

DANIEL'S FINAL APPEARANCE
A GREAT CONFLICT

PART 2: DANIEL 11:23–31

Engel Yoder

April 2019

2584 Third Avenue
Marquette, KS 67464–8815

eryoder1@lrmutual.com
(785) 212–0012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. THE REIGN OF PAPAL ROME	3
The Historic Union of Church and State	3
Even For a Time	7
Linguistic Parallels	8
2. THE DEADLY WOUND TO PAPAL ROME	11
The Spiritual King of the South	12
The Relationship Between the Literal and Spiritual Kings of the South	14
The Deadly Wound	16
“The End Shall Be at the Time Appointed”	18
The Three Principal Characters of the Great Controversy In Daniel 11	20
3. THE HEALING OF THE DEADLY WOUND	24
“He [Shall] Return Into His Land”	24
“He Shall . . . Come Toward the South”	24
The Time Appointed	26
The Ships of Chittim and the Holy Covenant	29
The Introduction of Apostate Protestants, the United States, and the “Daily”	33
4. THE “DAILY”	36
Sanctuary Context	36
Covenant Context	38
Regular	42
Sacrifice	44
Worship	51
Synopsis	55
Application	56
Summation	66
5. THE “DAILY” IN DANIEL 8	69
He Magnified Himself	69
He Took Away the “Daily”	71
He Cast Down the Sanctuary	72
The Interrelationship of Faith and the Form of Worship	75
The Trodding Under of the Sanctuary and Host and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary	77
Our Day In the Light of the Sanctuary Truth	80
6. THE “DAILY” IN DANIEL 11	82
The Pollution of the Sanctuary of Strength	82
The Setting Up of the Abomination of Desolation	83
The Taking Away of the “Daily”	84
Two Fulfillments of the Taking Away of the “Daily”	85
The Sunday Law of A.D. 538	87
Two Requirements For Papal Supremacy	91
The Great Last-Day Test	95
Daniel 11:31 In Larger Perspective	97
Our View and the Spirit of Prophecy	99
APPENDIX A: THE REFORMATION VIEW OF THE “DAILY”	101
APPENDIX B: THE MILLERITE/ADVENTIST OLD VIEW OF THE “DAILY”	104
APPENDIX C: THE ADVENTIST NEW VIEW OF THE “DAILY”	111
APPENDIX D: THE ADVENTIST VIEW OF EVENTS IN A.D. 538	116

1. THE REIGN OF PAPAL ROME

The Historic Union of Church and State

23 And after the league made with him (imperial Rome; the state) **he** (papal Rome; the church) **shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people.**

Having risen to power as described in the preceding two verses, the papacy now has the political clout to stand eyeball-to-eyeball with the state. This intimidation, then, led to the “league” spoken of in v. 23. The Hebrew word translated “league” here is a primitive root meaning, according to *Strong’s Concordance*, “to join.” This is the same word translated “join” in Daniel 11:6 regarding the unholy alliance between the kings of the North and South.¹ Now let’s consider Edwin Thiele’s comments on Daniel 11:23:

After the league made with him v 23

The league was between imperial and papal Rome, between the church and the state. The conversion of Constantine (306–337 A.D.) did much to draw the then rising church into close relationships with the state. Constantine sought to do everything he could for the church that he might have the support of the numerous body of Christians. He adopted a new Roman standard with a long cross with a golden wreath bearing the Christian monogram, he erected a statue of Christ with the cross in His hand as a symbol of victory for all in Rome to witness, and on his arch still standing near the colosseum was placed an inscription proclaiming jurisdiction of episcopal courts and he permitted the church to inherit property, thus constituting the church a legal civic corporation. The close bonds between the church and the state permitted the church to grow ever more powerful.

He shall become strong with a small people v 23

American Translation. “He shall practice treachery, and shall rise to great power, though he has but a handful of people.”

Jerusalem Bible. “Still conspiring, he will go from treachery to treachery, ever growing stronger despite the smallness of his following.”

New English Bible. “Although the people behind him are but few, he will rise to power and establish himself in time of peace.”

In view of the smallness of Christian beginnings, the amazing rise of the church to its overruling position of power is one of the most extraordinary and significant facts of history. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 139.

While we concur that Constantine contributed significantly to the rise of papal Rome onto the world’s political scene, in our view the days of Constantine would better be located where we have already put them — in v. 21² — and it is actually the days of Justinian that should be located in v. 23. Specifically, the date we assign the “league” of v. 23 is A.D. 533 when Justinian formally and legally recognized the pope’s ecclesiastical supremacy and conferred on the bishop of Rome political authority. This consummated the union between the apostate Christian church and the state, making it official, legal, and complete. Of course, for the papacy this was a significant step beyond merely positioning herself at the head of the Roman pagan kingdom. That is, the papacy obtained the kingdom of pagan Rome in v. 21 by positioning herself as the *religious* authority of the Roman Empire’s pagans, and her “league” in v. 23 was a natural progression beyond this in that the civil government

¹ Dan. 11:6 is quoted in Part 1, p. 50.

² See Part 1, pp. 89–91.

of imperial Rome was now willing to embrace the papacy as a partner in holding *political* authority over ecclesiastical affairs. Now let's go to the *SDA Bible Commentary* for comments regarding Justinian's role in the fulfillment of prophecy:

Justinian is noted not only for his success in temporarily reuniting Italy and parts of the West with the Eastern half of what had been the Roman Empire, but also for the gathering and organizing of the then-existing laws of the empire, including new edicts of Justinian himself, into a unified code. *Incorporated into this imperial code were two official letters of Justinian, which had all the force of royal edicts, in which he legally confirmed the bishop of Rome as the "head of all the holy churches" and "head of all the holy priests of God" (Code of Justinian, book 1, title 1). In the later epistle he also commends the pope's activities as corrector of heretics.*

Although this *legal recognition* of the pope's ecclesiastical supremacy was dated in 533, it is obvious that the imperial edict could not become effective for the pope so long as the Arian Ostrogothic kingdom was in control of Rome and the greater part of Italy. Not until the rule of the Goths was broken could the papacy be free to develop fully its power. In 538, for the first time since the end of the Western imperial line, the city of Rome was freed from the domination of an Arian kingdom. In that year the Ostrogothic kingdom received its deathblow (although the Ostrogoths survived some years longer as a people). That is why 538 is a more significant date than 533.

To summarize: (1) *The pope had already* been recognized generally (though by no means universally) as supreme bishop in the churches of the West, and had *exercised considerable political influence*, from time to time, under the patronage of the Western emperors. (2) In 533 *Justinian recognized the pope's ecclesiastical supremacy as "head of all the holy churches" in both East and West*, and this *legal recognition* was incorporated into the *imperial code of laws* (534). (3) In 538 the papacy was effectively freed from the domination of the Arian kingdoms that followed the Western emperors in the control of Rome and Italy. From then on the papacy was in a position to increase its ecclesiastical power. The other kingdoms became Catholic, one by one, and since the distant Eastern emperors did not retain control of Italy, in the turbulent developments that followed, the pope emerged often as the leading figure in the West. The papacy acquired territorial rule and eventually it reached its peak in political as well as religious dominance in Europe. Though this dominance came much later, the turning point can be found in the time of Justinian. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:827 (emphasis supplied).

According to our understanding thus far, Justinian's codified letters in 533/534 formalized the marriage of the papacy with the state in principle while papal freedom to actually exercise political authority in 538 formalized this marriage contract in fact.

The prophetic period of the little horn [*i.e. the 1260 years of papal supremacy*]³ began in A.D. 538, when the Ostrogoths abandoned the siege of Rome, and the bishop of Rome, released from Arian control, was free to exercise the prerogatives of Justinian's decree of 533, and thenceforth to increase the authority of the "Holy See." *Ibid.*, 834.

We will give our own assessment of what constitutes the fulfillment of prophetic events in 538 later; but for now we will merely note that, according to the Commentary, the Arian Ostrogoths as a political power to be reckoned with were eliminated in 538. Thus, from 538 on, the little horn of Daniel 7—the "Holy See" in Rome—now in official league with imperial Rome based in Constantinople, became an acknowledged partner in sharing *political* authority throughout the Empire; this political authority, most ominously to God's people, being found in Justinian's commendation that the pope was the corrector of heretics. This gave papal authorities imperial sanction to "correct" any dissidents to Catholicism in any way they chose, without the restraints of an impartial civil judicial

³ Dan. 7:25; also cf. Rev. 11:2, 3; 12:6, 14; 13:5.

system. In fact, Justinian’s actions implicitly vested the papacy *herself* judicial authority in such matters; and thus we see how the basic nature of Rome changed. No longer just a state civil power (imperial Rome alone), now, by virtue of the “league,” she was also an *ecclesiastical* power (imperial Rome married to papal Rome) formally vested with *political* authority, artfully exercising her ecclesiastical will through political intimidation. In this we see how “the dragon [*Satan acting through his earthly agent of imperial Rome*] gave him [*papal Rome*] his power, and his seat, and great authority” (Rev. 13:2),⁴ and we see how this new politico-ecclesiastical world power was to be “diverse from all kingdoms” (Dan. 7:23). And eventually the civil power of imperial Rome would be broken up into the separate nations represented by the ten horns of Daniel 7, leaving papal Rome as the Roman Empire’s sole political voice.

We should note that the history of the rise and reign of papal Rome as a world political power shows that, from A.D. 313 (with the Edict of Milan when Constantine first began to champion Catholicism) to A.D. 533 (when Justinian recognized the pope’s ecclesiastical supremacy), the political influence of papal Rome slowly but steadily grew. However, during this period there were serious schisms within the Church of Rome as the various bishops of the Empire’s major cities, particularly the bishop of Constantinople, challenged the bishop of Rome’s authority. This created serious doctrinal differences that produced competing factions and loyalties within the Church, and this, in turn, was a destabilizing influence on the Empire itself. But Justinian settled the church authority issue once and for all with his two letters of 533, even incorporating them into the imperial code of laws — the *Corpus Juris Civilis* — in 534, thereby making their pronouncements the law of the empire.⁵

We should also note that, for the purpose of maintaining a peaceful and orderly society, imperial Rome had *always* been involved in the religious affairs of the empire. But as with every world empire before it, the accepted religion of the Empire had been the many facets of paganism; thus, “imperial Rome” and “pagan Rome” have long been considered synonymous terms. But after the papacy accomplished to “obtain the kingdom [*of pagan Rome*]” in Daniel 11:21 (*i.e.* after imperial Rome embraced the papacy [in her own state of compromise with paganism] in the days of Constantine) the Roman Empire became less and less identified with overt paganism and more and more identified with a covert form of paganism; one that had been “Christianized.” And eventually, then, the Roman Empire became known, most inaccurately, as the “Holy Roman Empire.”⁶ Nevertheless, as noted in Part 1, p. 92, we make little distinction between imperial Rome and what has been called the Holy Roman Empire when it comes to the heart of its true religious state—they were both pagan.

Noting the event constituting the marriage of the apostate church with the state as Justinian’s codified decree in A.D. 533 will become important later when we identify the event constituting the

⁴ Cf. *GC* 54.

⁵ Justinian’s first letter was to Epiphanius, the bishop of Constantinople, and the second was to John, the bishop of Rome. Justinian wrote to Epiphanius that “the holy Pope and Patriarch of ancient Rome . . . was the head of the Holy priests of God” and that “the heretics that have arisen in his jurisdiction have been restrained by the decision and the correct judgment of his venerable seat” (*Corpus Juris Civilis* 1.1.7, articles 1, 2; edict dated 3/26/533). And he wrote to John that it was his desire “to preserve your apostolic seat as the point of unity” and “to make all priests of the whole Orient subject to the seat of Your Holiness and to unite them with it.” He also recognized the pope as “the head of all holy churches. For . . . we always strive to increase the honor and influence of Your Seat” (*Corpus Juris Civilis* 1.1.8, articles 8, 9, 11; edict dated 3/25/534). All quotes are from the Fred H. Blume translation of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* (<http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume%2Djustinian/ajc%2Ddedition%2D1/index.html> University of Wyoming website, accessed 8/31/2014). Also cf. the S. P. Scott translation at <http://www.constitution.org/sps/sps.htm>.

⁶ The foundation of the “Holy Roman Empire” was laid when Pope Leo III crowned the Frank king Charlemagne as Emperor of the Romans on Christmas Day in 800 (thereby, for the first time since 476, reconstituting, in theory at least, the Western Roman Empire). Nevertheless, the first recognized emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was Otto the Great, coronated by Pope John XII in 962. The Holy Roman Empire dissolved some 1000 years after Charlemagne when its last emperor, Francis II, was defeated by Napoleon in 1806.

healing of the apocalyptic beast's deadly wound of Revelation 13:3. Of course, the *healing* of the deadly wound occurs only *after* the deadly wound itself occurs, and the deadly wound marks the *end* of the "league" of papal union with the state. And as we might expect, the deadly wound and its healing are referred to in the following verses of Daniel 11. But right now we will note what papal Rome would do *during* her historic league with the state as it is described in Daniel 11:24:

24 He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places (the strongest Christian areas) **of the province**⁴⁰⁸² (the political jurisdiction of Rome); **and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them** (papal Rome's supporters) **the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds** (companies of God's true people), **even for a time**⁶²⁵⁶.

In our view, "He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province" is in reference to the papacy obtaining political control (in the area of religious practice) over the now Christian people of Europe. Strong's definition of the Hebrew word translated "province":

4082. **m^odiynah**, *med-ee-naw'*; from 1777; prop. a *judgeship*, i.e. *jurisdiction*; by impl. a *district* (as ruled by a judge); gen. a *region*: — (X every) province.

We understand the "province" of v. 24 to be the area of political jurisdiction the papacy just acquired through her political "league" with imperial Rome. Of course, the political influence of the papacy was geographically bound by that territory which her union with the state of Rome provided; namely, the boundaries of the Roman Empire. "[A]nd he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers" refers to the papacy's amalgamation, for the purpose of political expediency, of Christian and pagan doctrines and ceremonies; "he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches" refers to the papacy's distribution of her ill-gained riches among her followers;⁷ "and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds" refers to the papacy's overt persecution of the true church of God. Lastly, "even for a time" refers to the papacy's allotted time period in which God allows her to "forecast" her "devices against the strong holds," and in our view this time period is the 1260 years of Daniel 7:25. But before focusing on the "time" of v. 24, let's consider the "strong holds."

In the scenario we propose, the "strong holds" of v. 24 are obviously the object of the papacy's persecution and, consequently, would most logically represent the various groups of God's true people throughout the "province" who did not join the papacy in her flattering compromise with paganism, nor in her adulterous league with the state, and who continued to worship God in truth. We noted in Part 1, p. 52 how God's church has always been likened to a *fortress* and that in the spiritual fulfillment of v. 7 God's Old Testament church was referred to specifically as a "fortress" that Satan had, by enticing Israel to compromise with the paganism of her neighbors, successfully entered. Then we noted on pp. 70–73 how the apostate nation of literal Israel (spiritual Jasher) conspired with imperial Rome to enter, with the intent to corrupt, the implied New Testament church fortress of spiritual Israel while she was still in her infancy. However, this conspiracy failed in its objective and thus v. 17 stated that imperial Rome merely *purposed* (i.e. "set his face") to enter the New Testament Christian church fortress. But by the time we get to v. 24 we find that Satan has indeed *succeeded* in entering, this time through the traitorous institution of the Church of Rome, the New Testament church fortress.⁸ Satan having accomplished this, the true people of God were now forced into "strong holds" within the Christian church (within their own fortress) for self-protection. Consequently, whereas God's people up to this point could be referred to simply as God's "people" or His "church" (likened to a fortress), with the satanic papal infiltration of the Christian church

⁷ By imperial decrees beginning in the 4th century, anyone who refused to become a loyal Catholic was subject to the confiscation of their property which would then be transferred to the Catholic Church.

⁸ To review how this was accomplished, see the GC 384–385 quote in Part 1, p. 94.

God’s people must now be referred to as His “true people” or His “true church” (likened to strong holds within a corrupted fortress).

In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. Its seat of power was fixed in the imperial city, and the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church. Paganism had given place to the papacy. The dragon had given to the beast “his power, and his seat, and great authority.” Revelation 13:2. And now began the 1260 years of papal oppression foretold in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Daniel 7:25; Revelation 13:5–7. Christians were forced to choose either to yield their integrity and accept the papal ceremonies and worship, or to wear away their lives in dungeons or suffer death by the rack, the fagot, or the headsman’s ax. . . . Persecution opened upon the faithful with greater fury than ever before, and the world became a vast battlefield. For hundreds of years the church of Christ found refuge in seclusion and obscurity. *The Great Controversy*, 54–55.

