

Have We Followed Cunningly Devised Fables?

Could anything that the prophet Daniel wrote repeatedly be as insignificant as a lost horseshoe nail?

Jesus asks us to “read” and to “understand” Daniel. Close to the nerve center of the great doctrine of the sanctuary that has created the Seventh-day Adventist Church, lies the tiny prophetic detail of “the daily.” Daniel attaches great importance to it, speaking of it five times in chapters 8, 11, and 12—each in a different context.

The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church had a clear and cogent understanding of “the daily” which figured in our theological birth as a people. Their view has been all but abandoned today. For want of that pioneer understanding (which Ellen White endorsed), this tract suggests that confusion has settled in many Seventh-day Adventist minds about the vital teaching of the sanctuary. The loss can be immeasurable.

“For want of a nail the shoe was lost;
for want of a shoe, the horse was lost;
for want of a horse, the rider was lost;
for want of the rider, the battle was lost.”

—*Benjamin Franklin*, 1758

Robert J. Wieland

Preface

“The correct understanding of the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith.

“This [sanctuary] subject ... is the central pillar that sustains the structure of our position at this present time.”

(Ellen G. White, *Evangelism* 221; Letter 126, 1897).

We have all heard the story of a ship's captain who carefully piloted his precious vessel through dangerous waters by steering it exactly by the compass. But in spite of his best efforts, the vessel hit the rocks and sank. In the inquest, the ship's compass was examined.

It was found that someone cleaning the wooden case had carelessly left a fragment of a knife lodged in a crack. This had deflected the compass enough to lead the vessel onto the rocks.

If any fundamental doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventist church can be likened to the ship's compass, it is the sanctuary truth. This outline suggests that one of our illustrious leaders of a past generation deflected our compass by a false interpretation which has been accepted uncritically and thoughtlessly by generations of our scholars. Undetected by us, it has magnetized Brinsmead-Ford-Cottrell scholars into a repudiation of Bible support for the 1844 cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. They inherited a faulty compass. So this thesis suggests.

Daniel 8 and 9 provided direction for this church as a compass directs a ship. Our pioneers were virtually unanimous in their understanding of it. A key element was Daniel's figure of “the daily” taken away by the little horn. What they saw locked 1844 into Daniel 8:14, making the sanctuary in heaven the only one that could be cleansed, or justified. History shows that the pioneer's view was held practically unanimously by our people until about 1900, and enjoyed Ellen White's endorsement (EW 74, 75). Then came a change. Was it a disastrous one?

This outline suggests that Louis R. Conradi deflected our compass by introducing his new view about 1900. One of the first to accept this view, E.J. Waggoner, forthwith repudiated Ellen White, for he saw clearly that she upheld the pioneer's view. This was the beginning of his apostasy. Next, W.W. Prescott embraced Conradi's view, followed by A.G. Daniells, the General Conference president. These two gave the new view wide publicity, against Ellen White's counsel. In time, Conradi apostatized completely, and Prescott, in the end, virtually abandoned the sanctuary

doctrine. Others were Ballinger, Fletcher, Grieve, - a questionable track-record for new light.

Many have not pursued Conradi's view to its logical end. But some of our astute scholars have, and it has proved a short circuit that makes Antiochus Epiphanes of 168 B.C. to be the necessary "primary" fulfillment of the Daniel 8 prophecy. In their scheme, there is no room for an 1844 application except by a contrived "secondary" or "apotelesmatic" fulfillment. This is seen as a "face-saving" accommodation openly ridiculed by non-Adventist theologians and now by some of our own, built on Ellen White.

We must concede that the Seventh-day Adventist church has not as yet made the world conscious of the stupendous implications of an 1844 change in Christ's High Priestly ministry. And our own zeal in proclaiming the message is now considerably dissipated by these in-house misgivings. How can we expect to convince the world of a doctrine we are not ourselves sure of?

This outline is offered tentatively, soliciting criticism, comment or refutation from readers. Although I see evidence that Ellen White supported the pioneer view consistently, I appeal to a close study of the original Hebrew for its validation. I suggest the possibility that the pioneers were right, and Conradi was wrong. And had it not been for the latter, we would not be mired in our present confusion and controversy about the sanctuary.

Our Current Problem

1. Opponents from without, revisionists within, use "1844" to deny Biblical basis for existence of Seventh-day Adventist church:
 - a. Harold Lindsell: If 1844 is not Biblical, there is "no adequate basis for existence of Seventh-day Adventists." (he would wipe us off the face of the earth).
 - b. Donald Barnhouse: "You were founded on a lie ... Seventh-day Adventism will have to go back into the same position as Mormonism."
 - c. W.H. Olson: "Whole 1844 structure falls ... apart."
 - d. Raymond Cottrell: "No Biblical support for 1844" (only Ellen White's). In February 2002, is even more severely critical of our sanctuary doctrine.
 - e. Norman Jarnes: "The fundamental pillar of the Seventh-day Adventist church is ... built on October 22, 1844 event and when

that goes, traditional Adventism goes.”

- f. Ellen White agrees that SDA church was founded on understanding of Daniel 8:11-14. The sanctuary doctrine (with 1844) is “the foundation of our faith,” “the central pillar that sustains the structure of our position,” “the very message that has made us a separate people, ... given character and power to our work.” (Letter 126, 1897; *Evangelism* p. 221-225).

