day-year principle. (*Ibid*, p.107)

There you have it. By asserting the grammar of Dn8:13 means the *whole* vision (without explaining why the grammar does that), it is easy to argue that since these three empires are implied in the question, the year-day principle *must* be invoked in order to make some sense out of the relationship between the time period given and the events it must cover. And he wants us to believe "the point is obvious."

We get a repeat of his material in the 3rd quarter Sabbath-school lesson for 2006:

Read the question in Daniel 8:13 again. When you do, you realize that the word *concerning* does not appear in the Hebrew, nor does the Hebrew grammar allow for it. Thus, the question isn't just about the activities of the little horn. Instead, the question is about everything depicted in the chapter, which includes the vision about the ram and the goat (Media-Persia and Greece), as well as the activity of the little horn (pagan and papal Rome). A literal translation would read, "How long the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation to give the sanctuary and the host a trampling." In other words, the question lists everything that happened in the vision. In fact, the word for "vision" in verse 13 is *hazon*, which, as we saw earlier, deals with the ram and the goat and the little horn; that is, Media-Persia, Greece, and Rome.

The question, then, could be paraphrased like this, How long will all these things, from the rise of Media-Persia, the rise of Greece, and finally to Rome's attack on Christ's heavenly ministry, be allowed to go on?

...The point should be obvious: The 2300 days must cover all the events depicted in the vision of Daniel 8; that is, Media-Persia, Greece, Rome, and the sanctuary cleansed. A literal 2,300-day period of time does not even begin to cover one of those kingdoms, much less all. On the other hand, with the year-day principle, the problem is instantly solved. Twenty-three hundred years, rather than a little more than six, cover the events in question. (2006, p.74)

(5.) Weber

Daniel 8:13 asks, "How long ["Until when," literally] will be the vision about the regular sacrifice apply, while the transgression causes horror, so as to allow both the holy place and the host to be trampled?" In other words, Until what time will this sacrilegious sanctuary system function before its corruption is interrupted? This question is answered in the following verse: "For 2,300 evenings and mornings; then the holy place will be properly restored...."

Now we may inquire, What does it mean for the sanctuary to be " 'properly restored' "? ...

According to William Shea, "those translations which have translated this verb [the Hebrew *nisdaq*] as 'restored' have come closest to the original basic meaning of the verbal root involved. [Weber inserts the footnote: Shea, *Daniel and the Judgment*, p.409. Gerhard Hasel proposes: "It appears that the ideas of 'cleansing,' 'justifying,' 'setting right,' and 'vindicating' are part and parcel of the term '*nisdaq*.' Unfortunately, there does not seem to be a single word in the English language that captures these primary semantic connotations. All in all, this means that the 'cleansing' of the sanctuary is to be seen in a broader scope,

inclusive of the ideas of restoration to a rightful state – cleansing, justification, and vindication.” – “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8,” *Sanctuary*, p.204.] Then Shea answers the question as to how well this translation fits the context:

“Since something bad clearly did happen to the sanctuary in the verses preceding this reference, this basic root meaning can be used with perfectly good sense here, as reversing or setting right whatever bad had happened to the sanctuary. There is no need to go beyond this into less frequently attested extended meanings to bring good sense to this passage, and indeed they do not bring as good sense to it as this basic meaning does.” [Weber inserts footnote: Shea, *op. cit.*, pp.409, 410.]

Historically, Adventists have thought it necessary to ignore the question of Daniel 8:13 and go instead to Leviticus 16 in order to understand Daniel 8:14. This is because in Leviticus the cleansing of the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement is detailed. There is a legitimate link between the restoration of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 and the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16 (chapter 11 of this manuscript will review this connection), but it is unnecessary to go outside of Daniel 8 to establish this pillar of Adventism. In the restoration of the damage done by the little horn we see every principle of the Daniel 7 judgment.

Let us review those three elements from Daniel 7:

1. Christ’s right to rule is vindicated as He receives the kingdom.
2. The little horn has its challenge defeated. Its dominion is taken away when the kingdom is restored to Christ and given to the saints.
3. The saints receive a favorable verdict and officially become part of His kingdom.

Each of these points is repeated in Daniel 8. “In the cleansing, restoring, righting, and emerging victorious of the heavenly sanctuary, there is a strong element of vindication of both God and his people.” [Weber inserts footnote: Heppenstall, “The Pre-advent Judgment,” *Ministry*, December, 1981, p.15.] Since the sanctuary is the headquarters of salvation activity, it involves both the forgiveness and the condemned, as well as the fairness of the One who decides what occurs. Furthermore, the little horn has challenged the whole process of salvation by faith with a system of works mediated by human priesthood. This is rejection of Christ’s intercession in heaven’s sanctuary. The restoration of the sanctuary, therefore, must bring the following results:

1. God’s government of grace in the sanctuary is vindicated as the challenge against Christ’s right to be the only mediator is defeated.
2. The establishment of God’s system of salvation displaces the little horn’s rival counterfeit. Salvation by works is condemned, along with its adherents.
3. The saints, who were condemned and persecuted by the little horn, are vindicated with their Mediator when their accuser loses his case in court....

One final question remains: Precisely when can the 2,300-year period end and the sanctuary be restored? Daniel 8 states only that the time span stretches “ ‘to the time of the end’ ” – it provides no starting point for this prophecy. (1985, pp. 40-42)

From the opening statement above and especially the pages preceding this quote, Weber indicates that the 2300-days cover the trampling of host and sanctuary, the transgression causing horror, and the vision about the regular sacrifices. Does this mean that when the period starts these things begin? Or does he mean that they will end when the 2300-day period ends but that does not mean they begin when the 2300-days begin?

Notice another statement of his just after the above quote:

Daniel's apprehension increases as he remembers his vision received some ten years previously, when the angel Gabriel informed him of a long time of trouble ahead for the saints and their sanctuary. It had been predicted that "both the holy place and the host [were] to be trampled" until the 2,300 days had expired; "then the holy place will be properly restored" (chap. 8:13. 14) (Ibid p.44)

This statement does not help us clarify his position either. He hints on p.38 that the 2300-days covers the periods of the animal symbols when he says:

Since the forecast of Daniel 8 extended far into the future from Daniel's time, it is apparent that its 2300 days, like the 1260 days of Daniel 7, must be symbolic of years. This should be expected, since the context of Daniel's prophecies is figurative – short-lived animals illustrate centuries of national existence. (Ibid)

If that is the case then we must assume the quotes referred to above merely indicate that the items indicated in vs13 would cease at the expiry of the 2300 days. Notice this statement of Weber's again:

One final question remains: Precisely when can the 2,300-year period end and the sanctuary be restored? Daniel 8 states only that the time span stretches "to the times of the end" – it provides no starting point for this prophecy." (Ibid, p.42)

From this we see that Weber does not think that the starting point for the 2300-days begins when the events listed in verse 13 begin. Therefore, we can conclude that Weber takes a standard position on the scope of the question in verse 13. Even though he seems to indicate that the answer of verse 14 refers to the items in verse 13, when it comes down to it, he refers the time period to the whole vision, rather than beginning with the commencement of the items in verse 13.

