

THE PRINCE AND PAGANISM

Jesus Christ and the gospel is involved in mortal combat with Satan's counterfeit religion of Babylonian paganism. The spirit of self-exaltation and pride, so appealing to the human heart, counterfeits the true religion of Heaven which is God humbling himself to become a man and die for the sins of the world. Paganism brings an offering to sacrifice which appears to be the genuine: a ram, a he-goat, a little horn as counterfeit of the horns on the altar. These sacrificial hybrid animals can never expiate sin deriving from pagan philosophies of self-exaltation. Only the true sacrifice of the Son of God become the Son of man can remove sin; both in His death and the application of His blood in the heavenly sanctuary. This is the genuine truth of the plan of salvation which the little horn seeks to obscure.

Daniel 8:1. "In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first."

Daniel ties the two visions together by saying that this vision came "after that which appeared unto me at the first." Both visions were given to Daniel during the reign of Belshazzar, the eldest son of King Nabonidus, who was the crown prince and became the ruler of Babylon during the last ten years of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. The mention of Belshazzar who opposed God is a pale foreshadowing of the little horn to come.

Daniel 8:2. "And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai."

The visions recorded earlier in Daniel came as dreams in the night: Nebuchadnezzar (2:1; 4:5), and Daniel (7:1). This vision comes to Daniel during the daytime. The prophet was taken to the citadel of Susa, the capital of Elam, which was a border state between Babylonia and Persia. He came to stand on the west bank of the Ulai river near Susa.

Daniel 8:3. "Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last."

He looked eastward across that river and saw a ram coming toward him from the east. It had two horns on its head, but they were

uneven. The higher one came up later. Later, Gabriel, who was sent to Daniel to interpret the vision to him, explained this feature. “The two-horned ram that you saw represents the kings of Media and Persia” (vs. 20).

The Medes and Persians were related peoples who occupied the Iranian plateau—the Medes in the north and the Persians in the south. The Medes were the more powerful of the two, and they gave the Assyrians considerable difficulty on their eastern border from the ninth to the seventh centuries B. C. The royal houses of the Medes and Persians intermarried, and eventually, under Cyrus, the Persians became the stronger of the two. Cyrus conquered Media and incorporated it into his kingdom, hence the combined name of the Medo-Persian Empire. This dual power is represented by the ram in this vision.

Daniel 8:4. “I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.”

As Daniel watched, the ram charged off into three different directions. The accompanying statement makes it obvious that this represented conquests by this power: “No animal could stand against him, and none could rescue from his power” (vs. 4). The three directions of conquest were toward the north, the west, and the south. The major conquest of the Persians toward the north was the kingdom of Lydia in Anatolia or ancient Turkey. Cyrus conquered this area in 547 B.C. To the west, Persia, under Cyrus, conquered Babylon in 539 B. C. To the south, Cyrus’s son Cambyses conquered Egypt in 525 B.C. In this way the Medo-Persian Empire was extended in these three directions.

The presence of a ram in the vision reminds us of the sanctuary. This was a sacrificial animal. But here is a reversal of the rituals that took place there. The ram “became great,” *gadal* means “to be great,” or “to magnify oneself.” In terms of arrogance the ram reversed the ritual that took place in the sanctuary. Instead of submitting to sacrifice it exalts itself.

Flushed with success, the Persian emperors tried to extend their conquests one step further in the north. They invaded Greece. Two difference Persian kings, Darius I in 490 B.C. and Xerxes in 480 B.C., tried to subdue Greece. But after some initial successes, both were

eventually turned back and had to return home. Thus ended the Persian attempts to conquer Greece.

Daniel 8:5. "And as I was considering, behold, an he goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes."

This Greek goat did not forget this national humiliation of a Persian invasion and the destruction they had wrought. The goat came from the opposite direction from which the ram came. He moved very fast, appearing not to touch the ground, or flying. He was a unicorn.

Daniel 8:6. "And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power."

The goat ran at the ram "furiously." Greece was out to even the score, and it did so—and then some. Alexander the Great defeated the Persians, and his victorious army marched all the way to the valley of the Indus River in northwestern India before returning.