The Significance of “THE DAILY” (Ha Tamid)

1. Since the Maccabees, the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant view is: continual priestly ministry in the Lord’s sanctuary.
 - a. This view is crucial to identifying Antiochus Epiphanes as the little horn.
 - b. If early Adventists had so understood it, they would have been forced to recognize Antiochus as the primary fulfillment; no 1844 “Midnight Cry” movement could then have developed.
 - c. Miller’s wholly fresh approach to “the daily” established and locked in the 2,300 days as years, and led to establishing the 1844 terminus.
2. Miller and 1844 participants were virtually unanimous in seeing “the daily” as paganism supplanted by the papacy; it was an unusual view which captured attention.
 - a. Ellen White endorsed it (EW 75); is a clear statement. (See Appendix A)
 - b. After the Great Disappointment this view was pivotal in holding early Adventists from renouncing their faith in the 1844 movement.
 - c. 19th century Adventists were virtually unanimous in this view.
3. But since the early 1900’s, Conradi’s “new view” has captured nearly all Seventh-day Adventists. It holds;
 - a. “The Daily” is the ministry of the antitypical High Priest that was “taken away” by the papacy. This view is identical to the Antiochus Epiphanes view in principle: so that it sees an antitypical fulfillment in the papacy, whereas Antiochus constitutes the typical fulfillment.
 - b. Thus, it is impossible to exclude Antiochus consistently; he has to be considered the “primary” fulfillment the Holy Spirit intended. Reason and logic make it easy to see him as the exclusive application. This is John F. Walvoord’s strong contention.¹

- c. The Conradi view becomes captive to the Seventh-day Adventist type/anti-type principle.
- d. Seen in this light, present anti-Sanctuary agitation becomes the natural outgrowth of the “new view” adopted 75 years ago. It justifies, in principle, anti-Adventism from Miller’s 1844 era. If the papacy truly “took away” Christ’s High Priestly ministry, Antiochus must be the first or primary application of the prophecy. (This was Desmond Ford’s position clearly, even boldly, stated in his master’s thesis at Andrews University before the beginning of his meteoric Seventh-day Adventist career.)

The Historical Tension Between the Two Views

1. Miller arrived at his view contextually and historically:
 - a. He saw 2 Thessalonians 2:3-7 as commentary on Daniel 8:11-13.
 - b. Froom’s thesis that his view of “the daily” was tied to his mistaken 666 idea is not valid; there is no logical dependence.
 - c. J.N. Andrews saw “the daily” as an evil, desolating power; all early pioneers were unanimous in that view.
 - d. James White supported the pioneer view: see his *Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of our Lord* [1870], pp. 108-125).
 - e. All survivors of the pioneer days united in opposing Conradi’s view: Haskell, Loughborough, Smith, even Ellen White. The vigor of their opposition probably indicated conviction that it would result in the eventual scuttling of 1844 and the sanctuary doctrine as Cottrell has now done.²
2. Conradi’s “new view” grew out of his opposition to the 1888 message and identification of Luther as herald of “the third angel’s message in verity.” It displaces Jones’ and Waggoner’s concept of righteousness by faith.³
 - a. Conradi was one of the foremost despisers of the 1888 message at Minneapolis.⁴
 - b. He acknowledged his longstanding opposition to Ellen White.
 - c. His later apostasy was an outgrowth of his “new view;” he could not escape its logic.
 - d. E.J. Waggoner abandoned his confidence in Ellen White upon his acceptance of Conradi’s view: “*Early Writings* most clearly and decidedly declares for the old view,” he said. “O.A. Johnson shows most clearly that the *Testimonies* uphold the view taught by Smith.”⁵ This was the beginning of Waggoner’s serious downfall.

- e. Waggoner taught the “new view” to Prescott, Prescott to Daniells; both sought to win W.C. White, to his mother’s dismay.
 - f. Opposing *Early Writings* pp. 74, 75, Daniells declares it “an imperfect statement.” This was one source of his difficulty in maintaining a pro-Spirit of Prophecy image at the 1919 Bible Conference.
 - g. Daniells and Prescott swing almost the entire leadership and college teachers to the “new view.” H.M.S. Richards Sr. was the last evangelist to use Smith’s Daniel and Revelation.
3. The 1945 revision of Smith’s book forced a restudy of “the daily.”
 - a. The revisors are unanimous in accepting the new view, yet they could not force Smith to teach what he did not believe.
 - b. Result: the pioneer view reappears, but with added historical support for 508 A.D. as the start of the 1,290 years.
 4. Ellen White and “the daily.”
 - a. SDA Encyclopedia article⁶ cites Daniells as reporting that she either offered no objection to the “new view,” thus suggesting she supported it. Being an ardent believer in the “new view” himself, he may have misunderstood her. No evidence supports the opinion that she changed her view.
 - b. F.C. Gilbert, Hebrew scholar, reports that she told him on June 8, 1910, that agitation of the new view was a “scheme of the devil.” (see his “Report of Interview”). In 1908 she told Prescott that God permitted the view of the pioneers, that it was not “a mistake.” Gilbert being an ardent believer in the old view, could have misunderstood also? Possible, but his own view was based on Hebrew linguistics, not Ellen White statements. He was much more positive in his quotes attributed to Ellen G. White than was Daniells. He recorded his interview the day following, whereas Daniells waited some decades. Gilbert’s image was not impaired by reputed doubts regarding Ellen White.
 - c. Her 1910 counsels⁷ do not settle the issue one way or the other:
 - i. She deploras controversy, but especially regrets agitation of the “new view.”
 - ii. “Silence is eloquence” is not an endorsement of the “new view;” she never enjoined “silence” while the pioneer view was taught during all those decades.
 - iii. Don’t use “my writings” to “settle” the issue; advises the brethren to get together, study it out of the Bible and come to agreement on Biblical, linguistic grounds (does not mean

she was neutral).

- iv. Nothing in these 1910 counsels discourages further careful study of this issue in a times of crisis such as the present “sanctuary” opposition.
 - v. The general tenor of her life ministry was to support the leading of the Lord in the teachings of the pioneers in our early days.
5. W.H. Olson argues forcefully that the new view logically requires repudiation of Ellen White for it dissolves the 1844 position: “The whole 1844 structure falls hopelessly apart.”⁸
 6. There is no support for the “new view” in Ellen White’s writings; her only statement⁹ supports the pioneer view; she repeatedly deplors the agitation of the “new view;” Her advice: study the Bible as honest Christians, settle it there; she wanted Gilbert to help the brethren understand.
 7. She realizes that one view is true, the other is false, for there is a view that she called “the correct view,” “the true meaning of ‘the daily’”¹⁰; therefore, it is not meaningless trivia.
 8. Agitation of the “new view” is what created needless, unfortunate controversy that never existed prior to Conradi’s view.¹¹
 9. Tension is inevitable when two views are diametrically opposite.
 - a. Pioneers see “the daily” as the work of Satan, the evil of paganism exalted and absorbed into something worse—papalism.
 - b. The “new view” sees “the daily” as the work of Christ; His High Priestly ministry successfully removed by Satan. No two views of *anything* could be further apart.
 - c. A superficial reading of Daniel 8:11-13 appears to lean to the “new view,” largely due to prejudice created by pro-Antiochus translators; careful regard for Hebrew *ha tamid* in 11:31 and 12:11, 12 raises apparently insurmountable problems with that view.¹²