(6) Doukhan

In his book *Secrets of Daniel*, Doukhan departs from the usual SDA historicist explanation of the question in verse 13. He explicitly says that the question of verse 13 applies to the activities of *the little horn*. And he indicates that the 2300 days are related, not to the vision of the goat and the ram and the horn power, but only to the "rampage of the little horn. His position is well supported by a raft of commentaries, as is indicated in the quotes from other scholars listed down further.

This time a question shouted by one of the saints precipitates the decision: "Until when this vision of the perpetual: the devastating sin delivered, and the sanctuary and the army trampled?" (Dan.8:13, literal translation).

Almost all the words cited by this verse allude to the preceding actions of the little horn: "vision" (verse 1); "perpetual" (verse 11, 12); "delivered" (verse 12); "sanctuary" (verse 11); "army" (verses 11-12); "trampled" (verse 10). The passage speaks against its behavior. The reference to the perpetual offering and all related subjects (sin, deliverer, sanctuary, law, etc.) protests the little horn's attempt to replace God and thus surround itself with religious terminology. The mention of the army and related subjects (surrender, trample,) points to the persecution of the saints. "How long will [all this] take?" "How long?" (*ad matay?*). In the psalms the expression was the cry of the oppressed (Ps 6:4; 13:2; 62:3; 74:10; 94:3, etc.) And to their cry comes the shout of hope.

The same word that formulates the question – "*ad*" (until) – introduces the answer given by a second saint.

"Until when?" questions one saint (see Dan.8:13).

“Until 2300 evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary will be cleansed,” replied another (see verse 14).

Only after 2300 evenings and mornings will the destructive rampage of the little horn stop, and interpretation later offered by the angel Gabriel: “Yet he will be destroyed, but not by human power” (verse 25). The end of the little horn will not result from natural causes, but from an extraordinary act of judgment on God’s part, closing the circle of history (Dan. 2:34; 11:45). (2000, pp.126,127)

(7) John T. Anderson.

Adventist writer John T Anderson is another surprise in the rush of books being printed on the investigative judgment and the interpretation of Daniel. His publication in 2003 has this explanation of the question in Dn8:13 as limiting the question to the activities of the little horn:

It pays to make sure you have the question right when answering an exam! In a similar vein, it would be well at some point in our study of Daniel 8:14 to pause and realize that the verse actually answers a question posed in verse 13, and that it would be worthwhile for use to consider the meaning and message of that question as we ponder the answer in the next verse: “Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said to that certain one who was speaking, ‘How long will the vision be, concerning the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, the giving of both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled underfoot?’”

What exactly does the question of verse 13 have in mind? We could rephrase the question as: “How long will it be till the end of the trampling, persecution, and desecration of truth revealed in the vision?” Since Daniel’s visions encompass the ultimate deliverance of God’s people and the establishment of His kingdom, when exactly will that happen? How long until God finally puts down the enemy for good? That’s a very important question! It would be a natural question to raise, one that you and I would like to ask if we were at Daniel’s side watching the prophetic panorama unfold. The horn power stamps and treads on the saints and sanctuary unmercifully and without apparent restraint. How long will this go on? How long will all this pain and suffering continue? ...If this be the legitimate understanding of the intent of the question, we are reminded that the visions of both Daniel 7 and 8 strongly suggest that the enemy has the upper hand, that is, the “trampling” will continue until the “end,” until the return of Christ. The grand climax of Daniel’s visions goes through to the establishment of God’s glorious kingdom.

So we see that verse 14 of Daniel 8 acts as a direct answer to the implicit question “How long will truth be cast down?” because at the end of the 2300 day/year prophecy a movement began that restored truths about God which had been lost or replaced. Thus, the investigative judgment restores God’s reputation. We also see that verse 14 is an indirect answer to the explicit question “How long will the trampling go on?” in that the conclusion of the investigative judgment is a necessary prerequisite to Christ’s return, when the horn power will be destroyed. (2003, pp.109-110, 115)

Anderson clearly sees the question as addressing, not the length of the entire vision, but rather the events mentioned in the answer – the activities of the little horn. And although he does not reason in the same vein as we do, at least he admits that the question of verse 13 relates not to the whole vision, as is the usual line of reasoning from historicists’ books, but rather to the activities specified in verse 14. This is monumental advance in thinking from the standard line of reasoning from a SDA historicist.

Another detail needs to be considered which clearly associates the starting of the 2300 days with the desolation of the sanctuary rather than the beginning of the vision in v3. If the “setting right,” the “restoring,” the reconsecrating,” the “cleansing” of the sanctuary occurs at the expiration of the 2300 days, then

logically the beginning of the 2300 days is tagged to the occasion when the “setting wrong,” the “destructing,” the “deconsecrating,” the “pollution” of the sanctuary occurs.

For example, if one says, “This renovation job will take me 2300 days,” someone may ask, “2300 days from when?” The obvious answer is, “2300 days from the time I start renovating.” Similarly, the 2300 day period of Dn8:14 begins when the proper and rightful state of the sanctuary is forcefully changed, i.e., when “the place of his sanctuary is cast down.” verse 11.

E. Other Publications on this subject

Having examined the arguments presented by both modern theoreticians and pioneer Millerite and SDA writers, it would be advantageous to survey the position of some non-SDA scholars in regard to the arguments used in this debate. It appears to this writer, (and I hope I have made it clear in the paper) that the use by SDA authors of non-SDA references has been highly selective and in some crucial areas they refuse to mention credible alternate views, even though they may be the views of those authors whom the SDA author may quote.

Readers may have noted in the SDA historicist’s publications on this topic how *few* sources they quote when they discuss the nature of the construction of the grammar in verse 13. Why is that, you may well ask. Let us see.