We liken the New Testament “strong holds” of Daniel 11:24 to the Old Testament “strongholds of principle” Inspiration spoke of in the *PP* 459 quote in Part 1, p. 52.

Even For a Time

Strong’s definition for the word “time” in Daniel 11:24:

6256. **eth**, *ayth*; from 5703; *time*, espec. (adv. with prep.) *now*, *when*, etc. — + after, [al-] ways, X certain, + continually, + evening, long, (due) season, so [long] as, [even-, evening-, noon-] tide, ([meal-], what) time, when.

While this word is used sixteen times in the book of Daniel, thirteen of which are in this particular vision,⁹ it is never used to employ the prophetic year-day principle. This is because its definition does not allow its use to specifically define a literal year. However, even though there is no hint in the above definition that the word *eth* designates a literal year, most Adventist commentators will force the application of a prophetic year on this word in v. 24. That is, they understand the “time” here to refer to one prophetic year (*i.e.* 360 literal years).¹⁰

There are two words rendered “time” in Daniel that are used to represent either literal or prophetic years. One is the Aramaic word *iddan* found in Daniel 4:16, 23, 25, 31 (regarding the seven “times” Nebuchadnezzar became as a “beast”) and Daniel 7:25 (regarding the 3½ “times” God’s people “shall be given into his [papal Rome’s] hand”). The other is the Hebrew word *moed* found in Daniel 12:7 (also regarding 3½ “times”). Unlike the word *eth*, both of these words *can* be used to specifically designate a year and, therefore, *can* be used in apocalyptic prophecies like those of Daniel 7–12 to designate a *prophetic* year. Note how a definite year is mentioned in each of Strong’s definitions (underlined emphasis supplied):

5732. **iddan** (Chald.), *id-dawn*’; from a root corresp. to that of 5708; a *set time*; techn. a year: —time.

4150. **mow’ed**, *mo-ade*’; or

mo’ed *moade*’; or (fem.)

mow’adah (2 Chron. 8:13), *mo-aw-daw*’; from 8259; prop. an *appointment*, *i.e.* fixed *time* or season; spec. a *festival*; conventionally a year; by implication, an *assembly* (as convened for a definite purpose); technically the *congregation*; by extension, the *place of meeting*; also a *signal* (as appointed beforehand): — appointed (sign, time), (place of, solemn) assembly, congregation, (set, solemn) feast, (appointed, due) season, solemn (-ity), synagogue, (set) time, (appointed).

⁹ Dan. 8:17; 9:21, 25; 11:6, 13, 14, 24, 35, 40; 12:1 (four times), 4, 9, 11.

¹⁰ One prophetic month is considered 30 days long, thus making one prophetic year 360 days long. Applying the year-day principle then makes one prophetic year 360 literal years long. Cf. *4BC* 833.

The word *eth*, however, denotes only an *unspecified* point in time or period of time. The exact point in time or period of time in which it is used in reference to must be derived from the context of its usage. The context of its usage in Daniel 11:24 is, we have concluded, the period of time “he [papal Rome] shall forecast his devices against the strong holds” of God’s true people. This period was specifically defined in Daniel 7:25 where the Aramaic word *iddan* was used employing its prophetic year-for-a-day usage:

25 And he (papal Rome) shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they (the saints of the most High) shall be given into his hand until a time⁵⁷³² (one “time”) and times⁵⁷³² (two “times”) and the dividing of time⁵⁷³² (half a “time”).

Therefore, we believe the “time” (*eth*) of unspecified duration in Daniel 11:24 is in reference to the same period as the 3½ “times” (*iddans*) of specified duration in 7:25—this time period being, of course, the 3½ prophetic years of papal supremacy and persecution of A.D. 538–1798. Truly, with the “league” between imperial and papal Rome that Justinian presided over in A.D. 533/534 (that commended the pope as the “corrector of heretics”) securely in place, when papal Rome began to exercise her newly acquired political authority in 538 “the saints of the most High” were literally given into her hand. Unfortunately, as prophecy has declared and as history has revealed, the hand papal Rome extended was not a hand of mercy; it was a hand that showed *no* mercy. For the 3½ *iddans* of Daniel 7:25 and the *eth* of Daniel 11:24 the papacy would “wear out the saints of the most High” by “forecast[ing] his devices against the strong holds” of God’s true people.

Linguistic Parallels

While the little horn of Daniel 7 represents papal Rome in particular, the little horn of Daniel 8 “represents Rome in both its phases, pagan and papal” (4BC 841). As we know, over the centuries Rome has manifested itself in the two major phases of imperial and papal, and the prophetic description of the little horn in Daniel 8:9–12; 23–25 applies to both phases. That is, Daniel 8 makes no distinction between imperial and papal Rome and treats both phases of Rome as the single power they in essence are. But this application is not the case in Daniel 11. Daniel 11 is obviously an enlargement on Daniel 8, and therefore it should not be surprising to find that Daniel 11 describes the two phases of Rome separately. We believe Daniel 11 speaks of imperial Rome in vs. 16–20 and papal Rome in vs. 21–45. So now let’s parallel the relevant verses of Daniel 8 with those in Daniel 11 that we have considered thus far:

Daniel 8:9–12; 23–25

9 And out of one of them came forth a little horn (Rome), which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land (Palestine).

10 And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven (God’s people on earth); and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.

11 Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host (Christ), and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.

12 And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.

Daniel 11:16–24

16 But he (imperial Rome) that cometh against him (the king of the North) shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land (Palestine), which by his hand shall be consumed.

17 He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him.

18 After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him.

19 Then he shall turn his face toward the fort (the city of Rome) of his own land (the pagan Roman Em-

23 And in the latter time of their kingdom (after the four kingdoms of the divided Greek Empire), **when the transgressors** (those committing the “transgression” of vs. 12–13) **are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences** (the pope vested with political authority), **shall stand up** (shall rise to political prominence).

24 And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power (papal Rome’s power came by her union with imperial Rome); **and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people** (shall persecute God’s people).

25 And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many (the political intrigue of Rome is legendary); **he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes** (papal Rome placed her authority above God’s, and the pope was worshiped as a god); **but he shall be broken⁷⁶⁶⁵ without hand.**

pire): **but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.**

20 Then shall stand up in his estate one that causeth an exacter to pass over [margin] *in* the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.

[introduction of papal Rome]

21 And in his (the Roman emperor’s) **estate shall stand up** (shall rise to religious prominence) **a vile person** (the pope), **to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom** [of pagan Rome] **by flatteries.**

22 And with the arms of a flood shall they (God’s covenant people) **be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant.**

23 And after the league *made* with him (imperial Rome; the state) **he** (papal Rome; the church) **shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up** (shall rise to political prominence), **and shall become strong with a small people.**

24 He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do *that* which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers’ fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: *yea*, and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds, even for a time

We have seen that Daniel 8:9–12 is part of the original vision itself while vs. 23–25 is part of the first explanation.¹¹ Of course, we have also seen that Daniel 11:16–24 is part of the third explanation. And while the original vision makes no distinction between imperial and papal Rome in that both phases of Rome are symbolized by the “little horn” (v. 9), we believe the original vision, like its explanations, follows a chronological sequence. Thus, in the original vision *and* its explanations we would expect papal Rome to be described immediately following that of imperial Rome. In the original vision, we see imperial Rome in Daniel 8:9 and papal Rome in vs. 10–12. In the first explanation, we believe imperial Rome is ignored and papal Rome only is described. And in the third explanation, we see imperial Rome in Daniel 11:16–20 and papal Rome in vs. 21–45.

Regarding imperial Rome, we saw from our verse parallel in Part 1, p. 44 that Daniel 8:9 and 11:16 describe imperial Rome’s geographical takeover of the Greek Empire. We have also seen that Daniel 11:17–19 describes the three phases of Roman persecution of the apostolic church, and v. 20 describes the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the abomination-of-desolation Roman army in A.D. 70.¹² Verse 20 then tells us that imperial Rome “shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.” This fits history in that imperial Rome was not destroyed by a succeeding world power, but simply disintegrated, allowing papal Rome to carry on the Roman domination alone.

Regarding papal Rome, we will detail in a later chapter just how Daniel 8:10–12 applies to papal Rome. But as for the vision’s explanations, in our view (1) the “king of fierce countenance” who “shall stand up” in 8:23 is the “vile person” who “shall come up” in 11:23;¹³ (2) the king’s “power

¹¹ We paralleled these verses in Part 1, pp. 10 and 12.

¹² Regarding vs. 17–19, see “In the Face of the Serpent” in Part 1, pp. 70–78. Regarding v. 20, see “Retribution Comes on the Jews” on pp. 80–85.

¹³ We believe the “standing up” of the “vile person” in Dan. 11:21 refers to the rise to *religious* prominence of the papal power within the Roman Empire in the 4th century, while the “coming up” of the “vile person” in v. 23 and the “standing up” of the “king” in Dan. 8:23 refers to the rise to *political* prominence of the papal power within the Roman Empire in the 6th century. We also believe that any prophetic reference to the papacy as a “king” is a reference to the

shall be mighty, but not by his own power” in 8:24 equates with how the “vile person” “shall come up, and shall become strong” by virtue of his “league” with imperial Rome in 11:23; (3) the “king” who “shall destroy the mighty and the holy people” in 8:24 equates with the “vile person” of whom it is said that “with the arms of a flood shall they [*God’s covenant people*] be overflowed” in 11:22 and who would “forecast his devices against the strong holds [*of God’s covenant people*]” in v. 24; (4) the “king” who would “cause craft to prosper in his hand” in 8:25 equates with the “vile person” who would “obtain the kingdom by flatteries” in 11:21 and “work deceitfully” in v. 23; (5) the “king” who “by peace shall destroy many” in 8:25 equates with how the “vile person” “shall come in peaceably” in 11:21 and “enter peaceably” in v. 24; and (6) the “king” who would “stand up against the Prince of princes” in 8:25 equates with the “vile person” who would “break” not only God’s covenant people but “yea, also the prince of the covenant” in 11:22. We will see how papal Rome is “broken without hand” (8:25) later.

Recognizing the similarities between Daniel 8:23–25 and 11:21–24, and recognizing that these passages are respectively portions of the first and third explanations of the original vision of 8:1–14 and therefore should parallel each other,¹⁴ and making the application that the “king” of 8:23 is the pope, it is evident that the “vile person” of 11:21 is also the pope. Also, in our view the historical time period of 11:23–24—the reign of papal Rome of AD 533–1798—is essentially the same as that of the spiritual application of 11:11–12.¹⁵ Now we will see that the next three verses of Daniel 11 describe the infliction of the deadly wound to the papacy when she came to the end of her allotted time period (in her collusion with the state) against God’s covenant people. This is the subject of the next chapter.

papacy formally vested with political authority. This explains why the papacy was introduced in Dan. 11 as a “vile person” in v. 21 as opposed to a “king,” as, in our view, the papacy does not receive political authority until v. 23.

¹⁴ Cf. again “The Interrelationship Between Daniel’s Visions” in Part 1, pp. 6–7.

¹⁵ See Part 1, p. 57.

2. THE DEADLY WOUND TO PAPAL ROME

The term “deadly wound” comes from Revelation 13:3, and we will focus on Revelation 13 later in our study. Nevertheless, it is clear that Daniel 11:25–27 describes a deadly encounter between two characters, neither of which, as v. 27 makes clear, is of high moral integrity. These are the two principal “bad guys” in the great controversy — the king of the South and the “he” of this prophecy. Employing our pronoun rule, we understand the “he” to refer to the little-horn power of Rome;¹ and we will point out that this “he” has *not* been referred to as the “king of the North” despite the many opportunities Gabriel has had to do so since v. 16 when this “he” was introduced.

We need not assume that because v. 27 refers to both the king of the South and papal Rome as “kings” that this makes papal Rome the spiritual king of the North. We will note again that the title “king of the North” is not specifically mentioned following v. 15 until all the way down to v. 40; therefore, to identify the two kings of vs. 25–27 as the two kings of the North and South is only an assumption. But for Gabriel to refer to the papacy as a “king” even though the papacy is neither the king of the North nor the king of the South is appropriate given the fact that papal Rome, upon entering the “league” (v. 23) with imperial Rome, became the second phase of the “king” of Daniel 8:23.² Therefore, we view the two kings of Daniel 11:25–27 as the king of the South and the king of Daniel 8:23 and that the king of the North is a non-participant in these verses.

Because we have concluded that Daniel 11–12 constitutes Gabriel’s third and final explanation of Daniel’s vision of chapter 8,³ we would expect the papal “king” of Daniel 8:23 to be mentioned in Daniel 11–12; and we find this reference, we believe, as noted in our comments under “linguistic parallels” at the end of the previous chapter. In contrast, we have seen that the kings of the North and South are characters *unique* to Daniel 11–12; they had no part in the parent prophecy of chapter 8.⁴ In our view, this indicates that because the papacy *was* a character in the parent prophecy, when she is brought to view in Daniel 11 she should *not* be identified as either the king of the North or the king of the South. Even though the politicized papacy is indeed called a “king” in Daniel 8, in Daniel 11 we should expect the papacy to be portrayed as an entirely separate king from those of the North and South. Now let’s look at Daniel 11:25–27 with our parenthetical comments included:

25 And he (the papacy) shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he (the papacy) shall not stand: for they (the army of the king of the South) shall forecast devices against him.

26 Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (the papacy’s) meat shall destroy him, and his (the king of the South’s) army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain.

27 And both these kings’ (the king of the South and the king of Dan. 8:23 — the papacy/pope) hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed [in Dan. 7:25].

On pp. 48 and 51 of Part 1 we identified the spiritual kings of the North and South in the Seleucid and Ptolemy dramatization of vs. 5–15 as, in general terms, Christ and Satan [with their earthly forces] respectively; and on p. 65 as well as above, we determined that when the new power of Rome came on the scene (following the Seleucids) this new power did *not* qualify as the new king of the North. But having now come to the first direct reference to one of the kings of the North/South following the Seleucid/Ptolemy historical account, it is time to identify in specific terms who this new king of the South is as the great controversy continues to play out in the real world. And though

¹ For our rule, see Part 1, p. 65.

² Dan. 8:23 is quoted on p. 9.

³ See Part 1, pp. 6–7, 62.

⁴ See “Present Relevance of These Historical Events” in Part 1, pp. 44–48.

the general identity of the king of the North will be addressed again later in this chapter, we will not attempt to identify the specific spiritual post-Seleucid king of the North until we get to his specific reference in v. 40.

The Spiritual King of the South

Understanding the “time” in v. 24 as we do,⁵ we would expect the king of the South in v. 25 to spiritually refer to revolutionary France which, we know from history, inflicted the deadly wound to the papacy in 1798 at the end of the 3½ “times” of Daniel 7:25. Revelation 11:1–13 helps verify this as this text is another prophetic account of the 1260 years of papal persecution.⁶ Reading vs. 7–10:

7 And when they (the Bible Old and New Testaments)⁷ shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them.

8 And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.

9 And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves.

10 And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth.

The Spirit of Prophecy comments on these verses:

“The great city” in whose streets the witnesses are slain, and where their dead bodies lie, is “*spiritually*” Egypt. Of all nations presented in Bible history, Egypt most boldly *denied the existence of the living God* and resisted His commands. No monarch ever ventured upon more *open and highhanded rebellion against the authority of Heaven* than did the king of Egypt. When the message was brought him by Moses, in the name of the Lord, Pharaoh proudly answered: “Who is Jehovah, that I should hearken unto His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, and moreover I will not let Israel go.” Exodus 5:2, A.R.V. *This is atheism*, and *the nation represented by Egypt* would give voice to a similar denial of the claims of the living God and would manifest a like spirit of unbelief and defiance. “The great city” is also compared, “*spiritually*,” to *Sodom*. The corruption of Sodom in breaking the law of God was especially manifested in licentiousness. And this sin was also to be a pre-eminent characteristic of the nation that should fulfill the specifications of this scripture.

According to the words of the prophet, then, a little before the year 1798 some power of *satanic origin and character* would rise to make war upon the Bible. And in the land where the testimony of God’s two witnesses should thus be silenced, there would be manifest the *atheism of the Pharaoh* and the *licentiousness of Sodom*.

This prophecy has received a most exact and striking fulfillment in the history of France. *The Great Controversy*, 269 (emphasis supplied).

First, it is important to recognize what was atheistic about ancient Egypt and what was not. Historically, Egypt was one of the most polytheistic nations there ever was; they had a god for nearly everything.⁸ But it is not the historic *religion of Egypt* that is identified with atheism in the quote above; rather, it is the “*atheism of the Pharaoh*” so identified. Of course, Pharaoh’s atheism was manifested by his overt denial of the existence of the God of Israel. Now continuing where the above quote left off:

⁵ Cf. “Even For a Time” on pp. 7–8.