Linguistic and Contextual Study of “the Daily”

Literal Hebrew of the five “daily” passages in Daniel presents grave difficulties to the “new view”:

1. In Daniel 8:11, the verb is *rum*, which does not have a primary meaning of “take away” but “to exalt,” “to go on high,” “to lift up.” (every use in the Old Testament has this meaning implicit in its context).
 - a. The key thought in this verse: lifting up, rising up, or exaltation

of the little horn. In the process of its spectacular mushroom-like growth, with its rise to power it lifts up, takes up, or absorbs *ha tamid*.

- b. The law of first mention requires particular attention to this verb used with *ha tamid*. This is the “vision” (*chazon*); all subsequent mention of *ha tamid* is the “audition” (*mareh*).
 - c. Other uses of *rum* are found in Daniel 4:37; 5:19, 23; 11:36.
 - d. The verb *rum* is inconsistent with Antiochus’ removal of sacrifices from the Jerusalem temple; he did not lift up, take up, or exalt them.
 - e. *Rum* is equally inconsistent with the papacy removing, counterfeiting, or taking away Christ’s ministry; it did not lift up, take up, or exalt Christ’s ministry in any way—rather, the opposite.
 - f. Perhaps the clearest modern translation of *rum* in this context is to “incorporate” or “absorb.” Ellen White speaks of the papacy “incorporating” paganism¹³ and paganism “giving place” to it.¹⁴
 - g. The word *rum* used in Leviticus describes priests reaching in and lifting up the fat from the animal carcasses. This does not identify Daniel’s *ha tamid* as the Levitical “daily sacrifices” of the tabernacle or temple.
 - h. The word “sanctuary” in vs. 11 is *miqdash*, not the same as *qodesh* in vs. 14. *Miqdash* can refer to Satan’s dedicated place.¹⁵
 - i. “Sanctuary” in vs. 14 is *qodesh*, and is not the same; *miqdash* means “any dedicated place” usually requiring contextual or adjectival designation even when used in reference to the Lord’s sanctuary. In 2 Chronicles 36:17 it is used to make a derogatory reference to “their sanctuary,” that is, of the unfaithful Jews, as Ezekiel likewise refers to Satan’s “sanctuary” (*miqdash*, 28:18). In contrast, *qodesh* exclusively refers to the Lord’s true sanctuary, usually without adjectival designation. Daniel’s use of these two nouns in four verses is significant.
 - j. The word for “place” is unusual; means “base” or “headquarters.” Linguistic evidence could support the pioneers’ view that *miqdash* here is the dedicated place (or temple) of paganism, the city of Rome.
 - k. The ordinary word for take away or deprive is *adab*, and is not used in 8:11 (cf 5:20; 7:26).
2. Daniel 8:12: while *ha tamid* is “taken up,” truth is “cast down,” and “the host” set against *ha tamid* is designated as an earthly force—inappropriate to describe removal of Christ’s heavenly ministry.

- a. The force employed against *ha tamid be pasha*, is literally, “the continual in transgression.” Thus, the Hebrew identifies *ha tamid* as an evil thing and cannot refer to Christ. (No earthly force could take away His High Priestly ministry.)
- b. Pro Antiochus Epiphanes translators have manipulated the Hebrew *be* [in] to mean “by reason of transgression” instead of “in transgression.”
3. Daniel 8:13: literally, “How long the vision, *ha tamid*, the desolating iniquity, the giving both sanctuary (*qodesh*) and host to trampling?”
 - a. Places *ha tamid* in apposition with the “desolating iniquity.” This supports J.N. Andrews’ idea of “two desolating powers” mentioned here.
 - b. Why does Daniel now use *qodesh* instead of *miqdash* as he did in vs. 11? It indicates he means the Pioneer view.
4. Daniel 11:31: literally, “Military might shall stand on his part, and they shall disgrace (dishonor) the *miqdash* of military refuge (bastion, haven against military aggression) and shall remove (*sur*, not *rum*) *ha tamid* and shall place the abomination that makes desolate.”
 - a. Could plausibly be applied to Antiochus’ military attack on the Jerusalem temple, but is meaningless when applied to Christ’s High Priestly ministry which cannot be touched by military force. The verb *sur* is never used symbolically of taking something from the minds of the people.
 - b. The verb *sur* defines Daniel’s use of *miqdash* in 8:11 as the military bastion of *ha tamid*. Thus, it cannot fit the heavenly sanctuary.
 - c. The verb *sur* is appropriate for the removal of paganism as a political or military force opposing the papacy. Its incorporation spiritually into the papacy is denoted by the verb *rum* in 8:11. This profound insight is very important in the development of Christian history.
 - d. “Sanctuary of Strength” (*miqdash* with *maoz*) is a “military fortress,” a phrase inappropriate for the heavenly sanctuary; *maoz* as used by Daniel always means a military fortress of political fortification (11:1, 7, 10, 19, 31, 38, 39).
5. Daniel 12:11: a definite time set for removal of *ha tamid* militarily or politically in order to “set up” the papacy; recognizing the 1290 days is essential to a true identification of *ha tamid*.
 - a. The “new view” proponents are unable to explain this. This admission is prominent.¹⁶
 - b. All proponents of the Antiochus view flounder here in a hopeless

- quagmire of confusion. See any non-Adventist commentary.
- c. 150 years of Adventist exposition still see 508 A.D. as a reasonable application; the revised *Daniel and Revelation*, by Smith, supports this date with further evidence unknown in his day.
 - d. 508 A.D. does not refer to *rum* activity of the papacy in 8:11 as lifting up or incorporating paganism into the papacy, but to its political, military removal of paganism as a hindrance to the temporal supremacy of the papacy. This is the pioneers' identification of the "taking away" of 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7.
 - e. The logical extension of the "new view" (Antiochus) is to interpret the 2300, 1290, and 1335 days as literal; or even to ignore the 1290 and 1335 days aspect of *ha tamid*, thus leaving Daniel to fizzle out in a meaningless wilderness of speculation and futility. For example, in *God Cares*, by Mervin Maxwell, the Daniel 12 mention of "the daily" is totally omitted, depriving the reader of any understanding of the 1290 and 1335 "days." This is vivid contemporary evidence of the confusion engendered by the "new view."