We have already met the views of Keil and Leupold earlier but they are reproduced here for easy comparison:

Keil

The question [v13] condenses the contents of vers.10-12: “Till how long is the vision etc.?” hehazôn is not the action but the contents of the vision, the thing seen. The contents of the vision are arranged in the form of appositions: that which is continual and the desolating wickedness, for: the vision of that which is continual and of the desolation. The meaning of this apposition is more particularly defined by the further passage following asyndetos: to give up the sanctuary as well as the host to destruction. (1978, p.301)

Leupold

To make his inquiry more specific the angel that asked the other angel adds several explanatory terms that are in apposition with the general term “vision.” By these terms he indicates what portion of the vision is causing him trouble. And we dare not forget that Daniel’s problem was exactly the same as the angel’s. These appositional terms we have introduced by the phrase that is customarily used in English in such instances – “that is to say.” Four things are in apposition to the word “vision.” They are: a) “the regular daily offerings,” b) “The crime causing horror,” c) the giving over of the sanctuary to be trodden underfoot,” and d) “the giving over of the host to be trodden underfoot.” These last two could naturally be combined into one, and there might be three items in place of four.

That these four coincide and occur simultaneously, or nearly so is apparent to the questioner. Therefore he practically wants to know how long the suffering of the saints and the humiliation of the sanctuary will last. (1949, p.351f)

Driver

The sentence (if the text is correct) is harshly constructed; but the words following ‘vision’ must be understood to be in apposition with that word, and to indicate the contents of the vision.(1922, p.118)

Bultema

And this unknown person asked how long a period was covered by this vision concerning the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, and how long the sanctuary and the host would be trodden under foot. (1988, p.248)

Charles

The words following ‘vision,’ as Driver points out, must be taken in apposition as indicating the contents of the vision. Hence: ‘How long shall be the vision? The continual burnt offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, the giving both the sanctuary and the host,’ &c.

There are many inherent difficulties in the text, but with the help of the Versions, we arrive at the following text which meets all the difficulties: ‘How long is the vision to be, while the daily burnt offering is taken away (Heb. *Mûram* added with LXX and Theod.), the transgression that maketh desolate set up, and the sanctuary and the service trodden underfoot? (192?, p.88)

Calvin

If we are his disciples, being obedient, humble, and teachable, we shall desire to know only what he will manifest to us. But the angel asks, *what is the meaning of the vision of the perpetual sacrifice, and of sin?* That is, what is the object of the vision concerning the abrogation of the perpetual sacrifice, and concerning the sin which lays waste? ... (1948, pp.106f)

Lacocque

The terms of the question posed by the seer are not put together in terms of orthodox grammar. There are definite articles where there should not be, and they are absent where they should be. Yet the meaning is clear. Daniel refers to those elements of his vision which are a problem. (1979, p.164)

Heaton

The exact terms of the angel’s summary of the vision are as obscure as the vision itself, but they seem to include a reference to the daily sacrifices which were abolished, the heathen altar or sacrifice which replaced them, and the trampling under foot of the sanctuary. (1956, p.196)

Montgomery

Below is included the entire comment of Montgomery on verse 13 it is so comprehensive, but the specific comment that relates to this present point is on p.341: “For how long is the vision: the Constant, and the desolating Iniquity, the giving of both sanctuary and host to trampling? I.e., What is the term of this shocking vision? ...The subsequent items are epexegetical to ‘the vision,’ detailing its chief contents.”⁸

13. 14. The angelic announcement of the term of the vision.
13a. And I heard one Holy one speaking, and another [Heb., one] Holy one spoke to so-and-so who was speaking. ‘Holy one,’ קדוש, = angel, s. on קדוש 4¹⁰. For the seer’s ‘hearing in’ on an angelic conversation as introduction to a revelation cf. Zech. 1¹³ ^a, 2⁷; v. 1³ of the former passage, ‘the angel of the LORD spoke

⁸ The archaic word “epexegetical,” according to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, means “The addition of a word or words by way of further elucidation; that which is so added.” (Onions, 1975.) In this case, the words “the Constant” and “the desolating Iniquity” are the words that qualify the meaning of the word “vision.”

and said, O LORD of hosts, how long?' being model to v.^b here. 'So-and-so' (the Heb. word here is a hybrid) may be used where the name is not known, e.g., 1 Sa. 21³, Ru. 4¹, or, at least in Arabic narrative, even where the name is known, but it is tedious or unnecessary to repeat it; here the title of the addressee may be implied. As has not been observed, the contents of the first angel's 'speaking' must be the details of vv.¹⁰⁻¹². The vision has passed from the visual to the aural, for the moments of that climax could not be *seen*. **13b.** *For how long is the vision: the Constant, and the desolating Iniquity, the giving of both sanctuary and host to trampling? I.e., What is the term of this shocking vision? Cf. לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ v.¹⁹. 'How long,' עַד מָתַי, is an antique expression of religion, appearing constantly in the Bab. penitentials (*adi mati*); for example of the repetitious use of this liturgical formula s. the hymn to Ishtar in King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, 1, 222 ff. = Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 66 ff.; the same exclamative use in the Bible, e.g., Ps. 6⁴, 90¹³. It became frequent in apocalyptic usage, cf. *inf.* 12⁶, 2 Esd. 6⁵⁹, etc. (s. Volz, *Jüd. Esch.*, 162). The subsequent items are exegetical to 'the vision,' detailing its chief contents. The translation followed provisionally above is the one based on the Mass. punctuation, which has been in vogue since the early Prot. comm.; it is followed by GV, the Eng. VSS, and almost all scholars who will not amend the text. It treats the 'and' in וְקִדְשׁ as correlative to the following 'and,' i.e., 'both . . . and,' a usage only occasionally found in Heb. (for the cases s. BDB, p. 253a). It is not, however, the construction known to the ancient VSS, although Ⓢ 11 had our text at this point. But we might easily overcome the unusual syntax by reading תַּתּוֹ קִדְשׁ for תַּתּוֹ וְקִדְשׁ, 'his making sanctuary [and host a trampling].' The problem in v.¹² anent צְבָא 'host,' which we gave reason for deleting there, continues here, and all the attempted translations, 'army,' 'cult,' etc., are contrary to the sense of 'host' in v.¹⁰, *q.v.* The Grr. vary from Ⓢ and have given a starting-point for emendations, for which s. Berth., Graetz, *Beiträge*, 388, Bev., vGall, p. 52, Moore, *l.c.* (*JBL* 1896, 196). The first two terms inquired of are the Constant and the Iniquity. The former is doubtless improved by following the plus of the Grr., ἡ ἀρθεῖσα (with Graetz, Bev., vGall, Moore) = מוֹרָם, i.e., 'the Constant removed,' cor-*