Daniel 8:7. "And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand."

Alexander clashed with the Persian armies of Darius III, in the bloody battle of Arbela in 331 B.C., and completely overwhelmed them. It was a miracle that the tiny Grecian army should rout the huge hosts of the Persians, like a leopard killing a tired elephant. The Persians could not fight—they simply lost their will.

Daniel 8:8. "Therefore the he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven."

The goat is another sacrificial animal of the sanctuary. But Greece reverses the humility of the sacrificial goat and "waxed very great." Again, the word *gadal* is elevated to "very exalting."

Hardly had Alexander conquered the world at the age of only 33 than he himself, the great horn, "was broken." Conqueror of the world, he could not rule himself. Some history says he died from a drunken spree, whispering that he was leaving his newly conquered empire "to the strongest." His fate has been immortalized in a poem which contrasts his achievements with those of Jesus.

Jesus and Alexander died at thirty-three.

One lived and died for self,

The other died for you and me.

The prophecy predicted Alexander's death. "He was broken off." At the height of his powers and conquest, Alexander died in 323 B.C. He had a son, but this son did not inherit the kingdom (Dan. 11:4). Instead, Alexander's kingdom was divided among his generals. There was fighting among them for a period of about twenty years. But by 301 B.C., four kingdoms had emerged from the political chaos that ensued after the death of Alexander (8:8, 22). These were: (1) Macedonia under Cassander; (2) Thrace and northwestern Asia Minor under Lysimachus; (3) Syria and Babylonia under Seleucus; and (4) Egypt under Ptolemy.

Daniel 8:9. "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."

After these four kingdoms had been established a new power came on the scene of action. This power, a "small horn." One school of interpreters holds the little horn represents an individual king, Antiochus IV Euphron, a Greek king of the Syrian kingdom. We believe the "little horn" is the Roman Empire for the following reasons:

First, there is a progression of power utilized by these three kingdoms. The Persian ram was *gadal*—"became great." The Grecian goat was *gadal*—"very great." The little horn was *gadal*—"waxed exceeding great." This progression from the comparative to the superlative would be true in terms of the Roman Empire, but it would not be true in terms of an individual ruler such as Antiochus Euphron.

Second, Antiochus (175-163 B.C.) ruled in Syria about the *middle* of the Seleucid dynasty which lasted from 301 B.C. until 64 B.C. He was the seventh king out of twenty-seven in the Seleucid dynasty. The little horn power, however, appears on the scene of action "in the latter part of their reign" (vs. 23), at the *latter* end of the rule of the four Greek kingdoms. Rome did appear on the scene at the latter part of the rule of these four kingdoms, conquering each in turn—Greece in 168 B.C., Asia Minor in 133 B.C., Syria in 64 B.C., and Egypt in 31 B.C. Thus Rome fulfills this characteristic of the vision, but Antiochus does not.

Third, the little horn was to conquer to the east, the south, and the pleasant land. Antiochus was unable to conquer in any of these directions. He never took the "beautiful land" or Judea.

Fifth, any power which should rise up against Greece, must naturally come forth from some part of it. "Out of one of them came forth a little horn." Alexander's dominion was universal, extending even to Rome, is attested by the following statements:

"Alexander and a Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work, and to found a wider and still more enduring empire."¹

In the year 168 B. C., Antiochus Euphron, then king of the Syrian division, determined to make himself master of Egypt, which was then governed by his nephew and niece, who were very strong, and incapable of successful resistance. Says Prideaux:—

"This he most certainly would have accomplished, but that he met a Roman embassy in his way, which put a stop to his further progress, and totally dashed all the designs which he had been so long carrying on for the making of himself master of that country."²

