

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Master's Theses

Graduate Research

2009

The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the "Daily" in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008

Denis Kaiser
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Kaiser, Denis, "The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the "Daily" in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008" (2009). *Master's Theses*. 45.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses/45>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

ABSTRACT

THE HISTORY OF THE ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION
OF THE “DAILY” IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
FROM 1831 TO 2008

by

Denis Kaiser

Adviser: Denis Fortin

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Thesis

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE HISTORY OF THE ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF THE “DAILY”
IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL FROM 1831 TO 2008

Name of the researcher: Denis Kaiser

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Denis Fortin, Ph.D.

Date completed: July 2009

During the more than 160 years since Adventism’s inception, the interpretation of the *tāmîd* or “daily” in the book of Daniel underwent several changes with respect to the identification of the term itself, the employed methodology, and the style of argumentation, as well as the way differing views are handled.

This study analyzes various Millerite and Adventist interpretations of the *tāmîd* in Dan 8 between 1831 and 2008, focusing especially on the approach to the biblical text, the argumentation, and the atmosphere during the time of conflict (1900 – 1930), as well as on Ellen White’s counsels during that period, her puzzling statement, and possible explanations.

This documentary study was based primarily on published primary sources produced by Millerites and Seventh-day Adventists from 1831 to 2008. Both primary and secondary sources were used to provide background, historical context, and perspective for the present study.

While Seventh-day Adventists first adhered to the Millerite interpretation of the “daily” as Roman paganism, beginning around the turn of the nineteenth century they identified it as Christ’s heavenly ministration. The proponents of the Millerite interpretation eventually relied more on tradition and their understanding of a statement on the “daily” written by Ellen White in 1850. The proponents of the new interpretation drew their reasons rather from exegetical studies. This change did not happen without controversy, and both groups were responsible for the intensity of the conflict. Ellen White’s statement referred to the prophetic dates and the supplying of the word “sacrifice” in the text of Dan 8 rather than to a specific identification of the “daily.”

Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE HISTORY OF THE ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION
OF THE “DAILY” IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
FROM 1831 TO 2008

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Denis Kaiser
July 2009

© Copyright by Denis Kaiser 2009
All Rights Reserved

THE HISTORY OF THE ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION
OF THE "DAILY" IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
FROM 1831 TO 2008

A thesis
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts

by

Denis Kaiser

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Denis Fortin, Ph.D., Adviser

Merlin D. Burt, Ph.D.

Jerry A. Moon, Ph.D.

Date approved

To Angelika

h` agaph estin sundesmoj thj teleiothtoj

Joy of my life (Col 3:14-15)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Statement of Purpose	4
Review of Previous Research	4
Methodology and Sources	7
Design of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations.....	10
II. A SURVEY OF THE HISTORICAL PHASES	11
The Millerite Period (1831–1844).....	11
Roman Paganism	12
Biblical Arguments	12
Arguments from Tradition	16
Historical Arguments	16
Criticized Positions	18
Christ’s Heavenly Ministration.....	20
Biblical Arguments	20
Historical Arguments	20
Summary	21
The Early Seventh-day Adventist Period (1845–1900).....	22
Christ’s Heavenly Ministration.....	22
Biblical Arguments	23
Historical Arguments	24
Criticized Positions	25
Jewish Sacrifices and True Worship.....	25
Biblical Arguments	25
Historical Arguments	27
Roman Paganism	29
Biblical Arguments	31
Historical Arguments	34
Criticized Positions	36

A Brief Excursus	36
Summary	39
The Controversial Period in Adventism (1900–1930).....	40
Christ’s Heavenly Ministration.....	40
The First Stage–Ludwig Richard Conradi	40
The Second Stage–American Adventism.....	44
Roman Paganism	49
Biblical Arguments	51
Arguments from Ellen White’s Writings	53
Arguments from Tradition	54
Historical Arguments	55
Summary	57
The Later Adventist Period (1930–2008)	57
Christ’s Continual Mediation in Heaven	58
Biblical Arguments	58
Historical Arguments	65
Roman Paganism	66
True and False Sacrificial System.....	69
The Everlasting Gospel of Righteousness by Faith	70
True Worship	71
Summary	71
Conclusions.....	72
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE MAJOR INTERPRETATIONS	75
The “Daily” as Roman Paganism	75
Unchanged Aspects.....	76
Changed Aspects.....	79
Criticized Views.....	82
Approach to the Topic	83
The “Daily” as True Worship and Heavenly Mediation	86
Unchanged Aspects.....	87
Changed Aspects.....	88
Criticized Views.....	90
Approach to the Text	91
The Atmosphere of the Debates	92
The Proponents of the New View	93
The Proponents of the Old View	97
Conclusions.....	100
IV. AN ASSESSMENT OF ELLEN WHITE’S STATEMENTS	104
Explanations Offered	104
An Analysis of the Controversial Statement and Its Historical Context	106
An Analysis of the Statement	108
The Gathering Time	108
The 1843 Chart.....	108

The Daily.....	109
Time Setting.....	110
Journey to Jerusalem.....	110
Statements Made by Ellen White in the Context of the Daily.....	111
Statements on the 1850 Statement.....	111
Statements Regarding the Controversy.....	113
The Historical Background of the Statement.....	121
The Gathering Time.....	122
The 1843 Chart.....	122
The Daily.....	123
Time Setting.....	125
Journey to Jerusalem.....	126
An Evaluation of the Offered Explanations.....	127
Conclusions.....	130
V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	134
The Development of the Interpretations.....	134
The Millerite Period (1831–1844).....	134
The Early Seventh-day Adventist Period (1845–1900).....	135
The Controversial Period in Adventism (1900–1930).....	136
The Later Adventist Period (1930–2008).....	137
The Development of the Approaches.....	138
The Old View of Roman Paganism.....	138
The New View of Christ’s Ministration in Heaven.....	139
Ellen White’s Controversial Statement.....	140
Implications of the Study.....	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	143
Primary Sources.....	143
Books.....	143
Periodicals.....	151
Correspondence.....	158
Unpublished Materials.....	160
Internet Documents.....	160
Secondary Sources.....	161
Books.....	161
Periodicals.....	164
Unpublished Materials.....	165
Internet Documents.....	167

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAE-THF	Historical Archive of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Europe, Friedensau Adventist University, Friedensau, Germany
CAR-AU	Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA
EGWE-GC	Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA
EGWE-LLU	Ellen G. White Estate Branch Office, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif., USA
EGWSC-BS	Ellen G. White Study Center, Bogenhofen Seminary, St. Peter am Hart, Austria
GCA	Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, Seventh-day Adventism has been deeply interested in biblical prophecies, especially those found in the books of Daniel and Revelation. The movement's pioneers drew their identity and mission to a great degree from their understanding of these eschatological prophecies, considering themselves to be a prophetically foretold movement.¹ Inseparably connected to Adventism's origin and its prophetic understanding is its unique sanctuary doctrine.² Through the years, the

¹See LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1954), vol. 4; P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-Day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977), passim; Bryan W. Ball, *The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981), 159-228; Norval F. Pease, "The Second Advent in Seventh-day Adventist History and Theology," in *The Advent Hope in Scripture and History*, ed. V. Norskov Olsen (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1987), 173-190; Roy I. McGarrell, "The Historical Development of Seventh-day Adventist Eschatology, 1884-1895" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1989); Hans K. LaRondelle, "Armageddon: History of Adventist Interpretation," in *Symposium on Revelation, Book 2: Exegetical and General Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 7:435-449; Alberto R. Timm, *The Sanctuary and the Three Angels' Messages: Integrating Factors in the Development of Seventh-day Adventist Doctrines*, Adventist Theological Society Doctoral Series, vol. 5 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: 1995); C. Mervyn Maxwell, "Predicting the End: An Old Custom Lingers On," *Adventist Review*, October 29, 1998, 16-19; Donald E. Mansell, *Adventists and Armageddon: Have We Misinterpreted Prophecy?* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1999); Rolf J. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching: A Case Study in Doctrinal Development*, Friedensauer Schriftenreihe, Reihe A—Theologie, vol. 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 71-87, 135-137; Alberto R. Timm, "Seventh-day Adventist Eschatology, 1844-2004: A Brief Historical Overview," in *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical & Practical Insights*, ed. Ron du Preez, Scripture Symposium (Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007), 1:151-205.

²See Robert Haddock, "A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905" (B.D. thesis, Andrews University, 1970); Damsteegt, *Foundations*, passim; C. Mervyn Maxwell, "Sanctuary and Atonement in SDA Theology: An Historical Survey," in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard

Seventh-day Adventist Church has been shaken by several conflicts, but the conflict over the right interpretation of the dymit^1 (*tāmîḏ*, daily/perpetual/continual)³ stands out as a very prominent, long-lasting, hostile, and confusing controversy. Lasting from around 1900 to at least 1930, this conflict involved almost all major figures of Adventist leadership, one that was, in fact, split in two antagonizing parties. Apparently, one group put their emphasis more on the prophetic aspect, identifying the *tāmîḏ* as Roman paganism, while the other party highlighted rather the sanctuary aspect, interpreting the *tāmîḏ* as Christ's heavenly mediation.

Ellen G. White, Adventism's prophetess or messenger, had already made a statement in connection to the "daily" in 1850 that seemed to support the group that favored the paganism view.⁴ However, she herself declared that the Lord had neither shown her anything about the "daily," nor did she know which interpretation was true. No matter what, she did not want to be quoted in support of either view, which left both groups puzzled regarding what her 1850 statement actually meant. She called both groups

Leshner (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), 516-544; idem, "The Investigative Judgment: Its Early Development," in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), 545-581; Paul A. Gordon, *The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1983); Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5 (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989); Timm, *The Sanctuary and the Three Angel's Messages*; Merlin D. Burt, "The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White's Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2002), passim; Alberto R. Timm, "The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007): A Brief Historical Overview," in *For You Have Strengthened Me: Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Martin Pröbstle (St. Peter am Hart: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007), 331-345.

³Dan 8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11.

⁴Ellen G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," *The Present Truth*, November 1850, 87; idem, *Early Writings of Mrs. White: Experience and Views, and Spiritual Gifts, Volume One*, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1882), 64.

to silence their argumentative rhetoric. Thus the conflict calmed down over several decades, and the mediation of Christ view became more prominent, so that today one can hardly understand how anyone could believe differently.

Several questions present themselves to the scholar: How did the different interpretations evolve in Adventism? What developments took place in regard to that aspect of prophetic and biblical interpretation from Adventism's beginnings until today? Exactly which arguments were used, and what reasons did the "pioneers" have for their particular understanding? How did they approach the biblical text, and why did they reach different conclusions? How did these people treat each other or, in other words, what was the atmosphere of the conflict? What did Ellen G. White actually say, and what did she really mean by that puzzling statement of 1850? Did she provide them with any helpful advice which might also help modern Adventists or Christians at large in solving problems? This study seeks to provide answers to those questions.

Statement of the Problem

While some scholars have researched the development of the Adventist interpretations of the "daily," the reporting of their findings has typically been restricted to tangential discussions within works on broader subjects, and thus the "daily" as a topic in its own right has not been dealt with in depth. How did the development of the Adventist interpretation of the "daily" occur? What arguments and methodologies did they use? How did they handle differing views? A comprehensive study that deals with the historical development, the reasons, the approaches, the atmosphere of the conflict, an evaluation of different explanations for Ellen White's statement, and the possible implications of her advice to the conflicting parties is needed. The primary sources have

not been adequately investigated or used. Thus, a thorough exploration of these sources is greatly needed.

Statement of Purpose

The aim of this present study is to explore the Millerite and Adventist interpretation of the “daily” in Dan 8 between 1831 and 2008, focusing especially on the approach to the biblical text, the argumentation, and the atmosphere during the time of the controversy (1900–1930), as well as on Ellen White’s counsels during that period, her puzzling statement and possible explanations.

Review of Previous Research

Historical studies on the development of the interpretation of the *tāmîd* have generally appeared as parts of works on broader topics. While a lot of general works exist on Adventist history including the development of doctrines, I will consider here only the works that covered the present topic more thoroughly on the basis of primary sources.

LeRoy Edwin Froom (1940) shortly after the controversy made a brief compilation of Millerite and early Sabbatarian Adventist materials on the “daily” in order to shed more light on the historical context of Ellen White’s 1850 statement.⁵

The fourth volume of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (1955) provided an interesting but brief overview of the expositions of the *tāmîd* from pre-Reformation time to the early Seventh-day Adventist period (ca. 1873).⁶

⁵LeRoy Edwin Froom, “Historical Setting and Background of the Term ‘Daily’,” Washington, D.C., September 1, 1940.

⁶Francis D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1955), 4:60-65. See pp. 63-65 for the Millerite and Adventist period.

Egerton W. Carnegie (1971) in his M.A. report covered almost the same topics as the present study.⁷ He provided very interesting research in looking at the primary sources. However, at crucial points of interpreting the sources he just follows secondary sources, and leaves out important primary sources that would have provided a more realistic picture.

Bert Haloviak (1979) did some work on the 1919 Bible and History Teacher's Conference, and looking at it in the context of the "daily" controversy he focused especially on the implications for the authority of Ellen White's writings.⁸

Arthur L. White (1982), in one of the volumes in his series about Ellen White's life, spent a whole chapter giving a good overview of the time of conflict, based on correspondence of that time. His brief outline of the early Sabbatarian Adventist views testifies, however, of an apparent misinterpretation of primary sources.⁹

Gilbert M. Valentine (1982) provided an excellent account of the events when writing about the controversy of the "daily" at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, although it is only a part of his greater biographic work on W. W. Prescott. His report is based especially on the correspondence of the involved individuals.¹⁰

⁷Egerton Wilberforce Carnegie, "The Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'" (M.A. report, Andrews University, 1971).

⁸Bert Haloviak, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference" (Washington, D.C.: Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, November 14, 1979), 18-59. See also Bert Haloviak and Gary Land, "Ellen White & Doctrinal Conflict: Context of the 1919 Bible Conference," *Spectrum* 12, no. 4 (1982): 25-27.

⁹Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: The Latter Elmshaven Years (1905-1915)* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), 6:246-261.

¹⁰Gilbert M. Valentine, "William Warren Prescott: Seventh-day Adventist Educator" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1982), 389-410, 419-426. See also idem, *The Shaping of Adventism: The Case of W. W. Prescott* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1992), and idem, *W. W.*

Samuel Nuñez (1987) studied the interpretations of Dan 8 from 1700 to 1900. The “daily” is specifically mentioned in his volume, providing an interesting survey of different interpretations. The interpretations of John N. Andrews and Uriah Smith are briefly stated on one and a half pages.¹¹ Understandably this study covers only a small part of the present topic.

Jerry Moon (1993) spent twelve pages on the conflict over the “daily” in his Ph.D. dissertation on the relationship between W. C. White and his mother, Ellen G. White. He provided a very good overview, giving a brief explanation of the reasons of the two conflicting views, as well as Ellen White’s and W. C. White’s involvement with the topic and the parties.¹²

When Rolf J. Pöhler (1995) portrayed continuity and change in Adventist theology in his Th.D. dissertation, he also devoted three pages to the atmosphere of the conflict over the “daily” (1906-1922). He focused more on the existing antagonism of the “paganism view” supporters, as well as the implications for the authority of Ellen White’s writings, rather than an evaluation of exegetical or theological reasons and arguments of the respective conflicting parties.¹³

Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation, Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2005), 214-238.

¹¹Samuel Nuñez, *The Vision of Daniel 8: Interpretations from 1700 to 1900*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 14 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1989), 375, 376.

¹²Jerry A. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship Between the Prophet and Her Son*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 19 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1993), 415-427.

¹³Rolf J. Pöhler, “Change in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study of the Problem of Doctrinal Development” (Th.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1995), 320-322. See also idem, *Continuity and Change*, 156-158.

Recently a book has been published on the “daily” by Heidi Heiks (2008) which is a rather apologetic work to support the mediation view. He invested much time and effort in performing word studies, examining both interpretations, and explaining the context of Ellen White’s statement. However, I think that the primary sources still deserve a closer look.¹⁴

Most of the above studies provide either a historical overview of the events of the time of controversy, or they form merely a part of a larger work with a different objective. None of these studies can fulfill the objectives of this present study.

Methodology and Sources

This thesis is a documentary study based on a comprehensive examination and analysis of unpublished and published primary sources found especially in the Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., and several databases such as, for example, the *Ellen G. White Writings: Comprehensive Research Edition 2008* and the Online Document Archives¹⁵ of the Office of Archives & Statistics of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The sources used include books, periodicals, tracts, letters, and manuscripts.

Of special importance to this thesis are Millerite and Adventist periodicals published between 1843 and 1851, as well as Adventist pamphlets and letters written

¹⁴Heidi Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book* (Brushton, N.Y.: TEACH Services, 2008).

¹⁵See Office of Archives & Statistics of General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, *Online Document Archives* (Silver Spring, Md.: Office of Archives & Statistics of General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church); <http://www.adventistarchives.org/DocArchives.asp> (accessed February 15, 2009).

between 1907 and 1930. The study has been enriched by several editions of the *Day Dawn* published in 1845 and 1846, and the *Advent Herald* published in 1849.

Design of the Study

The study is presented in a deductive way, looking first at the large picture of the development of views from 1831 to 2008, then zooming in at the time of controversy (1900–1930), and eventually examining the meaning and significance of Ellen White’s statements in 1850 and then during the time of the controversy. Proper consideration is given to the chronology of statements and events. Each chapter begins with an overview and finishes with a conclusion.

Chapter 1 examines four different periods: (1) the Millerite period (1831–1844); (2) the early Sabbatarian period (1845–1900); (3) the period of controversy in Adventism (1900–1930); and (4) the modern Adventist period (1930–2008). In each period groups were present that held different views on the “daily.” The arguments and the argumentation of each group are presented, taking into consideration conclusions previous scholars have made and, if necessary, criticizing these.

Chapter 2 analyzes the interpretations, argumentations, and approaches of the two interpretations during the controversial period of 1900 and 1930. Further, the atmosphere of the debates between the differing positions is portrayed.

Chapter 3 investigates Ellen White’s statement in *Early Writings*, pp. 74-75, and the context in which this statement was originally made. Statements she made later in reference to that *Early Writings* statement are set in relation to that statement, since they can help to define the boundaries or the meaning of it. Several explanations that have been offered in the past are evaluated on the basis of the statement itself, the context in

which it was made, and later statements that Ellen White made in regard to it. Other statements that have been made by her towards the contending parties or individuals belonging to these are provided as well, in order to understand her advice and counsel during that controversial period.

Chapter 4 concludes the study with a summary of the findings in regard to the development of views on the *tāmîd*, the analysis of the controversial parties, the meaning of Ellen White's statement and the significance of her advice, as well as with a conclusion that highlights the relevance of this study for Adventism's modern doctrinal controversies.

Definition of Terms

Throughout this study I have used specific terms with certain meanings which could have different meanings in other contexts.

The Hebrew term *tāmîd* can be translated as “continual/ly, regular/ly, daily, perpetual/ly.” Millerite and Adventist writers referred to the term as well as to the topic often as the “daily.” Therefore the words *tāmîd* and “daily” are preferred in this study, and are also used interchangeably.

The terms “old view” and “new view” are employed in the way Adventists around 1910 used them. The old view refers to the interpretation that paganism denotes the *tāmîd*; the new view refers to the interpretation of the *tāmîd* signifying Christ's heavenly mediation. These terms define merely that the old view was the established view in Adventism around the turn of the century when the new view arose, although the new view may have existed even prior to the old view.

Although the term “Adventist” can historically refer to several groups or denominations, in this study the term always refers to the Seventh-day Adventist group or movement.

Limitations

Since this study covers more than 170 years and touches several other topics, certain limits have to be set so that the study can be kept to an appropriate size.

Theological statements are never made totally detached from actual events. However, since this study is more concerned with the theological content of statements, the historical incidents, connected to the whole issue of the “daily,” can only play a featured part. Thus they are mentioned only if they are necessary for the understanding of certain theological developments.

Especially during the controversial time (1900–1930) the question of the inspiration and authority of Ellen White’s writings became increasingly important. That could be, however, a whole study in itself. Therefore, this aspect is mentioned only as far as it concerns the present topic.

There are other sections and themes in the book of Daniel that are somehow related to the question of the *tāmîd*. A lot has certainly been written on these passages and topics. Yet, statements made regarding such texts are only mentioned in this study to the extent that they are significant for the issue of the “daily.”

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF THE HISTORICAL PHASES

Although the teachings and convictions of single individuals may change rapidly, the development of doctrines as taught by denominations and religious movements often occurs over longer periods of time. Therefore the division into various phases of development may certainly seem a little bit simplistic; yet, these phases often commence and conclude at crucial times when significant events take place. In reality, there exists an overlapping of the different thought developments.

Each of the following sections will provide an introduction into the four respective periods of development of the interpretation of the “daily” in Adventist history. The subsections will deal with different interpretations, a presentation of each interpretation’s arguments arranged according to arguments from the Bible (the book of Daniel, the OT background, the NT applications, and typology), tradition, and history, as well as criticized positions. While some arguments are only the personal views of the respective scholars and writers, they are nevertheless presented here as they represent the arguments present in that interpretational group.

The Millerite Period (1831–1844)

The Millerite movement formed the context from which the Sabbatarian Adventists emerged, their theological mind-set being impacted by the Millerite

interpretation of certain biblical passages. Since the Millerite interpretation of the eschatological texts formed a specific backbone of the later Adventist prophetic understanding, it is necessary to examine the interpretation of the Danielic phrase the *tāmîd* within the Millerite movement. Two interpretations of this phrase can be found in Millerite literature, namely the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism and the *tāmîd* as Christ's ministration in heaven.

Roman Paganism

The majority of the Millerite writers interpreted the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism. William Miller, Josiah Litch, Apollos Hale, Charles Fitch, Joshua V. Himes, and others were some of the more prominent proponents of that interpretation. The arguments for that position derived mainly from an exegesis of the respective texts in Daniel as well as from NT passages that used a similar terminology.

Biblical Arguments

Millerite interpreters had early recognized that the word "sacrifice" did not appear in the Hebrew text but had been supplied by the translators. They discovered also that the Danielic usage of the Hebrew term *tāmîd* differed from its common use in the OT. Thus they excluded its OT background, and decided to interpret the term just within the context of Daniel and from the NT as will be shown below.

The book of Daniel

Those writers understood the *tāmîd* as an adjective that needs a noun to modify, and since Dan 8:13 in the KJV reads "the daily *sacrifice*, and the transgression of desolation" (with the word "sacrifice" as supplied by the translators), questions were

raised regarding the appropriateness of the use of the word “sacrifice.” It was felt that *tāmîd* should modify another noun in that sentence. The conjunction “and” solved the problem, making the noun “desolation” serve as the noun modified by both the words “daily” and “transgression.”¹ Millerite writers suggested the translation of the text should read, “the daily desolation and the transgression of desolation,” presenting “two desolating powers” that desolated the sanctuary and the host.² They viewed several sanctuaries in Dan 8:11-14, namely a pagan “sanctuary” (Dan 8:11, 13) being the city of

¹A. Merrick, “Prophetic Times—Return of the Jews,” *Signs of the Times*, November 15, 1840, 122; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 417.

²Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions: or, A Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Time of Its Establishment*, 2 vols. (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 1:127. The same statements are found later without change in John N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1872), 33; cf. “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” *Signs of the Times*, February 15, 1842, 175. Some years earlier, Litch favored to supply the word “abomination” instead, so that the text would read “daily abomination.” Josiah Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843: Shown by a Comparison of Prophecy with History, Up to the Present Time, and an Explanantion of Those Prophecies Which are Yet to be Fulfilled* (Boston, Mass.: David H. Ela, 1838), 34, 35, 85; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 2:82; cf. George Storrs, *The Bible Examiner: Containing Various Prophetic Expositions* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 43, 111-116; N. Hervey, *Prophecies of Christ’s First and Second Advent: Daniel’s Visions Harmonized and Explained* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 89; John Starkweather, *A Narrative of Conversion to the Faith of the Premillennial Advent of Christ in 1843: With Suggestions and References Designed to Aid Serious Inquirers after Truth* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 38, 39. In 1833 Miller had already called it “the daily sacrifice abomination.” William Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A. D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years* (Brandon, Vt.: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833), 24, 30; cf. idem, “History of Bonaparte, 1290 days,” *Signs of the Times*, July 1, 1841, 50; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming of Christ in Eighteen Hundred Forty-three, from the Chronology of Prophecy,” *Signs of the Times*, August 31, 1842, 172; idem, *Miller’s Works: Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology, Selected from Manuscripts of William Miller; With a Memoir of His Life*, ed. Joshua V. Himes (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 1:48; idem, *Miller’s Works: Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843, Exhibited in a Course of Lectures* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 2:55, 103; Walter E. Straw, *Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1943), 54; Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 22, 33.

Rome, and God's "sanctuary" (Dan 8:14) which was first interpreted as Jerusalem with its worshipers and later as the earth and the church.³

New Testament applications

Millerite writers frequently told the story of how William Miller found an answer to the meaning of the "daily," when he came to the passage in 2 Thess 2:7, 8.⁴ The power to be "taken out of the way," and replaced by another power (2 Thess 2:7), paralleled the description of the "taking away" of "the daily *desolation*" only to be replaced by another desolation (Dan 8:11).⁵ Miller reasoned that the apostle Paul could only have referred to the power reigning at his time, the pagan Roman Empire. He concluded that the "two desolating powers" described in Dan 8 could only be Roman paganism and papal Rome.

³William Miller, *Letter to Joshua V. Himes, on the Cleansing of the Sanctuary* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 8; cf. Don F. Neufeld and Julia Neuffer, eds., *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, rev. ed., Commentary Reference Series, vol. 10 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1976), 367.

⁴N. Southard, "The Daily," *Midnight Cry*, October 5, 1843, 53; Apollos Hale, *The Second Advent Manual: in which the objections to calculating the prophetic times are considered; the difficulties connected with the calculation explained; and the facts and arguments on which Mr. Miller's calculations rest, are briefly stated and sustained* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 66; cf. Uriah Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth, No. 12: The 1290 and 1335 Days," *Review and Herald*, January 28, 1858, 92; John N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 34; Carnegie, "The Historical Setting," 7, 8; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367; Larry J. Hall, "The Daily of Dan 8:11-13: An Historical Look at the Millerite View" (Term paper, Andrews University, 1986), 4.

⁵See Miller, *Evidences from Scripture*, 30, 31; idem, "A Lecture on the Signs of the Present Times," *Signs of the Times*, March 20, 1840, 6; idem, "History of Bonaparte, 1290 Days," 50; idem, "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming," August 31, 1842, 172, 173; idem, *Dissertations on the True Inheritance of the Saints: And the Twelve Hundred and Sixty Days of Daniel and John; With an Address* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 34-37; idem, *Miller's Works*, 1:48, 49; "1260 days of Daniel and John considered as one and the same period of time," *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1842, 70; Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 37; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 2:81, 82, 128; Storrs, 114, 115; Hervey, 89; Starkweather, 37; cf. Nichol, 4:63; John W. Peters, *The Mystery of the "the Daily": An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*, rev. ed. (Flint, Mich.: The Author, 1994), 1, 2.

Thus the *tāmîd* in the book of Daniel was to be understood as “the daily abomination” caused by pagan Rome, or the rites, the sacrifices, and the worship of Roman paganism.⁶

Other passages, such as Matt 24 and Luke 21, as well as Rev 13 and 17, were understood as parallel passages to Dan 8.⁷ In Matt 24:15 and Luke 21:21, Jesus talked about the pagan desolation rather than the papal abomination, the latter of which was understood to not have started for more than 500 years after Christ spoke these words and which would last until Christ’s second coming.⁸ The two beasts of Rev 13 were

⁶William Miller, “Miller’s Answer to Queries of ‘A Subscriber’,” *Signs of the Times*, December 15, 1840, 143; idem, *Evidences from Scripture*, 24; idem, “A Lecture,” 6; idem, “The Beast—Anti-Christ—Pagan and Papal Abominations,” *Signs of the Times*, June 15, 1841, 41; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 172, 173; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming of Christ in 1843,” *The Midnight Cry*, November 23, 1842, 3, 4; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:49, 2:40, 95, 104, 296, 297; idem, *Miller’s Works: Supplement* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 2:3; Hale, 66, 70, 71; Josiah Litch, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy: On the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth, As Indicated by the Word of God, the History of the World, and Signs of the Present Times* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1841), 81, 108, 109; idem, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 35, 36, 84, 114, 116; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 1:143, 2:79, 82; C. French, “Diagram of Daniel’s Visions,” *Signs of the Times*, March 1, 1841, 18; idem, “Diagram of Daniel’s Vision,” *The Midnight Cry*, November 18, 1842, 4; “Mr. Miller,” *Signs of the Times*, May 15, 1840, 32; Merrick, 122; “Exposition of Miller’s Chronological Chart,” *Signs of the Times*, May 1, 1841, 21; Joel Spaulding, “Second Coming of Christ,” *Signs of the Times*, March 1, 1842, 179; “1260 days of Daniel and John,” 71; Charles Fitch, “Fitch’s two Sermons,—concluded,” *Signs of the Times*, June 8, 1842, 74; Storrs, 109, 111; Hervey, 85, 89, 90; Southard, “The Daily,” 53; Sylvester Bliss, “Paraphrase of Daniel XI and XII,” in *The Age to Come!: The Present Organization of Matter, Called Earth, to be Destroyed by Fire at the End of this Age or Dispensation*, ed. Lewis C. Gunn, rev. ed., Second Advent Library (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1844), 41:72; cf. Straw, 54; Nichol, 4:63; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367; Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 78; Pedro Arano, “The Daily” (Term paper, Andrews University, 1982), 2, 3; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 417; Peters, 2.

⁷Miller, “Miller’s Answer to Queries,” 143; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 172, 173; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” November 23, 1842, 4; idem, *Dissertations*, 35; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:49, 50, 2:40, 95; “1260 days of Daniel and John,” 70; Fitch, “Fitch’s Two Sermons,” 74; Storrs, 114, 115; Hervey, 89, 90; Starkweather, 37; cf. Straw, 54; Nichol, 4:63.

⁸Miller, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” November 23, 1842, 3; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:48; Hale, 71, 72.

considered as pagan Rome and papal Rome.⁹ The number 666 was viewed as the number of years the Roman beast would reign (Rev 13:18).¹⁰

Arguments from Tradition

One writer recognized that this interpretation might appear obscure to some readers since it differed so much from the current views. He referred to the church fathers for support of the view that pagan Rome is succeeded and replaced by the Antichrist.¹¹

Historical Arguments

Since the number 666 was viewed as the duration of Roman paganism, the end of that period fell together with the replacement of the “daily *desolation*” by the “transgression of desolation” (papal Rome). The league between the Romans and the Jews was declared to have started at 158 BC so that by doing the math as if there were a year zero, the 666 years concluded in AD 508.¹² Since AD 508 was considered the

⁹E. Pond, “The Little Horn,” *Signs of the Times*, November 16, 1842, 66; cf. Arano, 3.

¹⁰Miller, *Evidences from Scripture*, 24; idem, “A Lecture,” 6; idem, “Miller’s Answer to Queries,” 143; idem, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 2:95, 96, 296; “Mr. Miller,” 32; French, “Diagram of Daniel’s Visions,” March 1, 1841, 18; idem, “Diagram of Daniel’s Vision,” November 18, 1842, 4; Hervey, 76; cf. Straw, 54; Nichol, 4:63; Carnegie, 8, 9; Arano, 2.

¹¹Southard, “The Daily,” 53.

¹²“Mr. Miller,” 32; Miller, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; Storrs, 40; Hervey, 76; cf. Straw, 54; Nichol, 4:63, 64; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Arano, 2. Since the equation of the *tāmîd* with paganism was removed from the 1843 prophetic chart, some writers concluded that the originators (Charles Fitch and Apollos Hale) of that chart rejected or at least questioned the “paganism-view.” See Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 4, 5; idem, “Historical Data on ‘1843’ Chart,” *Ministry*, May 1942, 25; Straw, 54; George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1955), 174; Nichol, 4:64; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247. While it is correct that the 666 years had been removed from the chart, the year 158 BC as the starting date of the league between the Jews and the Romans was retained. See Froom, “Historical Data on ‘1843’ Chart,” 25. Some refer to Fitch’s questioning of the historical basis for the 508 and 538 dates to prove that he did not believe in the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd*. See Straw, 54; Nichol, 4:64; Carnegie, 14; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 17, 69, 70. Fitch’s statement is found in a letter to Miller from March 5, 1838. At that point he had not yet joined the Millerite movement but still had

starting point for the time of the desolating power of papal Rome, it also became the starting point for the calculations of the 1,290- and 1,335-year prophecies of Dan 12:12, 13. Furthermore, the duration of the “daily desolation” and the “transgression of desolation” covered the period of the 2,300 evening-mornings that lasted until 1843/1844. Thus the *tāmîd* played a significant role in the calculation of these time prophecies.¹³

Several historical events were offered as evidence for the change from “the daily desolation” to “the transgression of desolation” in AD 508. The conversion of the Ostrogoths to Christianity in AD 508 was mentioned because the accounts of the public

some questions that apparently had been satisfactorily answered before he joined the movement. See the letter in Sylvester Bliss, *Memoirs of William Miller: With Appendices Containing Three Other Contemporary Biographical Sketches*, Adventist Classic Library (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 2005), 128, 129. Further, both Fitch and Hale defended the 508 and 538 dates in their later writings. Charles Fitch, *Letter to Rev. J. Litch, on the Second Coming of Christ: With the Sentiments of Cotton Mather on the Same Subject, Approved by Thomas Prince, Both Eminent Ministers of Boston in the Last Century* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1841), 43, stated, “And from the time the daily [pagan sacrifice in the Roman kingdom] shall be taken away, [which occurred in the year 508,] and the [papal] abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days, [i. e., years,] to the end of that abominable power, 1798, which commenced 538 and continued 1260 years, to 1798, when the pope was carried captive.” See also idem, “Extract from Fitch’s Sermons, No. 7,” *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1842, 67; idem, “Fitch’s Two Sermons,” 74. For Apollos Hale see John N. Loughborough, “Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843: Testimony of Apollos Hale,” *Bible Training School*, October 1910, 89, 90. Thus the removal of the reference to paganism may have had no definite reason.

¹³William Miller, “Strictures,” *Signs of the Times*, June 15, 1841, 45; idem, “History of Bonaparte, 1290 days,” 50; idem, *Evidences from Scripture*, 30, 31; idem, “A Lecture,” 6; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 173; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” November 23, 1842, 4; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:50, 51, 190, 2:96, 100, 103, 104, 296, 297; idem, *Miller’s Works: Supplement*, 2:3; Josiah Litch, “Mr. Litch’s Reply to Rev. Ethan Smith, and others on the Little Horn in Daniel’s Fourth Kingdom,” *Signs of the Times*, May 1, 1840, 18; idem, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 112-117; idem, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 109; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 2:127, 128; “Mr. Miller,” 32; Merrick, 122; “Exposition of Miller’s Chronological Chart,” 21; French, “Explanation of the above Diagram,” *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1841, 39; “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” *Signs of the Times*, February 1, 1842, 166; “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” February 15, 1842, 175; Spaulding, 179; Fitch, “Extract from Fitch’s Sermons, No. 7,” 67; idem, “Fitch’s Two Sermons,” 74; Storrs, 43, 112, 113; Hervey, 80, 81, 85-89, 96; Starkweather, 45; cf. Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367, 368; Arano, 3.

sacrifices offered in the city of Rome ceased at that point.¹⁴ Others also mentioned the conversion of the Frankish king Clovis and other pagan kings, noting that they became the instruments of “taking away” pagan rites and sacrifices to make place for the “transgression of desolation” (i.e., papal Rome).¹⁵

Criticized Positions

Millerite writers often reacted against the prevalent view among Christian scholars of that time, namely that the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (215–164 BC) was the anti-Christian figure that was signified through the little horn of Dan 8.¹⁶ These scholars considered “the daily sacrifice” of Dan 8:11-13 as a reference to the Jewish morning and evening sacrifices at the temple in Jerusalem that was desecrated by Antiochus during the years 167-164 BC.¹⁷ In response, Millerite writers stated that the

¹⁴Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 84, 85; idem, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 81; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 2:79. See also Miller, *Miller's Works*, 1:50, 2:95, 96; Storrs, 112, 113; Hervey, 89; Bliss, “Paraphrase of Daniel XI and XII,” 41:70; cf. Carnegie, 9, 13. Since the Ostrogoths were Arians, Litch considered their Arian convictions as a kind of abomination. See Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 85. Some did not mention a certain specific event but stated just generally that in AD 508 the last of these ten kings converted to Christianity so that therefore the pagan sacrifices must have ceased. See Fitch, “Extract from Fitch’s Sermons,” 67; idem, “Fitch’s Two Sermons,” 74; “1260 days of Daniel and John,” 71; Miller, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 173.