⁶ Cf. *GC* 266.

⁷ Cf. *GC* 267.

⁸ Cf. Ex. 12:12.

During the Revolution, in 1793, “the world for the first time heard an assembly of men, born and educated in civilization, and assuming the right to govern one of the finest of the European nations, uplift their united voice to deny the most solemn truth which man’s soul receives, and renounce unanimously the belief and worship of a Deity.” — Sir Walter Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, vol. 1, ch. 17. “France is the only nation in the world concerning which the authentic record survives, that as a nation she lifted her hand in open rebellion against the Author of the universe. Plenty of blasphemers, plenty of infidels, there have been, and still continue to be, in England, Germany, Spain, and elsewhere; but *France stands apart in the world’s history as the single state which, by the decree of her Legislative Assembly, pronounced that there was no God*, and of which the entire population of the capital, and a vast majority elsewhere, women as well as men, danced and sang with joy in accepting the announcement.” — *Blackwood’s Magazine*, November, 1870. *Ibid.*, 269–270 (emphasis supplied).

Knowing Revelation 11 and Daniel 11 are apocalyptic prophecies that use related symbols and representations, and understanding, as we do, that Revelation 11:7–10 and Daniel 11:25–27 each describe events at the end of the 1260 years of papal supremacy, and knowing Egypt is identified in Daniel 11:5–15 as the *historic* king of the South, and understanding that the king of the South in Daniel 11:25 must be identified *spiritually*, and having noted the Spirit of Prophecy identification above of atheistic, revolutionary France as being “the great city” which “is ‘*spiritually*’ Egypt” in Revelation 11:8,⁹ the next logical step is to identify the “*spiritual*” Egypt of France in Revelation 11:8 as the “*spiritual*” king of the South in Daniel 11:25. This “*spiritual*” Egypt/king of the South is also described in v. 7 of Revelation 11 as “the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit.”¹⁰

Understanding that the identity of “*spiritual*” Egypt in Revelation 11:8 and the spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11:25 are one and the same power, we can now characterize the king of the South in Daniel 11:25 as an atheistic and licentious political power of, in the words of the GC 269 quote above, “satanic origin and character.” And this harmonizes perfectly with our previous conclusion that the spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11 is Satan and his earthly goons.¹¹

We will note that France at this time was going through her notorious French Revolution (1789–1798), and who would argue that the French Revolution was not of satanic origin and character? But having identified revolutionary France as the king of the South in Daniel 11:25, it is interesting to note that Daniel 11:25–27 depicts the attack of this atheistic power on *apostate* Christianity (directed toward the papacy) coming at the end of the “time” of v. 24 while Revelation 11:7–10 depicts her attack on *true* Christianity (directed toward the Bible) coming at the end of the 1260 days of v. 3. Both passages refer to events surrounding the same historical time period—the end of the first papal supremacy—but are set in the different contexts of how state endorsed atheism, when it ascended out of the bottomless pit and manifested itself as the king of the South of Daniel 11 and the prophetic beast of Revelation 11, reacted to the presence of apostate Christianity and true Christianity respectively.

Finally regarding the identity of the spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11, we believe that understanding Revelation 11:8 in its historical context is the key to unlocking this identity. In our view, reference to “*spiritual* Egypt” in the Apocalypse is an unmistakable link to the spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11. And allowing the Bible to interpret itself should always be our primary method of exegesis; anything else is speculation or private interpretation. We will return to Revelation 11 for further study later.

⁹ First sentence of first quote above.

¹⁰ Compare the quote of Isa. 14:15 and our associated comments in Part 1, p. 65.

¹¹ Cf. Part 1, p. 65.

The Relationship Between the Literal and Spiritual Kings of the South

Edwin Thiele also identified France as the spiritual king of the South of Daniel 11; however, as virtually every SDA commentator does, he mistakenly, in our view, makes this application to the king of the South in v. 40 rather than v. 25. Despite this, Thiele makes an interesting observation in this regard:

Not only did Napoleon take the pope prisoner in 1798 and thus bring an end to the 1260 years of papal supremacy, but that year he invaded Egypt in connection with a struggle in which he was engaged with England. He realized that an attempt at a direct invasion of England would offer him no chance of success, so he decided that he would strike at her by directing himself against her empire in the east. The east held a great fascination for him, and he declared, "only in the east can one do great things." The possession of Egypt he believed would provide him with a route to India. So he struck at Egypt, landing near Alexandria with his army on July 1, 1798. A month later Nelson destroyed the French fleet and Napoleon found himself cut off from France. However he brought Egypt down in a brilliant campaign. Egypt was declared a French protectorate, a colony of France, and remained in French hands for three years. Thus in 1798 Napoleon became the king of the South, and is the ruler thus referred to in Dan 11:40.

. . . By these events Napoleon became directly involved in the fulfillment of two of Daniel's prophecies having to do with the year 1798, with each providing an interesting confirmation of the other. By taking the pope prisoner in 1798 he brought about the fulfillment of Dan 7:25, and by his seizure of Egypt in 1798 he brought about the fulfillment of Dan 11:40. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 160.

Whereas we have identified revolutionary France as the king of the South because her atheistic theology identified her as "spiritual" Egypt, Thiele identified France as the king of the South because she literally occupied the land of Egypt. It would seem logical, therefore, to conclude that France actually met *two* separate criteria to be the king of the South in the post-Ptolemaic verses of Daniel 11: (1) the *spiritual* criteria of holding to the atheism of Pharaoh; and (2) the *literal* criteria of occupying the land of Egypt. But if we accept this to be the case, and if we reasonably expect the terminology of this prophecy [as well as the identifying characteristics of the main characters of this prophecy] to remain consistent throughout, we might now expect the *Ptolemies* to have met the same *dual* criteria making them deserving of the title "king of the South" in vs. 5–15.

That the Ptolemies occupied Egypt is a given fact, but did they qualify as "spiritual" Egypt as did France? To answer this question we must better understand the relationship between the king of the South in Ptolemaic history with the king of the South in post-Ptolemaic history.

Thiele took the view that France in the late 18th century constituted the king of the South both spiritually and literally. Of Thiele's two qualifications, however, the Ptolemies in the second and third centuries B.C. constituted the king of the South in only the literal way by militarily occupying the land of Egypt. That is, their theology did not make them the king of the South in that their religion had nothing in common with Pharaoh's atheism.

In our view of Daniel 11 we do not expect the theology of the Ptolemies to have been atheism any more than we expect the theology of the Seleucids to have been the worship of the true and living God. This is because these two kings were merely dramatizing in their earthly political and military battles the major battles of the spiritual warfare of the great controversy between Christ and Satan.¹² They were not themselves directly involved in the spiritual battles they dramatized; therefore, their own personal theologies had no relationship to the theologies of the spiritual powers they represented. On the other hand, France was in no way dramatizing anything. The part France played was a real-life part of the spiritual conflict. Therefore, we would expect the theology of France, in fulfilling the role of "spiritual" Egypt in Revelation 11:8 and the *spiritual* king of the South in Daniel

¹² See again "Present Relevance of These Historical Events" in Part 1, pp. 44–48 and Part 1, chapter 4.

11:25, to be essentially the same theology as that portrayed of Egypt’s Pharaoh in Scripture when he was contending with Moses regarding God’s people — it was the theology of Pharaoh when he defiantly asked, “Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go?” (Ex. 5:2). And this theology was the denial of the existence of God—atheism.

Thiele has pointed out that France occupied Egypt in 1798 which, he concluded, made France the new king of the South in post-Ptolemaic history. However, if the literal occupation of Egypt is the only criteria whereby we identify the king of the South, then to be consistent we would have to conclude that every nation that ever occupied Egypt must bear this title. And this means we would fully expect imperial Rome to be referred to as the new king of the South in v. 16 and onward when Rome became the new occupying power of Egypt. But since Daniel 11 does not refer to Rome as such, we conclude that there is still something in common between France and the Ptolemies that is not in common between France and Rome. But we have just seen that theology was not held in common by France and the Ptolemies; and we have also just seen that the literal occupation of Egypt was held in common by *all three* of these powers.

Looking again at why Thiele considered France to be the new king of the South in 1798, the occupation of Egypt by France beginning in 1798 lasted a mere three years. This seems such a short duration that it could hardly be the primary reason giving France the significant title “king of the South” in Daniel 11. And since, according to our understanding, it was actually the period of the French Revolution occurring in the ten years leading *up to* 1798 that fulfilled the description of the king of the South in Daniel 11:25–27, and since France was the “spiritual” Egypt in which the “dead bodies” of the Bible testaments lay for the prophetic “three days and an half” (3½ literal years) *prior* to 1798 that fulfilled Revelation 11:7–10, then it could hardly be the occupation of Egypt *beginning* in 1798 that made France the post-Ptolemaic spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11 *or* the “spiritual” Egypt in Revelation 11. Let’s note the precise time “spiritual” Egypt was in fact “spiritual” Egypt:

God’s faithful witnesses, slain by the blasphemous power that “ascendeth out of the bottomless pit,” were not long to remain silent. “After three days and a half the Spirit of life from God entered into them and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them.” Revelation 11:11. It was in 1793 that the decrees which abolished the Christian religion and set aside the Bible passed the French Assembly. Three years and a half later a resolution rescinding these decrees, thus granting toleration to the Scriptures, was adopted by the same body. *The Great Controversy*, 287.

It is clear that if the “dead bodies” of the “two witnesses” of Revelation 11 laid in the streets of spiritual Egypt for 3½ years beginning in 1793, then spiritual Egypt herself had to be in existence as early as 1793. Furthermore, the deadly wound which spiritual Egypt/the king of the South inflicted to the papacy occurred in *February* of 1798. The occupation of Egypt by France, however, did not begin until *July* of 1798.¹³ Therefore, the literal occupation of Egypt can in no way be cited as a characteristic by which France can be identified as either “spiritual” Egypt in Revelation 11 or the spiritual post-Ptolemaic king of the South in Daniel 11 as this characteristic *did not even apply* to France at the time the two witnesses were dead for the 3½ prophetic days of Revelation 11, nor did it apply when the deadly wound to the papacy was inflicted. We conclude, therefore, that the *only* reason atheistic France should be considered the “spiritual” Egypt of Revelation 11 and the spiritual king of the South of Daniel 11 is that she was so in the spiritual context of her theology being formally declared by her official governing body as atheistic.

Having ruled out the literal occupation of Egypt as a characteristic of the spiritual post-Ptolemaic king of the South, and having ruled out the theology of Pharaoh as a characteristic of the historic Ptolemaic king of the South, we must still look for a common denominator between the Ptolemies

¹³ See Thiele’s quote on p. 14.

and France that will with consistency constitute them both the king of the South in Daniel 11. Let's look again at the spiritual conditions necessary to be the king of the South.

We have ruled out the idea that the theologies between France and the Ptolemies have anything in common; but while it was the theology of France that made it the spiritual king of the South in Daniel 11:25, we have previously concluded that the Ptolemies also had their own spiritual application constituting them a "spiritual" king of the South. This spiritual application was the role they played in the dramatization of the great controversy by typifying Satan's overt anti-Christian forces which France later helped to fulfill in antitype. Though the specific spiritual applications for France and the Ptolemies are different, nevertheless, they are both spiritual applications each in their own way constituting their respective kingdoms a "spiritual" king of the South. And herein we have our common denominator. The relationship between the two spiritual applications of the Ptolemies and France in Daniel 11 could most simply be put this way: the spiritual application of the Ptolemies was the historical dramatization (in type) of what the spiritual application of France later helped to fulfill in reality (in antitype).

From this we can see all the more clearly the need of recognizing the spiritual application of the Ptolemies in Daniel 11:5–15. Without it, as Thiele's comments above give example, there is no spiritual common denominator linking the Ptolemaic and post-Ptolemaic kings of the South of Daniel 11 together. This is especially significant in that, as we have just noted, there is no literal common denominator linking the Ptolemaic and post-Ptolemaic kings of the South together. And since virtually every Adventist commentator recognizes the king of the South in v. 40 as being post-Ptolemaic, we can now make a spiritual application to this king of the South, as well as to the one in v. 25, that is consistent with our application of the Ptolemies in vs. 5–15. Of course, this same reasoning holds true with the king of the North in that we can now make a spiritual application to the king of the North in v. 40 that is consistent with our spiritual application of the Seleucids in vs. 5–15; but more about this when we get to v. 40.

Having explained our rationale for identifying late 18th century revolutionary France as the new post-Ptolemaic king of the South in Daniel 11:25, we will now focus on the deadly wound as it is described in vs. 25–27.

The Deadly Wound

In v. 25 we find words identical to words in v. 24. Compare:

24 . . . he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds

25 . . . they shall forecast devices against him.

According to our understanding, in v. 24 the papacy forecasts devices against God's true people, and in v. 25 the king of the South forecasts devices against the papacy. Just what exactly is referred to by "forecasting devices" is evident from Revelation 13:1–10 (which is yet another prophetic account of the 1260 years of papal persecution, just as is Rev. 11:1–13). Revelation 13:10 reads:

10 He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

The Spirit of Prophecy comments on Revelation 13:1–10:

"Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." And, says the prophet, "I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death." And again: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." The forty and two months are the same as the "time and times and the dividing of time," three years and a half, or 1260 days, of Daniel 7—the time during which the papal power was to oppress God's people. This period, as stated in preceding chapters, began with the supremacy of the papacy, A.D. 538, and terminated in 1798. At that time the pope was made captive by the

French army, the papal power received its deadly wound, and the prediction was fulfilled, “He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity.” *The Great Controversy*, 439.

Perhaps another way of stating Revelation 13:10 could be, “He that forecasts devices shall have devices forecast against him.” The “devices” in Daniel 11:25 that were forecast against the papacy are described in the next verse as “his [*the king of the South’s*] army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain.” In our view, they are also described by the Spirit of Prophecy:

All too well the people had learned the lessons of cruelty and torture which Rome had so diligently taught. A day of retribution at last had come. It was not now the disciples of Jesus that were thrust into dungeons and dragged to the stake. Long ago these had perished or been driven into exile. Unsparing Rome now felt the deadly power of those whom she had trained to delight in deeds of blood. “The example of persecution which the clergy of France had exhibited for so many ages, was now retorted upon them with a signal vigor. The scaffolds ran red with the blood of the priests. The galleys and the prisons, once crowded with Huguenots, were now filled with their persecutors. Chained to the bench and toiling at the oar, the Roman Catholic clergy experienced all those woes which their church had so freely inflicted on the gentle heretics.” . . .

. . . In the short space of ten years, multitudes of human beings perished. *Ibid.*, 283–284.

Thus, the “devices” the papacy “forecast” in v. 24 on the “gentle heretics” were retorted on the papacy in v. 25. Now let’s look again at the first part of v. 26:

26 Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (the papacy’s) meat shall destroy him . . .

This indicates that it is a former ally who destroys “him.” Though not making this application to this verse, C. Mervyn Maxwell notes:

“For the *first time in European history* since the days of the [Roman] Emperor Julian the Apostate a state deliberately embarked on a policy of de-Christianization.”

France had another “first” to its credit in addition to being the first Christian nation in Europe deliberately to oppose Christianity. Among the tribes that invaded and took over the western Roman Empire, the Franks in 496 were the first people permanently to accept Catholic Christianity. France came to be honored as “the eldest daughter of the church,” and Moslems often called all Catholics “Franks.” It was such a nation that was the first in modern Europe to turn officially against the religion of Jesus. *God Cares*, 2:290.

The king of the South and his army would also “feed of the portion” of the papacy’s “meat.” In our view, the fulfillment of this is noted in this statement:

It [*the French Revolution*] presented the most striking illustration which the world has ever witnessed of *the working out of the papal policy*—an illustration of the results to which for more than a thousand years the teaching of the Roman Church had been tending. *The Great Controversy*, 265–266 (emphasis supplied).

And the *SDA Bible Commentary*:

Finally, during the course of the French Revolution, the Catholic Church was outlawed in France—the first nation of Europe to espouse its cause, the nation that had, for more than twelve centuries, championed its claims and fought its battles, the nation where *papal principles had been tested more fully than in any other land*, and had been found wanting. In 1798 the French Government ordered the army operating in Italy under Berthier to take the pope prisoner. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:837–838 (emphasis supplied).

Thus, we understand Daniel 11:26 to say:

26 Yea, they (the French) that feed of the portion of his (the papacy’s) meat (i.e. they that partake of papal policy and principles) shall destroy him⁷⁶⁶⁵ [with a deadly wound in 1798], **and**

his (the king of the South's) **army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain** [during the course of the French Revolution].