The embassy was one which the Roman Senate had sent in response to the request of the young Egyptian monarch for assistance against Antiochus. The reader will not fail to note that only three ambassadors, and not an army, were sent by the Romans to command Antiochus to desist from his intended war on Egypt. These ambassadors met Antiochus when he was only four miles from Alexandria, when he was on his way to besiege that city. The chief ambassador was Popilius, with whom Antiochus had been intimate while he was in Rome as a hostage. On seeing Popilius, Antiochus reached for his hand to embrace him as an old friend. "But Popilius, refusing the complement, told him that the public interest of his country must take the place of private friendship; that he must first know whether he were a friend or an enemy to the Roman State, before he could own him as a friend to himself; and then delivered in his hands the tables in which were written the decree of the Senate, which they came to communicate to him, and required him to read it and forthwith give him his answer thereto. Antiochus, having read the decree, told Popilius he would consult with his friends about it, and speedily give him the answer they should advise; but Popilius, insisting on an immediate answer, forthwith drew a circle round him [Antiochus] in the sand, with the staff which he had in his hand, and

¹ Arnold's *History of Rome*, chap. 30, part. 1 and 2.

² Prideaux, *Connection*, Vol. 2, Book 3, "An. 168, Ptol. Philometer 13."

required him to give his answer before he stirred out of that circle; at which strange and peremptory way of proceeding, Antiochus, being startled, after a little hesitation, yielded to it, and told the ambassador that he would obey the command of the Senate; whereupon Popillius, accepting his embraces, acted thenceforth according to his former friendship with him.”

But the point of all this is found in the next two sentences of Prideaux. Says he: “That which made him [*i.e.*, Popillius] so bold as to act with him after this peremptory manner, and the other so tame as to yield thus patiently to it, was the news which they had a little before received of the great victory of the Romans, which they had gotten over Perseus, king of Macedonia. For Paulus Æmilius, having now vanquished that king, and thereby added Macedonia to the Roman Empire, the name of the Romans after this carried that weight with it as carried a terror in all the neighboring nations; so that none of them after this cared to dispute their commands, but were glad on any terms to maintain peace, and cultivate a friendship with them.”

Now since it was the conquest of Macedon which gave Rome its prestige among the nations, and made it virtually a universal empire, having the power to dictate to other kingdoms, and to stop their projects by a single word, it is evidently very proper to speak of it as “coming out” of one of the horns of goat, viz., the Macedonian horn. The historian, in describing the rise of the Roman Empire, could not well employ a more fitting expression than that used by the prophet, 370 years before the occurrence. The quotation given above shows the immense superiority of the Romans over Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus of itself effectually demolishes the theory held by some that that pusillanimous king was the “exceeding great” power represented by the little horn.

Daniel 8:10. “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 territorial conquests to the east, south, and the beautiful land in Daniel 8:9 represent territorial conquests by Imperial Rome. With verse 10, however, a transition takes place. The little horn has a new target identified as “the host of heaven” and “the stars.” The casting down of the stars is explained in vs. 24, “He will destroy the mighty men and the holy people.” The saints of the Most High are the targets of the little horn, and that tells us that the little horn was to be a persecuting power.

Of course Imperial Rome did persecute Christians from time to time. But persecution was carried on for a longer time and to a greater extent by religious Rome under the papacy.

The Crusades of the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries against “infidels” in the Middle East were holy wars directed by the papacy. From these, the idea of crusades against Christian “heretics” was developed, leading to attacks on the Albigenses in southern France and the Waldenses in northern Italy in the thirteenth century.

A latter form of the inquisition was developed in Spain. And since Spain controlled a considerable portion of the New World, the inquisition was exported to Latin America where it was carried on until the early nineteenth century. From Spain, this type of activity was also exported to Holland where the Duke of Alva led the Spanish troops in suppressing and killing Dutch Protestants in 1568.

France also saw aggressive action against Protestants. Thousands of Huguenots fell on St. Bartholomew’s Day in 1572. Again, when the French king revoked the Edict of Toleration in 1685, many of the Huguenots had to flee to other countries. All this activity correlates well with the type of persecution which the little horn is said to carry out by casting down to the ground the stars, or the saints of the Most High and trampling upon them.