responding to the Kr., v.¹¹ (Moore prefers הוֹסֵר after 12¹¹). In הַפְּשַׁע שָׁמָּה, 'the desolating Iniquity,' we would have a descriptive epithet added to 'the Iniquity' of v.¹², understanding פֶּשַׁע there as subject and omitting the prep. ב 'in.' The term is then equivalent, as Berth., Moore note, to שָׁקִין שָׁמָּה of 9²⁷ etc., the disguised term for 'the abomination which he built on the place of sacrifice,' 1 Mac. 6⁷. And Ra. finds in 'the Iniquity' in both vv. the idol that was set up. For ש' שָׁקִין s. at 9²⁷. But as שָׁמָּה is not an item in the preceding vv., the present writer is inclined to regard it as a gloss from 9²⁷. Further, on the alleged evidence of G Berth., Moore delete וּצְבָא, thus removing the trouble caused by this word. (S. at v.¹²; again, here as there G read some word = ἐρημωθήσεται in its place.) For the difficult inf. תַּת 'giving,' vGall, followed by Mar., proposes to read the Nif. נִתַּן, i.e., 'the Iniquity was set up.' Moore, following Hitz., retains תַּת, regarding it as postpositive to its obj., with the same result as vGall; a parallel for this hard construction is adduced from Jer. 10¹³ לְקוֹל תִּתּוּ, as though with AV = 'when he utters his voice,' but the natural mng. is given by JV, 'at the sound of his giving.' Bev. suggests a considerable amendment. The writer would propose that all the terms after '(desolating) Iniquity' are a series of glosses that have accumulated from terms in vv.^{10. 11. 12}, terms that provoked inquiry: תַּת וְקֹדֶשׁ וּצְבָא = תַּתְנִן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ וּצְבָא vv.^{11. 12}; מִרְמָס = תִּרְמָס v.¹⁰. Jeph. has a similar notion: "How long shall this person last who shall do the things mentioned in the v., which are three: giving, the sanctuary, the host?" The primarily abstract קֹדֶשׁ 'holiness,' is here used of the concrete 'sanctuary'; so often of holy things, occasionally of the holy place, e.g., Ps. 20⁵, and 'the holy of holies.' For מִרְמָס G καταπάτημα, θ συνπατηθήσεται, cf. the reminiscences in 1 Mac. 3^{48. 51}, 4⁶⁰, 2 Mac. 8², Lu. 21²⁴.

13. [מִשְׁכָּלִים] The Mass. tradition for — is certain; for similar cases of apparently arbitrary — , explained in part as due to following guttural, s. Kōn., *Lgb.*, 1, p. 74, GK §10, h. *N.b.* that in the Aram. dialects there was the tendency to replace the expected *a* stem vowel of the impf. with *u*; s. Nöld., *MG* p. 219, *SG* §170. For the cohortative form with *uaw*-consec. s. Dr., *Tenses*, §§569 ff.: "It occurs only at rare intervals except in two or three of the later writers, some ninety instances of its use being cited altogether."—אֶחָד . . . אֲחֵר = 'one . . . another'; for similar cases s. BDB *s.v.* §6. For the prepositive use cf. Nu. 31¹⁸ (if the text is correct). It is not here the indef. article, which is always postpositive (s. at 2¹, although cases otherwise in the Mishnah, s. Bev., p. 30), but is in apposition with אֶחָד, 'one, a saint' (so GK §125, b). For אֶחָד & uses in both cases ἑτέρος = אֲחֵר, which is nonsense in the first case. Orig. & om. קוּיט 2°.—[סִרְבָּר] For syntax of the ppl. s. at v. 4.—[מִלִּי] The Heb. expression for this indefinite pronoun is always מִלִּי מִלִּי. Ew., *Lehrb.*, §106, c, Brock., *VG* 1, 295, regard the form as contraction of the usual double term; Behr. as erroneous scribal combination of the two; Perles, *Analekten*, 82, as combination of two rdgs. Probably the ultimately alone current מִלִּי was original, and ס was inserted artificially to identify with the classical term. The text is ancient, the word being transliterated in & Θ φελμουσι; Sym. alone τινὶ ποτα (so & II Theodt.). Aq. gives the earliest treatment of the word as a proper, angelic name; acc. to *Ber. R.*, 21, he translated it 'to him who is inside,' identifying with מִטְבִּי, meaning Adam, whose seat is in front of the ministering angels; s. Field, *ad loc.*, Jastrow, *s.v.* Similarly Polych. regards it as name of an angel, and so Jeph., who finds three angels, Palmoni, Gabriel and an anonymous. *N.b.* the article in & supported prob. by the Grr. With the derivation of מִלִּי from מִלֵּה (s. BDB) = מִלֵּה 'be wonderful' (?), cf. Arab. *ṭahḡ*, 'individual, person,' primarily a 'phenomenon.'—[מִלִּי] There is no reason with Ew., *Lehrb.*, §290, c, to regard this as an irregular case of the construct, or with Pr. to read a const. On the VSS at v. 12^b s. Note at end of the chap.—14. [בִּסְרָא] Without depending on the evidence of & & II, which prefix cop. are may note that

(1927, pp.340-344)

Goldingay

The “how long” connects with that vision, but behind it with this question – rather plea – as it is expressed in lament psalms, not least concerning the devastation of the land and the defiling of the sanctuary. (Ps74:9-10; 79:5; 80:5[4]; 89:47 [46]; cf., 6:4 [3]; 13:2 [1]; 90:13; 94:3; also Isa 6:11; Jer 12:4; 2 Esd 6:59). The cry of the holy ones takes up the cry of afflicted Israel. (1989, p.212)

Buttrick

In our text the angel's question is unintelligible. On the basis of the LXX, Bevan emends it to read, "For how long is the vision to be, while the daily sacrifice is taken away and the iniquity set up – from the time when he shall tread down the sanctuary and the service?" However we choose to emend the text, the purport seems to be: how long is this intolerable situation to last? This **how long?** Became a standard element in apocalyptic... but it had already had a long history, for the How long? ...of Ps6:3; 80:4; 90:13; Isa6:11; Hab. 2:6; is the very phrase *adi mati* which occurs repeatedly in the Babylonian psalms.(1951-7, p.476)

Collins, John J

“For how long is the vision of the daily offering and the desolating transgression, and his giving over of sanctuary and host?”

