

HAVE WE FOLLOWED CUNNINGLY DEvised FABLES

Robert J. Wieland



Preface

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

In the inquest, the ship's compass was examined. Someone cleaning the wooden case had carelessly left a knife fragment 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 a ship's compass, it's the sanctuary truth. This outline suggests that one of our illustrious leaders deflected our compass by a radical interpretation of Daniel 8 which has been widely but mistakenly accepted uncritically.

Undetected, it has magnetized Brinsmead, Ford, Cottrell, and other scholars into a repudiation

of Bible support for the 1844 cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. Sincere scholars have inherited a faulty compass. So this thesis suggests.

The prophecy of 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. They saw it as paganism "taken away" politically in order to "set up" the temporal and persecuting power of the papacy. They understood the 1290 "days" as symbolic of years, commencing in 508 A.D. and ending in 1798. They also saw the 1335 "days" as parallel years, inter-related. This locked 1844 into Daniel 8:14, making Daniel's cleansing of the sanctuary to be necessarily the cleansing of the heavenly one. The pioneers' view was held unanimously by our people until the 1900s and enjoyed Ellen White's consistent endorsement (EW 74, 75; MS 67, 1910 [MS Release 1425]).

Then came a change. This outline suggests that

Louis R. Conradi deflected our “compass” by introducing his “new view” that “the daily” was not an evil power (paganism) taken away or supplanted by a worse one, but it was the heavenly High Priestly ministry of Christ “taken away” by the papacy.

One of the first to accept his view was E. J. Waggoner. He forthwith repudiated Ellen White, for he saw clearly that she upheld the pioneers' view. This was the beginning of his seriously losing his way. 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 1931 Conradi left the church completely, acknowledging that he had not been a Seventh-day Adventist for 25 years while being leader of our church in Europe.

Others who left over this issue were Ballenger, Fletcher, Grieve, Snide, Hilgert—a questionable track record for “new light.” Many others of course have not pursued Conradi's view to its logical end,

but these astute scholars did so, 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 schema, there is no room for an 1844 application except by a contrived “secondary” or “apotelesmatic” fulfillment which is seen as a “face-saving” accommodation ridiculed by non-Adventist theologians. Now some of our own such as Raymond F. Cottrell see the 1844 application as a “liability” supported only by Ellen White's writings. There is also resultant confusion spread by attempts to “interpret” the 1290 and 1335 days of Daniel 12 in a futurist literal sense.

These contradictory speculations are built on a repudiation of the pioneer view of “The Daily.” None could even exist today within the framework of the pioneer view.

We must agree 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. Is not our own zeal

in proclaiming the message considerably dissipated by these in-house misgivings? How can we expect to convince the world of a doctrine we ourselves are not sure of?

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

Chapter 1

Introduction: Our Current Problem

Opponents from without, revisionists within, use “1844” to deny biblical basis for the existence of the Seventh-day Adventist church:

Harold Lindsell: If 1844 is not biblical, there is “no adequate basis for the existence of the Seventh-day Adventists” (he would wipe us off the face of the earth).

Donald Barnhouse: “You were founded on a lie. ... Seventh-day Adventism will have to go back into the same position as Mormonism.”

W. H. Olson: The “whole 1844 structure falls ... apart.”

Raymond Cottrell: No Bible support for 1844 (only Ellen White's). In February 2002, is even

more severely critical of our sanctuary doctrine.

Norman Jarnes: “The fundamental pillar of the Seventh-day Adventist church is... built on the October 22, 1844 event and when that goes, traditional Adventism goes.”

Ellen White agrees that the Seventh-day Adventist church was founded on our 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, ... and given character and power to our work.” (Letter 126, 1897; Ev 221-225.)

Some students now digging deeply into Seventh-day Adventist history and Hebrew linguistics, re-affirm the pioneer view, as the thesis of this outline suggests.

Chapter 2

The Significance of “The Daily” (HA TAMID)

Since the Maccabees, Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant view is: continual priestly ministry in the Lord's sanctuary.

Crucial to identifying Antiochus Epiphanes as the “little horn.”

If early Adventists had so understood it, would have forced them to recognize Antiochus as its primary fulfillment; no 1844 “Midnight Cry” movement could then have developed.