Daniel 8:11. “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 vision next brings to view a chief opponent of the little horn: he is known as the “Prince of the host.” A “host” means an army. The Prince is evidently Christ who is identified in vs. 25 as “the Prince of princes” against whom the little horn stands up against. Indeed, Imperial Rome presided over the trial, condemnation, and execution of Christ upon the cross. However, the chief leaders of the Jews prosecuted the case before the Roman tribunal. However, in seeking to humiliate Christ by crucifixion they were the unwitting participants in exalting Christ. His ultimate sacrifice exalted Him in the eyes of the onlooking universe. It was by His being lifted up that the whole world is drawn to Him and must make a decision as to the gift which He has given to every man by virtue of His taken the penalty for their sins.

Just as the ram, the he goat are counterfeit sanctuary ritual animals, so is the little horn. The horn seeks to substitute its sacrifice in the place of Jesus’ cross. This he does by taking away “the daily” and casting down the sanctuary of the daily. Now “the daily” is the

continual pagan spirit of *gadal*. It is the self-exalting spirit of the ram becoming “great;” the he goat being “very great;” and the little horn “waxing exceeding great” (vs. 9). The *tamid* or continual, daily, spirit of these pagan empires self-exaltation was taken away.

“The place of his sanctuary was cast down.” This earthly dedicated pagan sanctuary is in stark contrast to God’s holy sanctuary (8:13, 14). The center of pagan worship, its sanctuary, was the city of Rome. The place or habitation of pagan Rome’s sanctuary was cast down by Constantine and transferred to Constantinople in 330 A.D. Pagan Rome’s original sanctuary in Rome remained and was permanently occupied by papal Rome. This same transfer is brought to view in Revelation 13:2, where it is said that the dragon, pagan Rome, gave to the beast, papal Rome, his “seat,” that is, the city of Rome.

Daniel 8:12. “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 practiced, and prospered.”

An army was given the little horn against pagan Rome. The host was an army which slowly degraded the pagan Roman Empire. The ten barbarian tribes represented by the ten toes of the great image and the ten horns on the terrible beast of Dan. 7, each played a role in demolishing over the course of time, the pagan Roman Empire. This was all to the benefit of papacy now left in the city of Rome.

The final liberation of the city of Rome from barbarian control came by a collaboration of the papacy with the Franks. This union of church with the state to accomplish its purposes is denominated “by reason of transgression.” Claiming to be acting in behalf of God and doing His will Clovis the king of the Franks supported the papacy in liberating Rome from the barbarians (508 A. D.) so that the papacy would be unhindered in its control of the former pagan sanctuary or stronghold.

The meaning of “the daily *sacrifice*” as paganism is confused by the translators adding the word “sacrifice” which is not in the original Hebrew of this text. When the English translations were made, this word “sacrifice” was supplied by the translators who innocently thought the meaning required it. To show that “sacrifice” is not part of the inspired text, they printed it in italics (or in parentheses) in some versions.

A comment by Ellen White is appropriate at this point: “Then I saw in relation to the ‘daily’ (Dan. 8:12) that the word ‘sacrifice’ was supplied

by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text, and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'daily'; but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed."³

Before the disappointment in 1844, union existed and "nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'daily';" but after the disappointment various opinions were advanced.

William Miller, the apostle of the judgment-hour cry, in "Second Advent Manual," p. 335, sums up an argument on the subject of the "daily" as follows: "*The daily must mean paganism.*"

Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers in giving the message prior to 1844, in his "Prophetic Expositions," Vol. I, p. 127, sums up an argument on the "daily" of Dan. 8:12 in these words: "They are two desolating powers which were to desolate the sanctuary and the host, the church and her metropolis. *They are paganism and popery.*"

Apollos Hale, another leader in the work prior to 1844, in "Second Advent Manual," p. 68, speaking of the "daily," teaches that paganism was the power taken away, and calls the Pantheon in Rome the "temple or asylum of all the gods," and the sanctuary of paganism.

In the "Advent Shield and Review" of May, 1844, p. 121, edited by Joshua V. Himes, Sylvester Bliss and Apollos Hale, is the following: "The only event we can find from which to date the 1335 days is the succession of the supremacy of papacy, to that of paganism in the Roman Empire, which the best chronologists place about A. D. 508."