[note] 44 the verse is difficult and some emendation is unavoidable. The MT has not construct here but juxtaposes vision, offering, and transgression in apposition.” (1993, p.326)

Hartman and Di Lella

How long are the events of this vision to last? Literally, “Until when the vision? Here and in 9:24; 10:14b, Hebrew *hazon* literally, “vision,” refers to the substance of a vision, the things seen in a vision.

the removing of the daily sacrifice, the setting up of an [appalling] offense, and the defiling of the sanctuary and the pious ones. A summary repetition of the events in the vision described in vss 11f. (1983, p.226)

Seow

The Hebrew text is exceedingly awkward at this point, however. Most modern commentators believe the text to be corrupt and offer various proposals to emend it....Hence, the question is posed with many ellipses, literally, Until when...the vision...the regular offering...and the transgression....devastating...delivering...and the sanctuary ...an army ...trampling? (author’s translation). Still, despite, the syntactical incoherence, the concern of the holy one comes through well enough. At issue is no doubt the duration of the vision-scene: how long will it last? (2003, p.125)

Russell

In the Daniel passage one angel asks another the key question: How long will this situation last – the cessation of burnt offering, “the transgression that makes desolate” and the destruction of “the sanctuary and the host”? (1981, p.147)

Mays

The desecration of the sanctuary, accompanied by a dread event called “the transgression that makes desolate” (v.13 RSV), must endure for 2300 evenings and mornings, i.e., 1150 days (v.14). (1988, p.703)

Prince

The extremely difficult text of this verse should perhaps be revised as follows [quotes revision in Hebrew] “For how long is the vision of the daily offering and of the devastation transgression? (For how long shall there be) a giving over both of the Sanctuary and the host to trampling?” The question is thus divided into two clauses, each reverting to [Heb *ad-matay*]. It seems better to read here finite verb-forms, which can be done without any radical alteration and not attempt with some commentators to introduce extra words into the text following the corrupt version of the LXX. The sentence can be made intelligible to the reader with only three minor changes; viz., the deletion of the [Heb-*he*] in [Heb-*hehazon*], which may have arisen from a dittography with the preceding [Heb-*waw*], the insertion of [Heb-*he*] before the Pilpel participle [Heb-*shomem* = *m^eshomem*], and the introduction of [Heb-*lamedh*] before [Heb-*mirmas*]. (1899, p.243)⁹

Sibley Towner

By eavesdropping on the conversation of the holy ones, Daniel learns the answer to the burning question, “For how long?” that was so often raised in Israel’s day of dereliction. The

⁹ One must consider this a much more superior attempt to see the relationship of the phrases within the question, than a similar attempt by Hasel examined earlier in this paper.

duration of the desecration of the sanctuary is to endure two thousand three hundred “evenings and mornings.” (1984, p.122)

Young

A second angel addresses the first, lit. *and one holy said to so-and-so who was speaking*, and asks the length of the vision. The thought may be paraphrased as follows: How long is to be the vision, the continual and the Transgression which desolates, the giving up of both (lit. and) the sanctuary and the host for trampling? (1949, p.173)

Baldwin

In this vision the seer overheard the dialogue of two holy ones (see on 4:10) asking not why this should be, which calls in question God’s moral ordering of events, but *how* long (cf., Ps 6:3; Is 6:11; Zc 1:12), which presupposes that God is limiting the triumph of evil. The rest of the verse summarizes what has gone before, though the trampling of *host* as well as sanctuary seems to add a further detail. (1978, p.158)

Walvoord

Having described the nefarious activities of Antiochus Epiphanes, Daniel now records a conversation between two “saints” or “holy ones,” apparently angels, concerning the duration of the desecration of the sanctuary. The question is, “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?” (1971, p.188)

Porteous

Daniel is represented as overhearing the conversation of two holy ones or angels, one of them asking the question ‘How long?’ which was forcing itself to the lips of the pious in Jerusalem at this time and the other indicating the precise duration of the time of trouble. Commentators refer especially to the parallel passage in Zech. 1.12 ff, in which is told how the angel standing among the myrtle trees asks God how long he is going to withhold his mercy from Jerusalem and the cities of Judah and receives a gracious reply. This is the prophet’s way of asserting that his conviction that God is about to show mercy to Jerusalem is God-given. The same is true here....It is sometimes argued that vv.13 and 14 are interpolated, but it should be noticed that they stand or fall with v.26 which refers back to them. If the question of the actual duration of the time of trouble was of burning importance to the writer and his readers, as we may well believe it was, it could obviously not be dealt with in a vision alone; there had to be an audition and that is precisely what these verses supply. (1979, pp.126f)

Archer

Apparently it was the second angel...who posed the question to the third...as to the duration of the terrible period during which the temple and altar of the Lord would be desecrated, as suggested by the words of v.11: “And it took away the daily sacrifice from him, and the place of his sanctuary was brought low.” The answer given in v.14 by the third angel was that this condition would last for “2,300 evenings and mornings”...(1985, pp.102f)

Conclusion regarding this Assumption

The purpose of this assumption as stated at the beginning of this paper is to show that the word “vision” in Dn8:13 does *not* apply only to the activities of the little horn as referred to in the rest of the question in verse 13, but in fact, *to the whole vision* in Dn8. This is important since, in the absence of any other starting point for the 2300 days, it sets the stage for using the starting point for the seventy weeks as the starting point for the 2300 days as well.

As has been shown in this paper, this purpose however, can only be achieved by arguing for a syntax of the question in Dn8:13 that ignores the facts of the text. A

correct understanding of the question in verse 13 will provide a correct understanding of the answer to that question in verse 14. Every interpretation offered by SDA writers manages to go astray when explaining the scope of the question. In fact, as we have seen with Hasel's approach shown in this paper, SDA historicists seem to make it *a science of avoidance* when it comes to the issue as to the real nature of the syntax in verse 13. The concentration of the efforts by SDA scholarship seems to be to find some esoteric explanation of the syntax without regard to the accumulation of research on the syntax by previous generations of scholars. For example, Hasel is prepared to throw up his own novel argument and quotes scholars to give some credibility to his paper, but ignores completely those same authors quoted by him who put up a strong defence for the presence of apposition in verse 13. He does not even raise the concept of apposition, even though he must have read it when developing his references for his paper. Surely an unbiased survey of the different concepts proffered for the syntax of verse 13 would include any idea worth canvassing, even if only to show its invalidity? The appositional explanation of verse 13 has been around for many generations, yet Hasel chose to ignore that option entirely. SDA authors do not have the courage even to discuss the appositional syntax argued by the scholars for the last century and a half. The closest SDA scholarship has come to even mentioning the concept of apposition in verse 13 is the recent admission by Shea of such a structure in his publications discussed in this paper.