We believe the destruction of papal Rome described here is the same experience described in the last part of Daniel 8:25: “he shall be broken without hand.”¹⁴ The words “he shall be broken” (8:25) and “shall destroy him” (11:26) are translated from the same Hebrew word (*shabar*).¹⁵ Now v. 27:

27 And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.

“[B]oth these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief” undoubtedly refers to the enmity these two “bad guys” had toward each other as well as the enmity both the papists of Rome and the atheists of France had toward God's true people. Without doubt, the ten years encompassing the French Revolution and leading up to the deadly wound in 1798 witnessed a dramatic falling apart of the once matrimonious relationship between the French government and papal Rome. This period surely, therefore, afforded many opportunities for these two “kings” to “speak lies at one table.” In our view, the “one table” here is the table of the church–state marital union, and the “lies” came in the divorce proceedings between papal Rome and France. And in this view we see how papal Rome “shall be broken without hand” (Dan. 8:25) as this church–state marriage relationship self-destructed by means of the French Revolution.¹⁶

Having noted these things, we can now clearly see the dichotomy Satan faces when he attempts to simultaneously manipulate two forces in the world that are both diabolically opposed to God and yet are also diabolically opposed to each other. Since history tells us that Satan's two principal earthly forces in the latter days have already met once in mortal combat, we can appreciate all the more the truth of Christ's words in Mark 3:24–26:

24 And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand.

25 And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.

26 And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end.

The prophecy of Daniel 11 speaks of Satan's two principal earthly powers repeating their history in a second and future deadly encounter in vs. 40–45 and, of course, we will address this when we reach that point in our study.

“The End Shall Be at the Time Appointed”

Obviously, in Daniel 11:27 there is an “end” that comes at a “time appointed.” Regarding this, two questions are fundamental: What is meant by “the end”? And when, exactly, is this end's “time appointed”? As usual, we turn to the context of the passage for the answers.

We have come to understand that Daniel 11:25–27 describes a deadly encounter between the two principal “bad guys” of the great spiritual controversy—the atheistic king of the South and the “vile person” papacy now vested with political authority. Verse 26 tells us that the king of the South shall destroy the vile person. Verse 27 then tells us that both of these unseemly characters “shall speak lies at one table,” but the lies do not forestall what is prophetically foreordained: “for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.” Since the papacy was not yet destroyed at the time she was lying throughout

¹⁴ Cf. the quote of Dan. 8:25 on p. 9. We will explain the context of “without hand” momentarily.

¹⁵ We can recall that *shabar* is the word translated “broken” in Dan. 11:22 regarding the Prince of the covenant being “broken” (cf. “The Prince of the Covenant and His ‘Breaking’” in Part 1, pp. 95–97). As noted on p. 95, this word is never employed in direct reference to death; nevertheless, an indirect reference to death can be seen in Dan. 11:26 when we equate the end of papal supremacy with a “deadly wound.” But in our view, likening the *shabar* (“breaking”) of a political power figuratively to a “deadly wound” does not mean that the word *shabar* in itself refers to death. Cf. again Strong's definition of *shabar* on p. 95.

¹⁶ We will see later just how and when in history France, like imperial Rome, entered into marriage with papal Rome.

the time of what we believe was the French Revolution, the “end” in v. 27 can reasonably be understood as the end of the papacy’s political life coming near the end of the French Revolution. Specifically, it came by the infliction of the deadly wound in 1798. And that the deadly wound in 1798 came at a “time appointed” is seen in the fact that it marked the end of the prophetic 3½ “times” of Daniel 7:25.¹⁷

We will now note that Daniel 11:27 connects linguistically with Daniel 8:17b–19:

17 . . . Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision (*hazon*).

18 Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright.

19 And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.

In our view, v. 17 here merely states that the events of the original vision of Daniel 8 will extend to what is termed “the time of the end.” This is affirmed by v. 19: “I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation.” That is, “I will tell you what will happen in the last days of the controversy.” Then Gabriel states: “for at the time appointed the end shall be.”

It seems that, just as the beginning point of the 2300 days of Daniel 8 was not defined until the vision of Daniel 9,¹⁸ the “time appointed” for “the end” of Daniel 8 was not defined until the vision of Daniel 11. That is, the “time appointed” for “the end” of 8:19 is the “time appointed” for “the end” in 11:27. Daniel 8:17–19 should thus be understood in light of 11:25–27. So now let’s look again at 11:25–27.

In our view, “the end” in Daniel 11:27 that “shall be at the time appointed” specifies the end of the “time” just mentioned in v. 24. What is described in vs. 25–27, then, actually occurs just before the “time” of v. 24 is completely expired. But we have determined that the “time” of v. 24 refers to the period of the first papal supremacy when the papacy was the *persecutor*,¹⁹ and vs. 25–27 describe events when the tables are turned and the papacy became the *persecuted*. To explain how the papacy can be the object of persecution even before her allotted period of supremacy has completely expired we will go to yet another account of this period. Matthew 24:21–22:

21 For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.

22 And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.

The Spirit of Prophecy comments:

The persecution of the church did not continue throughout the entire period of the 1260 years. God in mercy to His people cut short the time of their fiery trial. In foretelling the “great tribulation” to befall the church, the Saviour said: “Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.” Matthew 24:22. Through the influence of the Reformation the persecution was brought to an end prior to 1798. *The Great Controversy*, 266–267.

Though the 1260 years themselves were completed in full, the papal persecution that was to characterize these years did not continue throughout the entire period. Thus, though the papacy “forecast” her “devices” against God’s people in Daniel 11:24 for a “time” that covered the years A.D. 538–1798, we understand vs. 25–27 to actually describe approximately the last ten years of the 1260 years when the papacy herself was the object of great *atheistic* persecution. And thus the end of

¹⁷ Cf. the *GC* 439 quote on p. 16.

¹⁸ Cf. the *4BC* 851 quote and our comments in Part 1, p. 13.

¹⁹ Cf. “Even For a Time” on pp. 7–8.

the “time” in v. 24 and the “end” in v. 27 refer to one and the same end of the first papal supremacy in 1798.²⁰

In light of our understanding of Daniel 11:25–27, we now conclude that the “time of the end” of Daniel 8:17 is the time that follows the “time appointed” for “the end” in 11:27, which is the time that follows the deadly wound to the Roman “little horn” in 1798.²¹ We will discuss how this relates to the “time of the end” in Daniel 11:40 when we get to v. 40.

The Three Principal Characters of the Great Controversy In Daniel 11

We will note again that the titles “king of the North” and “king of the South” are mentioned in this prophecy only twice following v. 15 — in vs. 25 and 40. There can be no doubt that these verses, particularly v. 40 where both terms are used, are chronologically far into New Testament times. As also noted earlier, this means we can rule out any possibility that these titles in these verses refer to the historical political kingdoms of the Seleucids and Ptolemies. However, though the literal application of these kings ended in v. 15 with the conclusion of the great controversy dramatization and the rise of the Roman power in v. 16, the spiritual application following the dramatization remained unaffected as the spiritual application transcends the mere historical dramatization. Therefore, in order to maintain a consistent application of these titles throughout the prophecy, we can reasonably extend the spiritual applications of these titles as they are found in vs. 5–15 and apply them to vs. 25 and 40 — the spiritual application being that the kings of the North and South portray the two major forces in the great controversy between Christ and Satan as they meet each other on the battlefield of earth.

This said, however, even though we have recognized that the two principal characters of the great controversy described in Daniel 11 are the kings of the North and South, we have noted that the South’s forces are divided. We have also noted that Daniel 11:25–27 describes a deadly encounter between these divided forces. This being the case, we now recognize that there are actually *three* principal characters of the great controversy depicted in Daniel 11. (1) The king of the North represents Christ who enlists His loyal subjects on earth to fight for Him in the spiritual controversy regarding God’s character to verify who is representing the truth and who is not. The theology of the kingdom of the North is, obviously, the theology of the gospel of Christ — first extended to the world organizationally in the form of *Judaism*, then *Christianity*. (2) The king of the South represents Satan who also employs his subjects on earth to fight for him in this conflict. The theology of the kingdom of the South is, logically, the antithesis of the gospel of Christ — *atheism*. But while atheism is useful to Satan in resisting the spread of Christianity, it has its limitations. Before Christ came as the Messiah and the gospel of Christ was commissioned to be preached to every nation of the world, Satan employed a second force which in the long term would be even more effective in his conflict with the King of the North. This new power is represented in prophecy as (3) the “little horn” of Daniel 8:9 and the “he” of Daniel 11:16–45 (representing Rome); and the theology of this power is *paganism*.

It is evident that Satan has resisted the influence of the king of the North and the worship of the true God (Judaism/Christianity) by (1) the denial of God (atheism) via the king of the South, and (2) the introduction of false gods (paganism) via the little horn of Rome. But while atheism is diabolically opposed to the gospel of the king of the North, as we have noted it is also diabolically opposed to paganism; therefore, Satan can only effectively employ one of his two principal forces at any given time in earth’s history.

Each of the three principal characters of this conflict has a “homeland.” The homelands of the *historic* kings of the North and South were the nations of Syria and Egypt respectively; and the

²⁰ We will provide more justification for this view later in our study.

²¹ That the “time of the end” in Daniel refers to the time following 1798, cf. *GC* 356.

homeland of the *spiritual* king of the *South* is what in Bible prophecy “spiritually is called . . . Egypt” (Rev. 11:8).²² Identifying the homeland of the *spiritual* king of the *North* requires a bit more of an explanation. This is because there is no biblical prophetic reference to anything “spiritually called *Syria*,” and this is because there is no permanent *earthly* homeland for God’s people (that is, until God makes a new earth at the end of the millennium).²³ God’s people are truly “strangers and pilgrims on the earth” because their homeland is literally *out of this world*. Hebrews 11:13–16:

13 These (God’s heroes of faith) **all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen *them* afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.**

14 For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

15 And truly, if they had been mindful (“desirous”) of that *country* from whence they came out (*i.e.* Egypt), they might have had opportunity to have returned.

16 But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

Thus, the homeland of the spiritual king of the North is the heavenly country; and whereas the homeland of ancient Israel was the land of Canaan, the homeland of spiritual Israel is the *heavenly* Canaan. As for the homeland of the pagan little horn, this earthbound homeland is the land of the Roman Empire.

Correspondingly, as v. 16 above also indicates, each of the homelands of the principal characters of this conflict has a capital city which, together with its homeland, Daniel 11 describes as a “fortress.” The capital cities of the *historic* kings of the North and South were the cities of Antioch and Alexandria respectively. The capital city of the *spiritual* king of the *South* is what in Bible prophecy “spiritually is called Sodom” (Rev. 11:8). The capital city of the *spiritual* king of the *North* is, like its homeland, not earthbound; and whereas the capital city of ancient Israel was Jerusalem, the capital city of spiritual Israel is the *heavenly* New Jerusalem. That is, we as God’s New Testament spiritual people join our spiritual father Abraham in waiting for “the city . . . whose builder and maker is God” (Heb. 11:10).²⁴ Indeed, “here we have no continuing city, but we seek the one to come” (Heb. 13:14) — the “heavenly Jerusalem” (Heb. 12:22). However, at the end of the millennium this literal fortress city will, according to the testimony of John, reign supreme *on earth*. Revelation 21:2:

2 And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

And it will be securely within this fortress city that the church of Christ will witness the awesome Great White judgment scene when the enemies of God become no more.²⁵ In the meantime, however, while we are on our exodus from spiritual Egypt (Satan’s kingdom and rulership over this world) and are methodically making our way to our true homeland and the haven of the New Jerusalem, God has not left His people without the *temporary* shelter of an earthbound fortress. As noted in Part 1, p. 52,²⁶ this earthbound exodus fortress is the fortress of the *organization of God’s people* — first in the form of the nation of Israel, then the Christian church. As for the capital city of the pagan little horn, we have seen that this earthbound city is the fort city of Rome.²⁷

Regarding Satan’s two earthly forces of atheism and paganism, though these forces are incompatible with each other and cannot peacefully co-exist, they both constitute Satan’s forces during

²² Rev. 11:8 is quoted on p. 12.

²³ Cf. Rev. 21:1.

²⁴ Regarding the transition from God’s OT literal kingdom in the form of the literal nation of Israel to God’s NT spiritual kingdom in the form of the spiritual nation of Israel (the Christian church) that has no current, permanent, earthly dwelling place, see John 18:33–37.

²⁵ Cf. Rev. 20:7–15.

²⁶ Also Part 1, pp. 70–73 and this part, p. 6.

²⁷ Part 1, p. 77.

their respective appearances on earth. In this way we consider both forces as constituting the forces of the spiritual king of the South in the dramatization of Daniel 11:5–15. That is, the dramatization of vs. 5–15 constitutes a very skeletal outline of the great controversy, whereas the rest of the prophecy enlarges and gives considerably more detail,²⁸ and in this detail we find that a distinction is made between Satan’s two forces of atheism and paganism. Thus, we believe that in the spiritual application of the dramatization the “fortress” of the king of the South in v. 10, because this verse is descriptive of the early period of the Christian church, is the fortress of Satan’s *pagan* forces,²⁹ while the “king of the south” himself in v. 25, because this verse is descriptive of the end of the first papal supremacy, is Satan’s *atheistic* forces in the form of the beast ascended out of the bottomless pit of Revelation 11:7.³⁰

Regarding the little horn of pagan Rome, as noted earlier this little horn evolved in two consecutive phases—first the political organization of *imperial* Rome, then the politico-ecclesiastical organization of *papal* Rome.³¹ While the purely political form of pagan Rome was useful to Satan, he saw that his war against Christ would be more effectively waged if the advantages of the political could be combined with the advantages of the ecclesiastical. This he accomplished through the marital union (the *league*) of church and state.³² In fact, because the ecclesiastical authority of the apostate church is not sufficient by itself to allow this church to impose her will on the people, Satan finds it *essential* to utilize the civil powers of the state to enforce the dictates of his adulterated church. That is, because Satan is ultimately contesting with Christ in the religious arena for the hearts and minds of people, he seeks to impose his anti-Christ *religious* will on the people of the world; however, he can only *define* his will through an adulterated *religious* power, and he can only *impose* his will through the civil and judicial structure of a cooperating *political* power. Thus, inherent in the principle of union of church and state we see the machinations of Satan attempting to forcibly impose his will on the people of the world, and we conclude that *any* state power that seeks to impose purely religious requirements on its people is an instrument of Satan in the great controversy.

In looking at the advantages paganism afforded Satan over atheism, we will note that the paganism of imperial Rome in the critical early years of the Christian church presented a formidable obstacle to the spread of Christianity. Prime example of the conflict created by the growth of Christianity in a world where paganism had already taken root was the uproar of Ephesus.³³ But despite the difficulties, Christianity continued to make advances. This necessitated the prophetic little horn to resort to the overt persecution described in Daniel 11:17–19. But when it became evident that even this was ineffective in limiting the spread of Christianity, Satan disguised paganism with a clerical collar and what paganism failed to do overtly by its “reproach” in v. 18 it accomplished covertly by “flatteries” in v. 21.

In v. 21 the “Christian” papacy, through compromise, conquered and “obtained the kingdom [*of pagan Rome*].” And because paganism remained alive and well, though now with a new papal face, Satan was now in perfect position to inflict the greatest possible damage to God’s true “northern” forces as he had effectively created a bridge that married Christianity to paganism. Thus, as the popes eventually prevailed over the caesars in vying for political control over the Roman Empire, paganism prevailed over Christianity in vying for the hearts of men. And we can be sure that the advantage Satan now had would never have been gained through the king of the South considering the fact that the atheistic theology of the king of the South and the Christian theology of the king of the North are mutually exclusive. The pagan theology of the little horn, however, is more conducive to patronizing

²⁸ Cf. “A Change In Context” in Part 1, pp. 61–63.

²⁹ See our comments in Part 1, p. 56.

³⁰ Rev. 11:7 was quoted on p. 12.

³¹ Cf. Part 1, pp. 86–92.

³² Cf. our comments on Dan. 11:23 on pp. 3–5.

³³ Cf. Acts 19:23–41.

and compromising with the forces of the king of the North, even to the point that most of the northern forces (albeit under relentless pressure of satanic persecution) transferred their allegiance to the little horn, thereby making the seat of authority of the little horn — the city of Rome — their new fortress city. Of course, it was only the disloyal and the deceived among God’s forces who were paganized and who transferred their allegiance to the little horn. The fortress city of the northern forces who remained loyal to their Commander remained the same — the heavenly New Jerusalem — though they were still “strangers and pilgrims on earth” and were obliged to gather themselves into “strong holds” (v. 24) for self-protection from Rome.³⁴ Nevertheless, it was sadly the case that when it came to Satan sabotaging God’s New Testament people, the old “Balaam” trick worked again.³⁵ Would that the people of God would learn from experience.