On the 1843 Prophetic Chart, drawn by Charles Fitch and published by Joshua V. Himes, 508 A. D. is given as the date for the taking away of the "daily" of Dan. 12:11, margin. The chart gives 508 A. D. as the beginning of the periods of 1290 days and 1335 days of Dan. 12:11, 12. This is the chart referred to in "Early Writings," p. 74.

In "Miller's Life and Views," by Joshua V. Himes, p. 48, at the close of an explanation of Dan. 12:11, he says, "I have come to this conclusion, that this power called 'daily sacrifice' is Rome, pagan abomination, the same as Christ refers to in Matt. 24:15; Luke 21:21."

³ Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, pp. 74, 75.

From the above we find that the foremost leaders in proclaiming the judgment-hour message have left very decided testimonies in regard to their views of the “daily,” which are said to be “correct” views.⁴

The alternate view that has come in is that “the daily” is the heavenly sanctuary ministry of Christ as high priest. It has been taken away by the papacy. The problem with this view is that not even the papacy can take away the high priestly ministry of Christ. It cannot remove His ministry either physically nor from the Bible and those who read it and understand and follow their conscience as the truth impresses itself upon their hearts.

It is the issue over the new view of the daily that has caused some bright lights such as Desmond Ford, L. R. Conradi, A. F. Ballenger; and yes, even E. J. Waggoner, to forsake the sanctuary truth and leave the church.

The reason why is this: If the “the daily” is the high priestly ministry of Christ which the papacy seeks to destroy, then it opens the door for the 2300 days (vs. 14) to be misapplied. Those days begin in 457 B.C. and end in 1844 A.D. But the papacy did not even exist in 457 B.C. It did not emerge until the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

Hence, they say, the only little horn king that did exist shortly after Daniel’s time was Antiochus, the Syrian king. He desecrated the post-exilic temple at Jerusalem culminating in the sacrificial offering of a pig on its altar. His trampling of the temple on earth corresponded to approximately 2300 evenings and mornings or 1,150 days. This makes the 2300 days literal with a prophetic fulfillment before the coming of Christ. Thus the 2300 day/year prophecy has no significance so far as a far later date in 1844 A.D. when Christ went into the most holy place as our High Priest.

This line of thought undermines the Third Angel’s Message which is the whole reason for being of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It destroys the Spirit of Prophecy, manifest in the ministry of Ellen G. White. Thus there is no more reason to be a Seventh-day Adventist. The issue of the daily is indeed a serious one.

In his treatise on the Investigative Judgment, Desmond Ford explains that our evangelists in the early 1900s had difficulty in presenting the pioneer view of “the daily” and were searching for an alternate explanation that would be more acceptable to the audience

⁴ *Early Writings*, p. 74. S. N. Haskell, “The Testimony of Twelve Leading Men,” *Bible Training School* 18, 1 (June, 1919), p. 7.

attending our meetings. About 1900, L. R. Conradi came up with an alternate position that was readily accepted by many of our evangelists worldwide.

Writing on the “new position,” Desmond Ford states:

But in the twentieth century, an endeavor has been made to link the answer of 8:14 to the question of 8:13. Evangelists had had great difficulty in this area, and therefore the new view of the “daily” found enthusiastic acceptance, as well as energetic opposition of some such as S. N. Haskell, Leon Smith (the son of Uriah), J. S. Washburn, G. B. Starr, F. C. Gilbert and others who held extreme views on the nature of inspiration of Ellen G. White.

Conradi, W. W. Prescott, A. G. Daniells, W. A. Spicer, W. C. White and others emphasized the new view of the “daily” as the ministration of Christ and thus made possible the interpretation of verse 14 as the restoration of the truth of the gospel.⁵

According to the SDA *Encyclopedia* Conradi’s position covered four main points:

1. The word “sanctuary” meant the sanctuary of God in heaven.
2. The “daily” was the true sanctuary service in heaven.
3. The “taking away” of the daily was the displacement of the true sanctuary’s service by the false papal system of the Mass.
4. The prophecy of the cleansing of the sanctuary had to do with the time when the typical service in the earthly sanctuary would be restored.