Beside the work of Hasel, I examined the two traditional methods used by the pioneers and early writers of the SDA church and found they have no substantive Scriptural basis for their argument; it is based entirely on assumption. Shea must be acknowledged for his honesty in admitting the obvious and say that apposition is present in the structure of verse 13. The five reasons proposed by Shea to support his interpretation are however without any validity. The evidence clearly supports the application of the 2300 days to the events explained in the apposition of verse 13, involving the treading down of the sanctuary and its people by the little horn, not to the length of the whole vision as taught by SDA historicism.

The contemporary attempts by SDA scholars to try and support the traditional assumptions with some modicum of scholarship have floundered, showing that the traditional assumptions have no valid Biblical basis. Given that the attempts of Shea and Hasel have failed to convince us of a reason to justify applying the 2300 days to the entire vision, then any argument which is to be presented by SDA's to support the conclusion that the 2300 days of Dn8:14 covers the full vision of vs3-12 and begins at the beginning of the time prophecy of Dn9:24-27 can only argue along traditional lines using invalid assumptions that have been associated with this argument from the outset and just ignoring the fact that they are invalid.

It needs to be said however that none of the traditional assumptions even touch the issue of whether the word "vision" in Dn8:13 refers to vs9-12 or vs3-12. It is on this point that the whole argument linking the 2300 days to vs3-12 stands or falls, and as has been shown, nothing convincing has been presented to prove this point. On the contrary, the evidence supporting the application of hazôn in Dn8:13 to only vs9-12 is overwhelming.

And this is the best scholarship that the BRI can recommend the world SDA church as foundational studies on the topic? What a poor state of affairs. Talk about "clutching onto straws!" The work of Shea and Hasel should be an embarrassment to

the church. If the theory they attempt to prop was not so important to the SDA church, it would not have even got to the print stage. It is truly poor scholarship. But in another sense, they are to be pitied since they have the impossible task—to prove the unprovable—that the arguments of SDA historicism is based in solid scholarship.

The Assumptions Used in This Assumption.

The assumptions used in this assumption include:

1. The real question in verse 13 finishes with “how long shall be the vision?” (Used in traditional SDA writings, and contemporary scholars like Hasel);
2. The structure of the question is not apposition. (Held by some like Hasel);
3. Even if one admits the appositional structure of the question, it does not limit the scope of the question to the events in Dn8:10-12 (Held by those like Shea).
4. The meaning of the Hebrew word for “vision” in Dn8:13 can only refer to vs3-12.
5. The different meanings for hazôn and mar’e are valid. (Assumption 1).

Bibliography.

Anderson, John T.,

2003 Investigating the Judgment: Patterns of Divine Judgment, Hagerstown, M.D.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Andrews, J.N.,

1852 “The Sanctuary” *Review and Herald*, Dec 23, 1852, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on The Sanctuary, Daniel 8: 14, The Judgment, 2300 Days, Year- Day Principle, Atonement: 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, (No Publisher), 1983, pp. 261-268.

Archer, Gleason,

1985 “Daniel,” in The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, with the New International Version of the Holy Bible in Twelve Volumes, Volume 7: (Daniel – Minor Prophets), Grand Rapids, Michigan: Regency Reference Library.

Baldwin, Joyce,

1978 Daniel, an Introduction and Commentary, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, General Editor, D.J. Wiseman, Leicester, England: Intervarsity Press.

Bliss, S.,

1853a Memoirs of William Miller Generally Known as a Lecturer on the Prophecies and the Second Coming of Christ. Boston: Joshua V. Himes.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles A.,

1983 (1906) The New Brown – Driver – Briggs Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based

- on the lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. (No Location of Printer): Christian Copyrights, Inc.
- Bultema, Harry,**
1988 Commentary on Daniel, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications.
- Buttrick, George, (General Editor),**
1951-57 Interpreter's Bible in Twelve Volumes, New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Calvin, John,**
1948 Commentaries on the Book of Daniel, translated by Thomas Myers, in two Volumes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Charles, R. H.,**
192? The book of Daniel, Introduction, Revised Version with Notes, Index and Maps. London: T.C & E. C. Jack.
- Collins, John J.,**
1993 Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, in Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible Series, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Doukhan, Jacques B.,**
2000 Secrets of Daniel, Wisdoms and Dreams of a Jewish Prince in Exile, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Dowling, John,**
1840 An Exposition of the Prophecies, supposed by William Miller to Predict the Second Coming of Christ, in 1843, Providence: Geo. P. Daniels.
- Driver, S.R.,**
1922 The Book of Daniel, with Introduction and Notes, Cambridge: University Press.
- Elliger, K et Rudolph (Eds.),**
1984 Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, Stuttgart, Deutschland: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Froom, LeRoy E.,**
1948 The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation, Volume II, Pre-Reformation and Reformation Restoration, and Second Departure, Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Ford, Desmond,**
1978 Daniel, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association
- Goldingay, John E.,**
1989 Daniel, Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 30, Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Goldstein, Clifford,**
1988 1844 Made Simple, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- 1994 "The Significance of Daniel 8:14," *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.11-17.

- 2003 Graffiti in the Holy of Holies, an impassioned response to recent attacks on the sanctuary and Ellen White, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- Hartman, Louis F., and Di Lella, Alexander A.,**
1978 The Book of Daniel, in The Anchor Bible Series, New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Hasel, Gerhard F.,**
1974 "Revelation and Interpretation in Daniel," Ministry, Oct.: Washington, D.C: Review and Herald, pp.20-23.
1980 *The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27* Paper prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
1981a *The 'Little Horn,' the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8*, in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner, (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
1986d "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8: 9-14, in Symposium on Daniel, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series Volume 2, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
1992 "2300 Days: The Message of the Prophecy of Daniel 8, *Adventists Affirm*, Fall, pp.5-9, 11.
1992 "Is the 'Little Horn' Antiochus?" *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.10-18, 35.
1992 "How Our Pioneers Discovered the Sanctuary Doctrine," *Adventist Affirm*, Fall, pp.19-28.
1993a "Who are the Remnant?" *Ministry*, Fall, pp.5-13, 31.
- Heaton, E. W.,**
1956 The Book of Daniel: Introduction and Commentary, London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Kautzsch, E.,**
1982 (1909) Gesenius Hebrew Grammar 2nd English Edition revised in accordance with the 28th German edition by A. E. Cowley, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F.,**
1978 (1872) Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Daniel: Translated from the German by James Martin.
- Lacocque, Andre,**
1979 (1976) The Book of Daniel, Translated by David Pellauer, English edition revised by the Author, London: SPCK.
- Leupold, H.C.,**
1949 Exposition of Daniel, Nineteenth Reprinting, 1985, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House Company.