³⁴ Cf. our comments on p. 6.

³⁵ Cf. Num. 25; 31:1–18 and Stephen Haskell’s quote in Part 1, p. 93.

3. THE HEALING OF THE DEADLY WOUND

“He [Shall] Return Into His Land”

28 Then shall he (the papacy) **return into his land** with great riches; and his heart *shall be* against the holy covenant; and he shall do *exploits*, and return to his own land.

That the deadly wound did not destroy the papacy herself is an obvious fact. Not long after 1798 (1800 to be exact) the Church of Rome had another pope who re-established his position as Satan’s leading agent in the Christian church. But though this did not heal the deadly wound and the papacy at this time failed to regain her former position of *political* authority in the Roman Empire, she never relinquished her position of *ecclesiastical* authority in the Roman Empire. Indeed, the phrase “return into his land” refers, in our view, to the fact that in the years following the deadly wound the papacy was obliged to leave the political arena of world power and return to the ecclesiastical arena exclusively. This “land” is the Roman pagan “kingdom” the papacy obtained in v. 21 *prior* to her political league/marriage with the Roman state that came in v. 23.

We will recall that it was Emperor Justinian who, with his imperial decree in 533, formally established the league between Roman church and state, while it was Constantine who, at the Council of Nicea in 325, had formally conferred upon the papacy control of Roman paganism. Thus, we believe the Roman church “obtain[ed] the kingdom [of pagan Rome]” in 325 when she became the official overseer of Roman paganism,¹ she joined in league with the state in 533 when she tacitly *accepted* the political authority conferred on her by Justinian,² she then ratified her league with the state in 538 when she *exercised* her newly acquired political authority,³ and then the league was dissolved in 1798 when the papacy’s political authority was forcibly removed by the revolutionary French⁴ and she was forced to return to her mere status as overseer of Roman paganism.

That the papacy returned to the land of Roman paganism “with great riches” indicates that, though she was expelled from the political arena by the atheistic French, her position and status in the ecclesiastical arena had, despite the deadly wound, been greatly enhanced as the result of her former league with the state. In the monetary sense alone we can be sure her treasury had benefited beyond calculation. The amount of riches confiscated from the Christian multitudes who, throughout the Middle Ages, refused to compromise with paganism and whose wealth and property were then transferred to the Church of Rome must have been immense.

That the papacy at this time had her “heart . . . against the holy covenant” should be of particular interest to us. Nevertheless, the term “holy covenant” is used three times in this part of the prophecy (once in v. 28 and twice in v. 30); therefore we will defer commenting on the holy covenant [and the papacy’s attitude toward it] until we get to v. 30 later in this chapter.

“He Shall . . . Come Toward the South”

29 At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

We have just noted again that the league made in v. 23 was the marriage between the apostate church and the state that was formalized with Justinian’s decree in A.D. 533 which prepared the way for the 1260 years of religious persecution of A.D. 538–1798. We now liken the deadly wound described in vs. 25–27 and coming at the end of the 1260 years to be the event undoing what was

¹ Cf. “Paganism’s New Face” in Part 1, pp. 90–92.

² Cf. our comments on pp. 3–4.

³ We will discuss this in detail later.

⁴ Cf. the *GC* 439 quote on p. 16.

done at the beginning of the 1260 years. Using the marriage analogy, this event was the state handing the apostate church a bill of divorcement.

As noted in the previous chapter, Satan has thus far been represented in this prophecy as employing two different types of state political powers to assist him in his purpose of resisting the spread of Christianity — the first was the paganistic power of imperial Rome and the second was the atheistic power (that ascended out of the bottomless pit) of France. It is now interesting to note the relationship of Satan’s two state powers with his apostate ecclesiastical power when it comes to the historic 1260 years of marriage between church and state. Obviously, the dominating state power of imperial Rome was on friendly terms with the papacy when the marriage relationship began in A.D. 533. However, it is just as obvious that when the marriage was dissolved at the end of the 1260 years the character of the dominating European state power had changed from the paganism of Rome to the atheism of France. This change of character on the part of the dominating European state power made the divorce of the state and the church inevitable on grounds of incompatibility.

As also noted in the previous chapter, though in the spiritual application it is only Satan’s atheistic state power that is named the “king of the South” in Daniel 11, in the spiritual controversy Satan’s paganistic state power of imperial Rome can also be considered to be on the side of the South as Rome was also employed by Satan in warring against the spiritual king of the North. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that in the prophecy of Daniel 11 any state political power (whether its theology is atheistic, paganistic, or professed Christian) that Satan employs in his war against Christ can be considered to be in “the South.” However, of these only the atheistic state power is the *king* of the South. And from the papacy’s point of view, only a pagan or professed Christian state power is a prospective marriage partner. That is, the king of the South is *not* a prospective marriage partner.

We have noted that the papacy was the agent by which Satan enticed the preponderance of God’s people to transfer their allegiance from God to the pagan little horn of Daniel 8,⁵ doing so primarily by blasphemously placing the pope in the place of God.⁶ From this we can understand that, in the spiritual controversy between Christ and Satan, the papacy actually presents herself as occupying a position on the side of Christ in the spiritual North while *covertly* being an agent of Satan in the spiritual South.⁷ Of course, the king of the South himself is very much *overtly* on the side of the spiritual South. Also, because Christ’s kingdom is “not of this world” (John 18:36), Christ neither desires nor needs the help of world political powers to further His kingdom. Thus, when a church solicits the help of political powers to further her own ends, we can be sure that both the church and the political powers that consent to such an arrangement are instruments of Satan and not of Christ. In the spiritual controversy, then, any such political power can also be considered to be on the side of the spiritual South. And in this we also see that any Christian church which unites with any state power formally transfers her marital allegiance from Christ and can be described as a spiritual harlot or whore.⁸ She has left her true Husband in the North, disdaining His spiritual authority, and has entered an illegitimate marriage relationship in the South, grasping the political authority of the state.

We have also noted that, regarding the illegitimate marriage of church and state spanning the Dark Ages, immediately following the rather dramatic divorce proceedings of the French Revolution the apostate church was forced to return home to her own “land.” This was the ecclesiastical land, or “kingdom” (v. 21), of Roman paganism where she remained in control as the leading figure.⁹ In this land the papacy was limited again to *ecclesiastical* authority *only* over her subjects without the advantage of the *political* authority which her former husband in the South had provided for her

⁵ Fulfilling Dan. 8:12.

⁶ We will elaborate on how this was accomplished in a later chapter.

⁷ Cf. our comments in Part 1, p. 90.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 17:1, 5, 15–16; 19:2.

⁹ Regarding how the papacy originally obtained this kingdom, see “A Change In Tactics,” “Paganism’s New Face,” and “The Strategy of Flattery: Act One” in Part 1, pp. 88–93.

through their mutual league. Now her only political muscle was that of her influence on the political world as an outsider. But in v. 29 we find the apostate church leaving her “land” and returning and coming “toward the south.” In our view, this is an attempt on the papacy’s part to mend the broken marriage she had with the state.

Because of the brutal experience atheistic France took Europe through in the French Revolution and its Reign of Terror, it was not long before the people of Europe had had enough of the king of the South as well as of his theology. The people were once again willing to turn to Christianity as a means of insuring some semblance of peace and security.

The world stood aghast at the enormity of guilt which had resulted from a rejection of the Sacred Oracles, and men recognized the necessity of faith in God and His word as the foundation of virtue and morality. *The Great Controversy*, 287.

This change in attitude on the part of the people was reflected in the character of their state power (in that it was no longer atheistic and the atheistic beast of Rev. 11 [*i.e.* the king of the South of Dan. 11:25] was obliged to return to the bottomless pit)¹⁰ and the papacy now deemed it to her advantage to make overtures once again toward the state. However, “it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.” In our view, the “former” refers to the historic marriage of church and state as described in vs. 23–24 of Daniel 11 and which ended with a deadly wound — a divorce — and the “latter” refers to the future marriage of church and state as described in vs. 32–39 and which comes after the complete healing of the deadly wound — a remarriage. That Adventist commentators have historically ascribed vs. 32–39 to the historic “former” marriage is understandable given the fact that the events and circumstances of both marriages are similar; thus, the detailed description of the “latter” marriage in vs. 32–39 in many respects describes both marriages. That they have ascribed vs. 32–39 to the historic “former” marriage is also understandable given the fact that there has never been an Adventist consensus in interpreting vs. 16–31. Given their willingness to deem vs. 16–31 as relatively unessential prophetic history, Adventist commentators have, in our view, set themselves up to misplace the following verses in world history. We will have considerably more to say on this point later in our study. Of course, we will also explain our understanding of the latter marriage when we get to it in due course. But for now, having determined what is meant by the papacy coming “toward the south” in v. 29, we will want to identify the precise “time appointed” when the papacy “shall return, and come toward the south.”

The Time Appointed

It is only reasonable to suppose that each time in Daniel’s visions when the term “time appointed” is employed it refers to a significant and specific time in the history of the great controversy.¹¹ It is also reasonable to suppose that each of these specific times has been designated by God at which time or by which time a specific purpose is to be accomplished. We can be sure that the Lord sets His boundaries, including the boundary of time, on everything. It is also reasonable to suppose that these specific times will be identified by God’s people or their reference in prophecy would serve no meaningful purpose. Implied in the words “time appointed” is the idea that each of these appointed times is, or will be, common knowledge between God and His people. Furthermore, if the Lord was going to tell us that an appointed event was going to happen at an appointed time or by an appointed time, why would He tell us what the appointed event was going to be without telling us when the appointed time was going to be?

¹⁰ Cf. Rev. 11:7 and “The Spiritual King of the South” on pp. 12–13.

¹¹ These times are in Dan. 8:19; 11:27, 29, 35. The “time appointed” of Dan. 10:1 (KJV) is translated from a different Hebrew word which we have noted would better be rendered “great conflict” (see Part 1, p. 3).

The close of probation is an event the time of which God is pleased to keep from His people even until after it comes, and the time of this event is referred to in this prophecy merely as “at that time” (Dan. 12:1).¹² The Hebrew word translated “at that time” here is *eth* and, as noted in our discussion of its use in v. 24,¹³ is a word used in reference to an *unspecified* point in time or period of time. The Hebrew word translated “time appointed” in chapters 8 and 11, however, is *moed* and, as also noted in our discussion of v. 24 regarding its use in chapter 12 (where it is translated “time” and “times” in v. 7), is a word used in reference to a *specific* point in time or period of time. It is our view, therefore, that each use of the term “time appointed” (*moed*) in Daniel’s prophecies is a reference to a *specific* point in time in earth’s history.

In attempting to identify the specific “time appointed” in Daniel 11:29 and in light of our understanding of what is meant by the papacy coming “toward the south,” it now seems logical to understand this “time appointed” to be the time when the world political power that inflicted the deadly wound to the Roman Empire (in the form of the Roman Church vested with political authority) passes from the scene and the door is once again open for the papacy to “return” to attempt to re-establish her former position of marriage in the political arena of world power. As we have seen, the dominating world power that displaced the Roman Empire was the French Empire. The events of the rise and fall of the French Empire, the unprecedented restraints this empire imposed on the papacy, and the precise time this empire came to its end have been faithfully recorded by historians. Before identifying the specific time of the end of the French Empire, however, let’s look briefly at the rise and reign of this power.

Regarding events terminating the Roman Empire and which opened the door for the appearance of the French Empire we have no doubt:

The 1260 years of papal supremacy began in A.D. 538, and would therefore terminate in 1798. At that time a French army entered Rome and made the pope a prisoner, and he died in exile. Though a new pope was soon afterward elected, the papal hierarchy has never since been able to wield the power which it before possessed. *Ibid.*, 266.

The pope who was forcibly removed from the Vatican in 1798 was Pope Pius VI and the exact date of his removal was February 20. The date of his death in a French prison was August 28, 1799. The new pope, Pius VII, was elected March 14, 1800 and he entered the Vatican on July 3, 1800—nearly 2½ years after Pius VI was forced to leave. However, Pius VII returned to a papacy under significantly different circumstances than those enjoyed by the popes prior to the French Revolution.

Napoleon, the strategist he was, recognized the advantages of a cooperative papacy in the building of his empire; therefore, he was willing to make certain non-strategic concessions to the papacy in order to establish a beneficial relationship. Pope Pius VII, being the realist he was and recognizing not only the capability but willingness of Napoleon to use force in deposing the pope if need be to further the ends of the French, was also willing to make certain concessions in order for the papacy to retain as much power and influence as circumstances would allow. But, no doubt, both of these characters had not forgotten the lies they had spoken to each other at the divorce table just a few years earlier.¹⁴ The result of this mutually distrusting relationship was the Concordat of 1801.

CONCORDAT OF 1801 (FRANCE)

Concordat between Pius VII and Napoleon Bonaparte, which regulated Church–State relations in France for more than a century. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 4:115.

The part of this concordat that applies to our study here is the part that Napoleon:

¹² Regarding the “close of probation,” see Part 1, fn. 5 on p. 69. That this event comes a short time before the Second Coming, and that its precise time will not be known by God’s people even when it actually occurs, cf. *GC* 490, 615.

¹³ P. 7.

¹⁴ See our comments on v. 27 on p. 18.

. . . recognized Pius VII's authority, but on the condition that the Pope recognize the legitimacy of Napoleon's government. He admitted also the Pope's authority to remove bishops and to appoint others in their stead. In accordance with the principles of 1789, however, he insisted that *all cults must enjoy liberty and that Catholicism must not be the state religion*. *Ibid.*, 10:211 (emphasis supplied).

Going to events near the end of the French Empire we find that the Concordat of 1801 was not comprehensive enough to settle all disputes between Napoleon and the papacy and, consequently, we find the new pope, like his predecessor, being hauled off to a French prison.

Pius VII . . . was seized, carried off from Rome (July 10, 1809), and deported to Savona, near Genoa. . . . Military reverses in France induced Napoleon to liberate his prisoner, who reentered Rome on May 24, 1814. *Ibid.*, 11:403.

This time the pope's incarceration was nearly five years, but during this period his liberty was only as far away as the end of the French Empire. Napoleon's disastrous war with Russia in 1812 was the beginning of the end of his empire and by 1814 he was desperate enough to release the pope and make more concessions. But this was all in vain as one month later he was militarily forced to abdicate to the allied forces. Now we are ready to note yet another agreement between the powers of the day:

VIENNA, CONGRESS OF

The greatest international conference of the 19th century, held in 1814–15. Twenty years of almost continuous wars and reshuffling of territories made indispensable a complete overhaul of Europe's political order after the elimination of Napoleon I.

The four main victorious powers, Austria, Prussia, Russia and Great Britain, decided to call a general congress of all European states. . . .

Pope Pius VII was represented in the Congress by Cardinal Consalvi, his secretary of state. Consalvi's main achievement was to obtain the restoration of most of the States of the Church. . . . Consalvi also made good use of his encounter with European statesmen to lay the ground for negotiations by which, in the following years, he strove *to establish satisfactory relations between Church and State in various countries*. *Ibid.*, 14:657 (emphasis supplied).

During the time of the French Empire the papacy was virtually at the mercy of Napoleon in determining to what degree she would exercise her ecclesiastical authority. Her political authority was, of course, nil. That is, during the time of the French Empire the papacy would "return into his land" (v. 28) of ecclesiastical authority only in the ecclesiastical kingdom of Roman paganism. But this pagan "land" by itself the papacy is not content with. This is the "land" where the papacy is not recognized as the state religion and, consequently, where "all cults must enjoy liberty" (10NCE 211 quote above). With the fall of the French Empire, however, and with no one political power dominating the Old World, the door was now open once again for the papacy, by her secretary of state employed for just such a purpose, to "return, and come toward the south" (v. 29) to re-establish "satisfactory relations between Church and State" on a one-to-one basis with the "various countries" of the Old World. "But," as v. 29 also foretold, "it shall not be as the former, or as the latter."

We understand that the "time appointed" in Daniel 11:27 refers to the end of the Roman Empire in 1798 while the "time appointed" in v. 29 refers to the end of the French Empire in 1814. We also understand that the sixteen-year period of 1798–1814 was the time when the papacy would "return into his land" while the period from 1814 to the complete healing of the deadly wound is the time when the papacy courts the political powers of the Old World with some degree of success but when "it shall not be as the former, or as the latter." That is, it shall not result in a remarriage. Once the "latter" comes when the deadly wound is completely healed, however, it *will* result in a remarriage and thus it *will* be as "the former."