¹⁵Miller, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; cf. Arano, 2, 3.

¹⁶See William Allen, “On the Designation of Time in Daniel and John: The 1260 Days of Daniel and John, and the 1000 Years of John,” *Signs of the Times*, August 15, 1840, 73-74; Litch, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 77, 78; idem, “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” *Signs of the Times*, December 1, 1841, 134-136; “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” February 1, 1842, 166; “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” February 15, 1842, 174, 175; William Miller, *Miller's Reply to Stuart's "Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy": In Three Letters, Addressed to Joshua V. Himes* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 29; idem, *Miller's Works*, 1:188-190, 2:40; Hale, 67; Hervey, 70, 71; N. Southard, “Watchman’s Warning,” *Midnight Cry*, June 8, 1843, 102; cf. Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 67-69.

¹⁷See David Cambell, “Mr. Cambell’s Reply to Mr. Miller, on the Little Horn in Daniel’s Fourth Kingdom,” *Signs of the Times*, April 15, 1840, 9-10. Cambell actually also believed that the taking away of

word “sacrifice” did not appear in the Hebrew original but was rather supplied by the translators of the Bible.¹⁸ They mentioned further that the *tāmîd* is used only five times in the whole Hebrew Bible without a noun to modify, in contrast to all the other OT texts where it is always used with a noun which *tāmîd* modifies. They concluded, therefore, that those texts cannot serve to settle the meaning of the term in the book of Daniel.¹⁹ As was already stated, 2 Thess 2 provided the hermeneutical key for the interpretation of the “taking away” of the *tāmîd* in Dan 8. Millerite writers concluded, therefore, that the *tāmîd* could not signify the Jewish sacrifices for those had ceased almost 500 years before the Papacy was established.²⁰ Further, they reasoned that even if the Jewish sacrifices were meant at this point, the reign of the Papacy would have ended in AD 1360, a time when it was at the height of its power.²¹

the “daily sacrifice” happened when Christian churches were transformed into mosques. See also Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 58.

¹⁸Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 34; idem, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 81; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 1:127; “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller,” February 15, 1842, 175; Joshua V. Himes, “The insertion of an important omission in the minutes of the Low-Hampton Conference,” *Signs of the Times*, March 15, 1842, 189; Hale, 64; Storrs, 43, 111; Starkweather, 37; Southard, “The Daily,” 52; cf. Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 66.

¹⁹Merrick, 122.

²⁰Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 33, 34; Miller, “A Lecture,” 6; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 172; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” November 23, 1842, 3; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:48, 2:296; Storrs, 112. See also Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 33, for other reasons of Miller’s opposition against the view that the *tāmîd* could denote the Jewish sacrificial system.

²¹Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 34; Miller, “A Lecture,” 6; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 172; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” November 23, 1842, 3; idem, *Miller’s Works*, 1:48; cf. Carnegie, 18, 19. They arrived at AD 1360 by adding the 1260 years to AD 70, when the Jerusalem temple was destroyed and the sacrifices ceased. Cf. Storrs, 112.

Christ's Heavenly Ministration

While most of the Millerite leaders interpreted the *tāmîḏ* as the continual desolating activities of Roman paganism, at least one anonymous writer deviated from the above presented view.²² Although his article was published in the *Midnight Cry*, one of the major Millerite periodicals, his arguments were only printed in extracts along with an unfavorable reply by the editor.²³ The information found in these extracts, although very brief, is presented below.

Biblical Arguments

The author of that article recognized that the term *tāmîḏ* in Daniel appears as an adjective without a proper noun.²⁴ The writer attempted to show the possible relation between the term *tāmîḏ* and God by quoting several biblical passages that use adjectives to describe God's character. However, the writer then built his whole argumentation upon the term "sacrifice" found in the English translation, connecting it to the daily meat and drink offering, the loaves on the table of shewbread, as well as the perpetual fire on the

²²See [anonymous], "The Daily," *Midnight Cry*, October 5, 1843, 52. Burnside followed Straw in his claim that "many in the Millerite movement" held the interpretation that the *tāmîḏ* is Jesus' mediatory work in heaven. However, this cannot be substantiated by the primary sources and is a gross exaggeration. See G. Burnside, "Daily?," s.l., n.d., 7, CAR-AU; Straw, 55. Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 38, rightly recognized that the above interpretation was an "exception among Millerites." Some suggested that this anonymous writer was O. R. L. Crosier. See Burnside, 4; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 23-25. It is possible since he was apparently the only one who promulgated that position three years later. However, beyond these indices no information could be found to verify that suggestion. Straw, 54, suggested that Fitch wrote this article which would, however, contradict Fitch's statements in favor of the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîḏ* in the same year.

²³Southard, "The Daily," 52, 53. He emphasized the fact that Christ died once since the anonymous writer had mentioned the "continual sacrifice" of Christ. The important point was again that the word "sacrifice" did not exist in the text. Further, he referred to a former article printed in the same periodical. See idem, "Watchman's Warning," 94, 95, 97-104.

²⁴See [anonymous], "The Daily," 52.

altar.²⁵ All these sacrifices pointed to the eternal sacrifice of Christ that is daily applied through the mediator Jesus Christ.²⁶ Thus the *tāmîd* represents Christ’s daily or continual mediation in heaven on behalf of sinners that was eventually taken away by the work of the little horn.²⁷

Historical Arguments

In AD 538 the little horn representing the Pope “cast down the true doctrine of the cross of Christ,” and “took away the very heart of the gospel” (i.e. the daily or continual mediation of Jesus Christ).²⁸

Summary

During the Millerite period, the *tāmîd* was interpreted in two ways. The prevalent interpretation identified the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism and its rites. The supporters of this view argued against the supplying of the word “sacrifice” as well as the difference between the usual Old Testament usage of *tāmîd* and its use in the context of Daniel. On the other hand, at least one interpreter based their interpretation apparently on the supplied word “sacrifice.” While in the first interpretation the Old Testament usage of the

²⁵See *ibid.*

²⁶That view was criticized by the Millerites for the reason that Christ’s sacrifice happened once and not continually, and that the word “sacrifice” was added and is not found in the Hebrew text. See Southard, “The Daily,” 52.

²⁷See [anonymous], “The Daily,” 52; cf. Price, 174; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367, 368.

²⁸See [anonymous], “The Daily,” 52. S. Hawley stated that the little horn, which was Rome in its pagan and papal phases, “magnified itself against the prince of the host, took away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of his sanctuary.” While this statement could indicate that the writer considered the daily sacrifice as well as the place of his sanctuary as belonging to the prince of the host, he provided no plain identification since he was more concerned about the prophecy of the 2,300 days. S. Hawley, *The Second Advent Doctrine Vindicated: A Sermon Preached at the Dedication of the Tabernacle* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 66.

term *hatāmîd* was excluded, the second interpretation identified the term from its usual Old Testament usage.

The Early Seventh-day Adventist Period (1845–1900)

The first decade of this period after the great disappointment of October 22, 1844, was a time of fragmentation for the Millerite movement. In this phase, different groups developed various explanations for the failure of Christ’s second coming. Although more interpretations could be provided below, only those interpretational groups that apparently influenced early Sabbatarian Adventists are presented.

Christ’s Heavenly Ministration

Several writers have suggested that O. R. L. Crosier interpreted the *tāmîd* as Christ’s continual high-priestly ministry in heaven, based on his article in the *Day Star* Extra from February 7, 1846.²⁹ By interpreting the sanctuary and its cleansing as the heavenly sanctuary that had to be cleansed after the 2,300 evening-mornings with Christ serving as the great high priest, Crosier deviated from the major Millerite view.³⁰ While he argued in several of his articles for an extended atonement in a true heavenly

²⁹Richard W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1979), 397; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247; Arano, 3, 4.

³⁰O. R. L. Crosier, “The Law of Moses,” *Day-Star*, February 7, 1846, 37-44, reprinted in idem, “The Sanctuary,” *Advent Review*, September 1850, 42-47; idem, “The Priesthood,” *Advent Review*, September 1850, 57-63; idem, “The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, May 5, 1851, 78-80; Merlin D. Burt, “The Day-Dawn of Canandaigua, New York: Reprint of a Significant Millerite Adventist Journal,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44, no. 2 (2006): 318-329; O. R. L. Crosier, “Good Testimony on Time,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 3.

sanctuary,³¹ none of the mentioned articles makes explicit statements in regard to the *tāmîd*. Crosier did, however, present his views on the *tāmîd* in the March 19, 1847, edition of *The Day-Dawn*, which has apparently been overlooked by most researchers in the past.³² He ranked the “true understanding of the Daily Sacrifice and the Sanctuary” among the fundamental principles he and others had discovered.³³

Biblical Arguments

In contrast to other Millerites, Crosier always used the phrase “daily sacrifice” without noting once that the term “sacrifice” was added to the biblical text.³⁴ The taking away of the “daily sacrifice” needed to be understood as an “act of violence against the party from whom it was taken; but not so the transition from the Pagan to the Papal form of Rome.”³⁵

He pointed out that this phrase is always used in connection to the Israelite temple. Crosier stated that “the ancient Daily Sacrifice was a Jewish institution – this [in

³¹See also Merlin D. Burt, “The Extended Atonement View in the Day-Dawn and the Emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44, no. 2 (2006): 335-338.

³²O. R. L. Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2, responds to J. Weston, “Letter to Bro. Crosier,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 1, 2; cf. Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 126. Weston reacts to an article by Crosier on the *tāmîd* in the *Day-Dawn*, vol. 1, no. 12, in which Crosier, viewing the the *tāmîd* as a “*Christian Institution*,” desired his readers “to examine the meaning of *Daily Sacrifice* in Daniel.” Unfortunately, I could not yet find a copy of that issue of the *Day-Dawn*. At that time (March 1847) Crosier was apparently still in contact with Joseph Bates, James White, and Otis Nichols. See O. R. L. Crosier, “The Confession of Faults and the Reviving,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 3; Eli Curtis, “Note from Bro. Curtis to Bro. White,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 4; Joseph Bates, “Notice,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 4. Crosier was the editor of the *Day-Dawn*.

³³O. R. L. Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2. Other “principles” listed are “the true meaning of life and death, the penalty of the Divine law, the Atonement in its various parts . . . and the proper adjustment of the prophetic numbers.”

³⁴*Ibid.*, 2; *idem*, “Volume 2,” *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2; *idem*, “Good Testimony on Time,” 3.

³⁵Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2.

Dan 8], its antitype, must be a Christian institution.” Since Christ was the antitype of all the Jewish sacrifices, the “daily sacrifice” in Dan 8 was pointing to Christ’s sacrifice that was “taken *from Christ by the little horn.*”³⁶

Historical Arguments

In regard to historical evidences for his interpretation, Crosier referred only to Josiah Litch who showed that the first papal war occurred in AD 508 that resulted in papal victory over the heretics.³⁷ Pagans fought for the cause of the Catholics against their Arian enemies. The direct object in taking away the “daily sacrifice” was to set up the abomination of desolation, to put the Papacy’s “human merit, intercessions and institutions in place of Christ.”³⁸ Crosier defended himself against the accusation that he had “lost sight of Pagan Rome” by pointing out that he believed the fourth kingdom to be pagan Rome upon which Christianity was engrafted.³⁹ Several times, he also mentioned his belief that Christ would return around Passover 1847.⁴⁰ However, when his hope did not materialize, he left the movement.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid. He quoted from Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, 2:78-87.

³⁸Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2.

³⁹Weston, “Letter to Bro. Crosier,” 1; Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2.

⁴⁰Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2; idem, “Volume 2,” 2; idem, “Good Testimony on Time,” 3. While the group of Sabbatarian Adventists held fast to the 1844 date, Crosier’s emphasis of the 1847 date may have caused some uncertainty among Adventists regarding Crosier’s views on prophetic times.

Criticized Positions

Crosier claimed that Miller had departed from his own rules of interpretation by defining “the daily sacrifice” as Roman paganism. He pointed out that this phrase is always used in connection to the Israelite temple, and never as Miller interpreted it.⁴¹

Jewish Sacrifices and True Worship

A second interpretation during the period after the great disappointment of 1844 was offered by various groups that reached similar conclusions to Crosier.⁴² However, they also differed from him in several aspects. Since their emphasis was placed on the *tāmîd* as Jewish sacrifices, continued time setting, and/or the return of the Jews to Palestine they are grouped together in this section, although they were not members of the same homogenous group.

Biblical Arguments

Since the *tāmîd* is not used in connection with a qualified noun as usual in Dan 8, 11, and 12 these writers concluded that the “qualified term must be understood as included with itself.”⁴³ Several individuals had discovered that the term *tāmîd* is “borrowed from the sacerdotal offerings of the Jewish worship.”⁴⁴ Thus the intended

⁴¹Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2. He especially referred to Miller’s principles no. 1, 4, and 5. See Miller, *Miller’s Works*, 1:20.

⁴²At least some of them belonged to the so-called “Age to Come” Adventists, that is, one of the groups into which the Millerite movement had split after the disappointment. See Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1998), 50.

⁴³“Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c,” *Advent Herald*, March 3, 1849, 36.

⁴⁴F. H. Berwick, *The Grand Crisis: The Lord Soon to Come* (Boston, Mass.: n.p., 1854), 82; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11. When examining the usage of the term *tāmîd*, they quoted

noun qualified by the term *tāmîd* should be the word “sacrifice,” indicating that it was, in fact, correctly supplied by the translators.⁴⁵ The “place of his sanctuary” was consequently the temple in Jerusalem since both terms *!Ak̄m'* (*mākôn*, place) and *VD̄q̄mi* (*miqdāš*, sanctuary) are generally used in the sanctuary context.⁴⁶

Arriving at a slightly different interpretation, Jonathan Cummings considered the *tāmîd* to be the daily sacrifices of God’s people, also called the true worship of God’s people.⁴⁷ Similar to the Millerite idea, he considered the 2,300 years as encompassing the periods of the “daily sacrifice” and the “abomination of desolation.” The true sacrifice had been offered when Christ died on the cross.⁴⁸

Hiram Edson, although differing in several aspects from the above views, exhibited some similarities that should be mentioned at this point. He believed that the 2,300 years were the time in which Jerusalem was “trodden underfoot,” and that at the end of this period the appointed time for Jerusalem would arrive.⁴⁹ Several OT prophecies foretold the return of the Jews to Jerusalem which, of course, would happen

such texts as Gen 6:20; Exod 27:20; 30:8; Lev 6:13; Num 4:16; Pss 25:15; 105:4; Isa 62:6. See “Interpretation of Symbols,” 36. Froom suggested that Jonathan Cummings was the author of this article. See Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11. Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 39, follows this suggestion. Yet, the author’s name is neither given in this article nor in other articles that belonged to that series which ran in the *Advent Herald* from February 17 to September 29, 1849. The publisher of that periodical was Joshua V. Himes.

⁴⁵“Interpretation of Symbols,” 36.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*

⁴⁷Jonathan Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and Application of the Truth* (Concord, N.H.: Barton & Hadley, 1854), 3, 7.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*

⁴⁹Hiram Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy: Showing the Final Return of the Jews in 1850* (Canandaigua, N.Y.: Office of the Ontario Messenger, 1849), 4, 5. See also *idem*, *The Time of the End: Its Beginning, Progressive Events, and Final Termination* (Auburn, N.Y.: Henry Oliphant, 1849).

right before Christ's return.⁵⁰ Since this view was not in harmony with the views of the Millerites and other early Sabbatarian Adventists, Edson's work did not receive support from Ellen and James White. Further, Edson referred to the keeping of the Sabbath as one of the conditions under which God had promised to gather Israel to his holy mountain at Jerusalem.⁵¹

Some people went even further in stating that the Jews would not only return to Palestine but also rebuild the temple in Jerusalem and restore the OT sacrifices.⁵²

Clarinda S. Minor went so far as to actually travel to Palestine to preach to the Jews.⁵³

This historic "Age to Come" perspective may have led early Seventh-day Adventists to reject the interpretation of *hatāmîd* from its Old Testament background.

Historical Arguments

One writer stated that the Jewish sacrificial observances were terminated by the little horn, namely Rome, at the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.⁵⁴ Daniel 8:13 was paraphrased in this way: "In other words, How long will be the fulfilling of the vision in which is presented the termination of the Jewish service and the transgression of Rome, to accomplish the trampling down of the sanctuary and the holy people?"⁵⁵

⁵⁰Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5; cf. Carnegie, 33; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 41.

⁵¹Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 35, 36.

⁵²Burnside, 3.

⁵³Froom, "Historical Setting and Background," 13; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 41.

⁵⁴"Interpretation of Symbols," 36.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*

Cummings, however, concluded that the 2,300 years and the “daily sacrifice” commenced together at about 446 BC when the Jewish worship was restored in Palestine.⁵⁶ When Christ died on the cross, the bloody animal sacrifices ceased; the “daily sacrifice,” however, did not cease, only “the manner of offering changed.”⁵⁷ According to Cummings the “daily sacrifice” was taken away in AD 519, and replaced by the “abomination of desolation.”⁵⁸ The 1,290 years had commenced in AD 519, and would accordingly end in 1809. The 1335 as well as the 2,300 years would conclude in 1854, bringing Christ’s second coming and the resurrection in its train.⁵⁹

Edson, while holding fast with other Sabbatarian Adventists to the 1844 date, thought that the appointed time for Jerusalem had arrived in 1844, and that after 1844 the message should go forth to the Jews and to Jerusalem in regard to their return to Jerusalem.⁶⁰ Although Joseph Bates did not follow the idea of the Jews’ return to Jerusalem and held fast to the 1844 date, he suggested that the duration of Christ’s ministry in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary would be seven years (from

⁵⁶Cummings, 3, 7; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11, 12; Arano, 5.

⁵⁷Cummings, 7. He stated that under the new dispensation offerings looked different, referring to such texts as Rom 12:1; Heb 13:15, 16; 1 Pet 2:5.

⁵⁸Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and Application of the Truth*, 7.

⁵⁹Ibid., 246; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11, 12; Carnegie, 31, 32; Arano, 5. The later Advent Christian Church “had its origin among the followers of Jonathan Cummings.” See Arthur Whitefield Spalding, *Footprints of the Pioneers* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1947), 26. Raymond F. Cottrell, “Time has demonstrated this fact,” *Review and Herald*, April 5, 1864, 6, opposed views of some people who set, e.g., the date 1867. See also Uriah Smith, “Papal Supremacy: When did it commence?,” *Review and Herald*, December 6, 1864, 12.

⁶⁰Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5; idem, *The Time of the End*; cf. Carnegie, 33; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 41.

1844 to 1851), and thereby continued to set times for Christ's return.⁶¹ Neither Edson nor Bates later redefined the *tāmîd* from its usual Old Testament usage as will be seen in the next section.

Roman Paganism

In general, Sabbatarian Adventists held fast without interruption to the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd* as referring to pagan Rome.⁶² Joseph Bates, a leading speaker in the Millerite movement, continued to consider the *tāmîd* as paganism, based on his understanding of the "two desolating powers."⁶³ Following that understanding, James White stated that "the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation represent Rome in its pagan and papal forms."⁶⁴ Similar statements were made by Uriah Smith, Ellet J.

⁶¹Joseph Bates, *An Explanation of the Typical and Anti-Typical Sanctuary* (New Bedford, Mass.: Press of Benjamin Lindsey, 1850), 8, 9, 12; cf. Carnegie, 39; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 39. However, Bates did not mention the year 1851.

⁶²John N. Andrews referred to the writings of William Miller and Josiah Litch. See Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33, 34.

⁶³Joseph Bates, *The Opening of Heavens: Or a Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets and Apostles, Concerning the Opening Heavens, Compared with Astronomical Observations, and of the Present and Future Location of the New Jerusalem, the Paradise of God* (New Bedford, Mass.: Benjamin Lindsey, 1846), 30, 31. See also Otis Nichols, "The Signs of the End of the World," *Review and Herald*, December 9, 1852, 114; Uriah Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1873), 160; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8, 14* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1877), 41, 42; Ellet J. Waggoner, "The Little Horn of Daniel 8," *Signs of the Times*, November 19, 1885, 694.

⁶⁴James White, *Bible Adventism: Or, Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ: Our Faith and Hope, No. 1* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, n.d.), 127; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel: The Four Kingdoms, the Sanctuary, and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1863), 73; idem, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1870), 116, 117; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve--The Time," *Review and Herald*, February 15, 1870, 57-59.

Waggoner, and others.⁶⁵ They simply held fast to the Millerite identification of the *tāmîd*. And while continuing to believe in that interpretation, they adopted Crosier's redefinition of some aspects, for example, the meaning of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 and its cleansing.⁶⁶ However, during the later years of this period, explicit statements on the

⁶⁵Uriah Smith, "Short Interviews with Correspondents," *Review and Herald*, February 24, 1863, 100; idem, "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered," *Review and Herald*, November 1, 1864, 180; idem, "Papal Supremacy," 12; idem, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," *Review and Herald*, April 3, 1866, 139; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review and Herald*, June 28, 1870, 12; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review and Herald*, July 5, 1870, 20; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI," *Review and Herald*, February 28, 1871, 84; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 158; idem, "The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper--Daniel 8," *Review and Herald*, January 27, 1876, 28; idem, "The 1290 Days," *Review and Herald*, December 10, 1895, 794; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of These Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1897), 176, 177, 179; idem, "The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17," 26; "Historical Gleanings: By Reason of Transgression," *Review and Herald*, March 4, 1873, 92; Goodloe H. Bell, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII--Pagan and Papal Dominion," *Review and Herald*, August 29, 1878, 75; idem, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII--The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, September 5, 1878, 83; W. H. Littlejohn, "The Temple in Heaven: An Imaginary Conversation on a Very Important Theme," *Review and Herald*, October 21, 1884, 659; idem, "The Judgment and the Papacy," *Review and Herald*, October 20, 1891, 643; Waggoner, "The Little Horn of Daniel 8," 694; J. G. Matteson, "The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter IX," *Review and Herald*, May 17, 1887, 308. Uriah Smith, "Papal Supremacy," 12, clearly stated, "This daily has often been shown through the Review to be not a sacrifice but an abomination, referring to Paganism."

⁶⁶Schwarz, 397. This also contradicts Peters, who stated that "following the great disappointment the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism . . . embraced Miller's identification of the daily as pagan Rome" (2). At least those who experienced the Millerite movement first-hand already believed in that interpretation. The generation that did not experience the Millerite movement inherited it from their "pioneers." Further, Arthur L. White erred when saying that it took until the turn of the century to return to the old position. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247. It is certainly true that Smith's *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation* had a great influence in promoting his understanding of the *tāmîd*. See Schwarz, 397. However, it did not change the interpretation or the understanding of Seventh-day Adventists, as even before the book was published, others explicitly stated that view beginning with Joseph Bates in 1846. See Bates, *The Opening of Heavens*, 30, 31. On the acceptance of Crosier's understanding of the extended atonement ministry in the heavenly sanctuary see P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," in *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5 (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 57-117; Burt, "The Historical Background," 242-270, 402-404.

tāmîḏ were very seldom published.⁶⁷ Smith's *Thoughts on the Book of Daniel* became the classical source for that interpretation.⁶⁸

Biblical Arguments

The book of Daniel

Those who followed this interpretation left no doubt that the word “sacrifice” did not exist in the Hebrew text, and that it was added in the English text.⁶⁹ Since the term *tāmîḏ* had an article (*hatāmîḏ*) but not an accompanying noun, they assumed that the conjunction “and” should connect “the daily and the transgression” so that there would be

⁶⁷Several articles quote Dan 8:11-14 but do not provide an identification of the *tāmîḏ*, and/or even put the passage into the context of Christ's heavenly atonement ministry, 457 BC and AD 1844, although the authors clearly believe in the Millerite view as can be seen from other publications of the same authors. See Stephen N. Haskell, “Studies on the Book of Daniel,” *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, July 1, 1891, 200, 201; George B. Starr, “The Cleansing of the Sanctuary,” *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, March 5, 1900, 155, 156; Uriah Smith, “The Moment of Greatest Interest,” *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1901, 283, 284.

⁶⁸A brief look at the bibliographic references, given on pp. 28-34 in this study, shows that Uriah Smith's articles and books appear more often than those of any other writer. That is certainly also due to Smith's longer lifespan and accordingly a longer working time. James White had died already in 1881 and Andrews in 1884, while Smith did not pass away until 1903. Given the prominence of Smith's Daniel and Revelation commentary, it is due to this work that the *tāmîḏ* interpretation was carried to the next generation.

⁶⁹James White, *Bible Adventism*, 127; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, “Prophecy,” *Review and Herald*, May 29, 1860, 3; idem, “Short Interviews with Correspondents,” 100; idem, “The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered,” 180; idem, “Papal Supremacy,” 12; idem, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” June 28, 1870, 12; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” July 5, 1870, 20; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI,” 84; idem, “The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper--Daniel 8,” 28; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8, 14*, 41; idem, “The 1290 Days,” 794; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 176, 179; idem, *Looking Unto Jesus: Or Christ in Type and Antitype* (Chicago, Ill.: Review and Herald, 1898), 160; A. C. Bourdeau, “Our Present Position,” *Review and Herald*, May 14, 1867, 266; James White, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 116, 117; Bell, “Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII,” 75; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; D. T. Bourdeau, “The Value of the Prophetic Periods in the Study of Prophecy--No. 2,” *Review and Herald*, October 29, 1889, 675; idem, “The 1260 Days of Daniel 12,” *Review and Herald*, December 3, 1889, 755. Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308, objects also against the translation “daily service.”

two desolating powers that desolated the sanctuary and the host.⁷⁰ Although “the place of his sanctuary” mentioned in Dan 8:11 was still considered as the city of Rome, in harmony with the Millerite interpretation, Adventists now redefined the “sanctuary” in Dan 8:14 as the heavenly sanctuary, and no longer as the earth or church as the Millerites had interpreted it.⁷¹

Old Testament background

Smith stated that the OT background of the term *tāmîd* has to be totally excluded because the study of its usage had led him to the conclusion that the term is nowhere used in connection with sacrifices. However, at other times he as well as Andrews nevertheless recognized the OT background of *tāmîd* when stating that the pagan priests, altars, and sacrifices resembled the form of the Levitical worship of God.⁷²

⁷⁰Nichols, 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; cf. Nuñez, 376.

⁷¹James White, “Our Present Position,” *Review and Herald*, January 1851, 28, 29; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 43-72, 75-95; idem, “Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, July 14, 1863, 52, 53; idem, “Saving Faith,” *Review and Herald*, February 16, 1869, 58; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 57-59; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Fourteen--The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, March 1, 1870, 81, 82; Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 3, 4; idem, “The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered,” 181; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” June 28, 1870, 12; idem, “The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper,” 28; idem, “The Judgment of the Great Day,” *Review and Herald*, March 31, 1885, 200; idem, “The Angel’s Answer,” *Review and Herald*, January 5, 1886, 8; idem, “How Long the Vision?,” *Review and Herald*, July 27, 1886, 472; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 177; John N. Andrews, “The Order of Events in the Judgment: Number Twelve,” *Review and Herald*, January 25, 1870, 36; idem, “The Sanctuary of the Bible,” *Review and Herald*, March 10, 1874, 97-99; Bell, “Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII,” 83; “How long the vision?,” *Review and Herald*, November 14, 1878, 156; “Call to Remembrance the Former Days,” *Review and Herald*, March 27, 1888, 200; D. T. Bourdeau, “Principles by which to Interpret Prophecy--No. 19,” *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1889, 276; W. H. Littlejohn, “The Prophetic Scar,” *Review and Herald*, December 1, 1891, 738; cf. Schwarz, 397; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 418.

⁷²Uriah Smith, “The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered,” 180; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 179, 180. For statements where Smith and Andrews recognized the connection to the OT sacrificial services see Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 34, 35; cf. Nuñez, 375, 376. Smith

New Testament applications

Further, they saw striking terminological, chronological, and topical parallels between 2 Thess 2 and Dan 8, showing one power that had to be taken out of the way in order to be replaced by a second power.⁷³ They recognized the same change and transfer of power in Rev 17.⁷⁴ The references to the “abomination of desolation” as spoken of in Matt 24:15 and Luke 21:20 were considered to refer to the desolating power of pagan Rome as described in Dan 8:13.⁷⁵

However, Adventists differed from the Millerite interpretation in some related points. Adventist sources do not mention Miller’s identification of the 666 as the years of pagan Rome’s reign, commencing in 158 BC and reaching its conclusion in AD 508. They saw a transfer of power from the pagan Roman dragon of Rev 12 to the first beast in Rev 13, which they interpreted as papal Rome.⁷⁶ This interpretation of Rev 13 clearly

concluded that the term refers to the continuance of desolation by paganism throughout its history. See Uriah Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 179, 180.

⁷³James White, *Bible Adventism*, 127; idem, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 116, 117; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 58; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 34-36; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; D. T. Bourdeau, “The Value of the Prophetic Periods,” 675.

⁷⁴Uriah Smith, “The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17,” 27, 28.

⁷⁵Smith, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 35, 36.

⁷⁶Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 4; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” June 28, 1870, 12; idem, “The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper,” 28; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8, 14*, 42; idem, *Looking Unto Jesus*, 160; idem, “The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17,” 27; James White, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 59; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 36; Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1901), 112.

deviated from the Millerite view that the two beasts of Rev 13 would depict Rome in its pagan and papal phases.⁷⁷

Historical Arguments

The year AD 508 as the time when the *tāmîd* was taken away was maintained as the beginning point for the 1,290 and 1,335 years in Dan 12:11, 12.⁷⁸ This prophecy found its fulfillment when the pagan Germanic tribes that had conquered Rome converted to a corrupted form of Christianity and bowed their knees to the Roman pontiff so that pagan Rome became Christian and paganism was removed.⁷⁹ The “daily abomination,” or “the spirit of paganism,” was at work during the whole time of the 2,300 days/years,

⁷⁷While Millerites understood the first beast of Rev 13 as pagan Rome and the second beast as papal Rome, Sabbatarian Adventists identified the first beast as papal Rome and the second as the United States. See p. 15 of this study.

⁷⁸Nichols, 114; Joseph Bates, “Voices of the Prophets, vol. 1, no. 1,” *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1860, 90; Uriah Smith, “Short Interviews with Correspondents,” 100; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, “Papal Supremacy,” 12, 13; idem, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI,” 84; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XII,” *Review and Herald*, July 18, 1871, 36, 37; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 285, 341, 342; idem, “The 1290 Days,” 794; Cottrell, “Time has demonstrated this fact,” 6; James White, “The Time of the End,” *Review and Herald*, July 15, 1880, 56; J. G. Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter XI,” *Review and Herald*, May 24, 1887, 325; D. T. Bourdeau, “The 1260 Days of Daniel 12,” 755, 756. The setting up of the papacy occurred in AD 538, 30 years after the *tāmîd* had been taken away. See, e.g. Uriah Smith, “The 1290 Days,” 794.

⁷⁹Nichols, 114; Bates, “Voices of the Prophets,” 90; Uriah Smith, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI,” 84, 85; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8,14*, 41, 42; idem, *Synopsis of the Present Truth: A Brief Exposition of the Views of S. D. Adventists* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1884), 20; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 177, 283, 285, 341, 342; idem, *Looking Unto Jesus*, 160; idem, “The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17,” 26, 28; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; cf. Uriah Smith and James White, *The Biblical Institute: A Synopsis of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists* (Oakland, Calif.: Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House, 1878), 53; Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, 112. Andrews and Smith stated that in AD 508 Arthur became the first Christian king of England, founding the Christian worship there on the ruins of paganism. See Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 93; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 284. Haskell said that “when the Britons accepted Christianity” in AD 508, the last contest between paganism and papacy had occurred with the result that the *tāmîd* was taken away. See Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, 233, 264.

namely during the reigns of Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, and imperial Rome.⁸⁰ The heavenly sanctuary (Dan 8:14), or the heavenly city, has been “trodden underfoot” by calling the city of Rome (Dan 8:11) the eternal and holy city, in which sins are pardoned by the Pope.⁸¹ In harmony with the new understanding of the heavenly sanctuary, one member of the later publishing committee of the *Advent Review*⁸² stated that “in the autumn of 1844, Christ did close his daily, or continual ministration or mediation in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.”⁸³ This statement stands, however, only in the context of what happened on October 22, 1844, and has nothing whatsoever to do with Dan 8:11, 12, as some writers supposed.⁸⁴

⁸⁰Uriah Smith, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” July 5, 1870, 20.

⁸¹James White, “Our Present Position,” January 1851, 28, 29; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 73-75; cf. Jewell, “Bishop Jewell on Antichrist,” *Review and Herald*, November 29, 1870, 186; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308. Uriah Smith also referred to the Pantheon as “the place of his sanctuary.” See Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92.

⁸²See *Advent Review*, August 1850, 1.

⁸³David Arnold, “The Shut Door Explained,” *Present Truth*, December 1849, 45; cf. Andrews, “The Order of Events in the Judgment,” 36; James White, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 57; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Thirteen--The Time,” *Review and Herald*, February 22, 1870, 73-74; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Fourteen,” 81-82; Uriah Smith, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XII,” 37; “How long the vision?,” 156; W. H. Littlejohn, “The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Judgment,” *Review and Herald*, November 27, 1879, 172; idem, “The Temple in Heaven,” 659, 600; idem, “The Judgment and the Papacy,” 643, 644; idem, “The Prophetic Scar,” 738; idem, “The Sabbath in Prophecy: Or a Sabbath Movement to Take Place in the Last Days,” *Review and Herald*, November 15, 1892, 707, 708; Raymond F. Cottrell, “The Cleansing of the Sanctuary--No. 1,” *Review and Herald*, March 11, 1884, 169, 170; D. T. Bourdeau, “The Value of the Prophetic Periods,” 375. Similar statements can be found in A. C. Bourdeau, 266. He referred to the OT sanctuary daily and yearly services and the cleansing of the sanctuary since 1844 in the context of Dan 8:13-14. Such statements were often made to oppose time setting. See John N. Andrews, “The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing,” *Review and Herald*, December 15, 1868, 274.

⁸⁴Carnegie, 23-25; Arano, 5; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 26.

Criticized Positions

This interpretation rejected the idea that the prophecy of Dan 8 could have anything to do with Antiochus IV Epiphanes,⁸⁵ or that the *tāmîd* could signify Jewish sacrifices since the taking away of these in AD 70 had “occupied comparatively but an instant of time,” while the taking away of the *tāmîd* had to occur over a series of years.⁸⁶

Adventists also opposed continued time setting and the idea that the Jews should return to Palestine, both views being based on an emphasis of the supplied word “sacrifice” in Dan 8.⁸⁷

A Brief Excursus

Some writers suggested that early Sabbatarian Adventists adopted Crosier’s interpretation of the *tāmîd* based on the following indications. Joseph Bates and Ellen G. White recommended Crosier’s article that had been published in the *Day-Star* Extra of

⁸⁵John N. Andrews, “The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, December 23, 1852, 121-125; idem, “Daniel Chapters VIII and IX,” *Review and Herald*, November 21, 1854, 116, 117; idem, “Daniel Chapters VIII and IX,” *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1857, 202-204; James White, *Bible Adventism*, 123-127; idem, *The Four Universal Monarchies of the Prophecy of Daniel, and God's Everlasting Kingdom* (Rochester, N.Y.: Advent Review Office, 1855), 39-42; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 31, 32; idem, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 113; idem, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 58; Uriah Smith, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” 12; idem, “The Sanctuary: Third Paper--Exposition of Dan. 8,” *Review and Herald*, January 20, 1876, 20; J. G. Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter VII,” *Review and Herald*, May 10, 1887, 293.