When Daniel speaks unmistakably of the continual or daily temple services, he does not use *ha tamid*, but *zebah* and *minbah* ("the sacrifice and oblation [to cease]," in Daniel 9:27). There is no linguistic or contextual hint that he intends these terms to be synonymous with *ha tamid*. Further, if *ha tamid* does refer to temple services which "ceased" in the midst of the 70th week, how could it be "taken away" by the little horn centuries later? If he wished to speak of daily or continual temple services in 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31 and 12:11, why would he not be consistent and use *zebah* and *minbah*?

An Historical Approach to "the Daily"

1. History presents a sudden phenomenal dissolution of paganism that was supplanted by a meteoric rise to power of the papacy:
 - a. See Augustine's *City of God*—a commentary on this amazing historical development.
 - b. Pagan Romans bewailed the sack of Rome in 410 A.D. and attributed the calamity to Catholic Christians' triumph over paganism. J.N. Andrews and the pioneers saw Rome as the disgraced pagan "sanctuary" or "dedicated place" (*miqdash*) of Daniel 11:31. Linguistically, this is possible; but also historically justifiable.
 - c. A.B. Bruce: "Paganism is a perpetual eclipse of Divine Grace."¹⁷

- d. “The more Christianity supplanted the heathen worship the more did it absorb the elements of paganism.”¹⁸
2. Did Paul refer to this transfer and absorption of paganism into Romanism in 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7? If not, where did he get his “taken away” idea?
 - a. Ellen White firmly identifies his “man of sin” as the papacy. Her reason? Scriptural exegesis.
 - b. Perhaps Paul is commenting on Daniel 8:11-13; 11:31.
 - c. Jesus surely taught His disciples the significance of Daniel’s prophecies (Matthew 14:15; Luke 24:27, 44, 45; Acts 1:3).
3. Did John in Revelation 13:1, 2 allude to this development?
 - a. Early Adventists so understood this passage in Revelation. Emperors from Constantine to Justinian allowed the Bishop of Rome to assume political power.
 - b. Thus, the dragon was pagan Rome; the beast, papal Rome.
 - c. The “dragon’s seat,” the city of Rome, was the former bastion of paganism, spiritual successor in John’s day to the old Babylonian paganism which enveloped the Jews in their Exile in Babylon. John could be referring to the *miqdash* of Daniel 8:11 and 11:31.
 - d. The ancients clearly recognized Rome as successor of the Babylonian pagan worship headquarters; a worshiper from the East was at home in Rome’s Pantheon.
4. Historical comment in *The Great Controversy* could fit the pioneer view of Daniel 8:11: “The work of corruption rapidly progressed. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ. ... Paganism had given place to the papacy.”¹⁹
5. While paganism was “taken up” (Hebrew, *rum*) into the papacy, and “removed” politically and militarily (Hebrew, *sur*), there could never be an actual “taking away” of the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary?
 - a. When Daniel spoke of the papacy changing God’s law, he was careful to state that it was only an attempted action: “he shall think to change times and laws” (Daniel 7:25). In contrast, he does not say that the “little horn” will “think” to take away *ha tamid*. The “new view” says he actually does take it away.
 - b. Overwhelming emphasis of scripture: no earthly or hellish power can actually “take away” Christ’s high priestly ministry (Hebrews

4:14-17; 5:6; 6:19, 20; 7:24, 25; 8:1, and etc.). To suggest otherwise would be blasphemy.

- c. Further, the papacy never took away Christ's ministry from the minds of true Christians, for they preserved their faith pure throughout the Dark Ages.²⁰
- d. The papacy could not "take away" Christ's ministry from the minds of apostate or misinformed adherents, for they never had a true understanding of His ministry. Christ's letter to "Thyatira" (Revelation 2:18-29) is not to the papacy but to true followers of Christ at this time. There is no hint that His heavenly ministry had truly been taken away, ever.
- e. If the papacy actually took away Christ's ministry from the minds of the people (as "new view" proponents have said), it would follow logically that the 16th century Reformation restored it.
 - i. This would establish Lindsell's, Barnhouse's, Walvoord's, and Conradi's contention that 1844 is meaningless trivia; that there is no excuse for the existence of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Again, the "new view" presents itself as logically subversive of Seventh-day Adventism.
 - ii. If the "new view" is correct, it would logically follow that what was "restored" or "justified" in 1844 was the same ministry "taken away" earlier by the papacy, that is, the first apartment ministry of Christ as High Priest. 1844 inaugurates a new second apartment ministry.
 - iii. Either way, the "new view" of Conradi logically resolves itself into a denial of Seventh-day Adventism and is basic to the Cottrell's and Ford's position.
6. If the papacy, directed by Satan, could actually "take away" the High Priestly Ministry of Christ, how could Satan do this if he had been "cast out" of heaven at the time of the cross (Revelation 12:13)?

Did the Jews in Babylonian Exile Understand HA TAMID as an Idiom for Paganism?

1. The overwhelming problem of the Exile was the apparent superiority of paganism over YHWH (Jehovah). This was a terrible assault to the faith of the Jews.
 - a. Israel was now in complete subjection to the "heathen world-power."²¹ Moses' warning fulfilled (Deuteronomy 28:64-47).
 - b. Paganism was seemingly triumphant over YHWH's covenant

with Abraham. Babylonian Bel had “swallowed” Judah like a piece of candy (see Jeremiah 51:34, 44).