Miller's wholly fresh approach to “the daily” locked in the 2300 days as years, and led to establishing the 1844 terminus.

Miller and 1844 participants virtually unanimous in seeing “the daily” as paganism

supplanted by the papacy; unusual view captured attention.

Ellen White endorsed it; EW 74, 75 is a clear statement (see appendix A).

After the Great Disappointment this view pivotal in holding early Adventists from renouncing their faith in the 1844 movement.

Seventh-day Adventists continued unanimous in this view.

But since the early 1900s Conradi's “new view” has captured nearly all Seventh-day Adventists; it holds:

“The daily” is the ministry of the antitypical High Priest “taken away” by the papacy. Identical to the Antiochus Epiphanes view in principle: so that it sees an antitypical fulfillment in the papacy, whereas Antiochus logically must constitute the typical fulfillment.

Thus, impossible to exclude Antiochus consistently; he has to be considered the “primary” fulfillment which the Holy Spirit intended. Reason and logic then make it easy to see him as the exclusive application. This is John F. Walvoord's strong contention (Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation, pp. 184ff; Dallas Theological Seminary).

The Conradi view becomes captive to the Seventh-day Adventist type/antitype principle.

Seen in this light, the present anti-sanctuary agitation becomes natural outgrowth of the “new view” adopted a century ago. Justifies in principle the anti-Adventism which has existed from Miller's 1844-era. If the papacy truly “took away” Christ's High Priestly ministry, Antiochus must logically 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.)

Chapter 3

The Historical Tension Between the Two Views

Miller arrived at his view contextually and historically:

Saw 2 Thessalonians 2:3-7 as commentary on Daniel 8:11-13.

(Froom's thesis that his view of “the daily” was tied to his mistaken 666 idea is not valid; no logical dependence.)

J. N. Andrews saw “the daily” as an evil, desolating power; all early pioneers unanimous in that view.

James White supported pioneer view (see his Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of Our Lord [1870], pp. 108-125).

All survivors of pioneer days united in opposing Conradi's view: Haskell, Loughborough, Smith, even Ellen White. The vigor of their opposition indicated conviction it would eventually scuttle 1844 and the sanctuary doctrine (as Cottrell has now done; cf. his February 9, 2002 booklet, The “Sanctuary Doctrine”—Asset or Liability?, San Diego Adventist Forum).

Conradi's “new view” grew out of his opposition to the 1888 message and his identification of Luther as herald of “the third angel's message in verity.” Displaces Jones' and Waggoner's concept of righteousness by faith (The Founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination, pp. 60-62).

Conradi foremost despiser of the 1888 message at Minneapolis (Froom, Movement of Destiny, p. 248; 1972 ed.).

Acknowledged long-standing opposition to Ellen White.

His later apostasy an outgrowth of his “new view;” could not escape its logic.

E. J. Waggoner abandoned confidence in Ellen White upon 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” (Letter, Nov. 22, 1909). Beginning of Waggoner's serious downfall.

Waggoner taught the “new view” to Prescott, Prescott to Daniells; both sought to win W. C. White, to his mother's dismay.

Opposing Early Writings pp. 74, 75, Daniells declares it “an imperfect statement.” One source of his difficulty in maintaining pro-Spirit of Prophecy image at the 1919 Bible Conference.

Daniells and Prescott swung almost entire leadership and college teachers to the “new view.” H. M. S. Richards Sr. was the prominent evangelist to use Smith's Daniel and Revelation.

The 1945 revision of Smith's book forced restudy of “the daily.”

The revisers unanimous in accepting “new view,” yet could not force Smith posthumously to teach what he did not believe.

Result: the pioneer view reappears, but with added historical support for 508 A.D. as start of 1290 years.

Ellen White and “the daily.”

Encyclopedia article cites Daniells reporting that she 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. But no evidence supports the opinion that she changed her view.

F. C. Gilbert, Hebrew scholar, reports she told him on June 8, 1910 that the agitation of the new view was a “scheme of the devil” (cf. his “Report

of Interview”). In 1908 she told Prescott that God permitted the view of the pioneers, was not “a mistake.” Gilbert being ardent believer in the “old view,” could he have misunderstood her also? Possibly, but his own view was based on Hebrew linguistics, not Ellen White statements. Very much more positive in his quotes attributed to her than was Daniells; he recorded his interview the day following, whereas Daniells waited some decades. Gilbert's image not impaired by any reputed doubts regarding Ellen White.