Mansell, Donald Ernest,

2002 Open Secrets of the Antichrist: has the beast of Bible prophecy identified himself? Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Mays, James L. (Ed.),

1988 Harper's Bible Commentary, San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers.

McCready Price, George,

1955 The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Miller, William,

1836 Evidences from Scirpture [sic] and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843: Exhibited in a Course of Lectures. Troy: Kemble and Hooper.

1983 (1849) *Wm. Miller's Apology and a Defense*. Second Advent Library, New Series, No.5 September, 1849, Boston: Published by Joshua Himes, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on The Sanctuary, Daniel 8: 14, The Judgment, 2300 Days, Year- Day Principle, Atonement: 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, (No Publisher), 1983, pp. 8-18.

Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,

1961 Doctrinal Discussions: a compilation of articles originally appearing in the Ministry, June, 1960 – July, 1961, in answer to Walter R. Martin's book, The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, Washington, DC: Review and Herald.

1988 Seventh-day Adventists Believe...., Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Nichol, Francis D. (Ed.),

1976 (1957) The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment in seven Volumes. Volume 4: Isaiah to Malachi. Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association. Revised.

Porteous, Norman,

1979(1965) Daniel, A Commentary, Second, Revised, Edition, Old Testament Library, London: SCM Press.

Pfandl, Gerhard,

2004a "Daniel," *Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide*, Oct-Dec, 2004, Warburton, Australia: Signs Publishing Co.

2004b Daniel: The Seer of Babylon, Hagerstown, M.D.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Prince, J. Dyneley,

1899 A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, designed especially for the Students of the English Bible, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung; London: Williams & Norgate; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.

Rodríguez, Angel M.,

2002 Future Glory, The 8 Greatest End-Time Prophecies in the Bible, Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Russell, D.S.,

1981 “Daniel,” in Daily Bible Study Series (Old Testament), John C. L. Gibson (Editor), Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press; Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Seow, C. L.,

2003 Daniel, Lousville, London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Shea, William H.,

1980a. *Daniel and the Judgment*, Paper prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

1980b *The Apotelesmatic Principle: Philosophy, Practice and Purpose* Paper prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

1981 *The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9*, in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner , (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1982 Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation, (Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Volume 1), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1986 “Early Development of the Antiochus Epiphanes Interpretation,” in Symposium on Daniel, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series Volume 2, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1996 Daniel 7-12, (Prophecies of the End Time), *The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier*, George R Knight, General Editor, Boise, Idaho and Oshawa, Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

1997 “History and Eschatology in the Book of Daniel,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol.8, No.1-2, pp.195-205.

2003 “Historicism, the best Way to Interpret Prophecy,” *Adventist Affirm*, Spring, 2003, pp.22-34.

Smith, U.,

1870 Thoughts on the Book of Daniel chapter IX Continued, *Review and Herald*, August 23, 30, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14. The Judgment, 2300 days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement, 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, pp. 475-479.

1898 Looking Unto Jesus or Christ in Type and Antitype. Warburton, Victoria, Australia: Signs Publishing Company, 1898.

1944(1865-73) The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, Revised Edition, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Company.

Spangler, J. Robert (Ed.),

- 1980 "Christ and His High Priestly Ministry: Special Sanctuary Issue", Ministry, Vol. 53, No10, October, 1980.

Towner, W. Sibley,

- 1984 Daniel: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- 1988 "Daniel," in Harper's Bible Commentary, edited by James L. Mayes, (ed.,) San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.

Walvoord, John F.,

- 1971 Daniel: the Key to Prophetic Revelation, a commentary, Chicago: Moody Press.

Weber, M.,

- 1985 Some Call it Heresy: A Young Pastor Takes a Second Look at His Church. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

White, Ellen G.,

- 1950 (1888) The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

White, J. S.,

- 1854a "The Twenty Three Hundred Days," *Review and Herald*, April 18, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14. The Judgment, 2300 days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement, 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, p. 182.
- 1854b "Daniel Chapters viii and ix," *Review and Herald*, Nov 21, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14. The Judgment, 2300 days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement, 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, p. 187-189.
- 1863 "The Sanctuary (continued)," *Review and Herald*, July 21, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14. The Judgment, 2300 days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement, 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, pp.205-206
- 1870 "Our Faith and Hope: or Reasons Why we Believe as We Do, Number 12: The Time," *Review and Herald*, Feb 22, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14. The Judgment, 2300 days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement, 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, pp.241-243.

Young, Edward J.,

- 1949 Daniel, A Geneva Series Commentary, Reprinted 1978, The Banner of Truth Trust, London: Billing and Sons.
- 1954 "Daniel," in The New Bible Commentary, Second Edition, edited by the late Professor F. Davidson, London: The Inter-varsity Fellowship.

Appendix

1. Examination of the Use of Apposition in the O.T.

Kautzsch-Crowley's edition of *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, has a section devoted to the use of apposition with nouns in the Hebrew Text. Section §131

(pp.423-427) deals with simple apposition of substantives with substantives, numbers, adjectives, names and substantives with prepositions. There is no great attention to the use of clauses or phrases in apposition, but the grammar gives good general rules for apposition.

Apposition in the stricter sense is the collocation of two substantives in the same case in order to define more exactly (or to complete) the one by the other, and as a rule...the former by the latter. Apposition in Hebrew (as in the other Semitic languages) is by no means confined to those cases in which it is used in English or in the classical languages. It is not infrequently found when either the subordination of one substantive to the other or some other more circumstantial kind of exegetical addition would be expected.

The principle kinds of apposition in Hebrew are:

The collocation of *genus* and *species*....

Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and the *attribute*...

Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and *material*, or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*... Under this head may be included all the cases in which a numeral (regarded as a substantive) is followed by the object numbered in apposition....

Collocation of the thing and the measure or extent, number, etc.....

Collocation of the thing and its name....