- c. No Jerusalem *tamid* ministry was in existence during the Exile.
 - d. After the Exile, no true *tamid* ministry was ever reinstated because the Ark of the Covenant was never recovered; the real presence of YHWH in the Jerusalem sanctuary was therefore never truly restored (except in the brief personal visit of Christ to Herod’s temple).
 - e. The only possible identification of *ha tamid* (note, a substantive, never so used elsewhere in the Old Testament) during the Exile is as an idiom demoting the ever-continual, all pervading, all enveloping presence of surrounding paganism. It was a blight to Israel in Exile and a constant irritation, serious concern and challenge to their faith in YHWH.
2. The constant, supreme question in the minds of the Jews in Exile was, “How long” will this terrible “continual” paganism triumph over YHWH?²² It was the main burden of the Exilic Psalms (*tamid* is frequently used with reference to paganism). Note Isaiah’s Exilic concern for *tamid* paganism (Isaiah 51:12-14; 52:4-6; 65:1-3). “How long such unrequited *tamid* evil?” was the cry of Exilic writers.
- a. The vision of Daniel 8 was given as an answer to this persistent question: vs. 13.
 - b. Daniel’s surprise and agony: he sees paganism absorbed into a desolating power even more desolating, worse than itself because of its being now professedly Christian. The union creates the “abomination that maketh desolate.”
 - c. The literal Hebrew of Dan 8:11-14 presents a message that is relevant to the concerns of the Exilic Jews and satisfactorily answers their questions regarding paganism. The pagan-papal overreach becomes Daniel’s concern. Final victory of truth was assured as certain.
3. Only in Daniel is *tamid* used with the article, i.e., “*ha tamid*,” “the daily.”
- a. The *Cyrus Cylinder* uses a similar expression denoting paganism (line 7).
 - b. Without the article, *tamid* was used frequently in Exilic times as a desolating power.²³ It was natural for *ha tamid* as a unique substantive to be coined during the Exile as an idiom for paganism.
 - c. Neither Ezekiel nor any other Bible author uses *tamid* as a noun.
4. The prophet Daniel was not naive; his concern was not for mere cul-

tic ritual in the Jerusalem temple. As a prophet he was a man of very mature spiritual perception.

- a. The overwhelming concern of all the inspired prophets was for a personal heart relation to the YHWH, not a revival of ritualism.
- b. When David sinned, the Lord did not “desire” a ritual or daily “sacrifice.” (Psalm 51:6, 16, 17).
- c. Jeremiah disparaged preoccupation with their temple cultus and daily sacrifices. (Jer. 7:1-14, and etc.). The Lord actually “hated” the temple cultus (see Isaiah 1:14; Amos 5:21).
- d. True Israelites were not concerned for revival of the temple cultus or “daily sacrifice” (Hosea 6:6; Micah 3:11; 6:6-8; Amos 5:21-27; Malachi 1:10). Since the time of Moses, “daily sacrifice” in the sanctuary was not of itself of ethical importance; heart religion was important (Jeremiah 7:21-26).
- e. How could enlightened, faithful Jews in Exile be supremely concerned for reinstatement of ritual cultus? How could God give a major vision to Daniel with the main focus of attention the interruption of cultic ritual in which He had no “pleasure”?
- f. Cultic legalism and fanaticism in the time of the Maccabees contributed to misunderstanding Daniel’s prophecy and attributing undue significance to Antiochus Epiphanes.
- g. Daniel exerted tremendous influence on the Gentile world; he saw Israel as the evangelizing agency for “all families of the earth” (see Genesis 12:3). His concern was the accomplishment of this mission, not cultic ritual, but the Jews, in general, did not share the maturity of his vision.
- h. Daniel saw the sanctuary as an object lesson of the cosmic plan of salvation, as did other Hebrew prophets. He could well have had at least a rudimentary concept of the antitypical Day of Atonement as cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven, the final end of the sin of the world. In fact, knowledge of a heavenly antitype was common.²⁴ If Abraham rejoiced to see Christ’s day, surely Daniel did also. The gospel is “everlasting”.

CONCLUSION

1. If this thesis is correct, it would vindicate the Adventist pioneers as especially led of the Holy Spirit.
 - a. The foundation of the Seventh-day Adventist church (the sanctuary doctrine) rests on a solid linguistic, contextual, and historical

- basis.
- b. Adventist pioneers were the first group ever to properly reconstruct the true import of the Daniel 8 prophecy (as the Holy Spirit intended).
 - c. The Jewish interpretation of Antiochus Epiphanes as the little horn is the product of early apostasy and unbelief, even from the time of the Maccabees.
 - d. The preterist interpretation continues as the product of papal unbelief.
2. Our “new view” is logically an apotelesmatic appendage of the Antiochus Epiphanes view.
 - a. The Syrian king is a type, the papacy an antitype, of the little horn.
 - b. This view involves serious linguistic, contextual problems.
 - c. It’s inconsistencies virtually render Daniel a taboo topic. Our people, especially the youth, are widely ignorant of the Book of Daniel. Few sermons are preached on the prophecies of Daniel. Into this vacuum rushes the Cottrell-Ford assertion of Adventist prophetic illegitimacy which is widely accepted by scholars whose doubts are too often uncritically accepted by the laity.
 - d. The result: serious distrust of 1844 and our unique sanctuary truth.
 3. 1844 and 1888 are complimentary dates. If one stands, the other does; if one falls, inevitably, the other does also. If one loses significance, inevitably the other does also.
 - a. Present anti-1844 propaganda within Adventism is always accompanied by a parallel antipathy for the 1888 message.
 - b. As with Conradi, failure to discern the uniqueness of the 1888 view of justification by faith prepares for failure to appreciate the prophetic foundation of 1844.
 - c. The 1888 Message of righteousness by faith is integrally united with the doctrine of the cleansing of the sanctuary. It is parallel to and essentially consistent with it.
 - d. The 1888 message imparted spiritual appeal to the sanctuary doctrine, freeing it from narrow egocentric legalism.
 - e. Failure to appreciate the 1888 message perpetuated the old egocentric concept of the sanctuary doctrine, preparing the way for widespread internal and external criticism of the doctrine of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment. The 1888 view of the 1844 truths is refreshingly Christocentric, not the “stale, profit-