⁸⁶Uriah Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 179, 341. See also Nichols, 114; Cottrell, “Time has demonstrated this fact,” 6; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, “The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered,” 180; idem, “Papal Supremacy,” 12; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” July 5, 1870, 20; Littlejohn, “The Temple in Heaven,” 659.

⁸⁷James White, “Comments on Brother Miller’s Dream,” *Present Truth*, May 1850, 74; idem, “Our Present Position,” *Review and Herald*, December 1850, 13; Ellen G. White, “Letter to Brethren and Sisters,” 87; Joseph Bates, “The Laodicean Church,” *Review and Herald*, November 1850, 7; cf. John N. Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” *Review and Herald*, April 4, 1907, 10; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 37, 42.

February 7, 1846.⁸⁸ James White republished Crosier’s articles several times, and in 1854 Uriah Smith expounded on Crosier’s interpretation of the *tāmîḏ*. Thus they all must have endorsed the redefinition of the *tāmîḏ* as well, these authors concluded.⁸⁹ Smith’s book *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (1873) was considered by some as the point when Adventism turned back to Miller’s view on the *tāmîḏ*.⁹⁰ According to Arthur L. White, both views on the *tāmîḏ* were presented in Adventism but Smith’s view became “the accepted position until the turn of the century.”⁹¹

However, the above claims cannot be substantiated for the following reasons. As was already shown above, Seventh-day Adventists interpreted the term the *tāmîḏ* in Dan 8 unanimously as Roman paganism during that period. When they referred to Crosier’s views, they always pointed to his *Day-Star* Extra of February 7, 1846, but never to his other articles.⁹² They never mentioned Crosier’s views on the *tāmîḏ*. Rather they wrote extensively about his extended view of atonement and his redefinition of the sanctuary as being in heaven. That is why James White republished that *Day-Star* Extra article in two

⁸⁸Straw, 54, 55; Carnegie, 22, 54; Burnside, 3; Arano, 4; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 25, 26, 30.

⁸⁹Straw, 55; Price, 174; Nichol, 4:64; Carnegie, 22-24; Burnside, 4; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 26-28, 30.

⁹⁰Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247. Francis D. Nichol, suggesting that James White had adopted Crosier’s view of the *tāmîḏ* and Uriah Smith Miller’s view, even contended that “it was from these two leaders . . . [that] the two views [came] to be held among Seventh-day Adventists.” See Nichol, 4:65; cf. Carnegie, 26, 27.

⁹¹Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247.

⁹²See Bates, *The Opening of Heavens*, 25; Ellen G. White, “Letter to Bro. Eli Curtis, New York City, from Topsham, April 21, 1847,” in *A Word to the 'Little Flock'*, ed. James White (Brunswick, Maine: The Author, 1847), 12; cf. John N. Loughborough, *The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1909), 193; *Handbook for Bible Students: Containing Valuable Quotations Relating to the History, Doctrines, and Prophecies of the Scriptures* (Washington,

parts in nos. 3 and 4 in the *Advent Review* of September 1850.⁹³ The article was also republished in the *Advent Review Special* of September 1850.⁹⁴ Yet, a comparison of these shows that the Special issue slightly differs from nos. 3 and 4 of the *Advent Review* because the Special issue left out one paragraph dealing with a brief explanation on Dan 11:30, 31; 8:13; Rev 13:6; 2 Thess 2:1-8; etc.⁹⁵ Although Crosier did not mention the “daily” or *tāmîd* in that paragraph or at any other place in that article, he interpreted the sanctuary of Dan 11:30, 31 as Jesus’ sanctuary of the covenant that was cast down from heaven and polluted by the Roman church. In fact, “in the counterfeit ‘temple of God’” the Pope professed “to do what Jesus actually does in his Sanctuary.”⁹⁶ Through these statements he deviated from the Millerite interpretation, indicating that the taking away of the *tāmîd* could be a vertical activity (earth-heaven) rather than a horizontal activity

D.C.: Review and Herald, 1922), 21, 22. For a list of topics contained in that article see Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4:899, 900, 1228-1234.

⁹³Crosier, “The Sanctuary,” September 1850, 42-47; idem, “The Priesthood,” 57-63. A comparison with the original article shows that several passages were left out in the republished version. See idem, “The Law of Moses,” the whole page 37, on page 42 the 2nd to the (including) 2nd sentence in the 6th paragraph, on page 43 in the middle column in the 3rd paragraph the passage beginning with “The antitype of the legal tenth day . . .” till the end of the paragraph, as well as in the right column in the first paragraph the passage beginning with “This indignation is the Lord’s staff . . .” till the end of the paragraph, and the rest of the article starting with the subheading “The Transition.”

⁹⁴Crosier, “The Sanctuary,” *Advent Review*, Special, September 1850, 37-50.

⁹⁵See Crosier, “The Sanctuary,” September 1850, 43, and idem, “The Sanctuary,” Special, September 1850, 38; cf. Straw, 55.

⁹⁶Crosier, “The Law of Moses,” 38; idem, “The Sanctuary,” September 1850, 43. Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 26-28, quotes similar statements by James White and Uriah Smith suggesting that he shared Crosier’s interpretation of the *tāmîd*. See also Nichol, 4:64, 65. A thorough examination of James White, “Our Present Position,” January 1851, 28, 29, and Uriah Smith, “The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, March 28, 1854, 78, also found in idem, *The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary*, Advent and Sabbath Tracts, vol. 5 (Rochester, N.Y.: Advent Review Office, 1854), 22, shows that both accepted Crosier’s understanding of the heavenly sanctuary and the counterfeit activities of the Papacy but not his identification of the *tāmîd*.

(earth-earth).⁹⁷ One could surmise that James White left this paragraph out of the Special because he differed with Crosier in his explanation of the *tāmîḏ*, although that does not answer the question of why he retained it in the first instance in nos. 3 and 4 of the *Advent Review* in 1850. Yet, what can definitely be seen is the fact that the early Sabbatarian Adventists did not publish Crosier’s explicit views on the *tāmîḏ*.

Summary

It has been shown that O. R. L. Crosier interpreted the *tāmîḏ* as Christ’s heavenly ministration whereas early Sabbatarian Adventism just continued to interpret the term as the Millerites had done before. Although no evidence could be found to support the idea that Sabbatarian Adventists knew Crosier’s interpretation of the *tāmîḏ*, they probably would have rejected it because it was associated with three aspects that Adventists strongly objected to, that is, the word “sacrifice” appeared to be the foundation of the interpretation, the term *hatāmîḏ* was interpreted from the OT sacrificial background, and the end of the prophetic time period was still seen as being in the future. Adventists maintained their view on the *tāmîḏ* as long as major groups of former Millerites set new dates for Christ’s coming and interpreted the term from a sacrificial background. But they did not elaborate their argumentation or attempt to find new biblical arguments for their interpretation.

⁹⁷See Price, 174. Straw, 55, claimed, “It is clear from the above that Crosier believed the Daily had reference to the daily mediatorial work of Christ.” Yet, it is only clear from a new view perspective and not necessarily the only possible interpretation of Crosier’s statement.

The Controversial Period in Adventism (1900–1930)

Although early Adventists mainly believed in the *tāmîd* being Roman paganism, around the turn of the century a new view developed in Adventism that was similar to other interpretations already present in broader Millerite or Adventist circles during the two previous phases. Now, proponents of both views attempted to convince as many church members as possible of the correctness of their arguments. These debates were, however, increasingly exercised in personally published tracts, letters, and sermons. Explicit statements in the denomination's periodicals were very rare.

Christ's Heavenly Ministration

The development of the “new” interpretation of the *tāmîd* in Adventism happened actually in two stages. Although the German Ludwig Richard Conradi convinced several American Adventist leaders of the new view, his writings apparently influenced only European Adventists. Therefore his views are given in an excursus that precedes the presentation of the American writers.

The First Stage—Ludwig Richard Conradi

In the 1890s, Ludwig Richard Conradi⁹⁸ (1856-1939), leader of the Adventist work in Europe, came to believe that Dan 8:13 referred to a papal counterfeit of the

⁹⁸On Conradi see Gerhard Padderatz, *Conradi und Hamburg: Die Anfänge der deutschen Adventgemeinde (1889-1914) unter der besonderen Berücksichtigung der organisatorischen, finanziellen und sozialen Aspekte* (Hamburg: The Author, 1978); Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, “CONRADI, Ludwig Richard,” *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz (Nordhausen: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1990), 1:1116-1117; Daniel Heinz, *Ludwig Richard Conradi: Missionar, Evangelist und Organisator der Siebenten-Tags-Adventisten in Europa*, 3rd rev. ed., *Archiv für internationale Adventgeschichte*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1998); Johannes Hartlapp, “Eine vergessene Liebe: Ludwig Richard Conradi und die Adventgemeinde,” *Spes Christiana* 17 (2006): 69-83.

continuous mediatorial work of Christ in heaven.⁹⁹ He concluded that this heavenly ministry was signified by the *tāmîd* that is taken away and replaced by a service of a different kind.¹⁰⁰ However, before he put his views into print, he consulted with different people. Most of them told him “to go ahead,” except for Uriah Smith, who “simply told me to stick to the old landmarks.”¹⁰¹ Conradi had also talked about the matter of the “daily” in the book committee meeting of the General Conference which “appointed several brethren to see whether there was any real ground for objecting to the interpretation.”¹⁰² The people present in that committee, W. W. Prescott, O. A. Olsen, H. P. Holser, Westphal, and W. C. White, could see no objection to the position taken in the book.¹⁰³ Conradi’s books on the prophecies of Daniel were widely circulated. However, his reinterpretation of the *tāmîd* found therein did not produce a negative reaction in the English-speaking Adventist world for the book was not published in English.¹⁰⁴ That may be one of the advantages or disadvantages of literature in foreign languages.

⁹⁹Burnside, 7, claimed that Conradi’s book was published for the first time in 1910, suggesting that O. R. L. Crosier (1843) and A. T. Jones (1905) had originated the new view in Adventism, repudiating the idea that Conradi could have been its originator. Yet, as was already shown, Crosier’s views on the *tāmîd* did not find acceptance in Adventist circles, and Conradi did not become aware of Crosier’s interpretation until some decades after his discovery. Further, Conradi’s book was published in 1898. Thus he can be considered as the originator of the new view.

¹⁰⁰Arnold V. Wallenkampf, “Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary,” in *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5 (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 206; Denis Kaiser, “W. W. Prescott und Erziehung (1855 - 1944)” (Term paper, Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2005), 24; cf. Schwarz, 397, 398.

¹⁰¹Ludwig Richard Conradi to Ellen G. White, April 17, 1906, 6, 7, CAR-AU, DF 201-c. He explicitly mentioned W. W. Prescott, W. A. Spicer, and H. P. Holser.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁰⁴Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 217. The book was translated and published in Swedish and Finnish without causing any objections from the leaders in those countries. However, when it was to be published in Danish-Norwegian, O. A. Johnson objected to Conradi’s interpretation of Dan 8. See Conradi, April 17,

Biblical arguments

Conradi defined the meaning of the *tāmîḏ* on the basis of its use in Num 28 and 29 as the whole continuous service at the sanctuary, the “true service in the sanctuary of God” and “true worship.”¹⁰⁵ He refused to limit the term only to the morning and evening sacrifices since such an idea was foreign to the OT although present in the rabbinical literature.¹⁰⁶ He suggested that the term “sanctuary” in Dan 8 “was the sanctuary of God as it was in type on earth, and as it is in antitype now in heaven.”¹⁰⁷ Christ was the prince of the host whose “true sanctuary service [was] taken away from him.”¹⁰⁸

Historical arguments

The “sanctuary” in Dan 8:11 referred, according to his interpretation, to the sanctuary that had been destroyed by the Romans in AD 70 (cf. Dan 9:26).¹⁰⁹ The taking away of the *tāmîḏ*, however, happened in the papal phase of Rome (cf. 2 Thess 2:4; Dan

1906, 1, 7. Since Johnson objected to Conradi’s position based on his own understanding of Ellen White’s 1850 statement, Conradi in turn asked Ellen White again about what she meant in 1850. See *ibid.*, 2, 8. Apparently he did not get a reply that answered his question.

¹⁰⁵Ludwig Richard Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel* (Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1898), 155; *idem*, April 17, 1906, 3. While Ellen White was still in Australia, Conradi send her a letter asking if she had any light on that point. Since she did not reply to his letter, he concluded that she had no light on the subject. See William C. White to James Edson White, June 1, 1910, EGWE-GC; cf. Carnegie, 45; Schwarz, 398; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247. Heinz, 83, stated that Conradi had begun to interpret the term vehemently in that way since 1897.

¹⁰⁶Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 156; *idem*, April 17, 1906, 3.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰⁹Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 155.

7:25) by the mass, the confession, and the whole Catholic worship system.¹¹⁰ Conradi as a former member of the Roman Catholic Church stated now that it

has set aside the true High Priest by placing the pope in His stead, and it has displaced the true sanctuary service by its own human service, and in order to make this sanctuary service on earth possible, it has invented the mass, and the mass is certainly as terrible an assumption of the Catholic power as is the change of the Sabbath.¹¹¹

Between 1898 and 1925 his publications supported the view that the heavenly sanctuary needed to be cleansed at the great antitypical day of atonement that would commence after the end of the 2,300 years in 1844.¹¹² Since knowledge of the *tāmîd* was taken away by the medieval church, it is understandable why the unique understanding of the heavenly sanctuary service of Christ was not known prior to the Sabbatarian Adventist movement, and that the preaching of this message is the distinct reason for Seventh-day Adventism's existence.¹¹³ Similar statements can be found almost unchanged in his publications until the middle of the 1920s.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰Ibid., 156, 175-178; cf. Heinz, 83.

¹¹¹Conradi, April 17, 1906, 5.

¹¹²Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 159-161, 165-175, 182, 190-203; idem, April 17, 1906, 6; cf. Schwarz, 398. Further, Conradi also paralleled the day of atonement to the heavenly investigative judgment. See Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 172-175.

¹¹³Conradi, April 17, 1906, 6.

¹¹⁴See Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*, 2nd ed. (Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1901), 155-203; idem, *Die Weissagung Daniels oder die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*, 3rd ed. (Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1905), 155-203; idem, *Der Seher am Hofe Babels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel* (Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1912), 157-205; idem, *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*, 10th ed. (Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1919), 140-183; idem, *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*, 11th ed. (Hamburg: Advent-Verlag, 1922), 140-182; idem, *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*, 14th ed. (Hamburg: Advent-Verlag, 1924), 132-173; cf. Heinz, 81, 82. In 1930, however, it became clear that Conradi had come to reject the Adventist interpretation of Dan 8:14, the Day of Atonement since 1844, the investigative judgment, etc. Although he had not yet published his views at that point, he had already started to preach them. He now believed that the great Day of Atonement had started right after Christ ascended to heaven in AD 31. See W. W.

The Second Stage—American Adventism

Prescott had raised the question of the interpretation of the *tāmîd* with his fellow workers while working in England in 1899.¹¹⁵ E. E. Andross was so much troubled that he informed S. N. Haskell about it.¹¹⁶ When Prescott discussed the question with Uriah Smith, he found that the latter was not impressed either.¹¹⁷ A. G. Daniells and W. A. Spicer, however, became convinced that this new interpretation of the *tāmîd* fit better with the sanctuary understanding of Dan 8, and provided a further detail for the new

Fletcher, “Extracts from Diary: Talk with Eld. L. R. Conradi at Washington Sanitarium,” July 22 and 24, 1930, 1-3, CAR-AU; Ludwig Richard Conradi to W. W. Fletcher, June 29, 1931, 1, 2, CAR-AU; cf. Wallenkampf, 206-208; Hartlapp, 81. These views must have started earlier, at least in part. When in 1902 about 230 of the 250 Dutch Adventists left the church, rejecting the prophetic role of Ellen White, the significance of the Sabbath, and the Adventist sanctuary doctrine, it is reported that Conradi did not believe in two apartments of the heavenly sanctuary, and that Christ did not enter to the Father in 1844 but right after his ascension. See Heinz, 98, 115. But in 1905 he rejected A. F. Ballenger’s deviating views on the sanctuary doctrine. See Ludwig Richard Conradi to Arthur G. Daniells, April 5, 1905, GCA; cf. Heinz, 98. One can only guess what Conradi meant when he told Heinrich F. Schubert in 1916 that he found something new about the ministry of the high priest that would also cause changes in the book of Daniel. He called the sanctuary doctrine a pending question. See Ludwig Richard Conradi to Heinrich F. Schubert, August 12, 1916, AAE-THF; Hartlapp, 77. Later, Conradi had apparently quite an influence on the pastors in Germany for he mentioned to Fletcher “that a number of ministers in Germany had let them know that they could not accept Sister White’s theology on the sanctuary.” See Fletcher, 2. These doubts in regard to the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary apparently never really disappeared in Germany since they are still present today, and some writers refer to Conradi as the originator of their views. See Rolf J. Pöhler, *Das Heiligtum als Gleichnis im Hebräerbrief: Ein Beitrag zu einer Auslegung von Hebräer 9,1-14* (1974); http://christsein-heute.info/hoffnung/fileadmin/hoffnungdieunstraegt/data/Material/Poehler-Das_Heiligtum_als_Gleichnis.pdf (accessed January 28, 2009), 1, 2, 9-13; idem, “Wir haben einen großen Hohenpriester: Die Tür zu Gott steht immer noch weit offen,” *Adventecho*, May 2007, 25, 26; idem, *Hoffnung die uns trägt: Wie Adventisten ihren Glauben bekennen* (Lüneburg: Advent-Verlag, 2008), 155-158; Thomas R. Steininger, *Konfession und Sozialisation: Adventistische Identität zwischen Fundamentalismus und Postmoderne*, Kirche und Konfession, vol. 33 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 92-94, 90, 136-139, 192, 198, 202; Klaus Kästner, “Adventistische Lehre vom Heiligtum: Ein historischer Überblick - Teil 1,” *Miteinander*, no. 2 (2006): 11, 12; idem, “Adventistische Lehre vom Heiligtum: Ein historischer Überblick - Teil 2,” *Miteinander*, no. 3 (2006): 10, 11; “Die Gabe der Prophetie,” *Studienanleitungen zur Bibel*, no. 1 (2009): 62. Peters, 3, wanted to argue that Desmond Ford and others eventually rejected the Adventist sanctuary doctrine because they had followed Conradi’s view of the *tāmîd*. However, such reasoning cannot be substantiated since over the years many Adventist writers held to that doctrine while at the same time believing in the new view of the *tāmîd*. See also Gerhard Pfandl, “Evaluation of ‘The Mystery of ‘The Daily,’ by John W. Peters,” (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, July 2005), 2.

¹¹⁵Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 217; cf. Schwarz, 398.

¹¹⁶Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 217.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

Christocentric focus they wanted to encourage in Adventism.¹¹⁸ Although some arguments are similar to those of Conradi, there are also some differences. Since Conradi's views were more influential in Central and Northern Europe, statements made in North America in regard to the *tāmîḏ* are portrayed separately here. It is quite interesting that during the first two decades of the twentieth century, there was not much published in book or article form about the new view of the *tāmîḏ*.¹¹⁹

Biblical arguments

The proponents of the new view recognized that the term “sacrifice” was not found in the Hebrew text but supplied by the translators.¹²⁰ Based on the usage of the term *tāmîḏ* in Num 28 and 29, they considered the term as referring to “the continual service in the sanctuary.”¹²¹ It is “the continual or perpetual service of God, in which God

¹¹⁸Ibid., 216, 217. Schwarz, 398, stated that Conradi discussed the topic with Daniells and Spicer. Conradi himself mentioned also that he conversed with Spicer about it. See Conradi, April 17, 1906, 6.

¹¹⁹During the time between 1910 and 1920 clear statements were very seldom made. When supporters of the new view talked about Dan 8:13-14, they often talked only about the heavenly sanctuary services based on the concept of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary beginning in 1844 and on texts from the Pentateuch, without even mentioning the Danielic *tāmîḏ*. See Arthur S. Maxwell, “The Impending Individual Crisis,” *Signs of the Times*, September 24, 1918, 4; Alfred H. Williams, “Realities of Tabernacle Shadows,” *Signs of the Times*, January 20, 1920, 11. One writer, when discussing the sanctuary service and the priesthood of Christ, mentioned that the “Church of Rome has introduced earthly priests, serving at earthly altars, offering continual sacrifice, day by day, even as in the Levitical typical service.” Thus while discussing “the daily sacrifice on earthly altars,” he never referred to Dan 8, 11, or 12. See William A. Spicer, “Assuming the Priesthood of Christ,” *Signs of the Times*, March 25, 1919, 4.

¹²⁰W. W. Prescott, “The Message for This Time,” *Review and Herald*, October 29, 1903, 5; Alonzo T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1905), 99; M. C. Wilcox, “The 2300 Days,” *Signs of the Times*, January 8, 1908, 6; “If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” *Signs of the Times*, June 6, 1911, 2.

¹²¹Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99; cf. Wilcox, 6; [W. A. Colcord], ed., *Bible Readings for the Home Circle* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1914), 228. W. H. Wakeham, *Outline Lessons on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation*, Tentative edition (Berrien Springs, Mich.: College Press, 1927), 48, had observed that the term *tamid* was used in connection with the continual burnt offering (Exod 29:42), the continual ordering of the lamps upon the candlestick (Lev 24:4), the continual bread (Num 4:7), and the perpetual incense (Exod 30:8).

was present, and which He acknowledged,” stated one writer.¹²² Some terms, such as “sanctuary” or “host,” which occur several times in Dan 8:11-14, were identified with different meanings by the proponents of the old view. The supporters of the new view questioned this procedure, and suggested the same identification be used if the terms are so closely related.¹²³ Further, they recognized that by interpreting it in this way, a climax of the little horn’s actions appeared against the political powers of this world, the people of God, the prince of the host, and the place of the heavenly sanctuary with its “daily.”¹²⁴ Since 2 Thess 2 foretold an individual, the Pope, who would place himself in the temple of God, this text was viewed as a parallel passage to Dan 8.¹²⁵

Typological arguments

In the context of the book of Daniel the *tāmîd* was understood as signifying the “continual service, the ministry, and the priesthood of Christ.”¹²⁶ The term was used in reference to those services in the sanctuary which were typical of Christ’s work in the

¹²²“If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2; cf. Prescott, “The Message for This Time,” 5; Wilcox, 6.

¹²³Wakeham, 47.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Prescott, “The Message for This Time,” 5; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 98, 99.

¹²⁶Ibid., 98-100; cf. Colcord, 229, 237. Seven years earlier Jones did not provide any interpretation of the *tāmîd* when mentioning the text. See Alonzo T. Jones, *The Great Empires of Prophecy, from Babylon to the Fall of Rome* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1898), 34. Although he did not make an explicit statement about the *tāmîd* in his 1901 book *Ecclesiastical Empire*, the careful reader will recognize that Jones considered the daily sacrifice and the sanctuary as belonging to the Prince of the host, who, in fact, was divine. See idem, *Ecclesiastical Empire* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1901), 2. Although Jones promulgated the new view after the turn of the century, Burnside’s claim that the new view is a “part of the 1888 message,” and therefore part of God’s present truth for today, goes without foundation. See Burnside, 7. It is not verifiable that Jones preached or wrote on that topic before the turn of the century.

heavenly sanctuary.¹²⁷ The sanctuary in Dan 8:11-14 should not be understood as an earthly sanctuary but rather as the heavenly one.¹²⁸ Since God was also present in the OT sacrificial services, Christ was present in the worship of the church.¹²⁹ W. H. Wakeham considered the incense as a signification of Christ's intercession (Rev 8:3, 4; Heb 7:25), the showbread as a symbol of the bread of life—Christ who is ever in God's presence for us—and the seven lamps as pointing to the Holy Spirit in His sevenfold office operating in our behalf as Christ's representative on earth (Rev 4:5).¹³⁰

Historical arguments

The historical arguments offered in support of the new view centered mainly on the activities of the papacy, which was believed to have taken away the continual service of Christ and cast down his sanctuary.¹³¹ Matthew 24:15 talks about the abomination set up by pagan Rome and what it did to the earthly sanctuary, which was “the figure of the true.” The same was done spiritually by papal Rome to “the invisible or heavenly sanctuary that is in itself the true.”¹³² The perpetual, living service of the true heavenly High Priest Jesus Christ in the church was replaced by a human, sinful priesthood.¹³³ His

¹²⁷Wakeham, 48.

¹²⁸Ibid., 49.

¹²⁹“If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2.

¹³⁰Wakeham, 48, 49.

¹³¹Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99, 100.

¹³²Ibid., 100.

¹³³Ibid., 101; “If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2; Wakeham, 49.

once-and-for-all true sacrifice was replaced by a “daily sacrifice in the mass.”¹³⁴ Christ as the one mediator between God and man was replaced by the mediatrix Mary.¹³⁵ The place of the Holy Spirit as Christ’s representative on earth was usurped by the vicar of the Son of God.¹³⁶ The right to interpret the Scriptures was assumed by the “Roman church.”¹³⁷ Thus, that this church “‘took away’ from the common people the knowledge of the work of Christ as priest and sacrifice in heaven, and substituted in its place the idolatrous sacrifice of the Mass, a human priesthood, and an earthly sanctuary, is testified to by the concurrent voice of history.”¹³⁸ This “false system of human devising” could not really take away Christ’s ministration in heaven but it could take away the knowledge of it on earth.¹³⁹ This replacement did take place in AD 508 and lasted until 1798.¹⁴⁰ Although the restoration had already started in 1798, the last step happened at the close of the 2,300 years in 1844.¹⁴¹ Yet, some writers objected, saying that the abolition of paganism as the national religion of Rome did not take place in AD 508 but had already

¹³⁴Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 101; Wakeham, 49.

¹³⁵Wakeham, 49.

¹³⁶Wakeham, *Outline Lessons on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation*, 49.

¹³⁷*Ibid.*, 50.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, 50, 66. Prescott, “The Message for This Time,” 5, stated that to replace the true priest, the true temple, and the true leader would take away the heavenly sanctuary ministry, and in fact salvation. He applied the topic more on a personal level stating that “it is the purpose of this message to restore in the sanctuary and its services, to restore in the church, and to the church, that which has been taken away.” The “restoration of the true sanctuary idea and the true conception of God as salvation through that ministry” is the work that needs to be done.

¹³⁹Wakeham, 50.

¹⁴⁰William C. White, June 1, 1910; “If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2; Wakeham, 72.

¹⁴¹“If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2; Wakeham, 52-54, 74.

been done years earlier.¹⁴² The weakness of the Millerite argument for the league made between the Romans and the Jews in 158 BC was also recognized.¹⁴³ Further, although paganism had already been displaced as the national religion of the Roman Empire at the end of the fourth century, it was not totally removed from the Germanic tribes in that territory until the end of the eighth century.¹⁴⁴ What did start in AD 508, however, was the persecution and extermination of heretics, or fellow Christians with different convictions, by Catholic rulers.¹⁴⁵

Roman Paganism

While explicit traditional definitions of the *tāmîḏ* could only seldom be seen in the periodicals during the first decade of the twentieth century, some rather strong refutations of the new view appeared. For example, in 1907 John N. Loughborough authored an article with the obvious intent to refute the new view of the *tāmîḏ*.¹⁴⁶ Besides

¹⁴²Arthur G. Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908, CAR-AU; William C. White, June 1, 1910; W. W. Prescott, *The Daily: A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject* (n.p.: [1924]), 6-10; Wakeham, 47; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 70, 71.

¹⁴³William C. White, June 1, 1910; Prescott, *The Daily*, 5; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 20. W. C. White stated that this league was not made in 158 but in 161 BC.

¹⁴⁴E. J. Hibbard to Leon Albert Smith, October 24, 1909, quoted in Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 20, 21; Prescott, *The Daily*, 10-15.

¹⁴⁵Hibbard, quoted in Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 21.

¹⁴⁶John N. Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," 9, 10. His article was intended not so much to attack Prescott's view but rather the following one: John Kolvoord and Moses E. Kellogg, *The Vision of the Evening and the Morning: A Study of the Prophecy of Daniel VIII* (Battle Creek, Mich.: n.p., 1907). See Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 218. Other examples for refutations of the new view are Olie Andrew Johnson, *The Daily, is it Paganism?: A Brief Review and Critical Examination of the Daily in Daniel 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11* (College Place, Wash.: The Author, 1909); Leon Albert Smith and F. C. Gilbert, *"The Daily" in the Prophecy of Daniel* (n.p.: n.d.).

these open attacks, supporters of the old view often confined their explanations to a brief explanatory note that the “daily sacrifice” signified “the daily desolation.”¹⁴⁷

Beginning in the second decade, the topic is treated very reluctantly in the church periodicals and one will search in vain for apologetical or polemical articles on the subject. Some writers mentioned or quoted the key texts in Daniel but did not provide a definition for the *tāmîd*.¹⁴⁸ Others gave very brief but pointed explanations without attacking someone else’s view. Statements such as this can be found, “Many who have given careful study to this, believe that it marks the time when pagan rites and sacrifices gave way to papal ceremonies, which history places about 508 A.D.”¹⁴⁹ Another writer made the rather ambiguous statement that Dan 8:9-14 “portrayed a power that was to work harm against the truth and the worship of God,” only to later drive home the point that this power “is the Roman empire, which subjugated Palestine and the Jewish people.”¹⁵⁰ Most of the explicit refutations of the new view, or defenses of the old view, are found in personally published pamphlets or books.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷Stephen N. Haskell, “Prophecy for the Last Days,” *Review and Herald*, April 24, 1900, 259.

¹⁴⁸George I. Butler, “At the Time Appointed the End Shall Be,” *Review and Herald*, November 12, 1908, 9.

¹⁴⁹Albert Marion Dart, “Special Resurrection,” *Signs of the Times*, April 2, 1918, 5.

¹⁵⁰Kay M. Adams, “A Prophecy Accurately Fulfilled,” *Signs of the Times*, January 18, 1921, 4, 5.

¹⁵¹Johnson; Jean Vuilleumier, *Future Unrolled: or Studies on the Prophecies of Daniel* (Boston, Mass.: Richard G. Badger, 1928). There is one document that is attributed to LeRoy E. Froom. See LeRoy Edwin Froom, “A Scriptural Exposition of H-T-Mid, the Daily, Daniel 8:11-13,” n.p., n.d. However, the document favors the old view, whereas Froom did actually promote the new view. Another copy bears the name of “Elder Gilbert” which leads me to the conclusion that F. C. Gilbert could have been the author since he really favored the old view. Thus it would be F. C. Gilbert, “A Scriptural Exposition of H-T-Mid, the Daily, Daniel 8:11-13,” n.p., n.d.

Biblical Arguments

During this period, proponents of the pagan Rome view used basically the same arguments as their predecessors. They also mentioned that the term *tāmîd* is usually an adjective that is qualified by a noun or by the context,¹⁵² and that the accompanying term “burnt offering” is not found in the Hebrew text.¹⁵³ Since an accompanying noun is missing in the text in Daniel, and *tāmîd* is preceded by a definite article, it is understood to function as a noun. The qualification of *tāmîd* must happen by its immediate context rather than by OT usage.¹⁵⁴ The *tamid* is connected to the little horn power, and is taken away from the latter.¹⁵⁵ The *tāmîd*, or daily, had a sanctuary, which must be considered as a system of worship.¹⁵⁶ Since Satan had established sanctuaries here on earth (Ezek 28:13-18), this sanctuary was not to be understood as the Israelite sanctuary or the one in heaven but rather as a sanctuary of paganism.¹⁵⁷ Vuilleumier recognized that the term *tāmîd* was used in the OT as a qualification for different temple activities, yet he claimed that, when preceded by the definite article *ha* and without an accompanying noun, it “fitly describes ancient idolatry which was generally connected with a perpetual fire.”¹⁵⁸

¹⁵²Johnson, 24, 25.

¹⁵³M. H. Brown, *The Sure Word of Prophecy: A Study of the Book of Daniel*, Bible Student’s Library, vol. 131 (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1895), 94; Vuilleumier, 117; George B. Starr to C. P. Bollman, September 1930, 1, CAR-AU; “Scripture Problems Solved: The ‘Daily Sacrifice’,” *Watchman Magazine*, March 1933, 13.

¹⁵⁴Johnson, 25, 26.

¹⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 26; Vuilleumier, 116.

¹⁵⁶Johnson, 27.

¹⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 28-30.

¹⁵⁸Vuilleumier, 186.

The 2,300 days were understood as the time period that embraced the “daily” and the “transgression.”¹⁵⁹ Both constituted two great forms of error that successively deluded, misled, and inspired three world empires, that is, Persia, Greece, and Rome.¹⁶⁰ The animals described in Dan 7 and 8 pointed to the political side of world history whereas the “daily” and the “transgression” referred to the religious side of world history.¹⁶¹ Since the “daily” and the “transgression” cover the whole period of the 2,300 years, the *tāmîḏ*—a religious or political power—must accordingly be found in full operation at least from the days of Persia, five centuries before the Christian era.¹⁶² The “daily” and the “transgression” signified two desolating powers.¹⁶³ Parallel to Dan 8, the text in 2 Thess 2:7, 8 was considered to portray one power hindering another power to come but eventually being replaced by that other power.¹⁶⁴ The first power presented in Rev 13 was seen as papal Rome, in contrast to the Millerite view that it signified pagan Rome; although the transition from pagan to papal Rome (Rev 12-13) was seen as an evidence for the old view.¹⁶⁵ Daniel 12:11 was considered to point to “a definite date” for the taking away of the *tāmîḏ*.¹⁶⁶

¹⁵⁹Ibid., 115.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., 116.

¹⁶¹Ibid., 115.

¹⁶²Ibid.

¹⁶³W. C. Sisley, “Berean Library Study—Lesson 10,” *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1900, 71; Gilbert, 10; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

¹⁶⁴Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10; idem, “Taking Away the Daily,” *Bible Training School*, August 1910, 50; Starr, September 1930, 1.

¹⁶⁵Starr, September 1930, 1, 2.

¹⁶⁶Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10.

The “host” in Dan 8 denoted a civil and military power that was used to suppress the idolatrous cult.¹⁶⁷ This civil power (both imperial and barbarian) was employed against the *tāmîd* through transgression, namely the influence of an apostatizing church.¹⁶⁸ However, M. H. Brown interpreted the sanctuary and the host in Dan 8:13 as the temple and the people of God.¹⁶⁹ Although they considered the heavenly ministry of Christ as something that was already symbolized by the daily and yearly services in the OT sanctuary, they nevertheless identified the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism.¹⁷⁰

Arguments from Ellen White’s Writings

Frequently, the whole argumentation was based on a statement that Ellen White had made in 1850, published in her book *Early Writings*, pp. 74-75. This statement was understood as an affirmation of the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd* as paganism.¹⁷¹ Although the topic itself was considered by some writers as one of minor importance, they had the impression that the supporters of the new view would diminish the authority

¹⁶⁷Vuilleumier, 115.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., 116, 117.

¹⁶⁹Brown, 71.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., 71, 81, 82, 94.