Having determined that the papacy coming “toward the south” in Daniel 11:29 refers to the papacy’s renewed initiative in courting the state, and having determined the precise “time appointed” when this old romance is renewed, we will now want to determine *why* these overtures by the corrupt church toward the state “shall not be as the former, or as the latter.”

The Ships of Chittim and the Holy Covenant

30 For the ships of Chittim shall come against him (the papacy): therefore he shall be grieved, and return [from courting the state], and have indignation²¹⁹⁴ against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and [demonstrate his indignation by] have[ing] intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.

In order to determine the prophetic meaning of the term “ships of Chittim” in v. 30, let us consider the biblical usage of the term. The *SDA Bible Dictionary* says this under “Kittim”:

Kittim (kit'im), KJV frequently **Chittim** (kit'im). . . . the term as used in Dan 11:30 and Num 24:24 seems to have reference, first, to peoples and lands to the west of Israel, and, second, to invaders and destroyers from more distant quarters. *SDA Bible Dictionary*, 648.

Comments of the *SDA Bible Commentary* on Daniel 11:30:

30. Chittim. The name Chittim, or Kittim, appears several times in the OT and later ancient Jewish writings, and is used in an interesting variety of ways. . . . Although students of the Bible do not all agree as to the exact historical reference of the “Chittim” in this verse, it seems clear that in interpreting this passage, two thoughts should be kept in mind: first, that in Daniel’s day the word referred, geographically, to the lands and peoples to the west; and second, that the emphasis may already have been in process of shifting from the geographical meaning of the word to the thought of Chittim as invaders and destroyers from any quarter. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:872–873.

Considering the thought of Chittim as invaders and destroyers, in Balaam’s prophecy of Numbers 24:24 Chittim opposes Asshur and Eber, and in commenting on this the *SDA Bible Commentary* notes: “It is generally held that Asshur and Eber together represent the great powers of the East” (1BC 912). Thus again we see a west to east confrontation. So from these statements we have two clues as to the identity of Chittim in Daniel 11:30: (1) Chittim depicts invaders or destroyers; and (2) in applying the original meaning they come from the west.

Genesis 10:4–5 provides yet another biblical usage of the term “Kittim,” and here Kittim is included among the “isles of the Gentiles” (Gen. 10:5). The *SDA Bible Commentary* on Genesis 10:4:

Kittim. Many commentators have identified Kittim with Cyprus because the capital of Cyprus was named Kition. This would agree with Isa. 23:1, 12, which speaks of Chittim as being not far from Tyre and Sidon. In Jer. 2:10 and Dan. 11:30 the name Chittim denotes Greeks in general. But its earlier meaning, as in Isaiah, seems to be more circumscribed. It is, therefore, safe to identify Kittim either with Cyprus or with other islands in the vicinity of Greece. *Ibid.*, 1:273.

Adding this element of Kittim, the invaders that come from the west come from an island; therefore, it is necessary for their invasion force to cross a body of water, and this necessitates the use of ships.

While the historical application of the term “ships of Chittim” refers to literal Gentile invaders of Israel coming by ship from the west, we must remember we are studying an apocalyptic prophecy employing the customary symbolism. More importantly, though Daniel 11 is the final clear-language explanation of the true vision of chapter 8, we should remember that within this explanation we have the unique Seleucid/Ptolemy dramatization of the “great conflict” between Christ and Satan. And this

being the case, we have concluded that Daniel 11 should be interpreted within this “great conflict” or “great controversy” context.¹⁵

We will note that in the dramatization of Daniel 11:5–15, the titles “king of the North” and “king of the South” have both a literal-historical and a spiritual application. However, while the literal-historical application of these kings is limited to the dramatization, the spiritual application is employed exclusively when these kings are mentioned following the dramatization. Therefore, to be consistent with the “great conflict” context we could expect all other references to *proper names* following the dramatization to employ the spiritual application exclusively. Thus we can reasonably expect the reference to Egypt in v. 8 to refer, in the dramatization’s literal-historical application, to the literal nation of Egypt and, in the spiritual application, to this world,¹⁶ while the references to Egypt in vs. 42 and 43, because they come well after the dramatization in vs. 5–15, refer only to a spiritual Egypt. We would also expect the ships of Chittim in v. 30 to be some sort of *spiritual* navy sent forth in yet another significant battle of the great controversy. Understanding the historical non-prophetic application of “ships of Chittim” to refer to literal invaders coming by ship from an island to the west, we will now attempt to identify the spiritual prophetic application of “ships of Chittim” in the context of the prophecy of Daniel 11.

According to our understanding thus far, it is clear that in v. 30 Chittim is a force that opposes the papacy. This equates to the characteristic of Chittim as invaders or destroyers. That this spiritual Chittim is in fact an opposing force to the papacy is evident in that it causes the papacy to “be grieved, and return [*turn back*]” from her intended course. And as an opposing force, this force could either be another instrument of Satan that opposes the papacy (like the spiritual king of the South in vs. 25–27) or it could be another instrument of Christ that opposes the papacy (like the spiritual king of the North).¹⁷

Since the context of Daniel 11:30 is established in v. 29, we can see that this force is what prevents the apostate church of Rome from completely re-establishing her marital relationship with the state. Also, vs. 28, 30, and 32 reveal that the employment of the term “ships of Chittim” in v. 30 is set in the context of comments regarding the holy covenant. It seems the wording of v. 30 even implies that the ships of Chittim who “come against” the papacy do so *armed* with the holy covenant. This makes it impossible to view the ships of Chittim in a literal-historical way as: What literal military invasion force could in any way uphold the spiritual concept of the holy covenant? Thus, with a clear relationship of some type between the ships of Chittim and the holy covenant, and because the ships of Chittim work against the papacy’s self-interest of reuniting herself with the state, we conclude that it is Christ, not Satan, who is the spiritual power behind the ships of Chittim.

While we understand the term “ships of Chittim” to have a spiritual application, in identifying this spiritual application we believe it is still valid to retain the principal characteristics found in literal Chittim’s biblical record. Chittim’s literal geographical characteristic would indicate that, since the object of the ships’ attack is papal Rome, then spiritual Chittim must lie to the west of Rome. Also, the word “ships,” by itself, is not a proper name, and thus we need *not* apply a spiritual meaning to it in accordance with our rule regarding proper names proposed above; and this, then, would indicate that a barrier of water lies between Rome and spiritual Chittim. Now this is what we have: the ships of Chittim are a spiritual force of Christ’s that opposes the papacy with the holy covenant, and in their opposition they originate across a literal body of water to the papacy’s west. Now we will inject the time element of v. 30—the years immediately following 1814.

Taking all things into consideration, in our view the term “ships of Chittim” in Daniel 11:30 is a prophetic reference to that group of God’s people in the West whose Protestant influence (in taking the knowledge of the holy covenant to the world in the early 1800’s) prohibited the papacy in the

¹⁵ See “A Change In Context” in Part 1, pp. 61–63.

¹⁶ Cf. Part 1, p. 53.

¹⁷ See again “The Three Principal Characters of the Great Controversy In Daniel 11” on pp. 20–23.

East from regaining her lost position of political influence; consequently, “he [*the papacy*] shall be grieved, and return [*from courting the state*].”

The Protestant influence in the western world during this time had its greatest effect in the work of the American and British Bible and Missionary Societies. These societies undertook the monumental task of bringing the world out of the Dark Ages by reversing the papal policy of suppressing the Bible; that is, they endeavored to disseminate the word of God to every nook and cranny of the world, doing so with great success. This was even prophesied of in Revelation 11:11–12.¹⁸ Of course, this caused the light of truth to shine on the many fallacies of Rome, causing her much grief. But this was not all. The labors of these societies then bore fruit in the Great Advent Awakening that fulfilled in large part the proclamation of the first angel’s message of Revelation 14:6–7. The origin and working center of this movement, we know, was the United States.¹⁹ Of course, because there is no land link between North America and Europe, or for that matter between the British Isles and the Continent, the eastward movement of this entire Protestant force could only be accomplished in the early 1800’s by the use of ships. Despite the Great Disappointment in 1844, this movement was ordained by God to bring about a worldwide religious awakening designed to forewarn and prepare the people of the world for the second coming of Christ.²⁰

The comparison of prophecy and history indicates that the year 1798 marked the beginning of the “time of the end” Gabriel spoke of in Daniel 12:4.²¹ At this time the seal of “the book [*of Dan. 8–12*]” was broken and knowledge of the prophecies increased accordingly.²² It seems reasonable, therefore, to understand that the reason the papacy had “indignation against the holy covenant” in Daniel 11:30 was because it was in the post-1798 time period of v. 30 that God’s people were clearly shown, through Daniel’s unsealed prophecies and the work of the Bible and Missionary Societies, what the holy covenant was. The specific message regarding the holy covenant which the Lord gave His people during this time was the three angels’ messages of Revelation 14 and the proclamation of the second coming of Christ. Regarding the proclamation of the first angel’s message, the Spirit of Prophecy comments:

A great religious awakening under the proclamation of the Christ’s soon coming is foretold in the prophecy of the first angel’s message of Revelation 14. An angel is seen flying “in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.” “With a loud voice” he proclaims the message: “Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” Verses 6, 7.

The fact that an angel is said to be the herald of this warning is significant. By the purity, the glory, and the power of the heavenly messenger, divine wisdom has been pleased to represent the exalted character of the work to be accomplished by the message and the power and glory that were to attend it. And the angel’s flight “in the midst of heaven,” the “loud voice” with which the warning is uttered, and its promulgation to all “that dwell on the earth,” — “to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,” — give evidence of the rapidity and world-wide extent of the movement.

The message itself sheds light as to the time when this movement is to take place. It is declared to be a part of the “everlasting gospel;” and it announces the opening of the judgment. The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment *had come*. The prophecies present a succession of events leading down to

¹⁸ Cf. *GC* 287–288 and its associated appendix.

¹⁹ Cf. *GC* 368.

²⁰ Regarding the Great Disappointment, see our comments and fn. 46 in Part 1, p. 23.

²¹ Cf. “The End Shall Be at the Time Appointed” on pp. 18–20 and *GC* 356 (quoted below).

²² We will elaborate on “the book” spoken of in Dan. 12:4 being the book of Dan. 8–12 later in our study.

the opening of the judgment. This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But that part of his prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal “to the time of the end.” Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on a fulfillment of these prophecies. But at the time of the end, says the prophet, “many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.” Daniel 12:4.

The apostle Paul warned the church not to look for the coming of Christ in his day. “That day shall not come,” he says, “except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed.” 2 Thessalonians 2:3. Not till after the great apostasy, and the long period of the reign of the “man of sin,” can we look for the advent of our Lord. The “man of sin,” which is also styled “the mystery of iniquity,” “the son of perdition,” and “that wicked,” represents the papacy, which, as foretold in prophecy, was to maintain its supremacy for 1260 years. This period ended in 1798. The coming of Christ could not take place before that time. Paul covers with his caution the whole of the Christian dispensation down to the year 1798. It is this side of that time that the message of Christ’s second coming is to be proclaimed.

No such message has ever been given in past ages. Paul, as we have seen, did not preach it; he pointed his brethren into the then far-distant future for the coming of the Lord. The Reformers did not proclaim it. Martin Luther placed the judgment about three hundred years in the future from his day. But since 1798 the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the judgment near. *The Great Controversy*, 355–356.

With the message of the first angel of Revelation 14 proclaiming that the hour of God’s judgment had come, God’s people now had a working knowledge of the holy covenant in light of the loud voice of this first angel announcing the opening of the judgment and the proclamation of Christ’s soon coming. We will note that an integral part of the proclamation of Christ’s soon coming was the identification of the year 1798 as the year marking the beginning of the “time of the end” of Daniel 12:4, that 1798 also marked the end of the 3½ “times” of Daniel 7:25, and that the papacy was now confirmed without doubt to be the antichrist “little horn” of Daniel 7. Because events in 1798 had shown that the Protestant reformers were correct in identifying the papacy as the “man of sin” of 2 Thessalonians 2:3, and with this confirmation now being loudly proclaimed around the world, a strong anti-Catholic sentiment prevailed in the general population. Of course, this hedged any move toward a remarriage between the papacy and the state. But God still had two more messages for the spiritual “ships of Chittim” to carry to the world.

The prophetic and doctrinal truths brought to light in the latter part of the Millerite movement and then in the early part of the Adventist movement, specifically known as the second and third angels’ messages of Revelation 14, clarified and amplified the first angel’s message regarding the holy covenant.²³ The second angel’s message identified the papacy as the mother church of fallen Babylon,²⁴ and the third warned against worshipping “the [papal] beast and his image” or receiving his “mark” (Rev. 14:9).²⁵ These messages particularly presented a devastating argument against the “man of sin” and implicated the papacy even more pointedly than did the first. Furthermore, the great religious awakening of the Millerite and Adventist movements eventually led God’s people to the correct understanding of Christ’s true sanctuary ministry in heaven, thereby more clearly exposing the papal counterfeit sanctuary ministry on earth.²⁶ Certainly, after Daniel’s prophecies were unsealed in 1798 and subsequently understood in the Millerite and Adventist movements, the papacy had good reason to have “indignation against the holy covenant.”

Summing up, we understand the term “ships of Chittim” in Daniel 11 to be a symbolic prophetic reference to the Protestant movements of the American and British Bible and Missionary Societies

²³ Regarding the Millerite movement, see fn. 46 in Part 1, p. 23.

²⁴ Rev. 14:8; 17:5.

²⁵ See *GC* chs. 21–22, 25.

²⁶ See *GC* chs. 23–24.

originating in the West in the early 1800's and which, by the proclamation of the holy covenant as it is presented in the Bible in light of its unsealed prophecies, hindered the renewed political aspirations of the papacy in the East by publicly declaring worldwide the papacy's true nature and character. And we now also understand the spiritual warriors manning the ships of Chittim in v. 30 to constitute the preliminary forces of the "multitude" and "army" in the spiritual application of v. 13 as we discussed it in Part 1, p. 57. Also, we will address the relationship between the prophetic ships of Chittim and the spiritual king of the North when we get to the next reference to the king of the North in v. 40.

In Daniel 11:30 we have come to the point in the prophecy that applies directly to the days in which we now live. Though v. 30 takes us up to the time immediately following 1844, it still applies to our present time. It seems that due to an end-time failure on the part of God's people there has been an unscheduled (but allowed for) delay in the progress of events in the great controversy and thus also in the fulfillment of prophecy. Had God's people followed on in His providence in the years immediately following the end of the 2300 days in 1844, it seems, the remaining verses of Daniel 11–12 would have already been fulfilled and Christ would have returned many years ago. But because of failure on the part of the remnant people of God, the great hope of the early Adventists has still not been realized.²⁷ However, we can be sure that we are still within the time boundaries God has undoubtedly set for the great controversy between Christ and Satan to come to its conclusion.

The Introduction of Apostate Protestants, the United States, and the "Daily"

Looking again at the last part of Daniel 11:30:

30 . . . he (the papacy) shall even return [from courting the state], and have intelligence with them (the apostate Protestants) that forsake the holy covenant.

As we have identified the "ships of Chittim" in v. 30 to be the preliminary forces of the "multitude" and "army" in the spiritual application of v. 13, so we now identify "them that forsake the holy covenant" as apostate Protestants who represent in part the "robbers of thy people" in the spiritual application of the parenthetical v. 14. As previously stated, we believe the "robbers" of Daniel 11:14 in their historical literal fulfillment were the Maccabean Jews and in their spiritual fulfillment [in the great controversy dramatization of vs. 5–15] are the apostate Christians at the end of the controversy who work in cloaked opposition to God²⁸—these are papists and apostate Protestants alike. However, when we get to the end-time literal fulfillment of the spiritual application of the dramatization we find that the prophecy makes a distinction between papists and apostate Protestants.

That "those who forsake the holy covenant" (NIV) refers specifically to apostate Protestants is self-evident given the abandonment of the covenant law of God by apostate Protestants in the last days. Whereas papists have always presumptuously placed themselves above the law of God, this has not always been so with Protestants; thus, when Protestants knowingly turn from the historic faith of their fathers on this point, they will "forsake the holy covenant."²⁹ And that the papacy will have "intelligence with" or "show favor" (NIV) toward apostate Protestants is an accurate description of the relationship these two have with each other during the final events of earth's history, and it is but a natural way for the papacy to manifest her indignation against the holy covenant now being practiced and preached by *true* Protestants. Thus, in Daniel 11:30 we see apostate Protestants unwittingly playing into the hands of the papists, just as papists unwittingly play into the hands of Satan in

²⁷ We will take a close look at the failure of God's remnant people, and how this failure has delayed the second coming of Christ, later in our study.

²⁸ See Part 1, pp. 42, 58–59.