Her 1910 counsels (1SM 164-168) do not settle the issue one way or the other:

She deplores controversy, but especially regrets agitation of “new view.”

“Silence is eloquence” is not endorsement of “new view;” never enjoined “silence” while the pioneer view was taught during all those decades.

Don't use “my writings” to “settle” the issue; advises brethren to get together, study it out from

the Bible, come to agreement on biblical, linguistic grounds (does not mean she was neutral).

Nothing in these 1910 counsels discourages further careful study of this issue in times of crisis such as the present “sanctuary” opposition.

The general tenor of her life ministry: support the leading of the Lord in the basic teachings of the pioneers in our early days.

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” (2300 Day Prophecy, pp. 44, 51, 52).

No support for the new view in Ellen White's writings; her only specific statement (EW 74, 75) supports pioneer view; repeatedly deplores agitation of the “new view;” also deplores harshness in defending the “old view.” Her advice: study the Bible as honest Christians, settle it there; wanted Gilbert to help the brethren understand.

Recognizes that one view is true, the other false, for there is a view that she called “the correct view,” “the true meaning of the daily” (EW 74; 1SM 164); therefore is not meaningless trivia.

Agitation of new view is what created needless, unfortunate controversy that never existed prior to Conradi's view (1SM 164-168).

Tension inevitable as the two views are diametrically opposite:

Pioneers see “the daily” as the work of Satan, the evil of paganism exalted and absorbed in something worse—papalism.

“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.

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 (cf. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, vol. 4, p. 881).

Chapter 4

Linguistic and Contextual Study of “The Daily”

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

Daniel 8:11: the verb is *rum*, which does not have primary meaning of “takeaway,” but “to exalt,” “to go on high,” “to lift up” (every use in the Old Testament has this meaning implicit in its context).

The key thought in this verse: lifting up, rising up, or exaltation, of the little horn. In the process of its spectacular mushroom growth, with its rise to power it lifts up, takes up, or absorbs HA TAMID.

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).

Other uses of rum in Daniel: chapters 4:37; 5:19, 23; 11:36; all, “exalt.”

The verb rum inconsistent with Antiochus' removal of sacrifices from the Jerusalem temple; he did not lift up, take up or exalt them.

Is equally inconsistent with the papacy removing or taking away Christ's ministry; the papacy did not lift up, take up, or exalt it in any way, rather, the opposite.

Perhaps clearest modern translation of rum in this context is to “absorb” or “incorporate.” Ellen White uses that word of papacy “incorporating” paganism, paganism “giving place” to it (GC 50, 54).

The word rum used in Leviticus describes priests reaching in and lifting up the fat from the animal carcasses; does not identify Daniel's HA TAMID as the Levitical “daily sacrifices” of the tabernacle or temple.

The word “sanctuary” in vs. 11 is MIQDASH, not the same as QODESH in vs. 14; MIQDASH can refer to Satan's dedicated place (Isa. 16:12; Eze. 28:18; is used derogatorily in Eze. 21:2).

“Sanctuary” in vs. 14 is QODESH; but MIQDASH means “any dedicated place” usually requiring contextual or adjectival designation when used in reference to the Lord's sanctuary. In 2 Chronicles 36:17 is used to make derogatory reference to “their sanctuary,” that is, of unfaithful Jews, as Ezekiel likewise refers to Satan's “sanctuary” (MIQDASH, 28:18). In contrast QODESH always refers exclusively to the Lord's sanctuary, with no adjectival designation. Daniel's use of two different nouns in four verses is significant.

The word for “place” unusual; means “base” or “headquarters.” Linguistic evidence could support pioneers' view that MIQDASH here is the dedicated place (or temple) of paganism, the city of Rome.

The ordinary word for take away or deprive is ADAH, not used in 8:11 (cf. 5:20; 7:26).

Daniel 8:12: while HA TAMID is “taken up,” “truth is cast down,” and “a host” joined with HA TAMID is designated as an earthly force—inappropriate to describe removal of Christ's heavenly ministry.