¹⁷¹Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10; idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” *Bible Training School*, September 1910, 71; Johnson, 24, 25. That is why Haskell had a 1843 prophetic chart re-published in August 1908 with a quotation from Ellen White’s *Early Writings*, 74-75, where she stated that God had been active in the origination of the 1843 chart. See Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250. The chart that had been reprinted by Haskell showed the 666 years and Miller’s interpretation of the *tāmîd*. See Schwarz, 398, 399. Schwarz stated also that not only S. N. Haskell read this statement as a “blanket endorsement” of the old view, but also men like G. I. Butler, and George Irwin. See *ibid.*, 398. Although Loughborough did not refer to Ellen White and her quote in Loughborough, “Taking Away the Daily,” 50, he nevertheless quotes her words from *Early Writings* as proof that the Millerites “had the correct view of the daily.” See also idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 71; idem, “Other Views of the 1,290 and 1,355 Days,” *Bible Training School*, December 1910, 25.

of Ellen White's writings by obviously rejecting the statement in *Early Writings*.¹⁷²

Therefore it was considered as necessary to defend the old view in order to hold up the authority of Ellen White's writings.¹⁷³ Others stated that the *Early Writings* statement on the word "sacrifice" being supplied seemed not to be of much significance since the KJV already showed this word as being added, until some individuals promoted the new view basing this interpretation on new translations that read "continual burnt offering" or "mediation."¹⁷⁴

Arguments from Tradition

Although O. A. Johnson in his classic defense of the old view based his apologetic on Ellen White's *Early Writings* statement, objections against the old view were answered by statements made by William Miller and Josiah Litch, which were apparently endorsed by the statement from *Early Writings*.¹⁷⁵ Further, arguments for the old view were presented from the writings of Uriah Smith, John N. Andrews, James White, John G. Matteson, and Stephen N. Haskell.¹⁷⁶ Since James White was the husband

¹⁷²Stephen N. Haskell to Arthur G. Daniells, January 27, 1908, quoted in Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248, 252, 253; Stephen N. Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909, EGWE-GC; Starr, September 1930, 1; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54. Haskell stated, in fact, that he had never preached on the subject, and thought that the question of the "daily" itself did not "amount to a hill of beans." See Haskell, January 27, 1908.

¹⁷³Haskell, December 6, 1909; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54. Haskell wanted to "save the cause of God and those who believe the old view on the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy." See Haskell, January 27, 1908.

¹⁷⁴Starr, September 1930, 1.

¹⁷⁵Johnson, 2-14; Loughborough, "Taking Away the Daily," 50. He wrote a whole article on Apollos Hale's views on the *tāmîd*. See Loughborough, "Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843," 89, 90.

¹⁷⁶Johnson, 14-22; cf. Vuilleumier, 187-189; "Scripture Problems Solved," 13. Johnson also stated frequently that John N. Andrews quoted Miller and Litch. See Johnson, 4, 5.

of the author of *Early Writings*, “his testimony ought therefore to have some weight in this matter,” Johnson concluded.¹⁷⁷ Since Ellen White seemingly confirmed the correctness of the 1843 chart that showed the taking away of the *tāmîd* as the commencement point for the 1,290 years and the 1,335 years, she must have confirmed the Millerite identification of the *tāmîd* as well.¹⁷⁸ Loughborough also referred to the church fathers’ interpretation of 2 Thess 2 as proof that Dan 8 means the same, namely the replacement of pagan Rome by the antichrist.¹⁷⁹

Historical Arguments

Vuilleumier viewed the “continual” as a reference to the reign of Persia, Greece, and pagan Rome (ca. 500 BC to AD 500), and the “transgression” as pointing to the reign of papal Rome (ca. AD 500 to 1800), covering together approximately 2,300 years.¹⁸⁰ Others saw the *tāmîd* just as a symbol for pagan Rome, or the pagan religion upheld in Rome.¹⁸¹ Daniel 8:11 was considered as the turning point from imperial to Papal Rome.¹⁸² Accordingly, the historical fulfillment of that prophetic detail took place in

¹⁷⁷Johnson, 21.

¹⁷⁸Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 71; idem, “Other Views of the 1,290 and 1,355 Days,” 25. Loughborough had the 1843 chart also reprinted in idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 72, 73. However, this chart shows the “taking away of the daily sacrifice” at AD 508, but does not identify the *tāmîd*.

¹⁷⁹Loughborough, “Taking Away the Daily,” 50, 51.

¹⁸⁰Vuilleumier, 116.

¹⁸¹Brown, 94; Loughborough, “Taking Away the Daily,” 50, 51; idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 70; Starr, September 1930, 1; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

¹⁸²Vuilleumier, 114. George B. Starr stated that it was just a transition of power. Before AD 508 the emperor was the head of religion, afterwards the bishop of Rome was the “head with the state beneath.” See Starr, September 1930, 2.

AD 508 when papal Christianity replaced paganism as “the legally appointed religion of the empire.”¹⁸³ This date constituted the starting point for the 1,290 and 1,335 years.¹⁸⁴ The new view, it was claimed, would unsettle the prophetic framework.¹⁸⁵ Roman paganism as a kind of counterfeit worship had its “secret confession,” its priests, and a sacrifice of a mass with their cakes and wafers.¹⁸⁶ The “sanctuary of strength” in Dan 11:31, or “the place of his sanctuary” in Dan 8:11, was considered to be the eternal city of Rome, the seat of the Pantheon, the center of polytheism in Roman days.¹⁸⁷ The casting down of the “place of his sanctuary” was accordingly viewed as the closing of the Pantheon to its worshipers.¹⁸⁸ Thus in 607 the Pantheon had been caused to be purified by Pope Boniface IV, dedicating it to the invocation of the Holy Virgin and of all the

¹⁸³Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 71; cf. Brown, 94; J. Grant Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated: A short History of the World From Daniel's Day to the Day of the Lord* (Minneapolis, Minn.: 1909), 60; idem, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated: A short History of the World From Daniel's Day to the Day of the Lord* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: College Press, 1923), 20. The Jewish daily offerings lost their significance when Christ died on the cross in AD 31. However, adding 1,260 years or 1,335 does not lead to a satisfying date. Also, reckoning with AD 70 when the whole Jewish sacrificial system was destroyed by the Romans does not lead to a significant date. Thus these dates disqualify for the replacement of the *tāmīd*, as well as the identification of the *tāmīd* as the Jewish sacrifices. See Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10. The author of the article “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13, apparently made a mistake when mentioning AD 538 as the date for the taking away of paganism “to make way for Catholicism.”

¹⁸⁴Brown, 94; Loughborough, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 70, 71; idem, “The 1290 Days,” *Bible Training School*, November 1910, 104; Starr, September 1930, 3.

¹⁸⁵George B. Starr thought that the new view would disturb and unsettle “well established harmonious dates of time prophecy without presenting any substitute dates.” See Starr, September 1930, 2.

¹⁸⁶Johnson, 30.

¹⁸⁷Vuilleumier, 114, 115; Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1909, 58, 60, 68; idem, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1923, 19, 20, 82; Gilbert, 10.

¹⁸⁸Vuilleumier, 116.

Martyrs.¹⁸⁹ Further, it was stated by one writer that the *tāmîd* designated the pagan cult as characterized by the “perpetual fire kept burning in idolatrous temples.”¹⁹⁰

Summary

In the controversial period the interpretation of the *tāmîd* as Christ’s heavenly ministration had found new followers. Supporters of this interpretation no longer emphasized the term “sacrifice” as the basis for their interpretation but even acknowledged its incorrect addition to the text. The promulgators of the old view referred to tradition in support of their interpretation, that is, the Millerites, early Sabbatarian Adventists, and Ellen White had interpreted the term that way. A clash of the two opinions was inevitable for several reasons.

1. The promulgators of the new view criticized that the supporters of the old view did not base their interpretation so much on biblical arguments but on tradition.

2. The supporters of the old view were enraged by the arrogance of some supporters of the new view, and even more by the new interpretation’s apparent impact on other teachings, i.e. the authority of the spirit of prophecy, the prophetic framework, the heritage of the church’s past.

The Later Adventist Period (1930–2008)

The calming down of the conflict over the interpretation of the *tāmîd* was followed by an increase of Adventist scholars earning degrees at higher academic institutions. In 1955 George McCready Price could say, “I do not know of a single

¹⁸⁹Ibid., 187.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., 114.

Adventist college in America which now teaches the view that the term ‘daily’ means paganism.”¹⁹¹ Since then the argumentation and reasoning has become more complex and interacted more with the Hebrew text and background when compared with the argumentation of previous decades. Although most Seventh-day Adventist scholars and writers adhered to the new view, still other interpretations emerged, as can be seen in the following sections.

Christ’s Continual Mediation in Heaven

The first decades after the period of controversy were rather silent with almost no explicit statements in support of the new view in the periodicals.¹⁹² The most extensive and thorough exegetical investigation of the term *tāmîd* in the OT context and its Danielic context was made by Martin Pröbstle in 2006.¹⁹³ He showed that the use of the term in the book of Daniel itself—in the Hebrew part as well as in the Aramaic part—shows strong connections to the OT sanctuary service and worship of the believers.

Biblical Arguments

Old Testament background

As others have pointed out, the writers of the modern period referred to the fact that the expression תָּלִיחַ (*‘ōlat*, burnt offering, sacrifice) is not found in the Hebrew text,

¹⁹¹Price, 174.

¹⁹²Joel M. Coward, “An Unpackable Court,” *Watchman Magazine*, April 1938, 14, 17, 18, mentioned Dan 8:13-17 in the context of the daily and yearly services of the OT sanctuary as an antitype for Christ’s heavenly ministry as well as Rome represented by the little horn in its pagan and papal phase. There is, however, no clear identification of the *tāmîd*, or an explanation that could indicate the author’s preferences.

¹⁹³Martin T. Pröbstle, “Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2006), 206-232, 350-352, 475-477.

which uses only the term *hatāmîd*.¹⁹⁴ While it is usually used as an adjective modifying a noun, in the book of Daniel that adjective is used substantively without an extra noun to modify.¹⁹⁵ When the term *tāmîd* is used as a modifier, it qualifies different activities related to the Hebrew worship system as, for example, the daily evening and morning burnt offering (Exod 29:38, 42), the renewal of the shewbread (Exod 25:30; Lev 24:8; Num 4:7), the daily maintenance of the burning lamps (Exod 27:20, 21; Lev 24:2-4), the daily burning of incense (Exod 30:8), the continual maintenance of the fire upon the altar of burnt offering (Lev 6:13), the regular grain offering by the high priest (Lev 6:20), and the continual mediation by the high priest (Exod 29:38, 42).¹⁹⁶ Thus the term is used in

¹⁹⁴Price, 171; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, Notes with Historical and Theological Introduction by George R. Knight, Annotated edition, Adventist Classic Library (1957; reprint, Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 2003), 211; W. E. Read, “The Investigative or Pre-Advent Judgment,” *Ministry*, December 1960, 16; Roy Allan Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1975), 105; Gerhard F. Hasel, “Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven,” *Ministry*, Insert, January 1976, 27C; idem, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14,” in *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 405; Burnside, 1, 6; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, God Cares, vol. 1 (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1981), 163; Angel M. Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14,” in *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 533; idem, *Future Glory: The 8 Greatest End-Time Prophecies in the Bible* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2002), 54; G. Arthur Keough, *Let Daniel Speak* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1986), 87; Leslie Hardinge, *Jesus Is My Judge: Meditations on the Book of Daniel* (Harrisburg, Pa.: American Cassette Ministries, 1996), 168; Roy Gane, *Who's Afraid of the Judgment?: The Good News About Christ's Work in the Heavenly Sanctuary* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2006), 84; Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel—Wisdom for the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2007), 302. Burnside, 1-2, 6-7, considered, however, the adding of the word “sacrifice” in the translation as justified for he saw that the term *tamid* had an OT sacrificial background. He recognized nevertheless that the sacrifice was only a part of the “continual service in the sanctuary” as described in Num 28 and 29. Jacques Doukhan, *Daniel: The Vision of the End*, rev. ed. (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1989), 136, confines the *hatāmîd* apparently to “the continual offering” as it was also used in Talmudic literature.

¹⁹⁵Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367; Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14,” 533; Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary,” 404; Hardinge, 168; William H. Shea, *Daniel: A Reader's Guide* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2005), 182; Pröbstle, 206, 210, 211.

¹⁹⁶*Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 211; Read, 16; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 105; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 164;

connection with many activities the priest performed continually in the court and in the holy place of the sanctuary but it is never linked with an activity performed in the most holy place.¹⁹⁷ Therefore the usage of *hatāmîḏ* in Daniel comprehends all these services, and not only one of these.¹⁹⁸ Pröbstle further showed that the term occurs in its nominal view almost exclusively in cultic contexts, mainly in the cultic laws of the Pentateuch.¹⁹⁹ The form *hatāmîḏ* occurs exclusively in cultic contexts, although these occurrences differ from the Danielic use as they always occur in a construct relation with cultic terms.²⁰⁰ The regular cultic activities performed by the high priest often stand in connection with God's presence "so that the object or the activity is part of the regular worship of YHWH."²⁰¹

Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 406; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 533; idem, *Future Glory*, 51; Hardinge, 168, 169; Gerhard Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2004), 75; Shea, 182; Roy Gane, 39, 84; Pröbstle, 208-210; Stefanovic, 302. For the usage of *tāmîḏ* in the Qumran and OT writings see Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 421-425. Hardinge, 169, mentioned not only the different continual offerings and furnishings, but parts of the priestly robe (breastplate) and aspects of the worship (music, pillar of cloud and fire) as well.

¹⁹⁷Angel M. Rodríguez, "The Sanctuary," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen, Commentary Reference Series, vol. 12 (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000), 394; idem, *Future Glory*, 51; idem, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 528, 533; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 418; cf. Stefanovic, 302.

¹⁹⁸Price, 171; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 207; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 27C; idem, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 405, 406; Hardinge, 169; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 75, 76; Shea, 182; Stefanovic, 302, 311, 322. Price, 171, adds that the Talmud and other Jewish literature use the term *hatāmîḏ* without another noun to modify for all continual services collectively. Hasel did, however, state that the Talmudic use of the term is confined to the sacrifice. See Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 27C; cf. Pröbstle, 207. In 1960 Ford stated that "the taking away of the daily ministrations and the treading down of the sanctuary as well as its promised vindication . . . is the theme of the entire book." See Desmond Ford, "Daniel 8--Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God," *Ministry*, January 1960, 18.

¹⁹⁹Pröbstle, 211, 475-477.

²⁰⁰Ibid., 212, 213. The regular activities were usually executed by the priests, often even by the high priest.

²⁰¹Ibid., 215.

In response to the common view that the 2,300 evening-mornings signify 1,150 daily burnt offerings (evening and morning), Roy Gane pointed out that the burnt offerings at the Jerusalem temple represented morning and evening burnt offerings, not evening-and-mornings as in Dan 8:14, and that the morning and evening burnt offerings comprised only one unit (Num 28:1-8).²⁰² Since *hatāmîḏ* is referring to all the continual priestly activities in the holy place of the sanctuary on behalf of the people, it was suggested to translate the term as “continual intercession.”²⁰³ Pröbstle showed, however, that in cultic contexts the term “does not necessarily mean ‘non-stopping, unceasing, continual,’ but rather that the ritual acts in question are to be repeated at regular intervals and at fixed times.”²⁰⁴ That is why the term *tāmîḏ* should better be rendered as “regularly, not perpetually.”²⁰⁵

The book of Daniel

In contrast to the supporters of the old view, these scholars viewed the little horn to be taking away the *tāmîḏ* from the prince of the host (heavenly prince, the Messiah)

²⁰²Roy Gane, 84; cf. Pröbstle, 206, 207. This explanation can already be found in “The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Investigative Judgment in the Old Testament,” *Ministry*, October 1980, 43. *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 212, refers to the usage of the term *hatāmîḏ* in the rabbinical literature concerning the daily sacrifices at evening and morning as one unit so that the 2,300 evening-mornings should be understood as “2,300 *tamid* units.” However, the writers did not recognize the difference between the 2,300 evening-mornings, apparently pointing to the days of the creation week, and the morning and evening sacrifice being a part of the broader *tāmîḏ* service.

²⁰³Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14,” 528, 533; cf. Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary,” 409; Stefanovic, 302. Price, 171, 172, mentioned proposed “daily mediation” since the work of mediation between God and the sinner forms the central idea of all the services at the sanctuary.

²⁰⁴Pröbstle, 209.

²⁰⁵*Ibid.*, 210.

and throwing down the place of his sanctuary (the heavenly or God's sanctuary).²⁰⁶ Some writers stated that the personal pronoun "his" in regard to the sanctuary (Dan 8:11) refers to the "prince of the host," suggesting that the "prince" is a messianic term.²⁰⁷ The "daily" constitutes the starting point for the 1,290 and 1,335 days/years of Dan 12:11, 12.²⁰⁸ The term *hatāmîd* is used in Dan 8:11-13 in connection with several clear cultic terms.²⁰⁹ The taking away of the *tāmîd* "from him" (the prince of the host) can denote "the worship and cultic activities directed toward ... [the prince of the host] as well as the cultic activities of the ... [prince of the host] as (high) priest itself."²¹⁰ The service and true worship of the Lord is taken away and replaced by a false and abominable worship.²¹¹ The use of "the definite article ... without any introduction or explanation" in the respective places in Daniel indicates that the term *tāmîd* "must have been known and identifiable ... in this communicative situation."²¹² Pröbstle provided compelling evidences for the topical, contextual, and linguistical connections between the Aramaic

²⁰⁶Edward Heppenstall, "Some Theological Considerations of Perfection," *Ministry*, October 1970, 47; idem, "Sin, Salvation, and the Sanctuary," *Ministry*, March 1977, 14; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 27C; idem, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 408; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 528; idem, "The Sanctuary," 395; Hardinge, 168, 171. Shea suggested that the "prince" is a political title that was used in a priestly way in Dan 8. See Shea, 180; cf. Rodríguez, "The Sanctuary," 395.

²⁰⁷Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 402-404; Rodríguez, "The Sanctuary," 392; Shea, 180; Stefanovic, 307.

²⁰⁸Leo R. Van Dolson, "The 1335 Days," *Ministry*, December 1963, 31, 32, 35; Edward Heppenstall, "The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy," *Ministry*, October 1981, 17. The historical starting point was dated to the year AD 508.

²⁰⁹Pröbstle, 212, 213.

²¹⁰*Ibid.*, 215-217.

²¹¹*Ibid.*, 217-219.

²¹²*Ibid.*, 211.

רַדְּלִי. (*t' dîr*, continually; Dan 6:16, 20) and the Hebrew *hatāmîd* (Dan 8:11-13, etc.) that show that Daniel's prayers "can be regarded as cultic activity and as being closely associated with the sacrificial worship of JHWH," and that this occurrence in Dan 6 introduces and defines the term for the bilingual reader of the book of Daniel.²¹³

Typology

All the continual services and sacrifices in the Israelite sanctuary system typified Christ's true sacrifice at Calvary and his intercessory ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 8:1).²¹⁴ All through human history, there was only one mediator between God and men, namely Jesus Christ (1 Tim 2:5).²¹⁵ Thus the *tāmîd* in Dan 8 points to the "priestly activity of the Prince [Jesus Christ] in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary" (Heb 8:2).²¹⁶ Anderson explained that the burnt offering signified the death of Jesus, the true

²¹³Ibid., 219-230.

²¹⁴*Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 214; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 106; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 167-170; Hardinge, 169; Rodríguez, "The Sanctuary," 392; Gerhard F. Hasel, "Divine Judgment," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen, Commentary Reference Series, vol. 12 (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000) 842; Shea, 182, 183; Pfandl, 75, 76.

²¹⁵Price, 172; Joe W. Gresham, *The Wise Shall Understand: A Simple, Systematic Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Fort Worth, Tex.: The Fourth Angel's Publishing, 2003), 104, 105.

²¹⁶Price, 172; Read, 16; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 27C, 28C; idem, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 408, 416; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 163, 164, 179; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 529; idem, *Future Glory*, 78; Hardinge, 169-171, 235; Gresham, 104, 105; Shea, 178, 179; Stefanovic, 322. However, some considered the *tāmîd* as a reference to the continual "services of both sanctuaries," since the term "sanctuary" in Dan 8:11-14 was thought to "involve both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries." See *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 207. Following the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:843, Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 408, interpreted the *tāmîd* as Christ's continual ministry in the heavenly sanctuary and "the true worship of Christ in the gospel age."

Lamb of God. The shewbread and incense typified his high priestly and intercessory ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.²¹⁷

Parallels between Dan 8 and Lev

Shea pointed to close parallels between Dan 8 and Leviticus, the *tāmîḏ* being only one of these, although it is a key term in this passage.²¹⁸ The *tāmîḏ* refers to daily services (Lev 1-15) that took place during the 2,300 days until the yearly service started (Lev 16) at the end of the 2,300 days.²¹⁹ Just as Lev 1-7 shows the true application of *tāmîḏ* services as forgiving the sins of the believers and recording them in the sanctuary, so Dan 8:14a presents the prince as the heavenly high priest serving continually during the 2,300 days. Daniel 8:10-12 uncovers the activities of the little horn, namely a wrong and desolating application of the *tāmîḏ* services, while Lev 11-15 showed different states of impurity and uncleanness that defiled the sanctuary.²²⁰ Then eventually Lev 16 clarifies how the sanctuary is cleansed and restored by a final judgment on the rightful forgiven sins and the unrightful contaminations, just as Dan 8:14b and 7:9-10 show a judgment at the climax of the *tāmîḏ* services, at the end of the 2,300 evening-mornings.²²¹ Usually the rebellion of the little horn against God could be expiated in the sanctuary (Lev 16:16) but

²¹⁷Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 106.

²¹⁸Shea, 188, 189; Doukhan, 26, 29, 30; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 532; idem, "The Sanctuary," 394-398.

²¹⁹Shea, 192. He stated that the attack of the little horn could not hinder Christ's ministry in heaven in its continuance. That attack only had an impact upon the minds and the knowledge of the believers here on earth. See *ibid.*, 182, 183.

²²⁰*Ibid.*, 193.

²²¹*Ibid.*

in this case it is not possible because the little horn attacks and controls the *tāmîd*, the very instruments of expiation.²²²

Historical Arguments

The actual historical fulfillment is seen in the attempt of the medieval Papacy or the Roman Catholic Church to turn the eyes of the believers away from Jesus' true intercessory ministry in heaven by replacing it with an earthly counterfeit ministry.²²³

The taking away of the *tāmîd* has to be an action that takes place on earth since it is impossible to destroy Christ's ministry in heaven.²²⁴ Jesus' "once for all" sacrifice at Calvary is replaced by a continual earthly sacrificing of Christ in every mass.²²⁵ Every

²²²Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 535; idem, "The Sanctuary," 395; cf. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 417.

²²³Straw, 78, 85; Price, 172; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 208; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 28C; idem, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 399, 409; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 172-179; Hardinge, 171, 172, 215; Gresham, 104-106, 149, 165; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 76; Shea, 182, 183; Roy Gane, 89, 91; Stefanovic, 322. Price, 172-174, admits nevertheless that other historical individuals and powers interfered with the true sanctuary service as well. Yet, he rejects the idea that the prophecy could have found its fulfillment in Antiochus IV Epiphanes although this individual bore similar characteristics. *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 208, states that since the "sanctuary" of Dan 8:11-14 encompasses the earthly as well as the heavenly sanctuaries, the *tāmîd* was taken away twice: first, by pagan Rome when it desolated the Temple in AD 70, and second, by papal Rome by taking away the knowledge of Christ's continual ministry in heaven and by replacing it through their own innovative services. For a similar view see Stefanovic, 322. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 399, 401, suggested, however, a sequential rather than a simultaneous fulfillment, meaning that Dan 8:9, 10 was fulfilled by pagan Rome, and Dan 8:11-12 by papal Rome. Hardinge, 215, stated it was in AD 395 that the Papacy "removed the 'daily' from the thoughts of the people by establishing the sacrifice of the Mass." Later, he stated, however, that this happened in AD 508. See *ibid.*, 236. Although Stefanovic was quite clear on pagan and papal Rome as being signified by the little horn in Dan 8, the reader could be confused by the "literalist application" where the author mentioned that "in fulfillment of" Dan 8:11-12 Antiochus IV Epiphanes took away from God the *tāmîd*. See Stefanovic, 328.

²²⁴Doukhan, 25, 26.

²²⁵Price, 172; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 208; Roy Allan Anderson, "Ideas on the Atonement Contrasted," *Ministry*, January 1959, 16; idem, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 106; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 28C; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 177, 178, 187; Hardinge, 215; Gresham, 106, 149; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 76; Roy Gane, 89, 91; Stefanovic, 322.

believer could come to Christ, the heavenly high priest, to confess his/her sins, if it were not for the host of earthly priests responsible for the confessional claiming to forgive sins.²²⁶ Moreover, the teaching of the merits of the saints and salvation by works replaced the true gospel and cast it to the ground.²²⁷ However, there are definitely true Christians in every church, even in the Roman Catholic Church.²²⁸ Heidi Heiks provided examples of historical events that substantiate the replacement of paganism by the Catholic religion.²²⁹ Jacques Doukhan stated that in AD 508 religious power was settled on a political basis so that the church actually represented God on earth.²³⁰

Roman Paganism

Although most of the Adventist scholars and lay people during the later period held to the position that the *tāmîd* signifies the continual ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, a few individuals returned to the position that the *tāmîd* refers to paganism in general, or Roman paganism specifically.

²²⁶Straw, 78; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 208; Anderson, “Ideas on the Atonement Contrasted,” 16; idem, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 106; Hasel, “Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven,” 28C; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 178, 296; Hardinge, 215; Rodríguez, *Future Glory*, 53; Gresham, 105, 106, 149; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 76; Roy Gane, 89, 91; Stefanovic, 322.

²²⁷*Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 208; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 106; Hasel, “Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven,” 28C; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 178.

²²⁸Pfandl, *Daniel*, 82, 83; Roy Gane, 91, 92.

²²⁹Heidi Heiks, 508, 538, 1798, *1843 Source Book (Preliminary)*, rev. ed. (Knoxville, Ill.: Hope International, 2007), 1-19, 24, 95. In AD 392 the Theodosian law code prohibited “any further practice of the pagan state religion and the sacrificing of animals except under penalty of death.”

²³⁰Van Dolson, 31, 32, 35; Heppenstall, “The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy,” 17; Doukhan, 153, 67. Doukhan’s interpretation is combined with his view that it was the role of the continual sacrifice to represent God on earth. One needs only to look up various Adventist commentaries on Daniel to see that the year AD 508 is still held.

For example, Marc Alden Swearingen just followed the reasoning of the proponents of the old view during the time of conflict. He recognized the parallel between the words “taken away” in Dan 8:11 and “taken out of the way” in 2 Thess 2:7, and concluded that the power “taken out of the way” by the papacy must be pagan Rome since that was obviously the power active in Paul’s time. Based on this equation he suggested that the *tāmîd* has to be equated with paganism. Although he recognized Ellen White’s reluctance to identify the “daily,” he claimed that she assumed God had led the “pioneers” in their particular conclusion.²³¹ Since the majority of these “pioneers” equated the *tāmîd* with pagan Rome, he indicated that Ellen White apparently endorsed their particular view on the *tāmîd* as paganism.²³²

Although the above argumentation is the most usual one for the old view, there were also exceptions. The best defense for the old position is found in a manuscript by John W. Peters who tried to substantiate that position by exegetical studies.²³³ He considered the language of Dan 8 not simply as cultic but as having a “counterfeit cultic significance.”²³⁴ The key to his assumption is the fact that although rams and goats are

²³¹Marc Alden Swearingen, *Tidings Out of the Northeast: A General Historical Survey of Daniel 11* (Coldwater, Mich.: Remnant Publications, 2006), 39.

²³²*Ibid.*, 39, 40.

²³³Peters. See Pfandl, “Evaluation of ‘The Mystery of ‘The Daily,’ by John W. Peters,” for a critical evaluation of Peters’ manuscript. Peters, in turn, thinks that “current Adventist scholarship . . . destroys the integrity of the 2300 years terminating in 1844” by holding to and vindicating the new view of *tāmîd*. See Peters, 107. He is also criticized by Pauline W. Phillips, *Daniel Versus Babylon & 7 Thunders Peal: The Great Controversy Between Michael & Satan* (Centralia, Mo.: ProphecySpirit.com, 2001), 121, who, however, tries to merge both old and new views. Judy K. Iversen sets forth Peters’ argumentation in a summarized form, and she refers to his book as her source. See Judy K. Iversen, *Daniel 8:9-14: The Revealing of the Mystery of “The Daily”* (Meadow Vista, Calif., September 18, 2006); http://meadowvistaadventist.com/files/The_Revealing_of_the_Daily2.ppt#256,1, Daniel 8:9-14 The Revealing of the Mystery of “The Daily” (accessed February 3, 2009, 2, 29).

²³⁴Peters, 101.

cultic animals, in this context they represent pagan world powers.²³⁵ Thus he concluded that in this context everything has to necessarily have a counterfeit meaning. He preferred to translate the “taken away” in Dan 8:11 as “lifted up,” and accordingly the “him” points to someone who lifts himself up, that is, a counterfeit priest.²³⁶ The 2,300 years are seen as a period of time where “counterfeit worship” takes place, exhibiting “counterfeit light or truth,” “a counterfeit christ [*sic*],” “counterfeit incense or humility.”²³⁷ Further, he recognized different sanctuaries in the text: (1) the *miqdāš* in Dan 8:11 represents the sanctuary of the pagan Roman power that was located in the city of Rome; (2) the *ṽdḳḳ* (*qōdeš*, holy thing, sanctuary) in Dan 8:13, 14 may be associated with the heavenly sanctuary.²³⁸ He differed, however, slightly from the “pioneers” in his definition of the *tāmîd* for he defined it as the self-magnifying or self-exalting character of paganism.²³⁹

Robert J. Wieland, following in the same track, suggested to translate the phrase in Dan 8:11 as “the continual *in transgression*,” which signifies the self-exalting character of the pagan form of Rome.²⁴⁰ Daniel 8:11, 11:31, and 12:11 describe the transition from one desolating power to another, from Roman paganism to the Roman

²³⁵Ibid., 101, 104.

²³⁶Ibid., 101.

²³⁷Ibid., 104.

²³⁸Ibid.

²³⁹Ibid., 103, 104.

²⁴⁰Robert J. Wieland, *The Gospel in Daniel: Whoso Readeth, Let Him Understand* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Glad Tidings Publishers, 2004), 110, 111, 169, 197 (emphasis in original). For the whole argumentation see idem, *Have We Followed "Cunningly Devised Fables"? A New Look at the Old View of "the Daily" of Daniel 8:11-13* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: 1888 Message Study Committee, 2002).

papacy.²⁴¹ Linking Dan 8:11 with Rev 13:2 he concluded that “the place of his sanctuary” was cast down when pagan Rome moved its capital from Rome to Constantinople to make room for the papacy.²⁴² He based his interpretation as well on the claim that Ellen White endorsed the pioneers’ view.²⁴³

True and False Sacrificial System

Although most writers chose between one or the other interpretation, there was at least one author who considered it possible to merge both views. Pauline W. Phillips recognized the relationship between the *tāmîd* in Dan 8:11 and the earthly sanctuary which was patterned after the heavenly.²⁴⁴ She pointed out that this sacrificial system was perverted and paganized by the antediluvians, the Israelites, the pagans, Gnostic Christians, and the Roman Catholic Church.²⁴⁵ Therefore Miller was partly correct, according to Phillips. On the other hand, she also saw a connection between the *tāmîd* and true religion, the sacrifice of the Messiah, heavenly mediation, and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. Phillips viewed pagan Rome as a mixture of biblical Christianity, Gnosticism, and paganism. She claims that Ellen White’s statement in *Early Writings* did actually refer to the Millerite understanding of the *tāmîd*, although that does not, in Phillips’ understanding, contradict the new view.²⁴⁶

²⁴¹Wieland, *The Gospel in Daniel*, 111, 169.

²⁴²Ibid., 111, 168.

²⁴³Wieland, *Have We Followed "Cunningly Devised Fables"?*, 6, 8, 11, 12, 28, 29.

²⁴⁴Phillips, 121.

²⁴⁵Ibid., 121, 122.

²⁴⁶Ibid., 122.

The Everlasting Gospel of Righteousness by Faith

Desmond Ford, when comparing the terminology of chaps. 7-12, concluded that the following phrases parallel each other: “the continual burnt offering taken away” (8:11); “sacrifice and offering to cease” (9:27); “shall take away the continual burnt offering” (11:31; 12:11).²⁴⁷ He briefly applied the term, saying the “everlasting gospel of righteousness by faith, which has been ‘taken away’ by all counterfeit religious systems, must be proclaimed again.”²⁴⁸ His apotelesmatic principle made possible several fulfillments or applications at different times of history.²⁴⁹ According to him, the taking away of the *tāmîḏ* occurs every time when men teach that righteousness can be achieved by one’s own efforts.²⁵⁰ He essentially dismantled the Seventh-day Adventist prophetic basis for 1844 through his apotelesmatic principle.²⁵¹

²⁴⁷Desmond Ford, *Daniel*, Anvil Series (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1978), 168-170. Although in 1960 Ford explained Dan 8:11 and 11:31 from a sanctuary background, he did not clearly identify the *tāmîḏ*, or provide an exact historical fulfillment in time. See idem, “Daniel 8--Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God,” 18-21; idem, “Daniel 8-12, and ‘The Time of the End,’” *Ministry*, February 1964, 28-30; idem, “The Linguistic Connection Between Daniel 8:14 and 11:31,” *Ministry*, December 1965, 34-36; idem, “Dare to Study Daniel—12: Midnight and Morning,” *Ministry*, December 1974, 34-36.

²⁴⁸Ford, *Daniel*, 176. The *tāmîḏ* was already interpreted in that way by John Wycliffe, Walter Brute, Nicolaus von Amsdorf, and other Reformers, according to Ford. See *ibid.*, 181. In 1996 Ford did not define as clearly how he understood the *tāmîḏ*. Apparently, it can be Christ’s sacrifice at the cross, the everlasting gospel that man is saved by grace and not by works, etc. See idem, *Daniel & the Coming King* (Newcastle, Calif.: Desmond Ford Publications, 1996), 116, 117.

²⁴⁹Ford, *Daniel*, 172-174. He apparently used the terms application and fulfillment interchangeably. In the context of Dan 12:11, 12, he stated that “again in the last crisis the power will take away ‘the daily sacrifice.’” See idem, “Dare to Study Daniel—12,” 36.

²⁵⁰Ford, *Daniel*, 194, 195. He provided different examples for it, including the Roman cross at Golgotha, the Roman Catholic Mass, etc. See also idem, *Daniel & the Coming King*, 116, 118.

²⁵¹William H. Shea, “An Analysis of the Apotelesmatic Principle,” CAR-AU, WDF 2264.

True Worship

Some writers interpreted the *tāmîd* as all “legitimate services here on earth designed by God to assist in carrying the minds of the worshippers to Christ’s mediatorial work in heaven,” “the true divine worship,” or “the worship ordained by God.”²⁵² The replacement of the true worship is accomplished by “Satan working through his human agents of pagan as well as papal Rome.”²⁵³ Keough defined it a little more by stating that this occurred “by imposing the worship of the emperor or by setting up practices and teaching doctrines that the Scriptures do not sanction.”²⁵⁴ Yet, none of these writers provided more information on how they reached these conclusions.

Summary

The interpretation of *hatāmîd* as Christ’s heavenly ministration and the worship of the believers received the support of Adventists’ increasing academic community so that it became the prevalent view in Adventism. These scholars did far more exegetical research than interpreters of both views had done in the past so that the present Adventist understanding of the term is based on a solid biblical foundation. Several other views appeared on the edges of the church that received, however, no significant attention. Supporters of the old view bring up almost no new biblical arguments but just refer to Ellen White’s isolated statement interpreting it in support of their interpretation.

²⁵²Price, 172, 173; Keough, 87; Kendall K. Down, *Daniel: Hostage in Babylon* (Grantham, England: Stanborough Press, 1991), 72. Although Keough stated that, following the advice of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, he wants to postpone a final answer to a better day, he eventually chose the “true worship” interpretation. Keough, 87.

²⁵³Down, 72.

²⁵⁴Keough, 87.