²⁹ We will elaborate on how apostate Protestants forsake the holy covenant in subsequent chapters.

accomplishing his principal object in drawing all the world under his banner. This principal object is specifically spoken of in v. 31:

31 And arms (those in the New World of the West who forsake the holy covenant — the apostate Protestants) **shall stand on his** (the papacy's) **part, and they** (the apostate Protestants) **shall pollute the sanctuary⁴⁷²⁰ of strength⁴⁵⁸¹** (the United States), **and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.**

First, the word “arms” refers to the apostate Protestants in the United States as the papacy in Europe employs the apostate Protestants to, in effect, “reach across the gulf” and do for her in the United States what she cannot do for herself. Second, the pronoun “his” refers to the little-horn power of the papacy just as it has consistently since v. 21. And third, the term “sanctuary of strength” fittingly describes the United States as the United States has been the sanctuary of religious freedom and the strength of true Protestant Christianity throughout her over 200-year history as the beast with lamblike horns of Revelation 13. Regarding this beast we are told:

“And he had two horns like a lamb.” The lamblike horns indicate youth, innocence, and gentleness, fitly representing the character of the United States when presented to the prophet as “coming up” in 1798. Among the Christian exiles who first fled to America and sought *an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance* were many who determined to establish a government upon the broad foundation of *civil and religious liberty*. Their views found place in the Declaration of Independence, which sets forth the great truth that “all men are created equal” and endowed with the inalienable right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” And the Constitution guarantees to the people the right of self-government, providing that representatives elected by the popular vote shall enact and administer the laws. Freedom of religious faith was also granted, every man being permitted to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. *Republicanism and Protestantism became the fundamental principles of the nation. These principles are the secret of its power and prosperity.* The oppressed and downtrodden throughout Christendom have turned to this land with interest and hope. Millions have sought its shores, and the United States has risen to a place among the most powerful nations of the earth. *The Great Controversy*, 441 (emphasis supplied).

As “an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance,” and as “an asylum for the conscience-oppressed servants of God and defenders of His truth” (5T 714), and as “the land which the Lord provided as an asylum for his people, that they might worship him according to the dictates of their own consciences,”³⁰ the United States has indeed been an asylum/sanctuary for God’s people from the flood of Roman paganism. Consistent with this idea being applied to Daniel 11:31 is Strong’s definition of the Hebrew word translated “sanctuary” in this verse (underlined emphasis supplied):

4720. **miqdash**, *mik-dawsh*’; or
miqqedash (Exod. 15:17), *mikked-awsh*’; from 6942; a *consecrated* thing or place, espec. a *palace*, sanctuary (whether of Jehovah or of idols) or asylum: — chapel, hallowed part, holy place, sanctuary.

That God provided His people with the United States as an *asylum* or *sanctuary* from Roman paganism (in the form of Babylonian Christianity) was providential in that it fulfilled Revelation 12:16.³¹ Now let’s look at the word translated “strength” in v. 31 (underlined emphasis supplied):

4581. **maowz**, *maw-oze*’ (also
mauwz, *maw-ooz*’); or
maoz, *maw-oze*’ (also

³⁰ ST, June 12, 1893 par. 12.

³¹ Cf. “The Arms of a Flood” and our quote of Rev. 12:16 in Part 1, p. 94.

mauz, *maw-ooz'*) from 5810; a *fortified* place; fig. a *defence*: — force, fort (-ress), rock, strength (-en), (X most) strong (hold).

This word is found six times in the prophecy of Daniel 11: v. 7, “into the fortress of”; v. 10, “his fortress”; v. 19, “toward the fort of”; v. 31, “strength”; v. 38, “forces”; and v. 39, “most strong.” Understanding Daniel 11 as we do thus far, the word *maowz* is used in vs. 7, 10, and 19 in clear reference to a political power, described as a “fort” or “fortress. Thus, we believe *miqdash maowz* in v. 31 is better translated “asylum fortress” or, as in the NKJV, “sanctuary fortress” — this being a prophetic reference to the United States as a providentially provided political asylum for God’s oppressed Protestant people. And thus, because the United States was settled in large part by God-fearing believers seeking a political asylum of religious liberty in which they could worship God freely, it is accurate and appropriate for prophecy to describe the United States as a “*miqdash maowz*” — a political “asylum fortress” functioning as a safe haven for the survival of Protestantism.

We can be sure, however, that to the extent the “asylum fortress” of Daniel 11:31 effectively harbors God’s people, the papacy is intent on “polluting” it with her paganized form of Christianity; but her lack of political influence in the United States necessitates her employment of “arms” to accomplish this purpose. And this prophetic representation in Daniel 11:31 is a clear and accurate portrayal of last-day papal/apostate-Protestant relations and one that harmonizes perfectly with the portrayal of last-day events in Revelation 13.

It is also apparent that it was in large part from this “asylum fortress” in the New World of the West that the Lord sent the ships of Chittim to drive back the advances the papacy in the Old World was making into the political arena of world power in v. 30. Unfortunately, according to v. 31, what had been a pure haven to the spiritual ships of Chittim will one day become polluted by the “arms” of unwitting papal representatives. And it seems the event that completes the total pollution of the “asylum fortress” in v. 31 also marks the fulfillment of Revelation 13’s second beast both speaking as a dragon and making an image to the first beast,³² it indicates that the deadly wound to Revelation 13’s first beast has been completely healed, and it constitutes Satan’s principal object in his final attempt to draw all the world under his banner. But to understand all of this we must first understand what Gabriel meant by his use of the term *daily* in Daniel 11:31.

³² Cf. Rev. 13:11, 14–15.

4. THE “DAILY”

In the attempt to identify the Hebrew term *hattamid* (“the daily”) in Daniel’s prophecies,¹ we will make five observations, each of which makes an important contribution to the proper identification of this enigmatic term. These observations will then be followed by a brief synopsis, an application, and a summation.

Sanctuary Context

Our first observation has to do with the context in which *hattamid* is found in Daniel 8. Dr. Zdravko Stefanovic comments regarding this context:

In chapter 8, the wild beasts that represented earthly powers in the previous chapter are replaced by domestic, clean, sacrificial animals. The Ancient of Days and the humanlike Person to whom he grants authority and power are replaced by the institution of the temple and its continual services. Likewise, chapter 7’s portrayal of God’s judgment was intended for the whole world. In chapter 8, this message is recast for the covenant people and placed in the context of God’s sanctuary. *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise*, 293–294.²

The “continual services” (referring to *hattamid*) of ancient Israel’s temple constituted a principal component of the sanctuary related prophecy of Daniel 8, and this indicates that *hattamid* is itself a sanctuary related term. This relationship is further affirmed by the way the Old Testament frequently employs the word *tamid*. Martin Proebstle points out that “Of 104 occurrences, *tamid* stands 80 times in connection to the Israelite cult.”³ Dr. Leslie Hardinge goes into more detail:

The Hebrew word *tamid*, literally translated daily, is used in Scripture about fifty times to describe parts of the Sanctuary ritual. It may also be rendered continual or perpetual, and is applied most frequently to (1) the daily morning and evening burnt-offering presented on behalf of the covenant people as a whole (Ex 29:38, 42; Num 28:3–8); (2) the regular meal-offerings (Num 4:16); (3) the breastplate on the high priest’s heart (Ex 28:29, 30); (4) the *menorah* (Ex 27:20); (5) the showbread in the holy place (Ex 25:30); (6) the incense on the golden altar (Ex 30:8); (7) the fire upon the altar in the court (Lev 6:13); (8) the pillar of cloud and fire which guided Israel (Num 9:16); and (9) the music which accompanied the services of the Tabernacle (1 Chron 16:6, 16). In short, *tamid* described what occurred in the court and the holy place on a continuing, regular basis. *With Jesus in His Sanctuary*, 133.

Moreover, the Jews themselves historically understood *tamid* in the context of their sanctuary. This is evidenced by the fact that they employed the word *tamid* to denote the most basic element of what, in Hardinge’s words, “occurred in the court and the holy place on a continuing, regular basis.” The *SDA Bible Dictionary*:

In late Heb. *tamid* is the regular technical expression for the daily whole-offering, offered morning and evening; there is an entire tractate in the Mishnah devoted to this subject, and it bears the title *Tamid*. *SDA Bible Dictionary*, 258.

Since the Mishnah was composed by Jewish sages in the mid-2nd century AD, its tractate *Tamid* could only recollect the morning and evening temple services as they had been conducted prior to the destruction of the second temple in AD 70. Nevertheless, the Mishnah provides strong historical evidence that ancient Israel associated the word *tamid* with her daily sanctuary services.

¹ Dan. 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11.

² All underlined emphasis throughout this chapter is supplied.

³ *Where God and I Meet: the Sanctuary*, 115.

Given these connections between the Hebrew word *tamid* and the Old Testament sanctuary, it is evident that identifying Daniel's *hattamid* must be done with the sanctuary in view. So with this in mind, let's consider the Old Testament sanctuary.

The genesis of the Old Testament sanctuary is found in Exodus 25:8 when on Mt. Sinai God said to Moses:

8 And let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.⁴

The *Andrews Study Bible* note on this verse:

The main purpose of the “sanctuary” . . . is to have a visible dwelling place for God, right in the midst of the camp, and also in the center of all aspects of Israel's life. It is a place of meeting for God and humans. *Andrews Study Bible*, 105.

God then explained just how the earthly sanctuary and its daily services (the Jewish *Tamid* services) would serve as the point of contact between Himself and His people. Exodus 29:38–46:

38 Now this is what you shall offer on the altar: two lambs of the first year, day by day continually [tamid]. 39 One lamb you shall offer in the morning, and the other lamb you shall offer at twilight. 40 With the one lamb shall be one-tenth of an ephah of flour mixed with one-fourth of a hin of pressed oil, and one-fourth of a hin of wine as a drink offering. 41 And the other lamb you shall offer at twilight; and you shall offer with it the grain offering and the drink offering, as in the morning, for a sweet aroma, an offering made by fire to the LORD. 42 This shall be a continual [tamid] burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of meeting before the LORD, where I will meet you to speak with you. 43 And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by My glory. 44 So I will consecrate the tabernacle of meeting and the altar, I will also consecrate both Aaron and his sons to minister to Me as priests. 45 I will dwell among the children of Israel and will be their God. 46 And they shall know that I am the LORD their God, who brought them up out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them. I am the LORD their God.

The *SDA Bible Commentary* comments on v. 43:

At its dedication the tabernacle was filled with the “glory” of the Lord (ch. 40:34). The presence of the Shekinah was the true consecration of the tabernacle, for all things else about it were but types and figures (see on Gen. 3:24). Thus God not only “put his name there” (Deut. 12:21), but His visible presence as well. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 1:656.

Martin Proebstle notes in his Ph.D. dissertation *Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9–14* that there may be a connection between Daniel's *hattamid* and God's perpetual presence:⁵

The cultic background of [tamid] provides two further aspects which may have an effect on the meaning of [hattamid] in the book of Daniel. . . . The second aspect is that frequently the expression [tamid] is connected with or even stands indirectly for God's perpetual presence. The characteristic phrase “before YHWH,” or the like, is often mentioned in close connection with [tamid] when the latter appears in a cultic context. This should not be surprising since offerings and other cultic activities are thought of as worship to YHWH and are being carried out in the presence of YHWH—a fact also expressed by YHWH himself (Ps 50:8). All these nuances can be combined into a plausible description of the cultic context in which [tamid] is predominantly used: The priest, often the high priest, performs a regular cultic activity, of which the object or the activity itself stands frequently in connection with YHWH's presence

⁴ All Scripture in this chapter is quoted from the NKJV unless otherwise indicated.

⁵ In all quotes of Proebstle's dissertation, all words in brackets are our translation of the original Hebrew script Proebstle uses.

so that the object or activity is part of the regular worship of YHWH. Truth and Terror, 213–215.⁶

That “the cultic context in which [*tamid*] is predominately used” is connected with God’s presence has also been noted by Dr. Jacques Doukhan. Regarding the little horn of Daniel 8, Doukhan notes that:

. . . like the little horn in chapter 7, the one in chapter 8 assumes the prerogatives of the “Prince of the host” (verse 11) and takes the “daily sacrifice” (literally “perpetual sacrifice”) from Him. This sacrifice burned permanently on the altar (*tamid*: “perpetual”) and symbolized God’s faithful presence among His people. [*Portions of Ex. 29:42–46 quoted.*] *Secrets of Daniel*, 124.

While the “daily sacrifice” was *offered* at two specific times every day, it *burned* on the altar perpetually,⁷ signifying God’s perpetual presence among His people. This is consistent with the idea that “our God is a consuming fire” (Heb. 12:29) and that any sin that comes in to God’s presence, whether it has been figuratively laid on a sacrifice or otherwise, is consumed.⁸

Especially worthy of note, the Old Testament sanctuary was the appointed *place* where God would “dwell among the children of Israel” (Ex. 29:45), and the morning and evening *Tamid* service offered “at the door of the tabernacle of meeting” (v. 42) prescribed, according to v. 39, the appointed *time* when God would “meet with the children of Israel” (v. 43) and even “speak” (v. 42) with them through their representative priests and Levites. In the term “tabernacle of meeting” (vs. 42, 44; sometimes translated “tent of meeting”),⁹ the word “meeting” is translated from the Hebrew word *moed* — the same word translated “appointed time” in Daniel 8:19; 11:27, 29, 35 and “time” and “times” in 12:7.¹⁰ Therefore, we could understand that the Old Testament sanctuary could rightly be called the “tabernacle of appointed meeting of God with His people.”¹¹ But again, while the sanctuary structure served as the *place of meeting* and the place where God’s continuous presence was manifested *among* His people, what the 2nd century Jewish sages termed *Tamid* described the quintessential ritual sanctuary service and delineated the divinely appointed *time of meeting* when God actually *met* and *spoke* with His people. It will serve us well to keep this important point in mind as we proceed.

Covenant Context

Our second observation has to do with a second and even more encompassing context in which *hattamid* is found in Daniel’s prophecies. Looking first at Daniel 11:28–35:

28 "While returning to his land with great riches, his [the little-horn power of Dan. 8] heart shall be moved against the HOLY COVENANT; so he shall do damage [against the holy covenant] and return to his own land.

29 "At the appointed time he shall return and go toward the south; but it shall not be like the former or the latter. 30 For ships from Cyprus shall come against him; therefore he

⁶ Andrews University, 2006.

⁷ Lev. 6:8–13.

⁸ *7BC* 488 on Heb. 12:29: “A consuming fire. This fact was demonstrated at Mt. Sinai (see Ex. 24:17). The fires of the last day will destroy all that is tainted with sin (see on Mal. 4:1; cf. 2 Peter 3:7, 10–12; Rev. 20:9, 15).”

⁹ *E.g.* AB, ASV, NAS, NIV, RSV (KJV “tabernacle of the congregation”).

¹⁰ KJV: “time appointed.” Strong’s definition of *moed*:

4150. . . . properly, an *appointment*, i.e. a fixed *time* or season; specifically a *festival*; conventionally a *year*; by implication, an *assembly* (as convened for a definite purpose); technically the *congregation*; by extension, the *place of meeting*; also a *signal* (as appointed beforehand): — *appointed* (sign, *time*), (place of, solemn) assembly, *congregation*, (set, solemn) feast, (appointed, due) season, solemn (-ity), synagogue, (set) *time*, (*appointed*).

¹¹ Proebstle emphasizes the significance of this point by giving his Companion Book to the 4th quarter, 2013 SDA Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide the title *Where God and I Meet: the Sanctuary*.

shall be grieved, and return in rage against the HOLY COVENANT, and do damage [against the holy covenant].

“So he shall return and show regard for those who forsake the HOLY COVENANT. 31 And forces [who forsake the holy covenant] shall be mustered by him, and they shall defile the sanctuary fortress; then they shall take away the daily sacrifices [hattamid], and place there the abomination of desolation. 32 Those who do wickedly against the COVENANT he shall corrupt with flattery; but the people who know their God [by keeping the covenant] shall be strong, and carry out great exploits [by keeping the covenant]. 33 And those of the people who understand [Heb. *sakal*; those who understand the covenant experientially] shall instruct [Heb. *biyn*] many [about the covenant]; yet for many days they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plundering. 34 Now when they fall, they shall be aided with a little help; but many shall join with them by intrigue. 35 And some of those of understanding [*sakal*; those who understand the covenant experientially] shall fall, to refine them, purify them, and make them white, until the time of the end; because it is still for the appointed time.

We do not believe that our supplied phrases here violate the context of this passage. It can be seen, then, that this passage is immersed in the context of a conflict surrounding the holy covenant. Therefore, the actions of the little horn (papal Rome) and his recruits (*i.e.* “forces”) in v. 31 should be interpreted within this context, and we understand that the taking away of *hattamid* in this verse constitutes a direct attack by the little horn on God’s holy covenant.