In his exposition of the book of Daniel, Desmond Ford claims that “the treading down of the sanctuary could only be vindicated by its restoration and the implementation of all that its services symbolized. . . . The literary context of parallel passages leads to the same conclusion It speaks of a polluting of the sanctuary that would call for a corresponding cleansing. It speaks of a defiling that would demand an atonement.”⁶

This position implies that the heavenly sanctuary is not polluted by the sins of the people, but rather is “polluted” by the usurpation of the false priesthood that emphasizes the necessity of human priests and salvation through human works—an obscuring of the “truth of the gospel.”

⁵ Desmond Ford; *Daniel 8:14; The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment*; 1980; p. 80.

⁶ Desmond Ford; *Daniel*; 1978; pp. 176-177.

Let's, for a moment, assume that this position is correct. If this position is correct, then it would mean that the "cleansing of the sanctuary" has nothing whatsoever to do with God's people or with the removal of sin. It only has to do with removing the idea of a human priesthood (which supposedly "obscures" the heavenly priesthood from the people) from the minds of the people and pointing the people to a finished work that has been *provided* for them, and which awaits their *availing* themselves of it (Ford's position on the "truth of the gospel").

Daniel 8:13. "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?"

The daily represents the principle of self-exaltation (*gadal*) associated with ancient pagan nations. "The *vision* concerning the daily" is everything that has been shown to Daniel from the ram to the little horn." Then the pagan phase of the little horn is taken away by the papal phase united with the state described as "the transgression of desolation."

Paganism, although it deceived millions, still left a painful emptiness in human hearts that prepared many to seek after and welcome the word of God. The doctrines of papal Rome (desolate" even that natural hunger of the human heart for God, supplying a false hope that makes one feel so satisfied that he feels no need of the word of God.

The Christian religion of the apostles was so appealing and so satisfying to the people of ancient Rome that paganism trembled and fell away before it. Satan saw that the only way he could hold the world in deception was to invent a religion which *professed* to be Christian and thus take advantage of some of the ideas of Christianity, and yet was spiritually the same as the old paganism.

Satan's plan was to lead the early church away from the purity and simplicity of the gospel by introducing pagan philosophies and superstitions to be mixed with the gospel. The result was the great "falling away" which the apostle Paul spoke of in 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4. It would finally be so serious that the very "man of sin. . . [would] sit in the temple of God," usurping the place of Christ, "showing himself that he is God." Doctrines borrowed from ancient Babylon and mixed with Christian teaching, prepared the way for the temporal exaltation of the Roman bishop to the place of pope.

A recent historian, Arthur Hunt, writes of the survival of paganism within the professed Christian church: “. . . the paganism of late antiquity did not die out after the fourth century, but rather attached itself to the church, reshaping it. . . . The church’s assimilation of pagan forms and Europe’s subsequent plunge into the night. . . . The old system was incorporated into the new. . . . Paganism kept its original character [of self-exaltation] but was placed under new management.”⁷

Thus, the little horn or papal Rome destroyed European paganism politically, “cast down” the truth of simple biblical Christianity to the ground, professed to usurp the place of Christ as head of His church, and “practiced and prospered.” It followed the spirit of *gadal* until it tried to usurp the place of “the prince of the host,” Christ Himself.

Papal Rome absorbed or took up within herself the doctrine and spirit of paganism, while military force working for her took away its political power. The simple truth of Bible faith was “cast down to the ground.”

We now come to the part of Daniel’s vision of greatest importance to us today: how long should this desolating power continue to trample the truth of God and hold the world in deception?

Daniel 8:13. “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?”

How long shall this “transgression” which desolates persecutes, and slays God’s people, continue? Will it never have an end?

Worst of all, it seemed in the time of Daniel that the God of Israel had Himself been conquered by paganism. It was natural to ancient people to suppose that a nation’s victory in war meant that its gods were supreme. The question God’s people were asking was, “How long” was this “continual in transgression” to triumph? Some, like Daniel were more concerned for the honor of God than for their own security.

Daniel gets his answer as he listens to a conversation between two angels. They direct him to the symbolical services of the Hebrew sanctuary, which reveal the meaning of world history and make plain God’s plan of salvation.

⁷ Arthur Hunt, *The Vanishing Word*, pp. 57, 60.