Conclusions

The investigation of the primary sources uncovered several important points. During the Millerite period (1831–1844) the majority of Millerite writers supported the view that the *tāmîd* of Dan 8:11-13 symbolized Roman paganism, whereas only one anonymous writer identified the *tāmîd* as Christ’s heavenly ministration. The latter view was rejected by Millerite leaders for several reasons, one being that it was apparently based on the supplied word “sacrifice.” Although the Millerite period was rather short, the number of references to the *tāmîd* is extremely high. It is, however, understandable since it was one of the points that provided the basis for the prophetic framework of the Millerites, and that was questioned by people who claimed that the *tāmîd* referred to the daily sacrifices that were abolished by Antiochus Epiphanes.

After the time of disappointment in 1844, more people adopted views that included the word “sacrifice” as their basis. Continued time setting, the idea of the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, and Crosier’s view of the heavenly sanctuary were somehow connected to that interpretation. Although the early Sabbatarian Adventists accepted Crosier’s sanctuary view, they shunned the continued time setting, the idea of the Jews’ return to Palestine, and the “sacrifice”-based interpretation of the *tāmîd*. Instead they held fast to the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd* as being Roman paganism. The interpretation based on the word “sacrifice” was apparently too tainted with erroneous views so that it was easier to just reject, and hold fast to the old established Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd*. Yet, it is possible that they did not even know Crosier’s new interpretation of the *tāmîd*, for they never mentioned or criticized his identification of the *tāmîd*. In the past, scholars have repeatedly misinterpreted early Sabbatarian statements

in regard to the heavenly sanctuary service of Christ as proof for their endorsement of Crosier's interpretation of the daily. Further, the source quoted in support for Crosier's view on the *tāmîd* does not contain any explicit statements on that topic, although there are clear statements that have apparently been overlooked in the past.

It is apparent that most of the articles that explain or support the Millerite view of the *tāmîd* appeared during the time when the above-mentioned views on time setting and the Jews' return were still in circulation. During the last two decades of that period (1880–1900), the topic appeared only infrequently in denominational periodicals since it was no longer necessary to explain and defend it. Although it was still a part of the Adventist interpretation, the need for its defense had ceased.

Around the turn of the century (1900), this vacuum of arguments caused some people to rethink the interpretation of the respective texts in the book of Daniel. Through the influence of Conradi, the new view was ignited among Seventh-day Adventist leaders in Europe and North America. Primary sources do not provide much support for the assumption that fruitful theological discussions had occurred between the supporters of the two interpretations. Especially, the supporters of the old interpretation regarded the new view as an attack against the Adventist prophetic framework, the authority of Ellen White's writings, and the heritage of the early Seventh-day Adventist pioneers and the leaders of the Millerite movement. Thus the whole discussion became a question of loyalty.

Although the discussions ceased after the 1920s and the topic received only occasional mention, beginning with the 1950s a renewed interest arose in regard to the *tāmîd* based on an increase of knowledge and scholarship in biblical languages among

Seventh-day Adventists. Now, the majority of Adventist scholars supported the new view, promulgators of the old or other views being at the margins of the denomination. It is also apparent that the supporters of the old view just resorted to traditional arguments.

Since an overview of the respective arguments of all the Millerite and Adventist interpretations has been presented, it is now necessary to analyze and compare the two major interpretations, their sources of interpretation, their approach to the topic, their approach to the Bible, and the behavior of the contending parties.

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MAJOR INTERPRETATIONS

The four periods of the Millerite and Adventist interpretation of the *tāmîd* have been especially characterized by two conflicting views of what the Danielic term *hatāmîd* might denote. Whereas the arguments from the Bible, tradition, and history as well as the views that these interpretational groups had opposed have been presented in the previous chapter, it is now necessary to analyze the two main interpretations. This will be done by showing how each view's distinctive elements changed or remained unchanged, and by presenting the views they opposed as well as their approaches to the matter. Also, there will be a section on the atmosphere, or the way people treated each other, during the time of the conflict.

The “Daily” as Roman Paganism

Although the supporters of the old view emphasized the unbroken continuity of their interpretation as reaching back directly to the Millerites,¹ there are some aspects that have changed over time. The following subsections will show and analyze the developments that took place while that interpretation passed through several generations. Further, it is important to recognize the views that these writers opposed and

¹Johnson, 2-14; Loughborough, “Taking Away the Daily,” 50; idem, “Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843,” 89, 90.

that thereby may have shaped the argumentation of that interpretation. The exegetical approach to the text, namely the steps that were taken, will be pointed out as well.

Unchanged Aspects

Several elements did not change when early Sabbatarian Adventists continued to believe in the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîḏ*. Some points were settled since they were clear biblical facts. One obvious fact was the point that the word “sacrifice” did not exist in the Hebrew original.² Further, it was apparent that the Danielic use of the term *hatāmîḏ* differed from the common use in the rest of the OT.³ The question was whether that difference was significant or not. Millerites as well as Seventh-day Adventists solved the question by excluding the wider context of the OT from the interpretation of the text.⁴

Other elements that were not so clearly found in the text itself but needed further reasoning were the following points:

1. Since *tāmîḏ* is usually an adjective used with a modified noun, there has to be such a noun somewhere that this term would qualify and identify. The solution was found

²See Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 34; Himes, 189; Hale, 64; Storrs, 43, 111; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 3; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, *Looking Unto Jesus*, 160; A. C. Bourdeau, 266; James White, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 116, 117; Bell, “Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII,” 75; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Brown, 94; Vuilleumier, 117; Starr, September 1930, 1; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

³In the OT the term *tāmîḏ* is usually used to modify a noun. However, in the book of Daniel it is never used to modify a noun but it functions as a noun itself. This Danielic usage of the term distinguishes it from the common OT use.

⁴See Merrick, 122; Nichols, 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Johnson, 25, 26.

in Dan 8:13 where the word “desolation” seemed to be the needed noun, thus, the text portrayed apparently two desolating powers.⁵

2. The text of 2 Thess 2 shows two entities where one hinders the other but is finally replaced by that other power. The phrase “taken out of the way” in 2 Thess 2:7 paralleled the words “taken away” in Dan 8:11. In both passages the same powers were apparently described, namely pagan Rome and papal Rome.⁶

3. The date 508 BC was considered to be the date for the beginning of the time prophecies of the 1,290 and 1,335 years. Thus the date 508 BC continued to play an important role in the prophetic framework.⁷

4. This date was connected with the conversion of the Frankish king Clovis and other pagan kings who were instrumental in taking away the *tāmîd*.⁸

⁵See Merrick, 122; Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, 1:127; Miller, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; Bates, *The Opening of Heavens*, 30, 31; Nichols, 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8,14*, 41, 42; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; Sisley, 71; Gilbert, 10; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

⁶See Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History*, 30; idem, *Miller's Works*, 1:48, 49; Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 37; Storrs, 114, 115; Hervey, 89; Southard, “The Daily,” 53; Hale, 66; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; James White, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 116, 117; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; D. T. Bourdeau, “The Value of the Prophetic Periods,” 675; Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10; Starr, September 1930, 1; cf. Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368.

⁷See Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History*, 30, 31; idem, “Reasons for Believing the Second Coming,” August 31, 1842, 173; Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 112-117; Merrick, 122; Spaulding, 179; Fitch, “Extract from Fitch’s Sermons,” 67; Storrs, 43, 112, 113; Hervey, 80, 81, 85-89, 96; Starkweather, 45; Nichols, 114; Bates, “Voices of the Prophets,” 90; Uriah Smith, “Short Interviews with Correspondents,” 100; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; Cottrell, “Time has demonstrated this fact,” 6; James White, “The Time of the End,” 56; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 24, 1887, 325; D. T. Bourdeau, “The 1260 Days of Daniel 12,” 755, 756; Brown, 94; Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1909, 60; idem, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1923, 20.

⁸See Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 84; Miller, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; idem, *Miller's Works*, 2:84, 85, 95; Hale, 83; “John Cumming,” *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1860, 90.

5. The “sanctuaries” mentioned in Dan 8:11-14 denoted different sanctuaries, one being the pagan sanctuary of the city of Rome (Dan 8:11, 13), and the other being God’s sanctuary (Dan 8:14).⁹

6. The 2,300 years and the 1,335 years would last until 1843/44 when the “sanctuary” (irrespective of the meaning) would be cleansed.¹⁰

7. The 2,300 years were understood as the time where the pagan daily desolation would rule (ca. 457 BC – 508 BC) until it would be replaced by the papal transgression of desolation (ca. 538 – 1798/1843).¹¹

8. Such passages as Matt 24:15, Luke 21:20, and Rev 17 were still considered to be parallel passages to Dan 8:11-14.¹²

Since the early Sabbatarian Adventists were former members of the Millerite movement, it is understandable that they held fast to certain teachings that had not been seriously questioned.

⁹See Miller, *Letter to Joshua V. Himes*, 8; James White, “Our Present Position,” January 1851, 28, 29; Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 3, 4; Andrews, “The Order of Events in the Judgment,” 36; Bell, “Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII,” 83; D. T. Bourdeau, “Principles by which to Interpret Prophecy,” 276; Littlejohn, “The Prophetic Scar,” 738; Johnson, 27-30.

¹⁰See Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History*, 31; Bliss, *Memoirs of William Miller*, 76; Fitch, *Letter to Rev. J. Litch*, 43; James White, *Bible Adventism*, 185, 186; “John Cumming,” 90. In their understanding the transition was not an abrupt event but a process that took place over a certain period of time (30 years).

¹¹See pp. 16-17 of this study, as well as Uriah Smith, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” July 5, 1870, 20; Vuilleumier, 116.

¹²See Miller, “Miller’s Answer to Queries,” 143; Fitch, “Fitch’s two Sermons,” 74; Storrs, 114, 115; Hervey, 89, 90; Starkweather, 37; Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 4; idem, “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation,” 139; idem, “The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17,” 27, 28; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 35, 36; James White, “Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve,” 59; Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, 112; Starr, September 1930, 1, 2.

Changed Aspects

Several aspects of the Millerite view of the *tāmîd* were reinterpreted by early Sabbatarian Adventists in the process of the development of the new sanctuary doctrine because some of the details of the Millerite view were now unsustainable. Connected with the new sanctuary doctrine was the reinterpretation of the sanctuary mentioned in Dan 8:14. Although the Millerites had interpreted it first as Jerusalem with its worshipers and later as the earth and the church, Sabbatarian Adventists identified it as the heavenly sanctuary.¹³

Another change happened in the interpretation of Rev 13. Miller considered the number 666 as the years of pagan Rome, starting with the league between the Romans and the Jews in 158 BC and concluding in AD 508.¹⁴ The first beast of Rev 13 was accordingly interpreted as pagan Rome, and the second was understood to be papal Rome.¹⁵ Thus the same sequence was found as in Dan 8. Yet, Sabbatarian Adventists reinterpreted the first beast as papal Rome and the second as Protestant America.¹⁶ The number 666 was no longer interpreted as years but rather as the number which

¹³For the Millerite view see Miller, *Letter to Joshua V. Himes*, 8. For the Adventist view see James White, "Our Present Position," January 1851, 28, 29; Uriah Smith, "Prophecy," 3, 4; idem, *Daniel and The Revelation*, 177; Andrews, "The Order of Events in the Judgment," 36; Bell, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII," 83; D. T. Bourdeau, "Principles by which to Interpret Prophecy," 276; Littlejohn, "The Prophetic Scar," 738; Brown, 71, 81, 82, 94.

¹⁴Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History*, 24; idem, *Miller's Works*, 2:95, 96, 296; French, "Diagram of Daniel's Visions," March 1, 1841, 18; Hervey, 76.

¹⁵Pond, 66.

¹⁶Uriah Smith, "Prophecy," 4; James White, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve," 59; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 36; Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, 112; cf. Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368.

represented the name of the Pope, and the league between the Romans and the Jews lost its significance.¹⁷

In the controversial period some writers mentioned that the topic itself was one of minor importance¹⁸ since the interpreters of the new view also tried to uphold the prophetic time periods, whereas other writers felt an apparently disturbing and unsettling influence upon the prophetic framework by the introduction of the new view.¹⁹ The erroneous interpretations of the former times had ceased so that the paganism interpretation had also lost some of its significance.²⁰ These interpreters of the controversial period considered the topic not so significant because of the topic itself but rather because of its apparent influence on the authority of Ellen White's writings.²¹

When speaking about the *tāmîd*, some interpreters emphasized more the imperial aspect while others focused more on the religious or ritual aspect of pagan Rome.²² But this difference of weight is found as well when one compares different Millerite writers or different Adventist writers.²³ It was only during the controversial period that the

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Haskell, January 27, 1908; idem to William C. White, December 6, 1909, EGWE-GC; idem to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:252; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54.

¹⁹See Starr, September 1930, 3.

²⁰See pp. 30 and 39 of this study.

²¹See Haskell, January 27, 1908; idem to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; Starr, September 1930, 2, 3; cf. Haloviak, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily'," 20-23, 26, 34.

²²See pp. 51, 52, 55, and 56 of this study.

²³Some considered the *tāmîd* just as the Roman Empire while others viewed it as the rites, the sacrifices, and the worship of pagan Rome. Thus the latter interpreters recognized a kind of counterfeit cultic aspect of the term. This difference was, however, not considered as of so much importance in this study to divide the sources accordingly. For the positions see pp. 16, 17, and 32-34 of this study.

identification of the *tāmîd* as a system of worship and counterfeit cult increased. This view recognized all elements of true worship but turned them into a counterfeit.²⁴

One change that can be observed and will be dealt with in more details below has to do with the weight of tradition in the interpretation. Whereas only one Millerite interpreter could be found who referred to tradition, namely the writings of the church fathers, in support of the two-power interpretation of the *tāmîd*,²⁵ early Seventh-day Adventists quoted Millerite writers infrequently in support of their identification of the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism.²⁶ Adventist authors during the controversial period referred, however, frequently to the Millerite and early Adventist interpretation, quoting a statement made by Ellen White to support the former interpretation.²⁷ Thus it can be seen that Adventist writers increasingly relied on “tradition” whereas the Millerites had attempted to find support only in the Bible. The statement made by Ellen White in 1850

²⁴Johnson, 30; Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1909, 58, 60, 68; idem, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated*, 1923, 19, 20, 82; Gilbert, 10; Vuilleumier, 114-116, 187;

²⁵Southard, “The Daily,” 53. While it is true that some church fathers interpreted the restraining power in 2 Thess 2:6-7 as the Roman Empire, they never applied that interpretation to Dan 8. See Peter Gorday, ed., *Colossians, 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament, Vol. 9, ed. Thomas C. Oden (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000), 110-111; Kenneth Stevenson and Michael Glerup, eds., *Ezekiel, Daniel*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, Old Testament, Vol. 13, ed. Thomas C. Oden (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2008), 252, 253. I doubt, however, that these commentaries present an exhaustive list of all available statements.

²⁶See Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33, 34; Uriah Smith, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92.

²⁷Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10; idem, “Taking Away the Daily,” 50, 51; idem, “Time Taken Away of the Daily,” 71; idem, “Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843,” 89, 90; Haskell, January 27, 1908; idem to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; Johnson, 2-25; Vuilleumier, 187-189; Starr, September 1930, 1; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13; cf. William C. White to Percy T. Magan, July 31, 1910, EGWE-GC; idem to J. S. Washburn, October 27, 1910, EGWE-GC; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:252, 253; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 416.

was not quoted for the support of the “paganism view” until 1907.²⁸ Previous to that time her statement was seemingly not brought into relation with the paganism interpretation, or her statements did not have doctrinal significance for Adventist writers. Thus, with time, it is apparent that a kind of “inspired” tradition and the use of non-canonical writings were assigned a higher importance in the interpretation of the text than the study of the biblical text itself.

Criticized Views

Millerite writers criticized three different interpretations of Dan 8:11-14 that were, however, all based on the *tāmîd* as being identified as “sacrifices.” The liberal scholars of that day interpreted the little horn as the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes who took away the Jewish sacrifices between 167-164 BC.²⁹ Others considered the destruction of the temple in AD 70 by the Romans and the ceasing of the temple services as the taking away of the *tāmîd*.³⁰ One writer interpreted the *tāmîd* as Christ’s continuous sacrifice.³¹

Early Adventist writers did oppose similar views as did Millerite writers before.³² Articles appeared in their literature that criticized not only the Antiochus Epiphanes

²⁸Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 9, 10. That is the first time Ellen White’s statement was used at least in printed form to support the paganism view of the *tāmîd*.

²⁹See the reactions to that view in Allen, 73-74; Litch, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 77, 78; Miller, *Miller’s Works*, 1:188-190; Hale, 67; Hervey, 70, 71; Southard, “Watchman’s Warning,” 102.

³⁰See in the reaction of Storrs, 112.

³¹See Southard, “The Daily,” 52, reacting against [anonymous], “The Daily,” 52.

³²J. N. Loughborough reports of a meeting he had in 1852 with O. R. L. Crosier who had reinterpreted the 2,300 days and other periods claiming that they “would not terminate until 1909. At least

interpretation and the AD 70 view,³³ but also such new problems as the continued time setting and the idea that the Jews would return to Jerusalem.³⁴ The first two views were based on the *tāmîd* as the Jewish sacrifices, and the other two ideas were sometimes derived from the interpretation of Jewish sacrifices as well. During the first three decades until the middle of the 1870s these interpretations were attacked in Adventist periodicals; later the criticism ceased with the vanishing of such interpretations.

During the controversial period the supporters of the old view criticized the new view especially because its supporters seemingly undermined the authority of the writings of Ellen White because she apparently supported the interpretation of Miller and the early Sabbatarian Adventists.³⁵

Approach to the Topic

It is apparent that during the early Seventh-day Adventist period no further arguments were unearthed from the Bible to substantiate the interpretation of the *tāmîd* as paganism. Adventist writers just continued to use traditional Millerite arguments. In the later decades of that period the reasons for the “paganism view” were presented very

at that point Adventists felt a little bit queasy about some of Crosier’s views. See Loughborough, “Other Views of the 1,290 and 1,355 Days,” 26.

³³Nichols, 114; Andrews, “The Sanctuary,” 121-125; Jame White, *The Four Universal Monarchies*, 39-42; Cottrell, “Time has demonstrated this fact,” 6; Uriah Smith, “The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered,” 180; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” June 28, 1870, 12; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 10, 1887, 293; Littlejohn, “The Temple in Heaven,” 659.

³⁴James White, “Comments on Brother Miller’s Dream,” 74; idem, “Our Present Position,” December 1850, 13; Ellen G. White, “Letter to Brethren and Sisters,” 87; Bates, “The Laodicean Church,” 7; cf. Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 37, 42.

³⁵Haskell, January 27, 1908; idem to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; Starr, September 1930, 2, 3; cf. Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily,’” 20-23, 26, 34.

briefly, without much explanation, and increasingly seldom. Interpreters still attempted to prove it from the Bible but with Smith's increase of authority as the leading prophetic interpreter, historical accounts received more weight than biblical exegesis.³⁶ Since they received the paganism interpretation from the Millerites, they quoted understandably just such writers to offer explanations on the issue. In a certain way the considerations of other interpreters received higher attention than the study of the issue itself, although the linguistic and exegetical ability of some Adventist writers should not be diminished.

During the controversial period it became apparent that Adventist writers, who favored the old view, did apparently just rely on tradition. They quoted Millerite and early Adventist interpreters to show what they had said on the topic.³⁷ The punch line came when these Adventist writers quoted Ellen White's statement as "proof" of the correctness of the Millerite and early Adventist interpretation of the *tāmîd*. During the modern period supporters of the old view seldom presented new arguments (with the exception of John W. Peters) but just adopted the argumentation of the writers of the controversial period.³⁸

The interpreters of the "paganism view" throughout the different periods adhered to certain hermeneutical principles and they based their exegetical work on these principles. For them, the Bible writers were inspired by God so that the product, that is,

³⁶A brief look at the bibliographic references, given on pp. 29-35 in this study, shows that Uriah Smith's articles and books appear more often than any other writer. That is certainly also due to Smith's longer lifespan and accordingly a longer working time. James White had died in 1881 and Andrews in 1884, whereas Smith did not pass away until 1903.

³⁷Johnson, 2-22; Loughborough, "Taking Away the Daily," 50, 51; idem, "Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843," 89, 90; Vuilleumier, 187-189; "Scripture Problems Solved," 13.

³⁸See Swearingen, 39, 40; Wieland, *The Gospel in Daniel*, 6, 8, 11, 12, 28, 29, 110, 111, 168, 169, 197.

the biblical writings, was to be considered as the Word of God. To understand these writings, the Scripture itself should serve at its own interpreter by comparing one text with another. Based on these principles their exegetical findings and conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. The word “sacrifice” does not exist in the Hebrew text, and should not be supplied.³⁹

2. The word *tāmîd* is usually used as an adjective qualifying or qualified by a noun, which is however missing in this text. Since that is the case and a definite article is prefixed to *tāmîd*, the term itself becomes a noun in this text. Yet, the term *tāmîd* is still not qualified, and needs to be qualified by a noun in the context of Daniel. That was done by linking *tāmîd* to the noun *desolation* in Dan 8:13.⁴⁰

3. The difference in use of that term in the book of Daniel disqualifies the common OT usage as the context in which the term could be interpreted. Although the OT context is totally excluded from the interpretation, later interpreters recognize the OT

³⁹See Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 34; Himes, 189; Hale, 64; Storrs, 43, 111; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, “Prophecy,” 3; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, *Looking Unto Jesus*, 160; A. C. Bourdeau, 266; James White, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*, 116, 117; Bell, “Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII,” 75; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Brown, 94; Vuilleumier, 117; Starr, September 1930, 1; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

⁴⁰See Merrick, 122; Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, 1:127; Miller, “The Beast—Anti-Christ,” 41; Bates, *The Opening of Heavens*, 30, 31; Nichols, 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; idem, “Synopsis of the Present Truth,” 92; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8, 14*, 41, 42; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Waggoner, “The Little Horn of Daniel 8,” 694; Sisley, 71; Gilbert, 10; “Scripture Problems Solved,” 13.

usage while at the same time holding fast to the Millerite identification of the term, concluding that it must therefore have a counterfeit cultic meaning.⁴¹

4. The reconstructed phrases in Dan 8:13 were compared with and interpreted in the light of several NT passages (2 Thess 2; Rev 13; Matt 24:15; Luke 21:20).⁴²

Thus the emphasis of these interpreters was on the apparent application and use of that Danielic prophecy by the NT writers, rather than on the OT background of the terminology. Questions that are raised and should be settled by exegetes are, for example: Is it right to exclude totally the common OT usage of a certain term when the usage in a certain text differs from the other OT texts? What basic syntactic rules should be noticed to settle the meaning of a difficult or unusual construction? Could certain rules be developed on how to apply a certain OT passage in the NT? Is the interpretation of such NT passages correct, and how much of that passage can be read into an OT passage?

The “Daily” as True Worship and Heavenly Mediation

Except for the writers of the controversial and the modern periods, proponents of Christ’s heavenly mediation view apparently did not have so much contact and impact upon each other. Thus one can expect some differences in the details of the interpretation. Although quite a number of aspects existed that were changed, some elements also remained unchanged. It is of further special importance which views were criticized and what approach was taken to the biblical text.

⁴¹See Merrick, 122; Nichols, 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, 33; Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160; Matteson, “The Visions of Daniel and John,” May 17, 1887, 308; Johnson, 25, 26; Peters, 101-104.

⁴²See pp. 16, 17, 33, 34, 52, and 65-68 of this study.

Unchanged Aspects

There are a few arguments that did not change throughout the different periods. Although the arguments presented during the controversial period and the modern period do not vary as much as the ones from the previous periods, the focus of this paper is more on the first three periods.⁴³

1. Writers of this interpretation group always recognized the cultic background of the term *hatāmîd*, that is, the connection to the Israelite sanctuary services.⁴⁴

2. Based on the understanding of typology, they always saw the *tāmîd* as signifying the continual mediation of Christ in heaven.⁴⁵

3. Beginning with Crosier, interpreters frequently combined the *tāmîd* as Christ's ministration in heaven (Dan 8:11-13) with the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary (Dan 8:14),⁴⁶ although the later point was not necessarily combined to the "daily" interpretation as can be seen from the Adventist writers who favored the paganism view while holding up the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

⁴³Since each chapter of this study zooms more and more into the controversial events, the fourth time period is only a part of the bigger picture.

⁴⁴[Anonymous], "The Daily," 52; Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 155; idem, April 17, 1906, 3; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99; Wilcox, 6; Colcord, 228; Wakeham, 48.

⁴⁵[Anonymous], "The Daily," 52; Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; Conradi, April 17, 1906, 3; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 98-100; cf. Colcord, 229, 237; Wakeham, 48, 49.

⁴⁶[Anonymous], "The Daily," 52; Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; idem, "The Law of Moses," 37-44; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," 3; Conradi, April 17, 1906, 3, 4; Wakeham, 48, 49.

4. Proponents of this view considered the *tāmîd* to be taken away by the cultic, political, and military activities done or caused by papal Rome at the beginning of the fifth century (most of the time at AD 508).⁴⁷

Changed Aspects

Interpreters who favored Christ's ministration in heaven view were apparently not so much influenced by similar interpreters of former periods. The details for that interpretation presented in one period seem to be disconnected and varying from the ones in following periods, which could be an indicator that the studies being done in later periods were more independent from previous writers.

1. During the Millerite and Early Sabbatarian period one aspect is eye-catching, and that is the fact that those writers built their interpretation on the word "sacrifice" and/or the OT sacrificial background of the term *hatāmîd*.⁴⁸ However, later writers sided with the "paganism view" interpreters that the word "sacrifice" did not exist in the Hebrew original.⁴⁹ Further, they referred to the composite use of *hatāmîd* rather than limiting it only to the daily sacrifice.⁵⁰

⁴⁷[Anonymous], "The Daily," 52; Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 156, 175-178; idem, April 17, 1906, 3, 5, 6; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99-101; "If ye will inquire, inquire ye," 2; Wakeham, 49, 50, 66; Prescott, "The Message for This Time," 5.

⁴⁸So [anonymous], "The Daily," 52, built his interpretation on the term "sacrifice." Crosier always used the phrase "daily sacrifice" without mentioning once that the word "sacrifice" was supplied. See Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; idem, "Volume 2," 2; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," 3. Another interpreter reasoned that the meaning of "sacrifice" is implied in the term *tāmîd*. See "Interpretation of Symbols," 36. Others recognized the sacrificial background of the term, and they interpreted it as denoting "daily sacrifices." See Berwick, 82; Cummings, 3, 7; cf. Burnside, 3.

⁴⁹Prescott, "The Message for This Time," 5; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99; Wilcox, 6; "If ye will inquire, inquire ye," 2; Price, 171; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 211; Read, 16; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 105; Hasel, "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven," 27C; idem, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 405; Burnside, 1, 6; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message*

2. One writer during the first period stated that several adjectives were frequently used in the OT in reference to God, suggesting that the adjective *tāmîḏ* should be understood as standing in relation to God.⁵¹ This argument was never used again by later interpreters.

3. The same writer mentioned in point 2 gave the year AD 538 as the year in which the “daily sacrifice” was taken away.⁵² Later writers (beginning with Crosier) always referred to the year AD 508.⁵³

4. The writers of the first two periods narrowed down the literal meaning of the *tāmîḏ* to the daily sacrifice and to Christ’s sacrifice on the typological level, while at the same time including the idea that Christ as mediator would apply his sacrifice continually in the heavenly sanctuary.⁵⁴ Starting with the controversial period, interpreters focused more on the broader meaning of the *tāmîḏ* and its antitypical counterparts.⁵⁵ By

of Daniel for You and Your Family, 163; Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language,” 533; idem, *Future Glory*, 54; Keough, 87; Hardinge, 168; Roy Gane, 84; Stefanovic, 302.

⁵⁰Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 156; idem, April 17, 1906, 3; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99; Wilcox, 6; Colcord, 228; Wakeham, 48, 49; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 211; Read, 16; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 105; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 164; Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary,” 406; Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language,” 533; idem, *Future Glory*, 51; Hardinge, 168, 169; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 75; Shea, 182; Roy Gane, 39, 84; Pröbstle, 208-210; Stefanovic, 302.

⁵¹[Anonymous], “The Daily,” 52.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2; William C. White, June 1, 1910; “If ye will inquire, inquire ye,” 2; Wakeham, 72; Hibbard, October 24, 1909; Doukhan, 153, 67; cf. Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 21.

⁵⁴[Anonymous], “The Daily,” 52; Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2.

⁵⁵Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 156; idem, April 17, 1906, 3; Jones, *The Consecrated Way*, 99; Wilcox, 6; Colcord, 228; Wakeham, 48, 49; *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, 211; Read, 16; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, 105; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, 164; Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary,”

recognizing the broader meaning of the term, they also recognized that the difference in usage (OT vs. Daniel) posed no problem but was nevertheless of vital importance.⁵⁶

5. Crosier and others who interpreted the *tāmîd* with a sacrificial meaning differed from the early Sabbatarian group in having set different times and/or continuing to set times for Christ's second coming.⁵⁷ However, Adventists throughout their history opposed such practices.⁵⁸

6. While during the first two periods the *tāmîd* was interpreted just as what Christ did on the cross and does now in heaven,⁵⁹ some interpreters during the next two periods recognized the additional aspect of the true worship of the faithful believers.⁶⁰

Criticized Views

Crosier criticized Miller's interpretation of the *tāmîd* because the latter had apparently neglected his own rules of interpretation and totally excluded the OT background of the term *hatāmîd*.⁶¹

406; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language," 533; idem, *Future Glory*, 51; Hardinge, 168, 169; Pfandl, *Daniel*, 75; Shea, 182; Roy Gane, 39, 84; Pröbstle, 208-210; Stefanovic, 302.

⁵⁶See especially Pröbstle, 212-230.

⁵⁷Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; idem, "Volume 2," 2; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," 3; Cummings, 246.

⁵⁸James White, "Comments on Brother Miller's Dream," 74; idem, "Our Present Position," 13; Ellen G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," 87; Bates, "The Laodicean Church," 7; Cottrell, "Time has demonstrated this fact," 6; Uriah Smith, "Papal Supremacy," 12; cf. Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," 10.

⁵⁹[Anonymous], "The Daily," 52; Crosier, "The Law of Moses," 37-44, idem, "Response to J. Weston," 2; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," 3.

⁶⁰Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels*, 1898, 155; idem, April 17, 1906, 3; "If ye will inquire, inquire ye," 2; Pröbstle, 215-219.

⁶¹Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2; cf. Conradi, April 17, 1906, 2.

Adventist writers during the controversial period pointed out the weak points in the paganism view based on exegetical and historical arguments.⁶² Further, they emphasized strongly that this theological debate should be settled by biblical studies rather than by using Ellen White's writings to short-cut exegetical work.⁶³

Adventist scholars of the modern period criticized just the interpretations of historical-critical scholars who still apply Dan 8 to the historical events around the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁶⁴

Approach to the Text

The examination of the primary sources of that interpretational group throughout the different periods reveals that their arguments were not so much influenced by tradition or separation from other views.

The identification of the term *hatāmîd* happened largely in the context of the OT usage and before the background of the typology between the OT sanctuary services and Christ's salvation ministry. Not until the modern period did interpreters start to uncover various connections between the terminology of Dan 8 and Leviticus.⁶⁵ Only recently one

⁶²Prescott, *The Daily*, 4-15.

⁶³Ludwig Richard Conradi to John N. Loughborough, April 16, 1907, 2, 4, CAR-AU; William A. Spicer to Ludwig Richard Conradi, September 7, 1910, GCA; Prescott, *The Daily*, 13; Wakeham, 47. W. C. White stated that Haskell's interpretation of Ellen White's statement "would make the Spirit of Prophecy contradict history." See Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 223.

⁶⁴See "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Investigative Judgment in the Old Testament," 43; Roy Gane, 84; Pröbstle, 206, 207.

⁶⁵See pp. 63 and 64 of this study.

scholar provided significant support for the new view of the *tāmîd* from the exegesis in the book of Daniel itself.⁶⁶

There are some issues that were raised by the new view, and that deserve more careful study, as for example: More historical material from the first decades of the sixth century should be investigated about events that are of cultic, political, and military relevance.⁶⁷ What relation do some NT passages have that were formerly brought into connection with Dan 8? Are there passages in the NT that apply or refer to the Dan 8 passage? What practical relevance does that interpretation have for the life of common believers and the mission of the church?

The Atmosphere of the Debates

This section will especially deal with the controversial period (1900–1930), and how the members of the two opposing groups treated and reacted against each other. Although theological conflicts are most of the time fought with theological arguments, they almost always also include emotions being manifested in one's own conduct, behavior, as well as in the way the viewpoint and arguments of the other side are presented. When looking through the books and articles published after 1915, it becomes obvious that no explicit definitions for the *tāmîd* can be found. Although there are statements in regard to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, Christ's high priestly

⁶⁶Pröbstle, 212-230.

⁶⁷See Gerhard Pfandl, *Time Prophecies in Daniel 12*, Biblical Research Institute Releases, vol. 5 (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 2005); Heiks, *508, 538, 1798, 1843 Source Book*; Alberto R. Timm, "A Short Historical Background to A.D. 508 & 538 as Related to the Establishment of Papal Supremacy," in *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical & Practical Insights*, ed. Ron du Preez, Scripture Symposium, vol. 1 (Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007), 208-231.

ministry in heaven, or the transition from pagan Rome to papal Rome (Dan 11:31) that started the period of the 1,260 years of papal supremacy, there are no definite statements in regard to the *tāmîd*.⁶⁸ To get more information about the way the contending parties were treating each another, it is necessary to look at their correspondences.

The Proponents of the New View

The proponents of the new view considered it to be “impossible to sustain by good history the claim that Paganism was taken away or abolished as the national religion of Rome in 508,” and that is why they urged to correct this error.⁶⁹ Although General Conference president A. G. Daniells favored the new view, he tried to remain objective and unbiased in his treatment of the members of the other party.⁷⁰ He was afraid of another theological conflict that would cause the cry of heresy to be sounded, the unsettling of people, and the destructive influence upon the church.⁷¹ Therefore he advised not to discuss, agitate, or print the matter.⁷² Thus in July 1908, Daniells tried to convince the editor of the *Watchman* to refrain from the unwise step of republishing Haskell’s 1843 chart, claiming that “up to the present time this matter has been kept out

⁶⁸See *Two Great Prophecies With a Message to All Mankind: The Ancient Books of Daniel and the Revelation* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1925), 41, 42, 54, 57, 58. Also the 1,290 and 1,335 years are oftentimes mentioned as beginning in AD 508.

⁶⁹Daniells, July 15, 1908; Conradi, April 16, 1907, 3; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 70, 71.

⁷⁰See Daniells, July 15, 1908; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 70, 71.

⁷¹Arthur G. Daniells, “In Interview at Elmshaven,” January 26, 1908, EGWE-GC; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:246, 247.

⁷²Arthur G. Daniells, “In Interview at Elmshaven,” January 26, 1908, EGWE-GC; idem, July 15, 1908, 1; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:246, 247.

of our papers.”⁷³ Yet, Daniells knew at least from Prescott’s complaints about the lack of restraint on the part of “the *Signs* people,” that an article promoting the new view of the “daily” had already been published in early January.⁷⁴ Thus Daniells probably just referred to the time since the cease-fire had been agreed upon at the January 26, 1908, meeting at Elmshaven.⁷⁵ It was after that meeting that they had “refrained from expressing their view in our papers,” because they wanted to avoid “any controversy.”⁷⁶ Daniells suggested that “all parties wait a bit” so that they could get together, study the whole question, and “save an open dispute.”⁷⁷

However, W. W. Prescott apparently viewed himself as being “beyond the danger of making mistakes.” He had the tendency to diverge from clearly defined truths, spending hours on minor points of no real significance “for the salvation of the soul.”⁷⁸ His agitating the matter did cause confusion and unbelief, and led people to question the simple truth of God’s word, while keeping them away from the most essential work of

⁷³Daniells, July 15, 1908, 1.

⁷⁴Wilcox, 6; W. W. Prescott to Arthur G. Daniells, January 10, 1908, cited in Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 219.

⁷⁵The following persons were present at that meeting: A. G. Daniells, W. W. Prescott, J. N. Loughborough, S. N. Haskell and his wife, W. C. White, C. C. Crisler, and D. E. Robinson. See Daniells, July 15, 1908, 1; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248.