- less” egocentric view decried by external and internal opponents.
4. If this thesis is correct, the pioneers’ view of “the daily”:
 - a. In no way restricts the spiritual significance of the sanctuary doctrine.
 - b. Establishes 1844 and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary as the only possible linguistic understanding of Daniel 8:14.
 - c. It securely locks them in as exclusively referring to the terminus of the 2,300 day/years in the Christian era—that is 1844 A.D.
 - d. It eliminates the possibility of a logical reversion to Antiochus Epiphanes or any other preterist view.
 - e. Eliminates all futuristic conjectures in applying the 1260, 1290, 1335, and 2300 days literally.
 - f. Is supported exegetically, linguistically, and contextually, by the Hebrew text.
 - g. Is the obvious response of history to prophecy.
 - h. Is a lost truth whose hour has come, necessitated by the present anti-1844, anti-sanctuary propaganda.
 - i. Is simple to understand. Common people all over the world can readily “see” the principle of apostate Christianity supplanting or absorbing paganism as a historical reality and as an on-going principle observable even today.
 - j. The pioneers’ view was clear and cogent, tying together Daniel 8 and 2 Thessalonians 2, focusing the 2300 days as years. There is no mental stumbling block.
 5. It is true that no Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant commentaries support our view of *ha tamid*; but should this keep us from accepting it?
 - a. Inconsistencies of the popular view involve all these commentaries in a quagmire of confusion and conjecture.
 - b. Some commentators attempt to reconstruct or rewrite the text in order to make it fit their preconceived, popular theories. This we cannot do.
 - c. We are unworthy to exist if we are unwilling to confess truth which is obviously supported by the Bible, regardless of an inability of popular churches (or Jews) to see it.
 - d. Straightforward linguistic, contextual, historical exposition of these prophecies will command respect from thoughtful people “in Babylon.” We have no need to fear in presenting truth.
 - e. No non-Adventist Christian commentaries support us on the Sabbath truth; shall we abandon that truth for fear of opposition?
 6. Although the *ha tamid* truth is simple to understand, opposition and

the discussions of it through the decades have appeared to be confusing and distracting. Shall we refuse to restudy it for fear of controversy? Truth never causes disunity; only error does.

- a. Nearly universal acceptance of Conradi's view has now led us to a serious crisis over the sanctuary, 1844, and the Spirit of Prophecy positions. Our general concept of Daniel's prophecies are out of focus.
 - b. There is no lack of intelligence in the Seventh-day Adventist church; many minds need the challenge of deeper study as an alternative to the pervasive preoccupation with amusement and mental and spiritual stagnation in respect to Bible study.
 - c. The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary truth is of incomparable importance to the world and to the universe. No effort, time, or expense involved in establishing it can be thought wasted.
7. Desmond Ford's Glacier View manuscript links Conradi's "daily" as the vital factor in shaping the anti-1844 views of Ballinger, Fletcher, Snide, Grieve, Brinsmead, Hilgert, Sibley, and himself:
- a. Conradi was the first to introduce this view to us.²⁵
 - b. Ballinger acknowledged Ellen White opposed it.²⁶
 - c. Fletcher recognized the new view as the essential link in his rejection of the sanctuary doctrine.²⁷
 - d. G.B. Star opposed Fletcher by upholding the old view of the "daily."²⁸
 - e. Ford links the new view with downgrading the investigative judgement; considers it the essential step.²⁹
8. Of itself, in our original context as a people, "the daily" was not a prominent or vital leading doctrine, as Ellen White says (but it is nonetheless truth). But the abandonment of that apparently unimportant truth creates the confusion that triggers a tragic disavowal of our sanctuary doctrine.

Appendix A

Ellen White's 1851 statement

"I saw in relation to the 'daily,' Daniel 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."³⁰ Proponents of Conradi's view say this is an "imperfect statement" inasmuch as the author's intent was to uphold the "time."

However, could the Lord have had a deeper purpose in giving her apparently irrelevant details of this vision in order to safeguard the interpretation against the Antiochus Epiphanes view and the consequent abandonment of 1844 and the sanctuary doctrine?

If so, the statement is hardly "imperfect."

"The past fifty years [written, 1905] have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith. ... Not a word is changed or denied. That which the Holy Spirit testified to as truth after the passing of time, in our great disappointment, is the solid foundation of truth ... [that] made us what we are—Seventh-day Adventists."³¹ Could this be a comment on "the daily"?

"Almost imperceptibly the customs of heathenism found their way into the Christian church ... restrained for a time by the fierce persecutions which the church endured under paganism. But ... in the early part of the fourth century ... the work of corruption rapidly increased. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. ... Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ."

"This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of the 'man of sin' foretold in prophecy. ... That gigantic system of false religion is a masterpiece of Satan's power."³²

"In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. ... Paganism had given place to the papacy."³³

Does the statement (a) comment on the activity implied in Daniel's use of rum in 8:11, and (b) the taking away or replacement of the political, military power of paganism by the papacy in Daniel's use of sur in 11:31? If so, we have here firm support for the pioneer's view and an unintended demonstration of remarkable consistency in Ellen White's extensive writings over half a century from *Early Writings* (1850) to *The Great Controversy* (1911).

Appendix B

A Literal Translation of the *ha tamid* Passages in Daniel

- 8:11 And even up to the Prince of the host he [the little horn] acted greatly, and away from [opposed to] him *ha tamid* was lifted up [taken up, exalted, absorbed, incorporated], and was rejected [despised, cast down, overthrown] the site [headquarters, base] of his sanctuary [*miqdash*, a dedicated place, the center of paganism].
- 8:12a And a host [*tsaba*, the apostate church] shall be given and joined with *ha tamid* in iniquity [*ha tamid be pesha*].
- 8:12b And it cast down truth to the ground, and it wrought and prospered.
- 8:13a And I heard on holy one speaking, and another holy one spoke to so-and-so who was speaking.
- 8:13b “For how long the vision *ha tamid*, the desolating iniquity, the giving of both sanctuary [*godesh*, always refers only to the Lord’s holy sanctuary] and [its] host to trampling?”
- 8:14 And he said unto me, “Unto 2300 evening-mornings, then shall the sanctuary [*godesh*] be righted [justified, vindicated, cleansed].”
- 11:31 And arms [military might] shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute [disgrace, dishonor] the sanctuary [*miqdash*] of strength [military refuge, bastion, haven] and shall remove [*sur*, take away] *ha tamid*, and shall place [post, establish] the abomination that makes desolate [even worse than paganism—the papacy].
- 12:11 And from the time that *ha tamid* shall be taken away [*sur*, removed, turned aside] to set up the abomination that makes desolate, 1290 days.