(Kautzsch, 1982, p.423-425)

In the case of Dn8:13, type (a) above would best fit the relationship of the word “vision” to the rest of the question in v13. The broader word (or *genus*) “vision” is more completely or specifically defined by the apposition that follows it (or specific part of the vision). Had the substantive not have an apposition in collocation to it, the meaning would quite unequivocally have meant in the broadest sense the full vision of Dn8:3-12.

In the following section, an attempt is made to highlight the Biblical use of apposition, and the classification used by Gesenius above will be used to classify these appositions.

APPOSITION IN THE BIBLE

THINGS STILL TO DO

Can you spend more time on the Antiochus view? Cf Hasel and Shea’s stuff in Adventist affirm on this.

YOU COULD INCLUDE HERE AN EXTENDED EXAMINATION ON THE USES OF APPOSITION IN THE O.T AND PERHAPS LINK IT TO THE PAPER.

2. William Miller’s explanation of the question in Daniel 8:13

John Dowling, one of those writers who replied to Miller’s lectures with a publication arguing against Miller’s ideas, highlights some crooked logic of Miller in regard to the question of Daniel 8:13 and then his placing of the time of the beginning of the events that answer that question in the Persian empire. Miller sees the question as applying to the events described in verses 9-12 of Daniel 8—that is to say, the

activities of desecration and desolation, and then looks to the beginning of the 2300 evening-morning period as beginning with the announcement to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, rather than an event that signals the beginning of the desecrating activities he describes. Dowling was a supporter of the Antiochus Epiphanes IV view, but notwithstanding this, his comments on Miller's crooked thinking are pertinent. Here are Dowling's comments:

The reader of the foregoing remarks will, I think, be satisfied that there are, at least, very strong grounds for believing that the "little horn" means Antiochus Epiphanes.

Mr. M. supposes it to mean Pagan and Papal Rome. After quoting Rev. 11 : 2, "the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months," he adds,

This last text only has reference to the Papal beast, which was the image of the Pagan, but the text in consideration (viz.: Dan. 8 : 13, 14) has reference to both Pagan and Papal.

He explains the question, "How long shall be the vision, concerning the daily sacrifice?" by the following words:

That is, *how long shall the Pagan transgression and the Papal transgression tread under foot the sanctuary and the host?* This [says he] must be the true and literal meaning of our text.

Now supposing it were granted that the "little horn" is the Roman government, still there is no reason for placing the commencement of these calamities in the year BC 457.

Upon the above supposition, we cannot suppose the Roman power to spring up from the head of the he-goat, or from Alexander's Grecian empire, before the latter was in existence. The Roman power could only, in any sense, be regarded as a horn springing from the head of the goat, when it should succeed to at least a portion of the dominions of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's was divided. This took place when the Romans at Pydna, in Macedonia, obtained a decisive victory over Perseus, the last king of Greece and the west, and reduced that kingdom, which was one of the four that sprung from Alexander's, to the condition of a Roman province.

So that if Mr. M. is right, in supposing the 2300 days to mean 2300 years, and the little horn to mean the Roman power; still, the commencement cannot be dated before the Roman power became a horn of the he-goat, or in other words, a branch of Alexander's Grecian empire, by the conquest of Greece, BC 168.

Before passing to Mr. Miller's next position, I would remark that the commencement of the 70 weeks, and that of the 2300 days, cannot be identical, because *the former* commences at an event among *the most joyful* in the history of the Jewish nation, viz.: "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," after their long and weary captivity in Babylon should have ended; and *the latter* commences at an event among *the most painful and calamitous* in their history, viz.: "the taking away of the daily sacrifice, setting up the abomination of desolation, and giving the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot."

This was an event calling for mourning and lamentation and tears, but *that* was an occasion of heartfelt joy to the pious and patriotic Jews, as all will confess, who peruse the account of its fulfillment in the seventh chapter of Ezra, verses 6 to 10.

In the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, Ezra went up from Babylon: and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord God of Israel had given: and the king granted him all his request, according to the hand of the Lord his God upon him. And there went up some of the children of Israel, and of the priests, and the Levites, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinims, unto Jerusalem, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes the king. And

he came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king. For upon the first day of the first month began he to go up from Babylon, and on the first day of the fifth month came he to Jerusalem, according to the good hand of his God upon him. For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.

The commandment or decree of Artaxerxes "to restore and to build Jerusalem," predicted by Daniel, and recorded by Ezra, was an instance of special favor towards the Jews, such as they have too seldom experienced from the kings of the earth. He not only permitted them to return to the much-loved city of their fathers, and encouraged them to raise from its ruins the temple of Jehovah, but also furnished them with silver and gold, exempted from tribute the Levites, singers, porters, and others connected with the service of the temple, and recommended them to the especial favor of the surrounding nations.

After recording this memorable decree, the pious Ezra bursts forth in the joyful language of grateful thanksgiving:

Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart . . .

I need scarcely inquire of the attentive reader, after perusing Ezra's account of this most joyful event in the history of the Jews, from which the prophecy of the seventy weeks is to be dated -- Can this be the date of the beginning of those dreadful calamities predicted in the vision of the 2300 days, when the daily sacrifice was to be taken away, the abomination of desolation to be set up, and the sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot?

The fact that the two visions predict events entirely opposite in their character is of itself a proof abundantly sufficient that the date of the vision of the 2300 days does not begin in the same as that of the 70 weeks. As this is the one single assumption upon which Mr. Miller's theory of the end of the world in 1843 is founded, it must be evident that with the failure of this proof his whole system falls to the ground.

Every intelligent reader of Mr. Miller's book will perceive that the commencement of his other prophetic periods is obtained simply by subtracting them from this one, to ascertain the date of their commencement; consequently the disproof of this is the refutation of all the rest. As this fact, however, is not mentioned by Mr. Miller, and as many may be struck with the apparent singular coincidences arising from our author's making other supposed prophetic periods, besides the 2300 days, end in the same year 1843, I shall proceed in the ensuing chapters to examine his remaining imaginary proofs of the coming of Christ in that year. (1840, pp.25ff)

Clearly Miller's position on the meaning of the question in Dn8:13 does not augur well when we come to looking at the answer he provides. Dowling has shown that Miller cannot have the abomination of desolation be the actions of the Pagan and Papal Roman Empire, and yet have it begin in the times of the Persian Empire. It is absurd and anachronistic. A difficult position for supporters of Miller's logic to be in when faced with the arguments of John Dowling.