⁷⁶Daniells, July 15, 1908, 2.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 2, 3.

⁷⁸Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990), 10:334, 359; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248. Moon stated that Prescott dominated the discussion at the meeting at Elmshaven “so thoroughly that the Haskells felt steamrolled.” See Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 420. “He had talked for four hours and only then let Haskell and Loughborough respond.” See Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 220.

heart conversion and life transformation.⁷⁹ He was intent to point out mistakes and “flaws in our past experience.”⁸⁰ Ellen White counseled Prescott not to publish anything “that would unsettle the minds of the people regarding the positions held in the past.”⁸¹ In December 1909 Haskell was, nevertheless, complaining that Prescott tried to “weave adroitly” some of his personal views into the reading for the week of prayer.⁸²

Some of the promulgators of the new view claimed that they based their interpretation totally on the Bible, and that Adventists should not need “an infallible interpreter of the Word of God” to provide the lacking support.⁸³ The writings of Ellen White would have no doctrinal significance but only a paraenetic function.⁸⁴ It would be necessary to protest against the attempt to hinder a thorough examination of the biblical text, and to search for an infallible confirmation of our teachings in Ellen White’s writings.⁸⁵ They felt somewhat relieved when Ellen White stated that she had no light on the matter and was unable to clearly define the controversial points.⁸⁶

⁷⁹Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.

⁸⁰Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250.

⁸¹Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248.

⁸²Haskell, December 6, 1909; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 231, called the statement in the week of prayer reading “a veiled allusion to the idea” of the “daily.”

⁸³Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 37; Heinz, 97.

⁸⁴Ludwig Richard Conradi to Arthur G. Daniells, October 11, 1910, GCA; cf. Heinz, 98.

⁸⁵Spicer, September 7, 1910, quoted in Heinz, 97; cf. Conradi, April 16, 1907, 1; Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 231.

⁸⁶Cf. Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:107, 12:224; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:252. They believed that her 1850 statement pertained not to the historical identity of the “daily” but to the time periods. See Arthur G. Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily,” September 25, 1931, DF 201b, EGWE-GC; William C. White to George B. Starr, September 22, 1930, EGWE-GC; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 423, 424.

The new ideas were apparently presented sometimes in an arrogant way, denouncing the reasoning of the supporters of the old view as being absurd.⁸⁷ They called upon the members of the old view group to “accept evidence,” and to change the views “when they are proved to be incorrect.”⁸⁸ It should be “our sincere aim to know and teach the truth,” since that is more important “than to cling to a traditional teaching.”⁸⁹ Thus Prescott stated that “the use of ... [Ellen White’s] quotation for the purpose of forestalling any candid investigation of our teaching does not seem consistent with that spirit of fairness which opens the way for an unprejudiced consideration of Bible truth.”⁹⁰ However, some church members reasoned in response that if Prescott’s reasoning be accepted, it would be possible to change certain doctrines although these had been confirmed by the writings of Ellen White in the past.⁹¹

It is understandable that the proponents of the paganism view considered the new view of the “daily” as an attack against the prophetic framework and the authority of the writings of Ellen White. Although most of the proponents of the new view still held up the prophetic interpretation of the denomination, there were some who questioned not

⁸⁷Thus Conradi stated that the term *tāmīd* refers to the true sanctuary service, and “is as far from pertaining to heathenism as day is from night.” Talking down to Loughborough, he told him that he will be happy, if after the latter has studied the matter for himself, he “will in the future present the clear meaning of the Bible to the readers of the Review.” See Conradi, April 16, 1907, 2, 4. W. H. Wakeham stated, “How far-fetched it seems to apply this to paganism in the sixth century, and to the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem in A.D. 70, which had not been recognized as a sanctuary of God for 30 years.” See Wakeham, 47.

⁸⁸Prescott, *The Daily*, 1, 23; cf. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 157.

⁸⁹Prescott, *The Daily*, 1, 23; cf. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 157.

⁹⁰Prescott, *The Daily*, 13.

⁹¹Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54.

only the definition of the *tāmîd* but the whole interpretation of the Danielic prophecies as well, as the case of Kolvoord shows.⁹² Others like A. T. Jones got into trouble with the church in other areas, which was certainly not a recommendation of their views on that topic.⁹³

The Proponents of the Old View

Shortly after the meeting on January 26, 1908, at Elmshaven, S. N. Haskell wrote a letter to Daniells “expressing himself very emphatically regarding the question.”⁹⁴ He charged Daniells to make sure that the new view would not be published; otherwise he would publish an 1843 chart to “show our people what was right.”⁹⁵ In July of the same year Haskell would have had that chart reprinted in the *Watchman*, had not Daniells

⁹²Kolvoord and Kellogg, 21-41. Kolvoord had discovered that the word *tāmîd* is connected with the burnt offerings and that the Jews referred to the daily sacrifices later just as the *tāmîd*. He interpreted the little horn as Antiochus IV Epiphanes who took away the daily sacrifices. See *ibid.*, 21, 22, 49-41. While at this time Kolvoord had already separated himself totally from the church, his published views have certainly caused a certain kind of uneasiness in Adventism, and also among the supporters of the new view, since it was not really a recommendation of their views on the *tāmîd*. When Prescott was asked to rebut this book and affirm the traditional view, he declined because he could not agree with Uriah Smith’s explanations on the *tāmîd*. See Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 218. See also E. J. Waggoner who gave up his belief in the 2,300 years as coming to an end in 1844, interpreting the days no longer as years but as “evening and morning sacrifices.” See Ellet J. Waggoner, *The “Confession of Faith” of Dr. E. J. Waggoner* (n.p.: Albion F. Ballenger, n.d.), 14, 15, EGWE-LLU; cf. Woodrow W. Whidden, *E. J. Waggoner: From the Physician of Good News to the Agent of Division*, Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2008), 347. Further, Waggoner rejected the transfer of the sins to the heavenly sanctuary, and its cleansing, based on his erroneous understanding of atonement. See *ibid.*, 347-354.

⁹³Washburn believed that the originators of the new view have been people like E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, J. H. Kellogg, and W. W. Prescott. See Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 32. See also A. V. Olson, *Through Crisis to Victory, 1888-1901: From the Minneapolis Meeting to the Reorganization of the General Conference* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1966), 304-312, for more information on the diverging path of A. T. Jones.

⁹⁴Stephen N. Haskell to Arthur G. Daniells, January 27, 1908; Daniells, July 15, 1908, 2; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248.

⁹⁵Haskell, January 27, 1908; Daniells, July 15, 1908, 2.

convinced the editor to refrain from it.⁹⁶ After Haskell published his chart privately, Ellen White told him that he should have waited to get all the leading brethren together, and come to an agreement with them before circulating his 1843 chart.⁹⁷ He acted unwisely in bringing up a subject that “must create discussion,” and manifested that “various opinions” existed on the matter.⁹⁸ He should not agitate this matter.⁹⁹

Uriah Smith considered the matter of the “daily” as one of the “old landmarks.”¹⁰⁰ The contenders of the old view were apparently not willing to settle the conflict, and to come to unity.¹⁰¹ The new interpretation of the “daily” was denounced by some as a “deadly heresy,” “new theology,” Satanic innovation, the ultimate apostasy, and the Omega of apostasies, which would “change the original truth,” “the doctrines of Seventh Day [sic] Adventists,” and that would “destroy the foundation of the Adventist faith and play into the hands of the opponents of the church.”¹⁰² J. S. Washburn regarded the “new

⁹⁶Ibid., 2, 3.

⁹⁷Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250; Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 222, 223.

⁹⁸Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:251.

⁹⁹Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250.

¹⁰⁰Conradi, April 17, 1906, 6, 7.

¹⁰¹Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells: A Statement Relating to Elder A. G. Daniells and the Presidency of the General Conference” (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Publications, December 4, 1953), 2, CAR-AU. A. G. Daniells did express frequently his desire and hope to get together with the members of the old view group. See Daniells, July 15, 1908, 2, 3. When in May 1910 Ellen White and her son invited the members of both groups to “a meeting for prayer and Bible study,” the supporters of the old view were not willing to participate since in their opinion further dialogue would be fruitless. See Stephen N. Haskell to Ellen G. White, May 30, 1910, EGWE-GC; William C. White, September 22, 1930; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 421, 424.

¹⁰²Johnson; George I. Butler to Ellen G. White, July 3, 1910, EGWE-GC; Leon Albert Smith and F. C. Gilbert, 2, 31; J. S. Washburn, *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy* (n.p.: n.d.); idem, *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy* (Philadelphia, Pa.: The Author, 1920); idem, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference* (n.p.: 1922); idem, *The Fruit of the "New*

doctrine of the Daily” as “the heart, the core, the root, the seed theory of all our modern Washington new thought, and Adventist new theology.”¹⁰³ He stated that if his uncle, the former GC president G. I. Butler, “were to rise from the dead he would stand with me against [Daniells] and Prescott.”¹⁰⁴ The new interpretation of the “daily” was, however, not the only reason why Washburn criticized Prescott. He sharply attacked him also for having introduced “a brood of new theories” such as the “Higher Criticism” and the “Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.” These and other “false doctrines” would change “the original truth” taught by the Adventist church and exchange it for “a flood of new and strange teachings.”¹⁰⁵

Although Ellen White requested the supporters of the old view to refrain from quoting her writings in their support, they apparently used them even more, making the whole issue become a conflict over her “role as a prophetic/historical interpreter of the Bible.”¹⁰⁶ The supporters of these new views were “undermining the confidence of our

Daily” (Toledo, Ohio: The Author, 1923); Claude E. Holmes, *Have We an Infallible Spirit of Prophecy?* (Washington, D.C.: The Author, 1920), 1, 11; cf. Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 30-32; Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 156, 157. In his explanations on the conflict about the “daily,” Pöhler seemed to be more concerned with emphasizing the negative reactions of the traditionalists without setting it into the proper context. Although he portrayed their misguided loyalty to the writings of Ellen White in a negative light, he did not present a wholistic portrait of the events.

¹⁰³Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 24, 34; cf. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 157.

¹⁰⁴Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 24, 34; cf. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 157. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 220-235, has pointed out that some of the supporters of the old view were suspicious of everything Prescott did.

¹⁰⁵Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 24, 34; cf. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 157. Douglass, 440, shows as well that other questions were agitated that widened the split in Adventism. Such issues were, e.g., “the Eastern question, the Arian-Trinity controversy, the two covenants, the ‘daily’ (Dan. 8:11-13), beginning and ending of the 1260 years, . . . the king of the north (Daniel 11),” and “how to interpret Ellen White.”

¹⁰⁶George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs*, Adventist Heritage Series (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000), 127, 139, 171; cf. Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; Holmes, *Have we an infallible Spirit of Prophecy?*, 1, 11; Washburn, *The*

sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth.”¹⁰⁷ The supporters of the new view were unsettling “these dates and experiences,” and thereby doing “the work of the enemy of Jesus.”¹⁰⁸ One writer thought that the new view contradicted “the plain statements in ‘Early Writings’ ... [and] unsettle[d] minds in regard to the inspiration of all the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy and ... question[ed] the leadership of the Lord Jesus in the entire movement.”¹⁰⁹ He exhorted a younger brother “to hold fast to the faith as first delivered to you ..., and contend for it to the end.”¹¹⁰

Conclusions

The analysis of the two views has shown that both views agree that the power that is described as taking away the *tāmîd* and treading down the sanctuary is papal Rome.¹¹¹ Further, both views gave prominence to the Frankish king Clovis in the process of taking away the *tāmîd* in AD 508.¹¹² Thus the historical basis of the two views was similar, differing only slightly, so that it is questionable whether the historical differences are so “basic.”¹¹³ Although both groups believed in the heavenly mediatory service of Christ

Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy; Claude E. Holmes to Arthur G. Daniells, May 1, 1922, quoted in Knight, 139; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 54.

¹⁰⁷Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 28; Douglass, 441.

¹⁰⁸Starr, September 1930, 3.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, 3. Daniells had at one point said that the Early Writings statement was an “imperfect statement.” See Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily,’” 30.

¹¹⁰Starr, September 1930, 3.

¹¹¹Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:367.

¹¹²Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 418.

¹¹³Ludwig Richard Conradi, *Whoso Readeth, Let Him Understand: A Short Key to Dan. 7-12* (Hamburg: International Tract Society, [1910]), 43-46; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship Between the Prophet and Her Son*, 418.

and that the papacy tried to set up a counterfeit service, the difference between the old and the new views was found merely in the fact that the supporters of the old view did not connect these two points with Dan 8:11-13. Both interpretational groups recognized that the OT usage of the term *tāmîd* differed from its use in the book of Daniel. The basic difference was how the two groups solved and answered this problem. One group simply excluded the OT background using just similar NT passages for the interpretation, whereas the other group based their interpretation mainly on this OT background.

Although the supporters of the old view claimed to be the successors of the Millerite interpreters in regard to the *tāmîd*, they did not continue to believe in every aspect of the Millerite interpretation. It has been shown, on the other hand, that the new interpretation held in common with some individuals who promoted erroneous views, the same or similar exegetical basis, namely that the Hebrew term *tamid* had a cultic context. These erroneous views, as for example, the Antiochus Epiphanes theory, the recalculations of the time prophecies and subsequent continued time settings, and the idea that the Jews would return to Palestine, were all clearly rejected by the Millerites and the early Seventh-day Adventists. Since the early proponents of the new view (e.g., Crosier) agreed with those erroneous views in their emphasis on the word “sacrifice” in the Danielic text, all these interpretations were rejected by the “paganism view” interpreters because the word does not exist in the Hebrew text.

It has been shown that, especially starting with the controversial period, Adventist supporters of the “paganism view” relied heavily on the writings of the Millerite and early Sabbatarian writers, as well as on a statement made by Ellen White in 1850, without

giving much study to the biblical text itself. It is also apparent that even prior to the controversial period there was not much study done on that matter.

Although the supporters of the old view were proud to “hold fast to the faith as first delivered,” the contenders of the new view were proud to base their beliefs solely on the Bible.¹¹⁴ There apparently existed only two kinds of critics: one that criticized everything that did not seem to be in harmony with Ellen White’s writings, and another that appeared to suggest that her writings cannot be relied upon to settle matters of biblical exegesis and interpretation.¹¹⁵ Some applied only a paraenetic rather than a doctrinal function to her writings. There were even some contenders of the new view who went even further, openly rejecting other Adventist teachings. This fact may have caused uneasiness with the new view because it was not clear where this process of change would lead and stop.

Some members of the new view group presented themselves in a self-opiniated and arrogant way, opposing the old view as something that was totally absurd. Their agitation of the matter caused church members to question the authority and integrity of Ellen White’s writings, of God’s leading of this church, and of some other doctrines. Their opponents felt hurt, and considering themselves as the “keepers of the flame” and the fighters for the inherited truths, they reacted in sharp and inappropriate manners. When comparing both views it seems that the real issue was not so much the differences

¹¹⁴Cf. Starr, September 1930, 3, and Conradi, April 16, 1907, 1.

¹¹⁵Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 19.

in opinion but rather the behavior and the way they treated one another that made an agreement or reconciliation almost impossible.¹¹⁶

Although the arguments of the Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist writers have been examined in this chapter, it will be necessary to look at and analyze Ellen White's statement in the following chapter.

¹¹⁶Moon, W. C. *White and Ellen G. White*, 421.

CHAPTER IV

AN ASSESSMENT OF ELLEN WHITE'S STATEMENTS

Proponents of the old view have frequently quoted a statement which Ellen White wrote in 1850 in support of their interpretation of the *tāmîd* in Dan 8 as Roman paganism.¹ In the eyes of the old view supporters, supporters of the new view rejected that statement or attempted to explain it away somehow. They were thus viewed as undermining the authority of the testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy. The following section will give several explanations of that statement that have been offered by different individuals through the years. The second section will analyze the controversial statement itself. This section will examine statements made by Ellen White regarding the controversial statement as well as on the whole issue during the time of conflict. This section will also provide a historical background for the controversial statement. The third section will evaluate the explanations offered in the first section based on the results of the analysis of the second section.

Explanations Offered

Various interpretations have been offered for Ellen White's statement, focusing on different parts of the quotation. These attempts to explain the statement have

¹Ellen G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," 86-87, republished amongst others in Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000), 74, 75.

oftentimes been influenced by the individual's presuppositions, namely their personal interpretation of the *tāmîd*. Several of these explanations will be given as follows:

1. Some writers focused on the two aspects that the Lord directed the 1843 chart and that those who gave the judgment hour cry (before 1844) were united on the correct view of the "daily." Because the Millerite leaders interpreted the "daily" unanimously as Roman paganism, their interpretation should be considered as the "correct view."²

2. Heidi Heiks focused on the aspect of time, the supplied word "sacrifice," and the existing union before 1844. He suggested that the union existed on the time period, whereas the "correct view" referred to the fact that the word "sacrifice" had been added.³ He concluded that Ellen White was "at odds" with Miller's interpretation of the "daily" after comparing it to her statements on the daily ministration of the OT priests and Christ.⁴ He reasoned that her advice to Haskell, Loughborough, and Smith not to use her writings in support of their views should be understood as proof that she did not share their interpretation.⁵

3. W. H. Wakeham stated that the existing confusion had nothing to do with the term the *tāmîd* but with the time period connected with it. Many tried to readjust the periods as to set new times for Christ's second coming. Thus the "correct view" referred solely to the correct understanding of the prophetic time periods.⁶

²Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," 9, 10; Haskell, March 22, 1908; Wieland, *Have We Followed "Cunningly Devised Fables"?*, 6, 8, 12, 27, 28.

³Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 44, 45.

⁴*Ibid.*, 11, 12, 29, 30.

⁵*Ibid.*, 32.

⁶Wakeham, 51.

4. Ludwig Richard Conradi stated that the correct view embraced two points: first, the word “sacrifice” being supplied, and second, the 2,300 years being finished on October 22, 1844.⁷

5. O. A. Johnson argued that the “correct view” would embrace three points, namely, the word “sacrifice” had been supplied, the time period was right, and the Millerite interpretation of the “daily.”⁸

An Analysis of the Controversial Statement and Its Historical Context

The existence of such diverse interpretations of her statement call for a more thorough analysis of its content and its context. The text of the controversial statements as found in the *Early Writings*, pp. 74-76, is provided below. The passage is presented with divisions made for the different sections based on the flow of thoughts and topics in the text.

[1] September 23, the Lord showed me that He had stretched out His hand the second time to recover the remnant of His people, and that efforts must be redoubled in this gathering time. In the scattering, Israel was smitten and torn, but now in the gathering time God will heal and bind up His people. In the scattering, efforts made to spread the truth had but little effect, accomplished but little or nothing; but in the gathering, when God has set His hand to gather His people, efforts to spread the truth will have their designed effect. All should be united and zealous in the work. I saw that it was wrong for any to refer to the scattering for examples to govern us now in the gathering; for if God should do no more for us now than He did then, Israel would never be gathered.

[2] I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as He wanted them; that His hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until His hand was removed.

⁷Conradi, April 17, 1906, 7, 8.

⁸Ibid.

[3] Then 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. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the “daily”; but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed.

[3] Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test. The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, but it must not be hung on time. I saw that some were getting a false excitement, arising from preaching time; but the third angel’s message is stronger than time can be. I saw that this message can stand on its own foundation and needs not time to strengthen it; and that it will go in mighty power, and do its work, and will be cut short in righteousness.

[4] Then I was pointed to some who are in the great error of believing that it is their duty to go to Old Jerusalem, and think they have a work to do there before the Lord comes. Such a view is calculated to take the mind and interest from the present work of the Lord, under the message of the third angel; for those who think that they are yet to go to Jerusalem will have their minds there, and their means will be withheld from the cause of present truth to get themselves and others there. I saw that such a mission would accomplish no real good, that it would take a long while to make a very few of the Jews believe even in the first advent of Christ, much more to believe in His second advent. I saw that Satan had greatly deceived some in this thing and that souls all around them in this land could be helped by them and led to keep the commandments of God, but they were leaving them to perish. I also saw that Old Jerusalem never would be built up; and that Satan was doing his utmost to lead the minds of the children of the Lord into these things now, in the gathering time, to keep them from throwing their whole interest into the present work of the Lord, and to cause them to neglect the necessary preparation for the day of the Lord.⁹

The references to historical events and theological developments make it necessary to look not merely at this statement itself, but as well at Ellen White’s own comments on that statement and the historical circumstances at the transition from the Millerite period to the early Sabbatarian period.

⁹Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*, 74, 75.

An Analysis of the Statement

The topics mentioned in the above statement are interrelated but they are distinguished at this point for a clearer understanding. These topics are as follows: (1) the gathering time; (2) the 1843 chart; (3) the daily; (4) time setting; (5) journey to Jerusalem.¹⁰ These will be dealt with separately in the following subsections.

The Gathering Time

After the great disappointment the Millerites had been scattered into different groups with more and more divisions springing up. During the time of 1844-1846 it was difficult to find two believers who were united. The work of spreading the message among the former Millerites was very difficult. This time was called the scattering time. The “gathering time” constituted the following period when a little group emerged around the Sabbath truth, the new understanding of the heavenly sanctuary, and the guidance of the prophetic gift. This was the time when the preaching and spreading of “the truth” was effective and relevant.¹¹

The 1843 Chart

Ellen White talked about a specific chart generated in 1843, and that the generation of this chart was “directed by the hand of the Lord.” The figures were as God

¹⁰Cf. Julia Neuffer, “The Gathering of Israel: A Historical Study of Early Writings, pp. 74—76” (Ellen G. White Estate Research Document), 1; Carnegie, 28; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 32.

¹¹Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*, 74.

wanted them although there was “a mistake in some of the figures.” That mistake was apparently seen when God’s hand was removed.¹²

The Daily

Ellen White stated she was shown in relation to the “daily” that the word “sacrifice” was supplied and did not exist in the original. Further, she stated that the Lord had given the “correct view of it” to those who preached the judgment message. The word “it” can refer to two things in the preceding part of the sentence, either generally to the “daily” or specifically to the fact that the word “sacrifice” had been added. Since the only information given in regard to the “daily” is the explanation of the supplied word “sacrifice,” it would seem natural to interpret the pronoun “it” as a reference to that explained part of the “daily.”¹³ However, the phrase “the correct view of the ‘daily’” in the next sentence parallels the phrase “the correct view of it.” These two sentences are framed by passages on the 1843 chart and the correctness of the prophetic date of 1844. Thus it seems likely that the word “it” also refers to the “daily” in general, rather than only on the aspect of the “sacrifice.” She stated that the “correct view” was present among those who gave the judgment hour cry, and that before 1844 all were united upon this “correct view.” The phrase “correct view” refers to two points, the knowledge about the wrong supplying of the word “sacrifice” and the calculation of the prophetic time periods that led to 1844. In her understanding, the term “daily” was apparently closely

¹²Ibid.

¹³Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 18, stated that the supporters of the old view understood Ellen White’s statement literally while the promulgators of the new interpretation emphasized the context. Yet, a really literal reading of the statement does not support the old view.

linked to these two points. The second part of the sentence is introduced with a “but,” which shows that this part stands in an antithetical relation to the previous part. Accordingly the “other views” that have been embraced since 1844 and that resulted in confusion would constitute other views on the “daily.” The return of the Jews to Jerusalem is an example for such views that created confusion.¹⁴ The passages themselves do not contain a statement about the historical fulfillment of the “daily” and the taking away of it. Although the phrase “correct view” refers definitely to the time part and the sacrifice matter, it could also refer to a specific interpretation of the “daily” by these people prior to 1844. Yet, since she did not mention such an interpretation, the statement does not necessarily include an identification of the daily.

Time Setting

Although certain people were apparently starting to set new times, Ellen White was shown that the 1844 date should remain unchanged. Prior to October 22, 1844, the prophetic date was a central point of their message but now the third angel’s message (Rev 14:9-12) should be preached to gather the believers. This message should no longer be connected to a fixed time period. Thus this section is connected to the sections about the gathering time, the 1843 chart, as well as the “daily.”¹⁵

Journey to Jerusalem

This section is apparently connected to the first section about the gathering time. Ellen White mentioned that these people who wanted to go to the Old Jerusalem would

¹⁴Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*, 74, 75.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 75.

be distracted from the necessary work of preaching the third angel's message. Whereas they should partake in the gathering activity, they would, however, continue to scatter. Although not explicitly stated, it is possible that the sections on the "daily" and on the journey to Jerusalem are also connected. This is because the word "sacrifice" formed a basis for the idea that the temple at Jerusalem would be built up again.¹⁶

Statements Made by Ellen White in the Context of the Daily

It has been shown that the different parts of the above statement are interconnected. They point to the historical events around 1850, that is, the need of preaching the third angel's message to gather the believers who have been distracted and confused through continued time setting and ideas to travel to Palestine. The correct view on the "daily" was apparently a necessary point to recognize these distractions as such. The following two subsections show statements Ellen White made directly in regard to her 1850 statement and generally on the issue of the "daily" during the time of conflict.

Statements on the 1850 Statement

The passage in *Early Writings*, pp. 74-75, actually combined two visions and includes some additional notes.¹⁷ The first vision was from September 23, 1850, and dealt with the gathering of Israel, the dates of the 1843 chart, the "daily" and time setting, and the error of going to Jerusalem.¹⁸ The second vision was given on June 21, 1851, and had to do with the third angel's message and continued time setting. When the book *A Sketch*

¹⁶Ibid., 75, 76.

¹⁷Neuffer, 1.

¹⁸Ellen G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," 86-87.

of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White was first published in August 1851, a part of the second vision was inserted.¹⁹ Further, some notes were added such as a reference on the idea of going to Jerusalem and a statement that the “Old Jerusalem” would not be built up again. With some minor editorial corrections the whole text was reprinted in *Early Writings* in 1882.²⁰

In 1909, when Arthur G. Daniells asked Ellen White about her 1850 statement, she recalled that “some of the leaders who had been in the 1844 movement endeavored to find new dates for the termination of the 2300 year period ... for the coming of the Lord.”²¹ Whereas this caused confusion among those who had taken part in the Millerite movement, the Lord showed her that the old dates were correct for the 2,300 days and should not be revised to set new times for the Second Advent.²² When asked about the “daily,” it being taken away, the casting down of the sanctuary, etc., she replied that “these features were not placed before her in vision as the time part was,” and that she did not want to provide an explanation of those points.²³ At another time she said, “I do not

¹⁹Ellen G. White, *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: James White, 1851), 61, 62.

²⁰Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*, 74; cf. Neuffer, 1.

²¹Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily,” quoted in Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 33, 34. The content of the interview was apparently written down on September 25, 1931 (DF 201b, EGWE-GC).

²²Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*, 243; Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily”; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 423.

²³Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily”; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 423.

know what the daily is, whether it is paganism or Christ's ministry. . . . That was not the thing that was shown me."²⁴

It is apparent that when asked about her 1850 statement on the "daily," she always pointed to the aspect of the settled prophetic time periods and dates as well as the renewed time setting after 1844. In her thinking the "daily" was a kind of concept that was always related to the time periods but apparently never to the specific identification of the "daily." Therefore if the pronoun "it" or the phrase "correct view" in her 1850 statement would refer to the paganism interpretation of the "daily," Ellen White would have contradicted herself, for the Lord would have shown her the "correct view" of the "daily" while later she denied such a fact.²⁵

Statements Regarding the Controversy

Ellen White stated several times that she was not given any instruction or "special light on the point under discussion."²⁶ Since she had no special insight into the matter, she refused the use of her writings in support of either view.

I entreat of . . . our leading brethren, that they make no reference to my writings to sustain their views of "the daily." . . . I cannot consent that any of my writings be taken as settling this matter. . . . I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question.²⁷

²⁴Schwarz, 399.

²⁵Neuffer, 12.

²⁶Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20—A Call to the Watchmen," 1910, 5, 6; idem, *Notebook Leaflets from the Elmshaven Library* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1945), 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958), 1:164; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; cf. Arthur L. White, *The Ellen G. White Writings* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1973), 61; cf. Douglass, 419.

²⁷Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 5, 6; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164; cf. Schwarz, 399; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 422.

She saw “no need for the controversy” and the whole discussion, since it appeared to be a subject of “minor importance,” or not of “vital importance.”²⁸ Its discussion would only make “a mountain out of a molehill.”²⁹ The difference between the views was not as important as some portrayed it, and its magnification would constitute a big mistake.³⁰ The differences of opinion should not be made prominent.³¹ If the matter would be introduced into the churches, the disagreement caused on this point would make the whole matter even worse.³² Would the issue of the “daily” be agitated, the following results could be seen:

1. People would be exposed to questions that would not confirm their faith in the truth but cause confusion, unbelief, temptation, and the unsettling of their minds. That could lead “to the making of rash moves.” All that would especially be the case with such who were not yet “thoroughly converted.”³³

²⁸Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 9:106; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164; cf. Arthur L. White, *The Ellen G. White Writings*, 61; Schwarz, 399; idem, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 422.

²⁹Arthur L. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 10:334; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248, 250.

³⁰Ellen G. White, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164.

³¹Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 423; Schwarz, 399.

³²Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225.

³³*Ibid.*, 12:223-225, 9:107; idem, *Manuscript Releases* (Silver Spring, Md.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1993), 20:21, 22; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:251.

2. People would be occupied by this “unnecessary controversy,” and diverted from the necessary searching for “true conversion of heart and life,” as well as for a “secure sanctification of soul and mind.”³⁴

3. The leading brethren would be diverted from the “great questions that should be the burden of our message.”³⁵

4. The work of the Lord—evangelistic work especially in the large cities—would be delayed and hindered.³⁶

5. Some people who were unfavorably looking at the Adventist work would get the opportunity to present the whole matter of doctrinal difference in a way that the impression is left on minds “that we are not led by God.” Statements would be produced that could easily be misused to injure the Adventist cause.³⁷

That is why it was not “profitable ... to spend so much time and attention in its consideration.”³⁸ The whole matter was not a test question, and should not have been

³⁴Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225. Although Daniells had pledged to lay large plans for evangelism at the 1909 General Conference Session, he finally spent most of the time in defending the new interpretation of the *tāmîd*. See Lyndon de Witt, “Preach, Preacher, Preach,” *Ministry*, June 1976, 10.

³⁵Ellen G. White, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165.

³⁶Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; cf. Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells,” 2; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 422, 423.

³⁷Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 107, 20:21; idem, “Pamphlet 20,” 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250, 251.

³⁸Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; cf. Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells,” 2, 3.

regarded as such.³⁹ Rather, God wanted to have the leading brethren and pastors focus on other things. According to Ellen G. White, focus should be spent on things such as:

1. Instead of focusing on such “jots and titles,” pastors should rather devote their time in training their church members on how to teach others the simple and saving truth for this time.⁴⁰

2. The pastors should talk in an earnest, simple, easy, and clear manner about the “sacred truths,” the “testing truths,” “the binding claims of the law of God,” and “vital subjects that can be easily understood.”⁴¹

3. They should try to show unity and speak the same things so far as possible rather than reveal “a marked difference of opinion.”⁴²

4. It would be wiser for them to speak words that would confirm the believers in their faith.⁴³

5. Their first work should be to humble themselves and be reconverted so that the angels of God could cooperate with them and make a “sacred impression” upon their coworkers’ minds.⁴⁴

³⁹Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 6, 7; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164, 165; cf. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 422.

⁴⁰Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.

⁴¹Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 11; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:160, 161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167.

⁴²Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223, 9:105, 106; idem, “Pamphlet 20,” 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:160, 161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250, 251; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 3.

⁴³Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 225.

⁴⁴Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

Reading the above warnings and counsels one could conclude that the matter of the “daily” or *tāmīd* should not be studied at all since it is not really important. However, that would be a selective use of the sources. She made other statements where she stated explicitly her desire that the contending parties should have come together, study the issue on the basis of the Bible, and come to an agreement.⁴⁵ Thus there was a place for the study of that matter. Yet, what she repeatedly regretted was the fact that the people involved in the conflict had gone so far as to surmise evil against each other. They were unwilling to give up their preconceived opinions and study the matter together with members of the other group.⁴⁶ The atmosphere of the conflict already portrayed in the previous chapter supports her statements. Apparently the real problem was not so much the topic of the “daily” itself but the way the leading brethren had handled the matter and treated each other.⁴⁷ Therefore the point lying at the heart of the issue was a spiritual problem, namely, irreconcilability, unwillingness to study and talk, and a deportment that was unbecoming for Christians.⁴⁸ That explains why, when stating that it is unwise to agitate this matter, she frequently used such phrases as “now,” “at this time,” and “at this point of our history.”⁴⁹

⁴⁵Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223; cf. Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells,” 1, 2; idem, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 3.

⁴⁶Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells,” 2; idem, *Ellen G. White*, 6:251.

⁴⁷Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223; idem, “Pamphlet 20,” 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168; cf. Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 3.

⁴⁸Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells,” 2.

⁴⁹Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 11; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250.

While studying Ellen White's statements on the matter of the "daily," some scholars have drawn various conclusions that deserve to be mentioned and evaluated at this point.

1. Some suggested that Ellen White's prohibition to use her writings to settle the question of the "daily" indicated that she generally rejected any authority of her writings in doctrinal matters.⁵⁰ However, it should be noted that the reason she gave for being unwilling to make definite statements on the "daily" was that she had not been given any instruction. She was unwilling to settle the matter by mere guessing without having a clear word from God. There were other instances where she did not want to give a final word on the respective issue.⁵¹ The reason was again that she had not received any clear instruction from God.⁵² Yet, there were times when she did receive clear instructions on doctrinal matters to settle a doctrinal controversy.⁵³ At other times she shaped the

⁵⁰See Desmond Ford, "Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment," DF 990-b, EGWSC-BS, 1980, 12, 15, 606, 616; Ron Graybill, "The Power of Prophecy: Ellen White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century," (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1983), 113-135; Graeme S. Bradford, *Prophets Are Human* (Victoria, Australia: Signs Publishing Company, 2004), 50, 51, 61; idem, *More Than a Prophet* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Biblical Perspectives, 2006), 125. Other writers clearly point out the impact Ellen White had in doctrinal developments, although there still remains some ambivalence about the authority of her writings in doctrinal matters. See Knight, *A Search for Identity*, 127; Rolf J. Pöhler, "Adventisten, Ellen White und das Sola-Scriptura-Prinzip," *Spes Christiana* 17 (2006): 86-89; idem, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 232, 233.

⁵¹Such examples were, e.g., the identity of the 144,000, the law in Galatians, or the identification of the king of the north of Dan 11:40-45. See Robert W. Olson, *101 Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981), 42; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 415, 416; Gerhard Pfandl, *The Gift of Prophecy: The Role of Ellen White in God's Remnant Church* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2008), 80; Denis Kaiser, "Daniel 11:40-45 in Adventist Perspective: A Historical Survey and Evaluation" (Term paper, Andrews University, 2008), 1, 6, 7. While Ellen White had first rejected to identify the law in the book of Galatians, she later stated that it is both laws, "the ceremonial and the moral code of ten commandments." Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 1:233-235.

⁵²Arthur L. White, *The Ellen G. White Writings*, 60.

⁵³John H. Kellogg's pantheistic views about the Godhead, A. F. Ballenger's ideas on the sanctuary, and the theology of the holy flesh movement in Indiana were only some prominent examples. See Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 1:200, 2:31; idem, *Manuscript Release No. 760: The Integrity of*

church's understanding of certain doctrinal matters, or received visions that confirmed the conclusions reached by Bible study.⁵⁴ Thus she intended her writings "to settle doctrinal issues in the church on those points where God had given her light."⁵⁵ Thus while much of her writings are pastoral in nature, their meaning goes beyond that and they are authoritative also in doctrinal matters.⁵⁶ She nevertheless pointed to the study of the Bible as the source of doctrines. While the writings of Ellen White should not be used

the Sanctuary Truth (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981), 4, 10, 19; cf. "The Role of the Ellen G. White Writings in Doctrinal Matters," *Ministry* 53, no. 10 (1980): 57; Olson, 45; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 5:398-413; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 425, 426; Pfandl, *The Gift of Prophecy*, 79.