Is employed against HA TAMID be PESHA, literally, “the continual in transgression.” Thus the Hebrew identifies HA TAMID as an evil thing; is difficult to apply it to Christ. (No earthly force could take away His High Priestly ministry.)

Pro-Antiochus Epiphanes translators have manipulated the Hebrew be to mean “by reason of transgression” instead of “in transgression.”

Daniel 8:13 literally: “How long the vision HA TAMID the desolating iniquity, the giving both sanctuary (QODESH) and host to trampling?”

Places HA TAMID in apposition with “desolating iniquity;” supports J. N. Andrews' idea of “two desolating powers” here.

Why does Daniel now use QODESH instead of MIQDASH as he did in vs. 11? Indicates he means the pioneer view.

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.”

Could plausibly be applied to Antiochus' military attack on the Jerusalem temple, but meaningless when applied to Christ's High Priestly ministry which cannot be touched by military force. The verb SUR never used symbolically of taking something from the minds of people as “new view” supporters affirmed in early 1900s.

Verb SUR defines Daniel's use of MIQDASH

in 8:11 as the military bastion of HA TAMID; cannot fit the heavenly sanctuary.

Verb SUR appropriate for removal of paganism as a political or military force opposing the papacy; but its “incorporation” spiritually into the papacy is denoted by the verb rum in 8:11. A profound insight into a very important development in European history.

“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 or political fortification (11:1, 7, 10, 19, 31, 38, 39).

Daniel 12:11: a definite time necessary for removal of HA TAMID militarily or politically, in order to “set up” papacy; recognizing 1290 days as years essential to a true identification of HA TAMID.

The “new view” proponents unable to explain

this. See Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary where this admission is prominent (vol. 4, p. 881).

All proponents of the Antiochus view flounder here in hopeless quagmire of confusion; see any non-Adventist commentary.

150 years of Adventist exposition still see 508 A.D. as reasonable application; the revised Daniel and Revelation by Smith supports the date with further evidence unknown in his day.

508 A.D. does not refer to rum activity of the papacy in 8:11 as lifting up or incorporating paganism in the papacy, but to its political, military removal as a hindrance to the temporal supremacy of the papacy. This is pioneers' identification of the "taking away" of 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7.

The logical extension of the "new view" (Antiochus) is to interpret the 2300, 1290, and 1335 days as literal; or even to ignore 1290 and 1335 days aspect of HA TAMID, thus leaving Daniel to fizzle out in a 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 confusion engendered by “new view.”)

When Daniel speaks unmistakably of the continual or daily temple services, does not use HA TAMID, but ZEBAH and MINHAH (“the sacrifice and the oblation [to cease],” Daniel 9:27). No linguistic or contextual hint that he intends these terms to be synonymous with HA TAMID. Further, if HA TAMID does refer to temple sacrifices which “ceased” in midst of 70th week, how could it be “taken away” by the little horn centuries later? If he wished to speak in Daniel 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; and 12:11 of the daily or continual temple services, why should he not be consistent and instead use ZEBAH and MINHAH?

Chapter 5

An Historical Approach to “The Daily” Problem

History presents sudden phenomenal dissolution of paganism that was supplanted by meteoric rise to power of the papacy:

Augustine's City of God a commentary on this amazing historical development.

Pagan Romans bewailed the sack of Rome in 410 A.D., attributed the calamity to Catholic Christians' triumph over paganism. J. N. Andrews and pioneers saw Rome as the disgraced pagan “sanctuary” or “dedicated place” (MIQDASH) of Daniel 11:31. Linguistically possible; but also historically justifiable.

A. B. Bruce: “Paganism is a perpetual eclipse of Divine Grace” (The Galilean Gospel, p. 96).

“The more Christianity supplanted the heathen worship the more did it absorb the elements of paganism” (The History of the World, p. 617).

Did Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7 refer to this transfer and absorption of paganism into papacy? If not, where did he get his “taken away” idea?

Ellen White firmly identifies Paul's “man of sin” as the papacy. Her reason? Scriptural exegesis.

Perhaps Paul indeed comments on Daniel 8:11-13; 11:31.

(Jesus surely taught disciples significance of Daniel's prophecies; Matt. 24:15; Luke 24:27, 44, 45; Acts 1:3).

Did John in Revelation 13:1, 2 allude to this development?