*Appendix C — Are We Seventh-day Adventists,
or Seventh Day Baptists?*

It's the sanctuary truth that identifies us:

"The subject of the sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God's hand had directed the great advent movement, and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people."³⁴

"The subject of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment should be clearly understood by the people of God. All need a knowledge for themselves of the position and work of their great High Priest. Otherwise, it will be impossible for them to exercise the faith which is essential at this time, or to occupy the position which God designs them to fill. ... The sanctuary in heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men. It concerns every soul living upon the earth. It opens to view the plan of redemption, bringing us down to the very close of time, and revealing the triumphant issue of the contest between righteousness and sin. It is of the utmost importance that all should thoroughly investigate these subjects, and be able to give an answer to every one that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them."³⁵

"Satan is striving continually to bring in fanciful suppositions in regard to the sanctuary degrading ... the ministry of Christ for our salvation into something that suits the carnal mind. He removes its presiding power from the hearts of believers, and supplies its place with fantastic theories invented to make void the truths of the atonement, and destroy our confidence in the doctrines which we have held sacred since the third angel's message was first given. Thus he would rob us of our faith in the very message that has made us a separate people, and has given character and power to our work."³⁶

*Appendix D — Brief Biographical Details
of Individuals Mentioned*

- Andrews, J. N.:** Adventism's first post-1844 scholar and theologian.
- Ballenger, A. F.:** Former Seventh-day Adventist minister who left the church, opposed sanctuary teaching.
- Barnhouse, Donald Grey:** Pennsylvania pastor, founder of *Eternity Magazine*, prominent participant in the 1950s General Conference dialogues with non-Adventist theologians.
- Brinsmead, Robert:** Australian leader of an independent ministry eventually supportive of Desmond Ford's "reformationist" theology.
- Bruce, A. B.:** Conservative 19th century Scottish theologian.
- Conradi, Louis R.:** For decades, leader of Seventh-day Adventist work in Europe.
- Cottrell, Raymond:** General Conference scholar who co-edited the Seventh-day Adventist *Bible Commentary*.
- Daniells, A. G.:** General Conference president 1901-1922.
- Fletcher, W. A.:** Australian conference president who left church over sanctuary doctrine.
- Ford, Desmond:** Former Seventh-day Adventist minister and college professor who founded the independent ministry known as Good News Unlimited.
- Froom, L. E.:** Prominent General Conference scholar and historian.
- Gilbert., F. C.:** Jewish convert to Adventism who became pastor and General Conference leader.
- Grieve, R.:** Australian conference president, left church, sanctuary doctrine opponent.
- Haskell, S. N.:** Adventist pioneer missionary and Bible teacher; strongly supported Ellen White.
- Hilgert, Earl:** Andrews University Seminary teacher, left church over opposition to sanctuary doctrine.
- James, Norman:** Son of an Adventist college professor who supported Ford.
- Johnson, O. A.:** Prominent Bible teacher loyal to Ellen White.
- Jones, A. T.:** One of two young ministers whom "the Lord sent with a most precious message."
- Lindsell, Harold:** Prominent Evangelical scholar of the 1960s.
- Loughborough, J. N.:** Post-1844 Adventist pioneer.
- Olson, W. H.:** An independent critic opposed to Adventism.

- Prescott, W.W.:** Initially opposed 1888 message, later proclaimed it powerfully in Australia (1895). Lost conviction of sanctuary message when he accepted “new view” of “the daily.”
- Richards, H. M. S., Sr.:** Founder of The Voice of Prophecy.
- Smith, Uriah:** Editor of the church paper, *The Review and Herald*, in Ellen White’s time; author of *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*.
- Snide, Harold:** Seventh-day Adventist college professor, left church due to sanctuary doctrine opposition.
- Starr, G. B.:** Missionary to Australia, contemporary with and supportive of Ellen White.
- Waggoner, E. J.:** The other of these two (Jones and Waggoner).
- Walvoord, John:** Baptist pastor and theologian, professor at Dallas Theological Seminary.
- The Author of This Outline:** Formerly Presbyterian, became Seventh-day Adventist in 1929, attended Southern Junior College (Collegedale) 1933-35 while Snide taught there, graduated Columbia Union College 1939, ordained as pastor 1945, missionary to Uganda and Kenya 1945-65, graduated with M. Th. from Andrews University Seminary 1965 (had Hilgert for professor), pastor Southeastern California Conference, sent back to Africa as Adventist All Africa Editorial Consultant 1979-85 (during which time wrote this Outline), serves now as member of the editorial board of the 1888 Message study Committee, and local elder in home church in Northern California Conference.

Endnotes

1. *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*, pp. 184ff; Dallas Theological Seminary
2. See Cottrells February 9, 2002 booklet, *The "Sanctuary Doctrine"—Asset or Liability?*, San Diego Adventist Forum). [return to text]
3. *The Founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination*, pp. 60-62
4. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, p. 248; 1972 ed.
5. Letter, Nov. 22, 1909.
6. Seventh-day Adventist *Encyclopedia*, p. 369.
7. *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, pp. 164-168.
8. *2,300 Day Prophecy*, pp. 44, 51, 52.
9. *Early Writings*, pp. 74, 75.
10. *Early Writings*, p. 74; *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 164.
11. *Selected Messages* Vol. 1, pp. 164-168.
12. Seventh-day Adventist *Bible Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 881.
13. Ellen White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 50.
14. *Ibid.* p. 54.
15. Isaiah 16:12; Ezekiel 28:18; used derogatorily in Ezekiel 21:2.
16. Seventh-day Adventist *Bible Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 881.
17. *The Galilean Gospel*, p. 96.
18. *The History of the World*, p. 617.
19. *The Great Controversy*, p. 50, 54 (emphasis added).
20. See *The Great Controversy*, pp. 61, 74, 75.
21. Keil, p. 8
22. See Psalm 74:1, 3, 10, etc.; 79:5; 80:4; Zechariah 1:12.
23. Psalm 74:22, 23; Isaiah 52:5. See also Obadiah 16; Nahum 3:19; Habakkuk 1:17.
24. Exodus 25:8, 40; Psalm 20:1, 2, 6; Hebrews 9:11.
25. See *Glacier View Manuscript*, p. 79.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 395, 396.
30. *Early Writings*, pp. 74, 75.
31. *Special Testimonies*, Series B, No. 7 pp. 57, 58.
32. *The Great Controversy*, pp. 49, 50.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 54