⁵⁴She had an impact on the church's understanding of Christ's eternal, self-existent, and underived nature, the biblical understanding of the divine Trinity. She further confirmed and made contributions to the Adventist sanctuary doctrine, the Sabbath as the seal of God, etc. See LeRoy Edwin Froom, "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act," *Ministry* 30, no. 2 (1957), 11; Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 2:38; Erwin R. Gane, "The Arian or Anti-Trinitarian Views Presented in Seventh-day Adventist Literature and the Ellen G. White Answer" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1962); "The Role of the Ellen G. White Writings in Doctrinal Matters," 57; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 5:410; Roy E. Graham, *Ellen G. White: Co-Founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion, vol. 12 (New York: Peter Lang, 1985), 415; Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 1993), 107-109, 154; Merlin D. Burt, "Demise of Semi-Arianism and Anti-Trinitarianism in Adventist Theology (1888-1957)" (Term paper, Andrews University, 1996); Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon and John W. Reeve, *The Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2002), 190-220; Jerry Moon, "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 2: The Role of Ellen G. White," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41, no. 2 (2003): 275-293; Michael Dörnbrack, "Die Rolle Ellen Whites bei der Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre in der Adventgemeinde: Aussagen, Auswirkungen und Reaktionen" (Term paper, Theologische Hochschule Friedensau, 2004); Merlin D. Burt, "History of the Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 125-139; Denis Fortin, "God, the Trinity, and Adventism: An Introduction to the Issues," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 4-10; Pfandl, *The Gift of Prophecy*, 79; Denis Kaiser, "The Holy Spirit and the Hermeneutical Approach in Modern Adventist Anti-Trinitarian Literature" (Term paper, Andrews University, 2008), 34-38, 42-46, 48-50; idem, "A Forgotten Chapter of European Adventist History: Ellen White's Life of Christ" (Term paper, Andrews University, 2008), 6-8. For confirmatory visions during the early years of the Advent movement see Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts* (Battle Creek, Mich.: James White, 1860), 2:47-49; idem, *Testimonies for the Church* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2002), 75-87; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:206, 207; idem, *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2003), 24-26.

⁵⁵Olson, 45.

⁵⁶Denis Fortin, "Ellen G. White as Messenger of the Lord: What Else Could Dr. Smithurst Say?," in *"Ellen White and Current Issues" Symposium* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, 2005), 1:19-26; Pfandl, *The Gift of Prophecy*, 78-80.

as the basis of doctrine, they have nevertheless the purpose of guiding in understanding the teachings of the Bible and the application of these teachings.

2. Her statements on Jesus' and the OT priest's daily ministration were interpreted as an affirmation of the new view, and as a rejection of Miller's interpretation of the *tāmîd* as paganism.⁵⁷ Those statements were, however, made in the context of the OT sacrificial system and of Christ's heavenly priesthood as described in the book of Hebrews rather than in reference to Dan 8. Miller agreed that the OT priests were undertaking daily services while he did not yet understand that there is a sanctuary in heaven. There is no contradiction between the statements made by Ellen White and William Miller. However, to suggest that she had some knowledge on the matter, while she claimed she had none and did not understand the problem at all, would cause a contradiction between her own statements.

3. Since she asked brethren Haskell, Loughborough, and Smith not to use her writings to support their ideas, some argued that she therefore clearly indicated her opposition to their interpretation of the *tāmîd*.⁵⁸ Yet, such a reasoning would put statements in her mouth that would contradict each other since she denied knowing anything about the "daily" matter when, of course, she would have known something. Further, it is important to point out that she not only carried decided messages to the supporters of the old view but as well to the supporters of the new view. For example, although she told Haskell that Satan would use his mistake of re-circulating the 1843

⁵⁷Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 11, 12, 29, 30.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 32.

chart to create confusion and division among the leading workers of the church,⁵⁹ she warned Prescott and Daniells that they were in danger of “weaving into their experience sentiments of a spiritualistic appearance ... that would deceive, if possible, the very elect.”⁶⁰ She had to tell Prescott that he was “not beyond the danger of making mistakes.” He would sway from clearly defined points of truth, and give too much attention to items that do not need to be handled at all, and that were “not essential for the salvation of the soul.”⁶¹

Since she had not been given any instruction on the matter, and the leading brethren were not in the spiritual condition to get together to settle the problem through the study of the Bible, its presentation would have only a destructive influence so that, under those conditions, it would be better to be silent on the matter.⁶²

The Historical Background of the Statement

Other pieces needed to reconstruct the context of the 1850 statement are the historical background, the historical events, and theological developments. The following subsections will give such information arranged according to the five sections of the 1850 passage.

⁵⁹Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250, 251. See also Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 423, for a plain rebuke to Leon Smith who had condemned his brethren and their beliefs in a tract.

⁶⁰Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-226, 20:21, 22.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 10:334, 359; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248.

⁶²Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 6, 13; *idem*, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159, 161; *idem*, *Selected Messages*, 1:164, 168; *idem*, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 20:18; cf. Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:250.

The Gathering Time

The period between 1844 and 1847 was marked by various divisions and splits. These were not only manifested by different bodies or groups but also by contending theological solutions for the disappointment of October 22, 1844. These differing paths led some groups into such extremes that these groups totally disintegrated. Other groups were split into still further smaller divisions.⁶³

The term “gathering time” refers to the gathering of former Millerites to a group that was characterized by the integration of three new aspects: the seventh-day Sabbath, the new sanctuary understanding, and the prophetic role of Ellen White. During this period renewed evangelistic activities (reaching former Millerites) could be recognized by the members of that group. The preaching of the third angel’s message included the Sabbath, the sanctuary message, and the spirit of prophecy. Further, that group held fast to the October 22, 1844, date, and criticized the continued time setting of other groups.⁶⁴

The 1843 Chart

In the first section of the first chapter it has already been pointed out that although several prophetic charts existed, specific reference was always made to a chart that had been generated by Charles Fitch and Apollos Hale in 1842, and that gave 1843 as the end of the 2,300 years. Although both Fitch and Hale argued for the *tāmîd* being Roman paganism in their other writings, their 1843 chart no longer contained an identification of the *tāmîd* or the note that the number 666 of Rev 13 constituted the years of Roman

⁶³Burt, “The Historical Background, Interconnected Development,” 60-272.

⁶⁴Ibid., 273-389.

paganism's reign. The date AD 508 for the taking away of the "daily" and the beginning of the 1,290 years and the 1,335 years was retained but no identification or further explanation for the "daily" was provided.⁶⁵ Besides some erroneous ways of reckoning (seven times, etc.), the Millerites recognized that the reckoning of the 1843 date had been subject to a mistake. While that "mistake" was corrected in 1844, the cause for the disappointment of October 22, 1844, was found in the wrong interpretation of the term "sanctuary" in Dan 8:14. Afterwards, Sabbatarian Adventists frequently pointed out that the reckoning of the October 22, 1844, date was correct, and should not be changed.

The Daily

While it has been shown in this study that most of the Millerites were united on the identification of the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism, it was also shown that they were unanimously united on the 1844 date as well as on the fact that the word "sacrifice" was supplied and did not exist in the Hebrew text.⁶⁶ This was, in fact, the most important argument since all the other interpretations of Dan 8 considered "the daily sacrifice" as referring to the Jewish sacrifices.⁶⁷ After the great disappointment of October 22, 1844,

⁶⁵Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," 10. Loughborough suggested that Ellen White's reference to the 1843 chart was proof of the correctness of the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd*.

⁶⁶Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 34; idem, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy*, 81; idem, *Prophetic Expositions*, 1:127; Miller, "A Lecture," 6; idem, "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming," August 31, 1842, 172; idem, "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming," November 23, 1842, 3; idem, *Miller's Works*, 1:48; "Review of Dowling's Reply to Miller," 175; Himes, 189; Hale, 64; Storrs, 43, 111, 112; Starkweather, 37; Southard, "The Daily," 52; cf. Carnegie, 18, 19; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Neuffer, 12; Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 66.

⁶⁷Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming*, 33, 34; Miller, "A Lecture," 6; idem, "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming," August 31, 1842, 172; William Miller, "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming," November 23, 1842, 3; idem, *Miller's Works*, 1:48, 2:296; Storrs, 112. See also Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 33, for other reasons of Miller's opposition against the view that the *tāmîd* could denote the Jewish sacrificial system.

different individuals and groups emerged who questioned the former convictions and calculations and oftentimes identified the *tāmîd* as Jewish sacrifices.⁶⁸ That provided the foundation for renewed time settings and the idea that the Jews would return to Palestine to reinstitute the sacrificial system.⁶⁹ Loughborough remembered later that some groups after the disappointment redefined the *tāmîd* as meaning the “Jewish sacrifices.”⁷⁰ They did, according to him, first focus on AD 31 as the point of commencement for the 1,290 and 1,335 years. When that did not result in a satisfying date, they started to reckon with AD 70 but did not reach a significant date either. Then Loughborough suggested that they finally interpret the *tāmîd* as Christ’s continual offering in our behalf.⁷¹ The redefinition of the “daily” as sacrifices was accompanied by a rejection of the old-time calculations and a continued setting of new times.

⁶⁸“Interpretation of Symbols,” 36; Berwick, 82; Cummings, 3, 7; cf. Carnegie, 31; Neuffer, 12.

⁶⁹John Fondey, “The Twenty-Three Hundred Days,” *Bible Examiner*, November 1848, 175, 176; Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5, 35, 36; idem, *The Time of the End*; Cummings, 246; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11-13; Carnegie, 31-33; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Burnside, 3; Neuffer, 12; Arano, 5; Heiks, 41.

⁷⁰Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; cf. Carnegie, 32, 33; Arano, 6; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 40.

⁷¹Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10. He rejected this idea because (1) Christ was offered only once and not continuously, (2) the “mystery of iniquity” was already at work in Paul’s days, and (3) the loss of faith in Christ’s sacrifice has been a gradual process and did not take place at a “definite date.” Further, of course, he rejected it because he believed that Ellen White had affirmed the Millerite position.

Time Setting

The vision (September 23, 1850) on which the 1850 article was based was followed by another vision that dealt with the third angel's message and the continued time setting (June 21, 1851).⁷²

James White made a similar statement as his wife at around the same time: "Since the 2300 days ended in 1844, quite a number of *times* have been set, by different individuals for their termination. In doing this they have removed the 'landmarks' and have thrown *darkness* and doubt over the whole advent movement."⁷³ One month later he criticized again the renewed time setting, pointing to the fact that the 457 BC date as point of commencement for the 2,300 years is immovable.⁷⁴

With this clearly ascertained *date* for the commencement of the main pillar of the 'original' Advent faith, lecturers went forth *united to give the judgment hour cry*. This was the *date* written upon the '*chronological chart* of the visions of Daniel and John, [1843 chart], published by J. V. Himes, 14 Devonshire St.'⁷⁵

Both of James White's statements show striking terminological similarities to his wife's statement from November 1850. He suggested that the 457 and 1844 dates should not be changed, and that the setting of new dates after 1844 generated confusion among the Advent believers. Joseph Bates also mentioned that many of the former Millerite

⁷²Neuffer, 12.

⁷³James White, "Comments on Brother Miller's Dream," 74 (emphasis supplied); cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 37.

⁷⁴James White, "Our Present Position," December 1850, 13.

⁷⁵Ibid. (emphasis supplied); cf. Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 51, 52.

leaders were now continuously setting times.⁷⁶ The time settings of the following years were nearly all based on changes in the dating of the 2,300 years.⁷⁷

J. N. Loughborough recalled later that after the great disappointment some Millerite groups continued to set times for the second coming of Christ by removing the former dates.⁷⁸ He confirmed that the confusion was caused by those who continued to set times, and that they based their new calculations on a redefined view of the *tāmîd*.⁷⁹ Loughborough reported that in 1852 he had the opportunity to talk to O. R. L. Crosier who claimed that the 2,300 days and other prophetic periods “would not terminate until 1909.”⁸⁰ There were, however, other people also who rather than redefining the *tāmîd* continued to interpret it as Roman paganism. They simply changed the starting point for the taking away of the *tāmîd*, and thereby set new times for Christ’s second coming.⁸¹

Journey to Jerusalem

As already shown in the first chapter several individuals and groups concluded that the Jews would return to Palestine, rebuild the temple, and re-establish the sacrificial services.⁸² At least a few of those individuals based that idea on the view that the “daily

⁷⁶Bates, “The Laodicean Church,” 7; cf. Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 42.

⁷⁷Neuffer, 12.

⁷⁸Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10; cf. Carnegie, 32, 33; Arano, 6; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 40.

⁷⁹Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10.

⁸⁰Loughborough, “Other Views of the 1,290 and 1,355 Days,” 26.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 25, 26.

⁸²Fonday, 175, 176; Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5, 35, 36; *idem*, *The Time of the End*; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11-13; Carnegie, 31-33; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Burnside, 3; Neuffer, 12; Arano, 5; Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book*, 41.

sacrifice” of Dan 8 would constitute the Jewish sacrifices.⁸³ A few considered it even as their duty to go to Jerusalem to preach the message to Jews, although not all of them redefined the *tāmîd*.⁸⁴

An Evaluation of the Offered Explanations

Investigators need to be aware of the danger to read back modern views into old documents although similar concepts may be addressed and the same terminology used. This point will become clear when the explanations offered by various scholars and presented above will be evaluated in this section.

1. Whereas interpreters throughout the different periods presented in this study used the term *tāmîd* in the context of the book of Daniel, they did not always fill it with the same meaning. Supporters of the old view considered this term almost as an abbreviation for the paganism view. When Ellen White used the term it was in the background of certain interpretations (continued time setting, and journey to Jerusalem) that were derived from the word “sacrifice” that had been added to the word “daily” by the translators of the Bible. Although prior to the great disappointment of 1844 almost all Millerite interpreters interpreted the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism, they also agreed on the termination of the prophetic times in 1844 and clearly pointed out that the word “sacrifice” was added and not found in the Hebrew text. Although this fact provided one basic element for their interpretation, it was also a defense against other interpretations

⁸³“Interpretation of Symbols,” 36; Berwick, 82; Cummings, 3, 7, 246; cf. Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 11-13; Carnegie, 31-33; Neufeld and Neuffer, 10:368; Burnside, 3; Neuffer, 12; Arano, 5; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 41.

⁸⁴Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 13; Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5; idem, *The Time of the End*; cf. Carnegie, 33; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 41.

such as the Antiochus Epiphanes theory. The knowledge of the fact that the word “sacrifice” was added served also as a defense against the renewed calculations for Christ’s coming and the whole renewing of the old Jerusalem idea. Both views were based on the narrow emphasis of the word “sacrifice” referring to the Jewish sacrifices. Thus Ellen White’s reference to the word “sacrifice” cut at the root of the problem. Her use of the word “daily” constitutes a broad concept that includes several things which are related to this term in the biblical text, that is, the wrong adding of the word “sacrifice,” and the termination of the 2,300 years as well as the 1,335 years in 1843/44.

If she would have referred to the Roman paganism interpretation of the *tāmîd* when speaking about the “correct view,” then she contradicted herself when claiming later that the Lord had never shown her something in regard to the interpretation of the “daily” in Dan 8. Interpreters, who used her 1850 statement to support their view of the *tāmîd*, usually did so in an attempt to save the authority of her writings. Interpreting her phrase “correct view” as Roman paganism, they set her writings in an open contradiction that undermines her authority even more.

2. Although Heidi Heiks pointed out rightly that the phrase “correct view” refers to the fact that the word “sacrifice” was wrongly supplied by the translators, he misinterpreted her statements on the daily ministration of Christ and the OT priests by viewing them through the lens of the modern perspective of the new view. As has been shown in the first chapter, modern interpreters view Dan 8:9-14 as a point with connections to the OT sanctuary services as well as to the heavenly ministration of Christ. It needs to be noted, however, that not everyone who mentioned the daily services of the OT priests had the intention to also identify the *tāmîd* in Dan 8. Further, not

everyone who recognizes Christ as the heavenly high priest serving in the heavenly sanctuary, as depicted in the epistle to the Hebrews, wants to make a statement about the Danielic *tāmîd*. Whereas Ellen G. White firmly believed in the antitypical and typical sanctuary ministrations, she stated explicitly that she did not want to attempt to identify the Danielic “daily” for she had not been given any special light on it. To interpret her statements in this way, however, would set them in contradiction to her clear denial of any knowledge about the matter.

When suggesting that her criticism of Haskell and others would show that she disagreed with their interpretation, Heiks loses sight of her criticism towards the supporters of the new view. Since she criticized both parties for their behavior and deportment in the matter, no party could rightly claim these statements in support for their view. If Heiks’ suggestion would be true, this would mean again that she would have had some knowledge on the issue that she later denied to have had.

3. W. H. Wakeham apparently tried to take the issue with the *tāmîd* out of the conflict by stating that the “correct view” had nothing to do at all with the *tāmîd* or the “sacrifice” but only with the correct understanding of the prophetic time period. While Wakeham is right in his observation that the phrase “the correct view” was related to the termination of the prophetic time period in 1844, he overlooked that Ellen White spoke of the “correct view of the ‘daily,’” and that the matter of the supplied word “sacrifice” was mentioned “in relation to the ‘daily.’” Thus the “correct view” had something to do with the *tāmîd* and the “sacrifice.”

4. L. R. Conradi differed slightly from him and understood the phrase “correct view” as encompassing both aspects, the wrong supplying of the word “sacrifice” and the

right view on the time periods. Conradi correctly recognized that Ellen White's phrase "correct view" and her concept of the "daily" encompassed those two points. He also understood correctly that her statement could not be used in support of either view since she herself did not relate the term "daily" to any specific interpretation.

5. O. A. Johnson added one more aspect to Conradi's points, namely the Millerite interpretation of the "daily." Although Johnson correctly understood that Ellen White had a broader concept of the "daily" or the "correct view of the daily," he wrongly included a specific interpretation into the concept. However, to incorporate the Millerite view into the terms "daily" and "correct view" would set that statement again in contradiction to her later claim that she was not shown the true meaning of the "daily."

Conclusions

The examination of the statements Ellen White made in the context of the conflict over the "daily" and in regard to her controversial statement brought several results.

The often quoted statement from *Early Writings*, pp. 74-75, was originally made in 1850, and stands in the context of the so-called gathering time when the group of the Sabbatarian Adventists tried to preach the third angel's message to former Millerites to gather the remnant together. The time was marked by a confusion caused by renewed time settings by former Millerite leaders and by the idea promulgated by some that the people of Israel would return to Palestine with a reestablishment of the sacrificial services. Connected to this idea was the thought that it was the responsibility of the Christian believers to preach the gospel message to the Jews. Both issues, time setting and the return of the Jews, were more or less based on the interpretation of the *tāmîd* of Dan 8 as Jewish sacrifices. These groups and individuals either did not recognize that the

word “sacrifice” was supplied or they considered the sacrificial meaning to be implied in the word *hatāmîd*. Prior to the great disappointment, most of the Millerite leaders refuted various interpretations that were based on the identification of the *tāmîd* as Jewish sacrifices, by pointing out that the word “sacrifice” was added by the translators and was not a part of the Hebrew text. Further, the Millerites were united on the understanding of the prophetic time periods. They believed that the 2,300 years had commenced in 457 BC and would conclude in AD 1844. After the disappointment in the autumn of 1844, various Millerite groups departed from both points, the prophetic dates and the knowledge of the word “sacrifice” being supplied, to set new times for Christ’s coming and/or to refer to the return of the Jews that should occur prior to the second coming. Ellen White’s statement placed the finger directly at the heart of the matter. She later explained that the Lord had shown her nothing in regard to the taking away of the “daily,” or its identity. But she could still remember the problems present at that time, that is, continued time setting and believers who wanted to travel to Jerusalem. Considering her declaration, it only makes sense to interpret her phrase “correct view of the daily” only in reference to the termination of the prophetic time in 1844 and the adding of the word “sacrifice.” Thus the statement concerning the “daily” was only in reference to the fact that the word “sacrifice” had been added and that the calculation of the prophetic time periods was accurate and should not be changed. Only this interpretation of her 1850 statement allows her to be consistent when later she said she did not know the right interpretation of the “daily.” This contradicts the interpretations of the supporters of the old view (Haskell, Johnson, Swearingen, etc.) who tried to use that statement in their support. Neither can it be used in support of the new view (Heiks, etc.)

since that would set her statements in contradiction as well. It needs to be stated that the phrase “correct view” refers to the “daily” and to the word “sacrifice,” contrary to Wakeham who wanted to exclude both words totally from the “correct view.” Being aware of the unity that existed among the Millerites before 1844 and among the later Sabbatarian Adventists in regard to the prophetic date of 1844, Conradi and Johnson did correctly conclude that the aspect of the prophetic time belonged also to the “correct view.”

Since Ellen White herself did not know the meaning of the “daily,” and was not shown what the right meaning was, she demanded that the contending groups not use her writings in support of their views. To transform that statement made on that particular matter into a general principle that forbids the use of her writings in doctrinal matters would mean to isolate that statement totally from other statements where she confirmed certain doctrines or even formed Adventist thinking on certain biblical teachings. It could also be shown that some scholars interpreted some of her statements from a modern perspective to support their interpretation of the *tāmîd*. For example, statements in regard to the daily ministration of the OT priests or of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary must not necessarily stand in connection to Dan 8 but are just expositions of the OT services or the descriptions from the book of Hebrews or the Revelation. It is also necessary to note that she criticized not only one of the contending parties but members of both groups.

Although she considered the issue of the “daily” of no vital importance, she desired both groups to get together in order to study the matter on the basis of the Bible and to come to an agreement. She very much regretted that a meeting with such an outcome never materialized. The reason for the controversy and for the apparent

impossibility to solve the matter was spiritual. Ellen White clearly pointed out that the real problems were prejudices, evil surmising, animosity, irreconcilability, and unwillingness to give up preconceived opinions. Under such conditions every further word on the issue was making the situation and the condition of the church worse. Church members were confused, unsettled in their beliefs, and tempted to unbelief. The attention of the pastors was turned away from the really necessary things such as heart conversion, sanctification, and evangelistic work. Further, it would provide arguments for the critics of the Adventist church. Rather the pastors should themselves be reconverted and attempt to present the clear truths in a simple, understanding, and forcible way so that their church members would be confirmed in their faith. They should train their members how to do missionary work, and show a spirit of unity with their fellow pastors. If that would happen a spirit and atmosphere would be cultivated that would make a study of the matter possible. That explains why Ellen White oftentimes used such phrases as “now,” “at this time,” or “at this point of our history,” when pointing out that it was better to be silent on the topic. The underlying principle is that the healthy settling of a point of difference of opinion is only possible when every individual has the right inner attitude, namely one of humility, meekness, and charity.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

It was the purpose of the present study to examine the Millerite and Adventist interpretations of the term *hatāmîd* as used in Dan 8, during the time period between 1831 and 2008, with a special focus on the approach to the biblical text, the argumentation, and the atmosphere of the controversial time (1900–1930). Further, the puzzling statement that Ellen White made, as well as other statements made in connection with the controversy over the “daily,” was investigated. The results of this study will be presented as follows.

The Development of the Interpretations

The different periods were characterized by various dynamics and developments that are summarized according to their respective periods.

The Millerite Period (1831–1844)

The prevalent view during the Millerite period was the interpretation of the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism. That interpretation provided the basis for the calculations of several prophetic time periods (1,290, 1,335, and 2,300 years). On the other hand, the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd* was important to combat several views that reinterpreted the prophetic time periods, based on an emphasis of the supplied word “sacrifice” combined with the interpretation of the *tāmîd* from the OT sacrificial background. Millerite writers

considered the identification of the *tāmîd* as Christ’s mediatorial service merely as a minor variation of those interpretations, which they rejected.

The Early Seventh-day Adventist Period (1845–1900)

The first years of the early Adventist period were characterized by confusion due to the need of an explanation for the hoped-for but not-realized event of Christ’s second coming. Whereas former Millerite writers started to redefine the meaning of the *tāmîd* in order to recalculate the prophetic dates, early Sabbatarian Adventists held fast to the prophetic framework and the identification of the *tāmîd* as Roman paganism. Although they adopted Crosier’s reinterpretation of the “sanctuary” in Dan 8:14 as the heavenly sanctuary, they did not accept his identification of the *tāmîd* as Christ’s continual mediatorial service. Some scholars have interpreted such statements of an extended atonement ministry (Dan 8:14) as a proof for the early Adventists’ adoption of Crosier’s view of the “daily” without recognizing that the Adventist sources of that time support unanimously the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmîd*.¹ Further, Crosier’s famous *Day Star* Extra article from February 7, 1846, was oftentimes understood as a refutation of the new view of *tāmîd*.² Yet, that article makes no explicit statements about the *tāmîd*, although Crosier provided plain explanations on that matter in other articles that were, however, almost never mentioned by early Sabbatarian Adventist writers or the

¹Straw, 54, 55; Price, 174; Nichol, 4:64, 65; Carnegie, 22-27, 54; Burnside, 3, 4; Arano, 4, 5; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 25-28, 30

²Froom, “Historical Setting and Background,” 6, 7; Nichol, 4:64, 65; Carnegie, 26, 27; Arano, 3, 4; Schwarz, 397; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 23-25.

afore-mentioned scholars.³ During the 1850s and 1860s, articles appeared frequently to oppose views that were based on the supplied word “sacrifice,” namely renewed time-setting and the idea of the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. Since Crosier’s explanation of the *tāmîd* was apparently built upon on the word “sacrifice,” and since he also started to set new times for Christ’s second coming, it is understandable that Adventist writers distanced themselves from his interpretation of the *tāmîd*. Beginning in the 1870s these issues no longer posed a problem so that Adventist authors wrote merely infrequently and briefly about the topic of the *tāmîd*. The early deaths of James White and John N. Andrews left Uriah Smith as the major Adventist interpreter of prophecy, which led some scholars to erroneously reason that he had introduced the old view to the denomination.⁴

The Controversial Period in Adventism (1900–1930)

It has been shown that the German church leader Conradi was instrumental in igniting the new view of the *tāmîd*, seemingly disconnected from Crosier’s former interpretation. The interpreters holding to the new view interpreted the term *tāmîd* from its OT background. They clearly saw the cultic connotations of the term, and considered it in its Danielic context as a reference to all the continual services, and ultimately as a signification of Christ’s continual mediatorial service in the heavenly sanctuary. Several supporters of the new view were intent to convince everyone of their interpretation. By the apparent rejection of the church’s traditional interpretation and Ellen White’s doctrinal authority, they caused the members of the old view group to become alarmed.

³Damsteegt, *Foundations*, 126, was the only writer who mentioned the article on the “daily” in the *Day Dawn*.

⁴Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:247.

The proponents of the old view considered the prophetic framework and the authority of Ellen White's writings at stake. Although some scholars have portrayed only the "traditionalists" in a negative light,⁵ it has been shown that their opponents did not behave much better. Some supporters of the new view exhibited arrogant and self-opinionated behavior that hindered the reaching of an agreement. Others either publicly rejected or questioned other elements of the prophetic interpretation and Ellen White as the prophetic voice of the church. Church members were unsettled and confused by the whole controversy. Thus the members of the old interpretation had some reasons to be alarmed and nervous, although their sharp reactions were nevertheless out of place. The debates were not so much fought in the denominational periodicals but rather in private letters, in privately published pamphlets, and in public speeches from the pulpits. The atmosphere became so heated and aggressive that a friendly settlement of the problem was impossible. The real issue was the spirit and the behavior of the involved individuals rather than the differences of the interpretations.

The Later Adventist Period (1930–2008)

The later or modern Adventist period witnessed an increase in scholarly work. The conflict over this topic vanished almost totally, although there were still some individuals at the fringes of the denomination who held to the old interpretation. Beginning with the 1950s, the exegetical study of the Danielic texts has enormously increased in quantity and in quality.

⁵Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching*, 156, 157. While Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 220-235, gives a very interesting and objective account of the events, it seems that he pictured the events strongly from Prescott's perspective without giving some attention to his faults.

The Development of the Approaches

While looking at the differences in the two interpretations was important, it was necessary as well to detect the approach both interpretational groups had taken to the study and justification of the topic. The significant points of their approaches are summarized below.

The Old View of Roman Paganism

Since the Millerite interpreters recognized that the usage of the term *hatāmîd* differed from the common OT use, they chose to exclude the OT background from the interpretation, and interpreted Dan 8:11-13 from similar NT passages.

Early Seventh-day Adventist writers added nothing of significance to the Millerite approach to the matter of the *tāmîd*. The same arguments were used in the presentation of the topic, and no exegetical studies were done to get a more thorough understanding of the *tāmîd*.

Although Adventist writers during the controversial time just continued to hold the Millerite and early Adventist interpretation, a significant change in the approach to the topic took place. A single statement made by Ellen White in 1850, which had never been used in support for anything during the previous fifty years, now served the proponents of the old view to prove the rightfulness of the Millerite and early Adventist interpretation of the *tāmîd*. The old view had to be right because it was part of a kind of “inspired” tradition.

Supporters of the old view during the modern period relied just on the traditional argumentation and the use of Ellen White’s 1850 statement to support the traditional

argumentation. Almost no exegetical work was done to study the text and the term *hatāmîd* more deeply.

In conclusion, the old view was first based on the different usage of the term *tāmîd*, the exclusion of its OT usage, and the reading of a certain understanding of similar NT passages into the Danielic text. In later times the final argument was not so much based on exegetical work but on tradition and a single statement of Ellen White.

The New View of Christ's Ministration in Heaven

The basic premise of the new view was always that the Danielic term/phrase had to be interpreted from its OT background. Writers in the first two periods put much weight on the term "sacrifice." If it was recognized that the term was supplied, it was considered to be at least implied in the term *hatāmîd* for it was oftentimes used in sacrificial contexts. They interpreted it as Christ's continual sacrifice as well as Christ's heavenly mediation. These writers seldom recognized that Daniel differed in the use of the term from the OT usage.

During the next two periods Adventist writers recognized the different usage, and understood the term *hatāmîd* as intentional in order to comprehend all the perpetual services at the sanctuary. Thus it not only referred to the sacrifices but rather to all perpetual services. A lot of terminological connections between Dan 8 and Leviticus were unearthed by interpreters of those periods. Further, one scholar supported that idea even from the Aramaic part of the book of Daniel where the cognate term is used to describe the continual service of Daniel.

In conclusion, the new view was based on the exegetical study of the text and its OT background. Tradition and Ellen White's writings played almost no role in the interpretation.

Ellen White's Controversial Statement

Ellen White's controversial statement (*Early Writings*, 74, 75) was made during a time of confusion (1850), and was based on two visions. Her description matches clearly the theological explanations found in contemporary primary sources of some former Millerites, and parallels statements made by other Adventist writers at that time. She mentioned both, renewed time settings and the idea that people wanted to go to Jerusalem, in connection with the "daily." More precisely, her statement refers to specific parts of the Danielic "daily," namely the fact that the word "sacrifice" did not exist in the Hebrew text and the accurateness of the prophetic dates as interpreted by Millerites prior to 1844. The "correct view" that existed before 1844 refers to the fact that Millerite interpreters were almost all united in their recognition that the word "sacrifice" was added and that all time periods terminated in 1844. The primary sources of these groups after 1844 based their new time calculations and their idea of the Jews' return on the word "sacrifice." Ellen White's statement that this word was missing showed that these ideas had no factual basis in the biblical text. Her later statement, that God has not given her any light in regard to the accurate interpretation of the "daily" that had been taken away, shows that to use her 1850 statement in support of either view would denote a misuse of it and turn her later denial into an inaccurate statement.

Implications of the Study

This study unearthed some important principles and lessons that can be applied also to modern times. They are derived from the historical events, theological developments, and Ellen White's counsel to some individuals and her evaluation of the behavior.

First, the continual exegetical study of the biblical text is a necessary work that should, however, never lead to a depreciation of the work that previous scholars have done.

Second, unity in spirit, purpose, as well as in central and foundational truths is more important than to have a correct understanding of minor and insignificant matters.

Third, the exegetical study and settling of controversies should not divert the attention from the evangelistic work and the necessary spiritual heart-work.

Fourth, the settling of theological differences can be accomplished only if both parties display an open Christian, friendly, and humble spirit, as well as discard any pride, egocentricity, and irreconcilability.

Fifth, if an agreement on the basis of the study of the Bible with an open mind and Christian spirit is not possible, the differences should not be played out in public but silence on the matter will serve better the cause of God.

Sixth, the biblical text or the writings of Ellen White should not be studied to support a certain interpretation but to understand what the text wants to say, even if personal ideas are questioned or opposed.

Seventh, Ellen White's refusal to provide an interpretation of her own on the matter and her rejection of the use of her writings in support of either interpretation of the *tāmîd* should not be used to deny her a general significance in doctrinal matters.

Eighth, to better understand a statement made by Ellen White in one place it is necessary to gather together all statements on the same topic or in reference to that particular statement.

Ninth, there is a need of principles for the exegetical study of prophetic texts, for the right use of the OT background as well as the right use of similar NT passages in interpreting a text.

Tenth, future scholars should attempt to gather together as much material as possible in order to avoid historical misinterpretations and misrepresentations.

Although the present study has investigated a matter that has been studied frequently before, it has nevertheless looked more deeply into the reasoning of those Millerite and Adventist interpreters, uncovered some misinterpretations and misrepresentations by former scholars, and highlighted some aspects previously overlooked.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

- Adams, Roy. *The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 1993.
- Anderson, Roy Allan. *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1975.
- Andrews, John N. *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*. 2nd ed. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1872.
- Bates, Joseph. *An Explanation of the Typical and Anti-Typical Sanctuary*. New Bedford, Mass.: Press of Benjamin Lindsey, 1850.
- _____. *The Opening of Heavens: Or a Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets and Apostles, Concerning the Opening Heavens, Compared with Astronomical Observations, and of the Present and Future Location of the New Jerusalem, the Paradise of God*. New Bedford, Mass.: Benjamin Lindsey, 1846.
- Berwick, F. H. *The Grand Crisis: The Lord Soon to Come*. Boston, Mass.: n.p., 1854.
- Bliss, Sylvester. *Memoirs of William Miller: With Appendices Containing Three Other Contemporary Biographical Sketches*. Adventist Classic Library. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 2005.
- _____. "Paraphrase of Daniel XI and XII." In *The Age to Come!: The Present Organization of Matter, Called Earth, to be Destroyed by Fire at the End of this Age or Dispensation*. Rev. ed., edited by Lewis C. Gunn, vol. 41, 66–72. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1844.
- Brown, M. H. *The Sure Word of Prophecy: A Study of the Book of Daniel*. Bible Student's Library. Vol. 131. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1895.
- [Colcord, W. A.], ed. *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1914.

- Conradi, Ludwig Richard. *Der Seher am Hofe Babels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*. Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1912.
- _____. *Die Weissagung Daniels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*. Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1898.
- _____. *Die Weissagung Daniels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*. 2nd ed. Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1901.
- _____. *Die Weissagung Daniels oder die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel*. 3rd ed. Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1905.
- _____. *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*. 10th ed. Hamburg: Internationale Traktatgesellschaft, 1919.
- _____. *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*. 11th ed. Hamburg: Advent-Verlag, 1922.
- _____. *Weissagung und Weltgeschichte oder, Staatsmann und Prophet*. 14th ed. Hamburg: Advent-Verlag, 1924.
- _____. *Whoso Readeth, Let Him Understand: A Short Key to Dan. 7-12*. Hamburg: International Tract Society, [1910].
- Cummings, Jonathan. *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and Application of the Truth*. Concord, N.H.: Barton & Hadley, 1854.
- Doukhan, Jacques. *Daniel: The Vision of the End*. Rev. ed. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1989.
- Down, Kendall K. *Daniel: Hostage in Babylon*. Grantham, England: Stanborough Press, 1991.
- Edson, Hiram. *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy: Showing the Final Return of the Jews in 1850*. Canandaigua, N.Y.: Office of the Ontario Messenger, 1849.
- _____. *The Time of the End: Its Beginning, Progressive Events, and Final Termination*. Auburn, N.Y.: Henry Oliphant, 1849.
- Fitch, Charles. *Letter to Rev. J. Litch, on the Second Coming of Christ: With the Sentiments of Cotton Mather on the Same Subject, Approved by Thomas Prince, Both Eminent Ministers of Boston in the Last Century*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1841.
- Ford, Desmond. *Daniel*. Anvil Series. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1978.