Early Adventists so understood this passage; Emperors Constantine to Justinian allowed Bishop of Rome to assume political power.

Thus the dragon was pagan Rome; the beast, papal Rome.

The “dragon's seat,” the city of Rome, was the former bastion of paganism, spiritual successor in John's day to 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.

The ancients clearly recognized Rome as successor of the Babylonian pagan worship-headquarters; a pagan from the East at home in Rome's Pantheon.

Historical comment in The Great Controversy could fit 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” (pp. 50, 54, emphasis added).

While paganism was “taken up” (Hebrew, *rum*) into the papacy and “removed” politically and militarily (Hebrew, *SUR*), could there ever be an actual “taking away” of the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary?

When Daniel spoke of the papacy changing God's law, was careful to state it as only an attempted action: “he shall think to change times and laws” (7:25). In contrast, does not say “little horn” will “think” to take away HA TAMID. “New view” says he actually does take it away.

Overwhelming emphasis of Scripture: no earthly or hellish power can actually “take away” Christ's high priestly ministry (Heb. 4:14-17; 5:6, 6:19, 20; 7:24, 25; 8:1). To suggest otherwise could be blasphemy.

Further, papacy never took away Christ's ministry from the minds of true Christians, for they preserved their faith pure throughout the Dark

Ages (cf. GC61, 74, 75).

Papacy could not “take away” Christ's ministry from the minds of their apostate or misinformed adherents, for they never in the first place had the true understanding of His ministry. Christ's letter to “Thyatira” (Rev. 2:18-29) is not to the papacy, but to true followers of Christ at this time. No hint that His heavenly ministry had truly been taken away, ever.

If the papacy actually took away Christ's ministry from the minds of the people (as “new view” proponents said), it would follow logically that the 16th century Reformation restored it:

Would establish Lindsell's, Barnhouse's, Walvoord's, Conradi's contentions that 1844 is meaningless trivia, thus no excuse for the existence of Seventh-day Adventist Church. Again, the “new view” presents itself as logically subversive of Seventh-day Adventism.

If the “new view” is correct, also would

logically follow that what was “restored” or “justified” in 1844 was the same ministry “taken away” by the papacy earlier, that is, the first apartment ministry of Christ as High Priest. But 1844 inaugurates a new second apartment ministry.

Either way, the “new view” of Conradi logically resolves itself into a denial of biblical Seventh-day Adventism; is seen to be basic to Cottrell's and Ford's position.

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 (Rev. 12:13)?

Chapter 6

Could the Jews in Babylonian Exile Have Understood “HA TAMID” as an Idiom for Paganism?

Overwhelming problem of the Exile: apparent superiority of paganism over YHWH(Yahweh). Was a terrible assault to the faith of the Jews:

Israel now in complete subjection to “heathen world power” (Keil, p. 8). Moses' dire warnings in Deuteronomy 28:64-67 had been fulfilled.

In paganism's seeming triumph over YHWH's covenant with Abraham, Babylonian BEL had “swallowed” Judah like a piece of candy (see Jer. 51:34, 44).

No Jerusalem TAMID ministry even in existence during the Exile.

After the Exile, no true TAMID ministry ever reinstated, because ark of the covenant was never recovered; real presence of YHWH in the Jerusalem temple was therefore never truly restored (except in brief personal visit of Christ to Herod's temple).

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. A blight to Israel's existence in the Exile, a constant irritation, serious concern and challenge to their faith in YHWH.

Constant, supreme question in minds of the Jews in Exile was: “How long” will this terrible “continual” paganism triumph over YHWH? See Psalm 74:1, 3, 10, and 79:5; 80:4; Zech. 1:12. This, main burden of the Exilic psalms (TAMID is frequently used with reference to paganism). Note Isaiah's Exilic concern for TAMID paganism:

51:1214; 52:4-6; 65:1-3. “How long such unrequited TAMID evil?” was cry of Exilic writers.

Vision of Daniel 8 given to answer this persistent question: vs. 13.

Daniel's surprise and agony: sees paganism absorbed into a power even more desolating, worse than itself because of its being now professedly Christian. Creates the “abomination that maketh desolate.”

Literal Hebrew of Daniel 8:11-14 presents message relevant to concern of Exilic Jews, and satisfactorily answers their questions regarding paganism's oppression of Israel. The pagan-papal overreach becomes Daniel's concern; but final victory of truth assured as certain.