34. *The Great Controversy*, p. 423

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 488, 489

36. (*Special Testimonies*, Series B, No. 7, p. 17 [*Evangelism*, pp. 224, 225])

Following is the letter of explanation written to J.S. Washburn about how an interview with Sister White (also included in *this* document) was recorded.

June 10, 1945

Elder J.S. Washburn
#404½ W. Washington St.
Hagerstown, Md.

Dear Brother Washburn:-

Received your letter yesterday, and glad to learn you are at home once more, and I hope that you had a pleasant time during your stay at Takoma Park.

Am enclosing with this copy of that article, rather interview I had with Sister White. I should say this to you about that interview. Please remember, that Sister White did not write this. She started to tell me some things. I recognized at once that what she had to say was important. The way she began to speak. So I got a pencil and put down what she said. Then as soon as I was able, after she finished telling me, I transposed what she said, that I had written on the paper while she was talking, on to a typewriter, and the enclosed is the result. Sister McEnterfer her secretary and nurse and traveling companion was present, I feel certain when we had the interview.

I felt it was necessary for me to give you this explanation, so in case you should have occasion to say anything to any one about it, you would have the matter straight, and no one, neither you nor I, would have any misinformed come back.

I do not know of but two other persons but you and I who have this document. So I thought it might be well for you to know this.

Always glad to hear from you. May be some time I can send you an article or two that might be of interest to you.

Sincerely your brother in Christ,

[signed] F.C. Gilbert

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "F. C. Gilbert". The signature is written in dark ink and is underlined with a single horizontal stroke.

An Interview with Sister White at St. Helena, June 8, 1910.

There was a reproof given to Daniells and Prescott at the time of the General Conference at Washington. Prescott wanted to work himself and his ideas into the minds of the people. If he did, I know that he would work himself out. We have a testing message to give to the people, and we do not want to get the people stirred up about a little item that does not affect our salvation. What they are doing is to try and work up a lot of jots and tittles.

I was shown Prescott's case, and saw that he ought to be engaged in better business. There was a paper presented to us that he was looking over, and he was working over it and trying to find something that was different from what other people had. There was nothing in it that was of any effect to the people; and therefore they ought to spend their time in spreading the message, and in doing the work that should be done in the cities.

They had to be getting up something new, and of course by doing so they would not give the older brethren in the cause any chance to say anything that these older brethren knew about the early days of the message. In the work they are doing they are taking up hours and hours of the time of the people, and it all does not amount to anything. We have a life and death question to settle, and what is needed is to teach the people how to meet this great vital testing message.

When they did not accept my message of reproof I knew what they would do and I knew what Daniells would do in getting the people all stirred up. I have not written to Prescott because his wife is so very sick, and so did not feel like writing to him at the present time. Daniells was here to see me, and I would not see him on any point, and I would not have anything to

[page -2-]

say to him about anything. About this daily that they are trying to work up, there is nothing in it, and it is not a testing point of character. What we want is to know about the things which are vital, and which affect our salvation.

There is no need of anything of this kind being taken up at all with the people; they will get the people off the real vital work of the message, and there is nothing of any consequence in this thing they are agitating.

I have just been writing to Elder Daniells to get the work done in the

cities. This is the work that ought to be done, and they are not to bother with these other things. When I was at Washington there seemed to be something that just encased their minds, and I could not seem to touch them. We are to have nothing to do with this question of the daily; we are to have our minds on more vital points of the message.

When I gave them my message and saw the way they treated it, I knew that the Lord would work against them. I knew they would work against my message, and then the people would not think there was anything in my message. They are taking the minds of the people off the testing message for this time. I have written to him, and told him that he was showing himself not fit to be President of this General Conference. He was showing that he was not the man to keep the Presidency.

If this message of the daily were a testing message the Lord would have shown me. These people do not see the end from the beginning in this thing. This work they are doing is to divide the people of God, and to take their minds off the testing truths for these last times. I utterly refuse to see any of them who are engaged in this work.

The light that was given me of God is that Brother Daniells has stood in the Presidency long enough. He was there as long as God wanted him there. When he comes here and switches the people off as he

[page -3-]

has, the Lord has no more use for him as the President of the General Conference, and I was told not to have any more conversations with him about any of these things.

I would not see Daniells about the matter, and I would not have one word with him. They pled with me that I would give him an interview, but I would not give him any at all. They have stirred up the minds of the people about these things.

God is testing these men, and they are showing how they are standing the test, and how they stand with regard to the Testimonies. They have shown by their actions how much confidence they have in the Testimonies. I was told to warn our people not to have anything to do with this thing they are teaching. They are to give no attention to it at all, as there is nothing in it that amounts to a single thing; they must have something that no one else has. There is no test about this matter; there is no life and death question about it, its purpose is simply to distract the mind, and to divert the attention away from the truth for this time. You see there is nothing to it, and the light that was given to me was that I

was forbidden of the Lord to listen to it.

I have expressed myself as not having a particle of confidence in it. I saw how that they had a paper in their hands, and they wanted to get a hearing on this question at Loma Linda; but I saw I had nothing to do with it, and there was nothing to be done about it.

I saw why it was that Daniells was rushing this thing through from place to place; for he knew that I would work against it. That is why I know they did not stand the testing. I knew they would not receive it. The time has come when his Presidency should come to an end. He has been in too long. This whole thing they are doing is a scheme of the devil. He has been president too long, and should not be there any longer.

F. B. Gilbert.