- _____. *Daniel & the Coming King*. Newcastle, Calif.: Desmond Ford Publications, 1996.
- Gane, Roy. *Who's Afraid of the Judgment?: The Good News about Christ's Work in the Heavenly Sanctuary*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2006.
- Gresham, Joe W. *The Wise Shall Understand: A Simple, Systematic Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Fort Worth, Tex.: The Fourth Angel's Publishing, 2003.
- Hale, Apollos. *The Second Advent Manual: in which the objections to calculating the prophetic times are considered; the difficulties connected with the calculation explained; and the facts and arguments on which Mr. Miller's calculations rest, are briefly stated and sustained*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- Handbook for Bible Students: Containing Valuable Quotations Relating to the History, Doctrines, and Prophecies of the Scriptures*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1922.
- Hardinge, Leslie. *Jesus Is My Judge: Meditations on the Book of Daniel*. Harrisburg, Pa.: American Cassette Ministries, 1996.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "Divine Judgment." In *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, edited by Raoul Dederen, vol. 12, 815–856. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000.
- _____. "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14." In *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 2, 378–461. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Haskell, Stephen N. *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1901.
- Hawley, S. *The Second Advent Doctrine Vindicated: A Sermon Preached at the Dedication of the Tabernacle*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- Hervey, N. *Prophecies of Christ's First and Second Advent: Daniel's Visions Harmonized and Explained*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- Holmes, Claude E. *Have We an Infallible Spirit of Prophecy?* Washington, D.C.: The Author, 1920.
- Johnson, Olie Andrew. *The Daily, is it Paganism?: A Brief Review and Critical Examination of the Daily in Daniel 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11*. College Place, Wash.: The Author, 1909.
- Jones, Alonzo T. *The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection*. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1905.

- _____. *Ecclesiastical Empire*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1901.
- _____. *The Great Empires of Prophecy, from Babylon to the Fall of Rome*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1898.
- Keough, G. Arthur. *Let Daniel Speak*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1986.
- Kolvoord, John, and Moses E. Kellogg. *The Vision of the Evening and the Morning: A Study of the Prophecy of Daniel VIII*. Battle Creek, Mich.: n.p., 1907.
- Lamson, J. Grant. *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated: A Short History of the World From Daniel's Day to the Day of the Lord*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Educational Secretary, Northern Union Seventh-day Adventist Conference, 1909.
- _____. *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated: A Short History of the World From Daniel's Day to the Day of the Lord*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: College Press, 1923.
- Litch, Josiah. *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy: On the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth, As Indicated by the Word of God, the History of the World, and Signs of the Present Times*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1841.
- _____. *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843: Shown by a Comparison of Prophecy with History, Up to the Present Time, and an Explanation of Those Prophecies Which are Yet to be Fulfilled*. Boston, Mass.: David H. Ela, 1838.
- _____. *Prophetic Expositions: or, A Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Time of Its Establishment*. 2 vols. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- Loughborough, John N. *The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1909.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. "The Investigative Judgment: Its Early Development." In *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, edited by Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, 545–581. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.
- _____. *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*. God Cares. Vol. 1. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1981.
- _____. "Sanctuary and Atonement in SDA Theology: An Historical Survey." In *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, edited by Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, 516–544. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.

- Miller, William. *Dissertations on the True Inheritance of the Saints: And the Twelve Hundred and Sixty Days of Daniel and John; With an Address*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- _____. *Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A. D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years*. Brandon, Vt.: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833.
- _____. *Letter to Joshua V. Himes, on the Cleansing of the Sanctuary*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- _____. *Miller's Reply to Stuart's "Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy": In Three Letters, Addressed to Joshua V. Himes*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- _____. *Miller's Works: Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology, Selected from Manuscripts of William Miller; With a Memoir of His Life*. Edited by Joshua V. Himes. Vol. 1. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- _____. *Miller's Works: Supplement*. Vol. 2. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- _____. *Miller's Works: Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843, Exhibited in a Course of Lectures*. Vol. 2. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1842.
- Nichol, Francis D., ed. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1955.
- Peters, John W. *The Mystery of the "the Daily": An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14*. Rev. ed. Flint, Mich.: The Author, 1994.
- Pfandl, Gerhard. *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2004.
- _____. "Evaluation of 'The Mystery of 'The Daily,' by John W. Peters." Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, July 2005.
- _____. *Time Prophecies in Daniel 12*. Biblical Research Institute Releases. Vol. 5. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 2005.
- Phillips, Pauline W. *Daniel Versus Babylon & 7 Thunders Peal: The Great Controversy Between Michael & Satan*. Centralia, Mo.: ProphecySpirit.com, 2001.
- Pöhler, Rolf J. *Hoffnung die uns trägt: Wie Adventisten ihren Glauben bekennen*. Lüneburg: Advent-Verlag, 2008.
- Prescott, W. W. *The Daily: A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject*. n.p., [1924].

- Price, George McCready. *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1955.
- Rodríguez, Angel M. *Future Glory: The 8 Greatest End-Time Prophecies in the Bible*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2002.
- _____. "The Sanctuary." In *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, edited by Raoul Dederen, vol. 12, 375–417. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000.
- _____. "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14." In *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 2, 527–549. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*. Notes with Historical and Theological Introduction by George R. Knight. Annotated edition. Adventist Classic Library. 1957. Reprint. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 2003.
- Shea, William H. *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2005.
- Smith, Leon Albert, and F. C. Gilbert. "The Daily" in the Prophecy of Daniel. n.p., n.d.
- Smith, Uriah. *Daniel and The Revelation: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of These Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures*. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1897.
- _____. *Looking Unto Jesus: Or Christ in Type and Antitype*. Chicago, Ill.: Review and Herald, 1898.
- _____. *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8,14*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1877.
- _____. *Synopsis of the Present Truth: A Brief Exposition of the Views of S. D. Adventists*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1884.
- _____. *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1873.
- _____. *The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary*. Advent and Sabbath Tracts. Vol. 5. Rochester, N.Y.: Advent Review Office, 1854.
- Smith, Uriah, and James White. *The Biblical Institute: A Synopsis of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists*. Oakland, Calif.: Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House, 1878.

- Starkweather, John. *A Narrative of Conversion to the Faith of the Premillennial Advent of Christ in 1843: with Suggestions and References Designed to Aid Serious Inquirers after Truth*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- Stefanovic, Zdravko. *Daniel—Wisdom for the Wise: Commentary on the book of Daniel*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2007.
- Steininger, Thomas R. *Konfession und Sozialisation: Adventistische Identität zwischen Fundamentalismus und Postmoderne*. Kirche und Konfession. Vol. 33. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Storrs, George. *The Bible Examiner: Containing Various Prophetic Expositions*. Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- Straw, Walter E. *Studies in Daniel*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1943.
- Swearingen, Marc Alden. *Tidings Out of the Northeast: A General Historical Survey of Daniel 11*. Coldwater, Mich.: Remnant Publications, 2006.
- Two Great Prophecies with a Message to All Mankind: The Ancient Books of Daniel and the Revelation*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1925.
- Vuilleumier, Jean. *Future Unrolled: or Studies on the Prophecies of Daniel*. Boston, Mass.: Richard G. Badger, 1928.
- Waggoner, Ellet J. *The “Confession of Faith” of Dr. E. J. Waggoner*. n.p.: Albion F. Ballenger, n.d.
- Wakeham, W. H. *Outline Lessons on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation*. Tentative edition. Berrien Springs, Mich.: General Conference Department of Education: College Press, 1927.
- Washburn, J. S. *The Fruit of the “New Daily.”* Toledo, Ohio: The Author, 1923.
- _____. *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference*. n.p., 1922.
- _____. *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy*. n.p., n.d.
- _____. *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy*. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Author, 1920.
- White, Ellen G. *Early Writings of Mrs. White: Experience and Views, and Spiritual Gifts, Volume One*. 2nd ed. Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1882.
- _____. *Early Writings of Ellen G. White*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000.

- _____. "Letter to Bro. Eli Curtis, New York City, from Topsham, April 21, 1847." In *A Word to the 'Little Flock'*, edited by James White, 11–12. Brunswick, Me.: The Author, 1847.
- _____. *Manuscript Release No. 760: The Integrity of the Sanctuary Truth*. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981.
- _____. *Manuscript Releases*. Vol. 9. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990.
- _____. *Manuscript Releases*. Vol. 10. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990.
- _____. *Manuscript Releases*. Vol. 12. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990.
- _____. *Manuscript Releases*. Vol. 20. Silver Spring, Md.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1993.
- _____. *Notebook Leaflets from the Elmshaven Library*. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1945.
- _____. *Selected Messages*. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958.
- _____. *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White*. Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: James White, 1851.
- _____. *Spiritual Gifts*. Vol. 2. Battle Creek, Mich.: James White, 1860.
- _____. *Testimonies for the Church*. 9 vols. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2002.
- _____. *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers*. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2003.
- White, James. *Bible Adventism: Or, Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, n.d.
- _____. *The Four Universal Monarchies of the Prophecy of Daniel, and God's Everlasting Kingdom*. Rochester, N.Y.: Advent Review Office, 1855.
- _____. *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1870.
- _____. *The Prophecy of Daniel: The Four Kingdoms, the Sanctuary, and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1863.

Wieland, Robert J. *The Gospel in Daniel: Whoso Readeth, Let Him Understand*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Glad Tidings Publishers, 2004.

_____. *Have We Followed "Cunningly Devised Fables"?: A New Look at the Old View of "the Daily" of Daniel 8:11-13*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: 1888 Message Study Committee, 2002.

Periodicals

Adams, Kay M. "A Prophecy Accurately Fulfilled." *Signs of the Times*, January 18, 1921, 4-5, 11.

Allen, William. "On the Designation of Time in Daniel and John: The 1260 Days of Daniel and John, and the 1000 Years of John." *Signs of the Times*, August 15, 1840, 73-74.

Anderson, Roy Allan. "Ideas on the Atonement Contrasted." *Ministry*, January 1959, 13-18.

Andrews, John N. "Daniel Chapters VIII and IX." *Review and Herald*, November 21, 1854, 116-117.

_____. "Daniel Chapters VIII and IX." *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1857, 202-204.

_____. "The Order of Events in the Judgment: Number Twelve." *Review and Herald*, January 25, 1870, 36.

_____. "The Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, December 23, 1852, 121-125.

_____. "The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing." *Review and Herald*, December 15, 1868, 273-275.

_____. "The Sanctuary of the Bible." *Review and Herald*, March 10, 1874, 97-99.

[Anonymous]. "The Daily." *Midnight Cry*, October 5, 1843, 52.

Arnold, David. "The Shut Door Explained." *Present Truth*, 6, December 1849, 41-46.

Bates, Joseph. "The Laodicean Church." *Review and Herald*, November 1850, 7-8.

_____. "Notice." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 4.

_____. "Voices of the Prophets, vol. 1, no. 1." *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1860, 89-91.

Bell, Goodloe H. "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII--Pagan and Papal Dominion." *Review and Herald*, August 29, 1878, 75.

- _____. "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII--The Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, September 5, 1878, 83.
- Bourdeau, A. C. "Our Present Position." *Review and Herald*, May 14, 1867, 265–266.
- Bourdeau, D. T. "Principles by Which to Interpret Prophecy--No. 19." *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1889, 275–276.
- _____. "The 1260 Days of Daniel 12." *Review and Herald*, December 3, 1889, 755–756.
- _____. "The Value of the Prophetic Periods in the Study of Prophecy--No. 2." *Review and Herald*, October 29, 1889, 675.
- Burt, Merlin D. "The Day-Dawn of Canandaigua, New York: Reprint of a Significant Millerite Adventist Journal." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44, no. 2 (2006): 317–30.
- Butler, George I. "At the Time Appointed the End Shall Be." *Review and Herald*, November 12, 1908, 8–9.
- "Call to Remembrance the Former Days." *Review and Herald*, March 27, 1888, 200–201.
- Cambell, David. "Mr. Cambell's Reply to Mr. Miller, on the Little Horn in Daniel's Fourth Kingdom." *Signs of the Times*, April 15, 1840, 9–10.
- "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Investigative Judgment in the Old Testament." *Ministry*, October 1980, 33–47.
- Cottrell, Raymond F. "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary--No. 1." *Review and Herald*, March 11, 1884, 169–170.
- _____. "Time has demonstrated this fact." *Review and Herald*, April 5, 1864, 5–6.
- Coward, Joel M. "An Unpackable Court." *Watchman Magazine*, April 1938, 14, 17, 18.
- Crosier, O. R. L. "The Confession of Faults and the Reviving." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 3.
- _____. "Good Testimony on Time." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 3.
- _____. "The Law of Moses." *Day-Star*, February 7, 1846, 37–44.
- _____. "The Priesthood." *Advent Review*, September 1850, 57–63.
- _____. "Response to J. Weston." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2.
- _____. "The Sanctuary." *Advent Review*, September 1850, 42–47.

- _____. "The Sanctuary." *Advent Review*, Special, September 1850, 37–50.
- _____. "The Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, May 5, 1851, 78–80.
- _____. "Volume 2." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2.
- Curtis, Eli. "Note from Bro. Curtis to Bro. White." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 4.
- Dart, Albert Marion. "Special Resurrection." *Signs of the Times*, April 2, 1918, 4–5.
- "Die Gabe der Prophetie." *Studienanleitungen zur Bibel*, no. 1 (2009).
- "Exposition of Miller's Chronological Chart." *Signs of the Times*, May 1, 1841, 21.
- Fitch, Charles. "Extract from Fitch's Sermons, No. 7." *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1842, 66–67.
- _____. "Fitch's two Sermons,—concluded." *Signs of the Times*, June 8, 1842, 74–75.
- Fonday, John. "The Twenty-Three Hundred Days." *Bible Examiner*, November 1848, 175–176.
- Ford, Desmond. "Daniel 8--Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God." *Ministry*, January 1960, 18–21.
- _____. "Daniel 8-12, and 'The Time of the End'." *Ministry*, February 1964, 28–30.
- _____. "Dare to Study Daniel—12: Midnight and Morning." *Ministry*, December 1974, 34–36.
- _____. "The Linguistic Connection Between Daniel 8:14 and 11:31." *Ministry*, December 1965, 34–36.
- French, C. "Diagram of Daniel's Vision." *Midnight Cry*, November 18, 1842, 4.
- _____. "Diagram of Daniel's Visions." *Signs of the Times*, March 1, 1841, 18.
- _____. "Explanation of the above Diagram." *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1841, 39–40.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "Christ's Atoning Ministry in Heaven." *Ministry*, Insert, January 1976, 15C-30C.
- Haskell, Stephen N. "Prophecy for the Last Days." *Review and Herald*, April 24, 1900, 259–260.
- _____. "Studies on the Book of Daniel." *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, July 1, 1891, 200–201.
- Heppenstall, Edward. "Sin, Salvation, and the Sanctuary." *Ministry*, March 1977, 13–16.

- _____. “Some Theological Considerations of Perfection.” *Ministry*, October 1970, 41-17.
- _____. “The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy.” *Ministry*, October 1981, 16–19.
- Himes, Joshua V. “The insertion of an important omission in the minutes of the Low-Hampton Conference.” *Signs of the Times*, March 15, 1842, 189–190.
- “Historical Gleanings: By Reason of Transgression.” *Review and Herald*, March 4, 1873, 92.
- “How long the vision?” *Review and Herald*, November 14, 1878, 156.
- “If ye will inquire, inquire ye.” *Signs of the Times*, June 6, 1911, 2.
- “Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c.” *Advent Herald*, March 3, 1849, 36–37.
- Jewell. “Bishop Jewell on Antichrist.” *Review and Herald*, November 29, 1870, 185–186.
- “John Cumming.” *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1860, 90.
- Litch, Josiah. “Mr. Litch’s Reply to Rev. Ethan Smith, and others on the Little Horn in Daniel’s Fourth Kingdom.” *Signs of the Times*, May 1, 1840, 17–19.
- _____. “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller.” *Signs of the Times*, December 1, 1841, 134–136.
- Littlejohn, W. H. “The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Judgment.” *Review and Herald*, November 27, 1879, 172–173.
- _____. “The Judgment and the Papacy.” *Review and Herald*, October 20, 1891, 643–644.
- _____. “The Prophetic Scar.” *Review and Herald*, December 1, 1891, 738–739.
- _____. “The Sabbath in Prophecy: Or a Sabbath Movement to Take Place in the Last Days.” *Review and Herald*, November 15, 1892, 707–708.
- _____. “The Temple in Heaven: An Imaginary Conversation on a Very Important Theme.” *Review and Herald*, October 21, 1884, 659–660.
- Loughborough, John N. “Other Views of the 1,290 and 1,355 Days.” *Bible Training School*, December 1910, 25–26.
- _____. “Reasoning of the Adventists in 1843: Testimony of Apollos Hale.” *Bible Training School*, October 1910, 89-89.

- _____. "Taking Away the Daily." *Bible Training School*, August 1910, 50–51.
- _____. "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days." *Review and Herald*, April 4, 1907, 9–10.
- _____. "Time Taken Away of the Daily." *Bible Training School*, September 1910, 70–73.
- _____. "The 1290 Days." *Bible Training School*, November 1910, 104–105.
- Matteson, J. G. "The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter VII." *Review and Herald*, May 10, 1887, 292–293.
- _____. "The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter IX." *Review and Herald*, May 17, 1887, 308.
- _____. "The Visions of Daniel and John: Part I--The Visions of Daniel, Chapter XI." *Review and Herald*, May 24, 1887, 324–325.
- Maxwell, Arthur S. "The Impending Individual Crisis." *Signs of the Times*, September 24, 1918, 3–5.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. "Predicting the End: An Old Custom Lingers On." *Adventist Review*, October 29, 1998, 16–19.
- Merrick, A. "Prophetic Times—Return of the Jews." *Signs of the Times*, November 15, 1840, 121–124.
- Miller, William. "The Beast—Anti-Christ—Pagan and Papal Abominations." *Signs of the Times*, June 15, 1841, 41–43.
- _____. "History of Bonaparte, 1290 Days." *Signs of the Times*, July 1, 1841, 49–50.
- _____. "A Lecture on the Signs of the Present Times." *Signs of the Times*, March 20, 1840, 3–7.
- _____. "Miller's Answer to Queries of 'A Subscriber'." *Signs of the Times*, December 15, 1840, 143–146.
- _____. "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming of Christ in 1843." *The Midnight Cry*, November 23, 1842, 3–4.
- _____. "Reasons for Believing the Second Coming of Christ in Eighteen Hundred Forty-three, from the Chronology of Prophecy." *Signs of the Times*, August 31, 1842, 171–173.
- _____. "Strictures." *Signs of the Times*, June 15, 1841, 45–46.

- “Mr. Miller.” *Signs of the Times*, May 15, 1840, 31–32.
- Nichols, Otis. “The Signs of the End of the World.” *Review and Herald*, December 9, 1852, 114.
- “1260 days of Daniel and John considered as one and the same period of time.” *Signs of the Times*, June 1, 1842, 70–71.
- Pöhler, Rolf J. “Adventisten, Ellen White und das Sola-Scriptura-Prinzip.” *Spes Christiana* 17 (2006): 45–68.
- _____. “Wir haben einen großen Hohenpriester: Die Tür zu Gott steht immer noch weit offen.” *Adventecho*, May 2007, 23–26.
- Pond, E. “The Little Horn.” *Signs of the Times*, November 16, 1842, 65–67.
- Prescott, W. W. “The Message for This Time.” *Review and Herald*, October 29, 1903, 4–6.
- Read, W. E. “The Investigative or Pre-Advent Judgment.” *Ministry*, December 1960, 14–19, 35.
- “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller.” *Signs of the Times*, February 1, 1842, 166.
- “Review of Dowling’s Reply to Miller.” *Signs of the Times*, February 15, 1842, 174–176.
- “Scripture Problems Solved: The ‘Daily Sacrifice’.” *Watchman Magazine*, March 1933, 13.
- Sisley, W. C. “Berean Library Study—Lesson 10.” *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1900, 71.
- Smith, Uriah. “The Angel’s Answer.” *Review and Herald*, January 5, 1886, 8.
- _____. “The Daily and Abomination of Desolation.” *Review and Herald*, April 3, 1866, 139.
- _____. “How Long the Vision?” *Review and Herald*, July 27, 1886, 472.
- _____. “The Judgment of the Great Day.” *Review and Herald*, March 31, 1885, 200–201.
- _____. “The Moment of Greatest Interest.” *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1901, 283–284.
- _____. “Papal Supremacy: When did it commence?” *Review and Herald*, December 6, 1864, 12–13.

- _____. "Prophecy." *Review and Herald*, May 29, 1860, 1–6.
- _____. "The Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, March 28, 1854, 77–79.
- _____. "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered." *Review and Herald*, November 1, 1864, 180–181.
- _____. "The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper--Daniel 8." *Review and Herald*, January 27, 1876, 28.
- _____. "The Sanctuary: Third Paper--Exposition of Dan. 8." *Review and Herald*, January 20, 1876, 20.
- _____. "Short Interviews with Correspondents." *Review and Herald*, February 24, 1863, 100.
- _____. "Synopsis of the Present Truth, No. 12: The 1290 and 1335 Days." *Review and Herald*, January 28, 1858, 92–93.
- _____. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel." *Review and Herald*, June 28, 1870, 12–13.
- _____. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel." *Review and Herald*, July 5, 1870, 20.
- _____. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI." *Review and Herald*, February 28, 1871, 84–85.
- _____. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XII." *Review and Herald*, July 18, 1871, 36–37.
- _____. "The 1290 Days." *Review and Herald*, December 10, 1895, 794.
- Southard, N. "The Daily." *Midnight Cry*, October 5, 1843, 52–53.
- _____. "Watchman's Warning." *Midnight Cry*, June 8, 1843, 94–95, 97–104.
- Spaulding, Joel. "Second Coming of Christ." *Signs of the Times*, March 1, 1842, 179–180.
- Spicer, William A. "Assuming the Priesthood of Christ." *Signs of the Times*, March 25, 1919, 4.
- Starr, George B. "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, March 5, 1900, 155–156.
- Van Dolson, Leo R. "The 1335 Days." *Ministry*, December 1963, 31–32, 35.
- Waggoner, Ellet J. "The Little Horn of Daniel 8." *Signs of the Times*, November 19, 1885, 694.

- Weston, J. "Letter to Bro. Crosier." *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 1–2.
- White, Ellen G. "Letter to Brethren and Sisters." *Present Truth*, November 1850, 86–87.
- White, James. "Comments on Brother Miller's Dream." *Present Truth*, May 1850, 73–75.
- _____. "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Fourteen--The Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, March 1, 1870, 81–82.
- _____. "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Thirteen--The Time." *Review and Herald*, February 22, 1870, 73–74.
- _____. "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve--The Time." *Review and Herald*, February 15, 1870, 57–59.
- _____. "Our Present Position." *Review and Herald*, December 1850, 13–15.
- _____. "Our Present Positon." *Review and Herald*, January 1851, 27–30.
- _____. "Sanctuary." *Review and Herald*, July 14, 1863, 52–53.
- _____. "Saving Faith." *Review and Herald*, February 16, 1869, 57–59.
- _____. "The Time of the End." *Review and Herald*, July 15, 1880, 56.
- Wilcox, M. C. "The 2300 Days." *Signs of the Times*, January 8, 1908, 6–7.
- Williams, Alfred H. "Realities of Tabernacle Shadows." *Signs of the Times*, January 20, 1920, 11–12.
- Witt, Lyndon de. "Preach, Preacher, Preach." *Ministry*, June 1976, 10–11.

Correspondence

- Butler, George I. to Ellen G. White. July 3, 1910. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- Conradi, Ludwig Richard to Arthur G. Daniells. April 5, 1905. Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to Ellen G. White. April 17, 1906. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.
- _____ to John N. Loughborough. Hamburg. April 16, 1907. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.

- _____ to Arthur G. Daniells. October 11, 1910. Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to Heinrich F. Schubert. August 12, 1916. Historical Archive of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Europe, Friedensau Adventist University, Friedensau, Germany.
- _____ to W. W. Fletcher. June 29, 1931. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.
- Daniells, Arthur G. to I. A. Ford. July 15, 1908. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.
- Haskell, Stephen N. to Arthur G. Daniells. January 27, 1908.
- _____ to Arthur G. Daniells. March 22, 1908.
- _____ to Ellen G. White. December 6, 1909. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to William C. White. December 6, 1909. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to Ellen G. White. May 30, 1910. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- Hibbard, E. J. to Leon Albert Smith. October 24, 1909.
- Holmes, Claude E. to Arthur G. Daniells. May 1, 1922.
- Prescott, W. W. to Arthur G. Daniells. January 10, 1908.
- Spicer, William A. to Ludwig Richard Conradi. September 7, 1910. Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- Starr, George B. to C. P. Bollman. September 1930. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.
- White, William C. to J. S. Washburn. October 27, 1910. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to James Edson White. June 1, 1910. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.
- _____ to Percy T. Magan. July 31, 1910. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.

_____ to George B. Starr. September 22, 1930. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.

Unpublished Materials

Daniells, Arthur G. "In interview at Elmshaven." January 26, 1908. Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, Md., USA.

_____. "Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily." September 25, 1931.

Fletcher, W. W. "Extracts from Diary: Talk with Eld. L. R. Conradi at Washington Sanitarium." July 22 and 24, 1930. Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.

Ford, Desmond. "Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment." 1980. DF 990-b, Ellen G. White Study Center, Bogenhofen Seminary, St. Peter am Hart, Austria.

Froom, LeRoy Edwin. "A Scriptural exposition of H-T-Mid, the daily, Daniel 8:11-13." n.p., n.d.

Gilbert, F. C. "A Scriptural exposition of H-T-Mid, the daily, Daniel 8:11-13." n.p., n.d.

Pröbstle, Martin T. "Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14." Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 2006.

Smith, Uriah. "The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17."

White, Ellen G. "Pamphlet 20—A Call to the Watchmen." n.p., 1910.

Internet Documents

Iversen, Judy K. *Daniel 8:9-14: The Revealing of the Mystery of "The Daily."* Meadow Vista, Calif., September 18, 2006; http://meadowvistaadventist.com/files/The_Revealing_of_the_Daily2.ppt#256,1, Daniel 8:9-14 The Revealing of the Mystery of "The Daily" (February 3, 2009).

Pöhler, Rolf J. *Das Heiligtum als Gleichnis im Hebräerbrief: Ein Beitrag zu einer Auslegung von Hebräer 9,1-14* 1974, 2007; http://christsein-heute.info/hoffnung/fileadmin/hoffnungdieunstraegt/data/Material/Poehler-Das_Heiligtum_als_Gleichnis.pdf (accessed January 28, 2009).

Secondary Sources

Books

- Ball, Bryan W. *The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981.
- Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm. "CONRADI, Ludwig Richard." In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, vol. 1, 1116–1117. Nordhausen: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1990.
- Bradford, Graeme S. *More Than a Prophet*. Foreword by Samuele Bacchiocchi. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Biblical Perspectives, 2006.
- _____. *Prophets Are Human*. Victoria, Australia: Signs Publishing Company, 2004.
- Damsteegt, P. Gerard. "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)." In *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 5, 57–117. Silver Spring, Md. 1989.
- _____. *Foundations of the Seventh-Day Adventist Message and Mission*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Douglass, Herbert E. *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1998.
- Froom, LeRoy Edwin. *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1954.
- Gorday Peter, ed. *Colossians, 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament. Vol. 9, edited by Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Gordon, Paul A. *The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1983.
- Graham, Roy E. *Ellen G. White: Co-Founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church*. American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion. Vol. 12. New York: Peter Lang, 1985.
- Heiks, Heidi. *508, 538, 1798, 1843 Source Book (Preliminary)*. Rev. ed. Knoxville, Ill.: Hope International, 2007.
- _____. *The "Daily" Source Book*. Brushton, N.Y.: TEACH Services, 2008.

- Heinz, Daniel. *Ludwig Richard Conradi: Missionar, Evangelist und Organisator der Siebenten-Tags-Adventisten in Europa*. 3rd rev. ed. Archiv für internationale Adventgeschichte. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1998.
- Holbrook, Frank B., ed. *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series. Vol. 5. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989.
- Knight, George R. *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs*. Adventist Heritage Series. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000.
- LaRondelle, Hans K. "Armageddon: History of Adventist Interpretation." In *Symposium on Revelation, Book 2: Exegetical and General Studies*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 7, 435–449. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1992.
- Mansell, Donald E. *Adventists and Armageddon: Have We Misinterpreted Prophecy?* Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1999.
- Moon, Jerry A. *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship Between the Prophet and Her Son*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 19. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1993.
- Neufeld, Don F., and Julia Neuffer, eds. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*. Rev. ed. Commentary Reference Series. Vol. 10. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1976.
- Nuñez, Samuel. *The Vision of Daniel 8: Interpretations from 1700 to 1900*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 14. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1989.
- Olson, A. V. *Through Crisis to Victory, 1888-1901: From the Minneapolis Meeting to the Reorganization of the General Conference*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1966.
- Olson, Robert W. *101 Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White*. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981.
- Padderatz, Gerhard. *Conradi und Hamburg: Die Anfänge der deutschen Adventgemeinde (1889-1914) unter der besonderen Berücksichtigung der organisatorischen, finanziellen und sozialen Aspekte*. Hamburg: The Author, 1978.
- Pease, Norval F. "The Second Advent in Seventh-day Adventist History and Theology." In *The Advent Hope in Scripture and History*, edited by V. Norskov Olsen, 173–190. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1987.
- Pfandl, Gerhard. *The Gift of Prophecy: The Role of Ellen White in God's Remnant Church*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2008.

- Pöhler, Rolf J. *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching: A Case Study in Doctrinal Development*. Friedensauer Schriftenreihe, Reihe A - Theologie. Vol. 3. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Schwarz, Richard W. *Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes*. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1979.
- Spalding, Arthur Whitefield. *Footprints of the Pioneers*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1947.
- Stevenson, Kenneth, and Michael Glerup, eds. *Ezekiel, Daniel*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, Old Testament. Vol. 13, edited by Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Timm, Alberto R. *The Sanctuary and the Three Angels' Messages: Integrating Factors in the Development of Seventh-day Adventist Doctrines*. Adventist Theological Society Doctoral Series. Vol. 5. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Adventist Theological Society, 1995.
- _____. "The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007): A Brief Historical Overview." In *"For You Have Strengthened Me": Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Martin Pröbstle, 331–345. St. Peter am Hart: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007.
- _____. "Seventh-day Adventist Eschatology, 1844-2004: A Brief Historical Overview." In *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical & Practical Insights*, edited by Ron du Preez, vol. 1, 151–205. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007.
- _____. "A Short Historical Background to A.D. 508 & 538 as Related to the Establishment of Papal Supremacy." In *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical & Practical Insights*, edited by Ron du Preez, vol. 1, 208–231. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007.
- Valentine, Gilbert M. *The Shaping of Adventism: The Case of W. W. Prescott*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1992.
- _____. *W. W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation*. Adventist Pioneer Series. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2005.
- Wallenkampf, Arnold V. "Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary." In *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 5, 197–216. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989.

Whidden, Woodrow W. *E. J. Waggoner: From the Physician of Good News to the Agent of Division*. Adventist Pioneer Series. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2008.

Whidden, Woodrow W., Jerry Moon, and John W. Reeve. *The Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2002.

White, Arthur L. *Ellen G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years (1900-1905)*. Vol. 5. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.

_____. *Ellen G. White: The Latter Elmshaven Years (1905-1915)*. Vol. 6. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982.

_____. *The Ellen G. White Writings*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1973.

Periodicals

Burt, Merlin D. "The Extended Atonement View in the Day-Dawn and the Emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44, no. 2 (2006): 331–39.

_____. "History of the Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 125–39.

Fortin, Denis. "Ellen G. White as Messenger of the Lord: What Else Could Dr. Smithurst Say?" In *"Ellen White and Current Issues" Symposium*, vol. 1, 10–29. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, 2005.

_____. "God, the Trinity, and Adventism: An Introduction to the Issues." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 4–10.

Froom, LeRoy Edwin. "Historical Data on '1843' Chart." *Ministry*, May 1942, 23–26.

_____. "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act." *Ministry* 30, no. 2 (1957): 9, 11.

Haloviak, Bert, and Gary Land. "Ellen White & Doctrinal Conflict: Context of the 1919 Bible Conference." *Spectrum* 12, no. 4 (1982): 19–34.

Hartlapp, Johannes. "Eine vergessene Liebe: Ludwig Richard Conradi und die Adventgemeinde." *Spes Christiana* 17 (2006): 69–83.

Kästner, Klaus. "Adventistische Lehre vom Heiligtum: Ein historischer Überblick - Teil 1." *Miteinander*, no. 2 (2006): 10–12.

_____. "Adventistische Lehre vom Heiligtum: Ein historischer Überblick - Teil 2." *Miteinander*, no. 3 (2006): 10–11.

Moon, Jerry. "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 2: The Role of Ellen G. White." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41, no. 2 (2003): 275–93.

"The Role of the Ellen G. White Writings in Doctrinal Matters." *Ministry* 53, no. 10 (1980): 53–60.

Unpublished Materials

Arano, Pedro. "The Daily." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1982.

Burnside, G. "Daily?". n.p., n.d.

Burt, Merlin D. "Demise of Semi-Arianism and Anti-Trinitarianism in Adventist Theology (1888–1957)." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1996.

_____. "The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White's Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849." Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 2002.

Carnegie, Egerton Wilberforce. "The Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'." M.A. report, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1971.

Dörnbrack, Michael. "Die Rolle Ellen Whites bei der Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre in der Adventgemeinde: Aussagen, Auswirkungen und Reaktionen." Term paper, Theologische Hochschule Friedensau, Friedensau, 2004.

Froom, LeRoy Edwin. "Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'." Washington, D.C., September 1, 1940.

Gane, Erwin R. "The Arian or Anti-Trinitarian Views Presented in Seventh-day Adventist Literature and the Ellen G. White Answer." M.A. thesis, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1962.

Graybill, Ron. "The Power of Prophecy: Ellen White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century." Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 1983.

Haddock, Robert. "A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905." B.D. thesis, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1970.

- Hall, Larry J. "The Daily of Dan 8:11-13: An Historical Look at the Millerite View." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1986.
- Haloviak, Bert. "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference." Washington, D.C.: Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, November 14, 1979.
- Kaiser, Denis. "Daniel 11:40-45 in Adventist Perspective: A Historical Survey and Evaluation." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 2008.
- _____. "A Forgotten Chapter of European Adventist History: Ellen White's Life of Christ." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 2008.
- _____. "The Holy Spirit and the Hermeneutical Approach in Modern Adventist Anti-Trinitarian Literature." Term paper, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 2008.
- _____. "W. W. Prescott und Erziehung (1855–1944)." Term paper, Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, St. Peter am Hart, 2005.
- McGarrell, Roy I. "The Historical Development of Seventh-day Adventist Eschatology, 1884-1895." Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1989.
- Neuffer, Julia. "The Gathering of Israel: A Historical Study of Early Writings, pp. 74—76." (Ellen G. White Estate Research Document).
- Pöhler, Rolf J. "Change in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study of the Problem of Doctrinal Development." Th.D. dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1995.
- Shea, William H. "An Analysis of the Apotelesmatic Principle." Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., USA.
- Valentine, Gilbert Murray. "William Warren Prescott: Seventh-day Adventist Educator." Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1982.
- White, Arthur L. "Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells: A Statement Relating to Elder A. G. Daniells and the Presidency of the General Conference." Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Publications, December 4, 1953.

Internet Documents

Office of Archives & Statistics of General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. *Online Document Archives*. Silver Spring, Md.: Office of Archives & Statistics of General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church; <http://www.adventistarchives.org/DocArchives.asp>; Internet (February 15, 2009).