Only in Daniel is HA TAMID used with article, i.e., “the daily.”

The Cyrus Cylinder uses similar expression

denoting paganism (line 7).

Without the article, TAMID is used frequently in Exilic times, refers to paganism as a desolating power: Psalm 74:22, 23; Isa. 52:5. See also (but not Exilic) Obad. 16; Nah. 3:19; Hab. 1:17. Would be natural for HA TAMID as a unique substantive to be coined in Babylonian Exile as idiom for paganism.

Neither Ezekiel nor any other Bible author uses TAMID as a noun.

Prophet Daniel not naive; his concern not for mere cultic ritual in the Jerusalem temple. As a prophet, had very mature spiritual perception.

Overwhelming concern of all inspired prophets was for personal heart relationship to YHWH, not revival of ritualism.

When David sinned, the Lord specifically did not “desire” a ritual or daily “sacrifice” (Psalm 51:6, 16, 17).

Jeremiah disparaged the people's preoccupation with their temple CULTUS and daily sacrifices (Jer. 7:1-14, etc.). The Lord actually “hated” the temple CULTUS(see Isa. 1:14; Amos 5:21).

True Israelites not concerned for revival of the temple CULTUS or “daily sacrifice” (see Hos. 6:6; Mic. 3:11; 6:6-8; Amos 5:21-27; Mal. 1:10). Since time of Moses, the “daily sacrifice” in the sanctuary was not of itself of ethical importance; heart religion was important (Jer. 7:21-26).

How could God give major vision to Daniel with its main focus of attention the interruption of cultic ritual He had no “pleasure” in?

Cultic legalism and ritual fanaticism in the time of Maccabees contributed to misunderstanding Daniel's prophecy and attributing undue significance to Antiochus Epiphanes.

Daniel exerted tremendous influence on Gentile world; saw Israel as evangelizing agency for “all

families of the earth” (cf. Gen. 12:3). His concern: accomplishment of this mission, not reinstatement of a cultic ritual; but Jews in general did not share maturity of his vision.

Daniel saw sanctuary as an object lesson of cosmic plan of salvation, as did other Hebrew prophets. Could well have had at least a rudimentary concept of antitypical Day of Atonement as the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven, the final “end” of the sin of the world. In fact, knowledge of a heavenly antitype was common (cf. Ex. 25:8, 40; Psalm 20:1, 2, 6; Heb. 9:11). If “Abraham rejoiced to see” Christ's day, surely Daniel did also. Gospel has always been “everlasting.”

Chapter 7

Conclusion

If this thesis is correct, would vindicate Adventist pioneers as being especially led of the Holy Spirit.

Foundation of Seventh-day Adventist church (the sanctuary doctrine) rests on solid linguistic, contextual, historical basis.

Adventist pioneers thus the first group properly to reconstruct the New Testament import of Daniel 8 prophecy (as the Holy Spirit intended).

Jewish interpretation of Antiochus Epiphanes as the little horn is the product of early apostasy and unbelief, even from time of Maccabees.

Preterist interpretation continues as the product of papal unbelief.

Our “new view” of “the daily” logically an

apotelesmatic appendage of the Antiochus Epiphanes view:

The Syrian king is a type, the papacy an antitype, of the little horn.

This view involves serious linguistic, contextual problems.

Its inconsistencies virtually render Daniel a taboo topic. Our people, especially youth, widely ignorant of Book of Daniel. Few sermons on prophecies in Daniel. Into this vacuum rushes Cottrell-Ford assertion of Adventist prophetic biblical illegitimacy, widely accepted by scholars whose doubts are too often uncritically accepted by laity.

Result: serious distrust of 1844 and of our unique sanctuary truth.

1844 and 1888 are complementary dates. If one stands, the other does; if one loses significance, inevitably the other does also.

Present anti-1844 propaganda within Adventism accompanied always by a parallel antipathy for 1888 message.

As with Conradi, failure to discern the uniqueness of the 1888 view of justification by faith prepares for failure to appreciate prophetic foundation of 1844.

The 1888 message of righteousness by faith is integrally united with the unique doctrine of the cleansing of the sanctuary, in essence uniquely parallel to and consistent with it.

The 1888 message imparted spiritual appeal to the sanctuary doctrine, freed it from narrow egocentric legalism.

Failure to appreciate 1888 message perpetuated egocentric concept of the sanctuary doctrine, prepared way for widespread internal and external criticism of the doctrine of the sanctuary and investigative judgment. The 1888 view of the 1844

truths is refreshingly Christocentric, not the “stale, profitless” egocentric view decried by external and internal opponents.

If this thesis is correct, pioneers' view of “the daily”:

In no way restricts the spiritual significance of the sanctuary doctrine.

Establishes 1844 and the cleansing of heavenly sanctuary as only possible linguistic understanding of Daniel 8:14.

Securely locks them in as exclusively referring to the terminus of the 2300 days/years in the Christian era, that is, 1844 A.D.

Eliminates possibility of a logical reversion to Antiochus Epiphanes or any other preterist view.

Eliminates all futuristic conjectures in applying the 1290, 1335, 1260, 2300 days literally.

Is supported exegetically, linguistically, and contextually by the Hebrew text.

Is the obvious response of history to prophecy.

Is a lost truth whose hour has come, necessitated by the present anti-1844, antisanctuary propaganda.

Is simple to understand; common people all over the world readily “see” apostate Christianity supplanting or absorbing paganism as a historical reality, and as an on-going development easily observable even today in Africa and South America.

The pioneers' view is clear and cogent, tying together Daniel 8 and 2 Thessalonians 2, focusing the 2300 days as years. No mental stumbling block.

It is true that no Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant commentaries support our pioneer view of HA TAMID; but should this keep us from accepting it?

Inconsistencies of the popular view involve all these commentaries in a quagmire of confusion and conjecture.

Some commentators attempt to reconstruct or rewrite the text in order to make it fit preconceived, popular theories. This we cannot do.

We are unworthy to exist if unwilling to confess truth which is obviously supported by the Bible, regardless of inability of the popular churches (or Jews) to see it.

Straightforward linguistic, contextual, historical exposition of these prophecies will command respect from thoughtful people in “Babylon.” We have no need to fear presenting it.

No non-Adventist Christian commentaries support us on the Sabbath truth; should we therefore abandon it?

Although the HA TAMID truth is simple to understand, opposition through the decades appears

to make it confusing and distracting. Shall we refuse to restudy it for fear of controversy? Truth never causes disunity; only error does:

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. General concept of Daniel's prophecies is out of focus.

But there is no lack of intelligence in the Seventh-day Adventist Church; many minds need challenge of deeper study as alternative to pervasive preoccupation with amusement and mental and spiritual stagnation in respect to Bible study.

Cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is a truth of incomparable importance to the world and the universe; no effort, time, or expense involved in establishing it can be thought wasted.

G. Desmond Ford's Glacier View manuscript links Conradi's “daily” as the vital factor in shaping

the anti-1844 views of Ballenger, Fletcher, Snide, Grieve, Brinsmead, Hilgert, Sibley, and himself:

Says Conradi was first to introduce this view to us (page 79).

Ballenger acknowledged that Ellen White opposed it (page 79).

Fletcher recognized the “new view” as essential link in his rejection of the sanctuary doctrine (page 129).

G. B. Starr opposed Fletcher by upholding “old view” of “the daily” (page 129).

Ford links Conradi view as an essential step in downgrading the investigative judgment (pages 295, 296).

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 was 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” (EW 74, 75). Proponents of Conradi's view say this is an “imperfect statement,” the author's intent was to uphold the “time.”

However, could the Lord have had a deeper purpose in adding the 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 can hardly be considered “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 the time, in our great disappointment, is the solid foundation of truth ... [that] made us what we are—Seventh-day Adventists” (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 7, pp. 57, 58). Could this be a comment on “the daily”?

A. “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” (GC 49, 50).

B. “In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. ... Paganism had given place to the papacy” (p. 54).

Does 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 11:13? If so, we have firm support here for the pioneers' 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 one 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 [QODESH, 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 [QODESH] 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” (GC423).

“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" (pp. 488, 489).

"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” (Special Testimonies, Series B. No. 7, p. 17 [Ev 224, 225]).

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.

Jarnes, 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 as member of the editorial board of the 1888 Message Study Committee.