Given the many connecting points, when we go to the parallel passage in Daniel 12 we can safely bring the underlying context of Daniel 11:28–35 with us.¹² Daniel 12:9–11:

9 And he said, “Go your way, Daniel, for the words [of this prophecy] are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. 10 “Many shall be purified, made white, and refined, but the wicked shall do wickedly [against the covenant; compare v. 32 above]; and none of the wicked shall understand [*biyn*; the words of this prophecy as they shed light on the covenant], but the wise [*sakal*; those who understand the covenant experientially] shall understand [*biyn*; the words of this prophecy].

11 “And from the time that the daily sacrifice [hattamid] is taken away, and the abomination of desolation is set up, there shall be one thousand two hundred and ninety days.

The centrality of the holy covenant in these prophetic conflicts and the significant part that the taking away of *hattamid* plays in them provides the basis for our belief that the taking away of *hattamid* constitutes an attack on the holy covenant by the antichrist little-horn power. We further observe that, according to Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, the taking away of *hattamid* is accomplished by means of setting up “the abomination of desolation,” and we understand this to mean that *hattamid* is actually replaced by the abomination. Thus, the act of setting up the abomination constitutes an equivalent attack on the holy covenant.

Now let’s go to Daniel 8 and consider the actions of the little horn as they are described within the context of God’s sanctuary. Daniel 8:11–13:

11 He [the little horn] even exalted himself as high as the Prince of the host; and by him the daily sacrifices [hattamid] were taken away, and the place of His sanctuary was cast down. 12 Because of transgression, an army was given over to the horn to oppose the daily sacrifices [hattamid]; and he cast truth down to the ground. He did all this and prospered.

13 Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said to that certain one who was speaking, “How long will the vision be, concerning the daily sacrifices [hattamid] and the transgression of desolation, the giving of both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled under foot?”

Here *hattamid* is again said to be “taken away” (v. 11). And while there is no specific reference to the holy covenant in Daniel 8, we are told that some type of “transgression” is involved “to oppose

¹² Dr. William Shea has identified six verbal parallels between Dan. 11:32–35 and Dan. 12:10 in DARCOM 6:338.

hattamid" (v. 12), and this "transgression" is further said to be "the transgression of desolation" (v. 13). In our view, v. 13 sets *hattamid* in opposition to "the transgression of desolation." That is, *hattamid* is not only taken away but, as in the case of Daniel 11:31; 12:11 regarding "the abomination of desolation," it is replaced by "the transgression of desolation."

We understand that the taking away of *hattamid* in Daniel 8 is accomplished by the perpetration of the transgression. But what transgression? Because this prophecy is an apocalyptic one relating especially to the sanctuary, the transgression referred to could only be the transgression of the moral law of God — the Ten Commandments — that had been codified and deposited in the heart of the sanctuary. Now we will note that, according to Dr. Meredith Kline, God's moral law constitutes God's holy covenant itself.

The two stone tables are not, therefore, to be likened to a stele containing one of the half-dozen or so known legal codes earlier than or roughly contemporary with Moses as though God had engraved on these tables a corpus of law. The revelation they contain is nothing less than an epitome of the covenant granted by Yahweh, the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, to his elect and redeemed servant, Israel. Not law, but covenant. That must be affirmed when we are seeking a category comprehensive enough to do justice to this revelation in its totality. *Westminster Theological Journal* 22 (1960), "The Two Tables of the Covenant," 137.

Dr. Kline contends that the Decalogue is much more than a mere corpus of law; it constitutes God's covenant itself, and he defends this view with Deuteronomy 4:13:¹³

13 So He declared to you His covenant which He commanded you to perform, the Ten Commandments; and He wrote them on two tablets of stone.

We see, then, that even in Daniel 8 the little horn's act of taking away *hattamid* is associated with the opposition to, or an attack on, God's covenant with His people — this attack coming in the form of opposing God's law-covenant. This idea is borne out by the Hebrew word translated "transgression" ("rebellion"; NIV) in v. 12, as Dr. Stefanovic notes in commenting on this verse:

8:12 "Rebellion." Among several words for sin that are used in the Bible, *pesa'*, "rebellion," is one of the strongest because it conveys an act of willful covenant breaking. . . . Scholars do not agree on whose rebellion is meant here, the little horn's or a host's. It could be that both are implied, since through the work of the little horn an abomination is set up with the purpose of replacing the true worship of God. *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise*, 303.

That the "transgression" of Daniel 8:12 replaces *hattamid* and that this transgression constitutes "an act of willful covenant breaking" implies that *hattamid* is the antithesis of covenant breaking. Indeed, it implies that *hattamid* is an act of covenant keeping. But whether an act of covenant breaking or an act of covenant keeping, as cultic acts both *hattamid* and its "transgression" antithesis are inextricably linked, positively or negatively, to the covenant itself. Proebstle makes this point in his comments on Daniel 8:13:

Cult and covenant are inextricably connected. The cultic center of the sanctuary or temple is the visible symbol for the presence of the covenant God and thus of the covenant bond itself. It is the covenant that ensures God's presence. An attack on the cult is therefore nothing else than an attack on the covenant God. Likewise, an attack on God's covenant people should provoke God as suzerain into action for his covenant partners. God is bound by the covenant to defend his sanctuary and his covenant people. If for some time he does not react to attacks on either or both, the urgent question [*until when?*] "until when?" that implores his intervention becomes more than legitimate. The cry in 8:13c can be understood as the cry to the suzerain to do something about those who trample the covenant. Since here the beseeching is

¹³ Also Ex. 34:28 regarding the Ten Commandments being "the words of the covenant" and Deut. 9:9, 11, 15 regarding them being "the tablets of the covenant." Of course, the repository for the tablets was called "the ark of the covenant."

directed toward God, not toward humans, it is also apparent that the question of unfaithfulness to the covenant is God's. God is apparently not fulfilling his part of the covenant, that is, protecting as suzerain his people and his cult. In other words, the anguished cry to God in 8:13c implies that the covenant problem is not on the side of God's people in the sense that they would have transgressed the covenant. Rather the source of perplexity is God's silence toward the attack on the covenant by the horn power. *Truth and Terror*, 483.

Accepting that the cry of Daniel 8:13 "Until when?" is the cry to God "to do something about those who trample the covenant" reaffirms the view that the "transgression" of vs. 12–13 is an act of covenant breaking while *hattamid* of vs. 11–13 is an act of covenant keeping.

Now let's go to Daniel 7 and consider the actions of the little-horn power described there. Daniel 7:25:

25 He [the little horn] shall speak *pompous* words against the Most High, Shall persecute the saints of the Most High, And shall intend to change times and law. Then *the saints* shall be given into his hand For a time and times and half a time.

Here there is no specific reference to either *hattamid* or God's holy covenant; nevertheless, there is an even more direct reference to an attack on God's law. Comments of the *Andrews Study Bible* on this verse:

times and law. God's times and law. It would not be prophetically significant for the little horn power to attempt to change human times and laws, for that is commonly expected in a struggle for worldly dominion. The conflict described here is between earth and heaven. The little horn intends to change God's times and law, most clearly seen in His Ten Commandments. One obvious illustration of God's "times" is His Sabbath. Any attempt by an earthly power to change God's Sabbath is an attempt to change God's law, the heart of which is the Sabbath itself. *Andrews Study Bible*, 1124.

And the comments of Dr. William Shea on this verse:

Daniel 7:25 says that the religious power identified by the various characteristics of the little horn would make an attempt to change a particular type of time—a repeated point in time that is connected with God's law. This prediction fits precisely with the role of the little horn in regard to God's seventh-day Sabbath. *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*, 122.

The presumptuous attempt by the little horn of Daniel 7 to change the times connected with God's law has its unmistakable historical fulfillment in papal Rome's attempt to change the Sabbath of the Decalogue.

The papacy has attempted to change the law of God. . . . An intentional, deliberate change is presented: "He shall *think* to change the times and the law." The change in the fourth commandment exactly fulfills the prophecy. For this the only authority claimed is that of the church. Here the papal power openly sets itself above God. *The Great Controversy*, 446.

Daniel 7:25 does not say that the little horn would think to *do away* with the times of God's law; it says it would think to *change* the times of God's law. This is a significant distinction in that it shows the real motive of the little horn. Dr. Hans LaRondelle has noted this motive:

The essential nature of Daniel's antichrist is his self-exalting will "to change" God's law and the sacred times (Dan. 7:25) and to exchange the redemptive worship in God's temple for his own idolatrous cult (Dan. 8:11–13, 25). Therefore Daniel's perspective represents a double apostasy: one from the divine law (Dan. 7) and one from the gospel of the sanctuary (Dan. 8). It is crucial to grasp the point that the evil goal is not to establish atheism, but rather to impose a counterfeit religion with a false system of worship and salvation. *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible*, 66–67.

The goal of the little horn is not simply to deny God the worship of His people; it is to redirect this worship to itself—*i.e.* to usurp the place of God. This unholy aspiration was spoken of by the preeminent New Testament theologian in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–4 where he refers to Daniel’s little-horn power as “the man of sin”:

3 Let no one deceive you by any means; for *that Day will not come unless the falling away comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition, 4 who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he sits as God in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.*

In order to usurp the place of God, the little horn could not be content to *do away* with the times of God’s law; the “man of sin” must necessarily *change* them. And as we have seen, this change was effected by the pretentious change of Sabbath to Sunday, and thus we have God’s Sabbath replaced by the papal Sunday as the day of rest and worship. Of course, this parallels the replacement of *hattamid* with “the transgression of desolation” in Daniel 8, and it parallels the replacement of *hattamid* with “the abomination of desolation” in Daniel 11 and 12.

It might be wondered why the little horn would focus on the times of God’s law in its attempt to usurp the place of God, and what the significance is of which day of the week is recognized as the Christian day of rest and worship. The answer is found in the connection between God’s Sabbath and God’s covenant. Exodus 31:16–18:

16 Therefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant. 17 It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel forever; for *in* six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh day He rested and was refreshed.

18 And when He had made an end of speaking with him on Mount Sinai, He gave Moses two tablets of the Testimony, tablets of stone, written with the finger of God.

The Spirit of Prophecy comments on this:

To us as to Israel the Sabbath is given “for a perpetual covenant.” To those who reverence His holy day the Sabbath is a sign that God recognizes them as His chosen people. It is a pledge that He will fulfill to them His covenant. Every soul who accepts the sign of God’s government places himself under the divine, everlasting covenant. *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:350.

The little horn’s attempt to change what God has established as the sign of His everlasting covenant is, as Proebstle has well said, “nothing else than an attack on the covenant God.”¹⁴ And in this we again see how this action of the little horn in Daniel 7 equates with the transgression against God’s law-covenant by the little horn in Daniel 8 that takes away *hattamid*. And we again see how this action of the little horn in Daniel 7 accords with our observation that *hattamid* in Daniel 11 and 12 is a term associated with the holy covenant and that its “taking away” constitutes an attack on the holy covenant by the little horn.

Regular

Our third observation has to do with the technical meaning of the Hebrew term *hattamid*: *ha* being the definite article “the” and *tamid* being the word commonly translated “daily,” “continual,” or “perpetual.” Proebstle notes another important point regarding *tamid*:

As far as meaning is concerned, [*tamid*] designates the regularity (with intervals) or continuity (without interruption) of activities, events or state of affairs. In a cultic context, [*tamid*] “designates a variety of sacrificial rites that are regular, most often but not always of daily

¹⁴ *Truth and Terror*, 483 (larger quote on p. 40).

occurrence.” Hence, [*tamid*] “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.” For example, [*tamid*] can be connected with daily, weekly, perpetual or continual activities or events. It is then clear that “tamid must be rendered ‘regularly,’ not ‘perpetually.’” *Truth and Terror*, 209–210.¹⁵

That “*tamid* must be rendered ‘regularly,’ not ‘perpetually’” accords with Strong’s definition of *tamid*:

8548. **tamiyd**, *taw-meed*’; from an unused root meaning to *stretch*; prop. *continuance* (as indefinite *extension*); but used only (attributively as adjective) *constant* (or adverbially, *constantly*); ellipt. the regular (daily) sacrifice: – alway (-s), continual (employment, -ly), daily, ([n-]) ever (-more), perpetual.

As noted, the word *tamid* by itself is used only as an adjective or adverb, but in Daniel’s prophecies *hattamid* (“the *tamid*”) is an elliptical expression in which the adjective is used with the definite article “the” but without the noun the adjective modifies (the noun is assumed). This literary device employs the adjective itself as the noun. In *Strong’s Concordance*, Daniel’s elliptic “the *tamid*” is defined as “the regular” and the assumed noun is “sacrifice.” The full meaning according to Strong, then, is “the regular sacrifice.”

Adventist theologians are coming to recognize that Daniel’s *hattamid* indeed means “the regular” or “the regularity.” This is seen in the *Andrews Study Bible* note on Daniel 8:11:

and by him the daily sacrifices were taken away. Meaning, “and from Him (the Prince of the host) he (the little horn) removed the regularity/the daily” (compare 11:31; 12:11). The word “sacrifices” is often supplied by translators but is not in the original text . . . In the context of the earthly sanctuary/temple, the Hebrew term for “regularity” (sometimes referred to as the “continual” or “daily”), applied to a variety or system of regular rituals (lamps, burnt offerings, incense, placing bread) that were performed daily (Ex. 27:20; 29:38; 30:7–8) or weekly (Lev. 24:8). *Andrews Study Bible*, 1125.

Accepting this view, to translate *hattamid* as “the continual” or “the perpetual” conveys the misleading implication that what is referred to occurs only on a *non-stopping* or *unceasing* basis. But in the cultic context of religious rituals such as Israel’s sanctuary services, *tamid* should be understood to mean *perpetually periodic* or *regularly recurring*. This understanding of *tamid* connects *hattamid* with Daniel 7:25 at yet another point. Let’s look at Daniel 7:25 again:

25 He [the little horn] shall speak pompous words against the Most High, Shall persecute the saints of the Most High, And shall intend to change times and law. Then the saints shall be given into his hand For a time and times and half a time.

Dr. Shea comments on the word translated “times” in this verse:

The Aramaic word for “times” is *zinnin*, the plural form of *z’man*. When used in the singular, this word refers to a point in time, but as a plural, it refers to repeated points in time. *Daniel: A Reader’s Guide*, 120.

Recognizing that the Aramaic word translated “times” in Daniel 7:25 refers to “repeated points in time” (which Dr. Shea has identified as God’s recurring seventh-day Sabbath)¹⁶ harmonizes the “times” in Daniel 7 with the “regular” aspect of Daniel’s *hattamid*.

¹⁵ Proebstle’s sources for the three quotes he cites are, respectively: Baruch Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 371 (The Anchor Bible, vol. 4. New York: Doubleday, 1993); Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*, 207 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978); and Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, 2088 (The Anchor Bible, vol. 3B. New York: Doubleday, 2001).

¹⁶ See his *Daniel: A Reader’s Guide*, 122 quote on p. 41.

Also, understanding that *tamid* means *perpetually periodic* or *regularly recurring* means that translating *hattamid* as “the daily” conveys the misleading implication that what is referred to occurs only on a *daily* basis. But it could just as well occur on a *weekly, monthly, annual* or any other periodic basis. Dr. Stefanovic’s comments on the word *tamid* are relevant here:

The word is frequently used in the texts of the Bible that are in the priestly genre. In several passages, the term is applied to the daily (morning and evening) offering of a lamb—also described as a “regular burnt offering” (Exod. 29:38–42; Num. 28:3; 1 Chron. 16:40). Yet, the same term is applied to the lamps in the sanctuary (Lev. 24:2) as well as to the sacred showbread (2 Chron. 2:4). . . .

In this chapter [*Dan. 8*], the noun *tamid*, “daily, continual,” is used with the definite article. As such, it covers a number of activities that were regularly performed by the priest in the holy place in the sanctuary. Thus, the best way to understand this term is to say that it covered various types of services that were regularly performed in the sanctuary. Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise, 302.

We conclude that, in the context of Daniel’s prophecies, the word *tamid* indeed means “regular,” but in itself it does not prescribe the length of the regular cycle in view. This must be determined by other means. Nevertheless, in light of these things we believe the NKJV translators correctly changed the KJV “continual [*tamid*] burnt offering” in Numbers 28–29 to “regular burnt offering.”¹⁷ We also concur with the Bible translators who have changed the KJV and NKJV “the daily” in Daniel’s prophecies to “the regular.”¹⁸

Sacrifice

Our fourth observation has to do with connecting *hattamid* with the word “sacrifice.” It is self-evident that *something* is assumed in the meaning of the Hebrew elliptic *hattamid*. But what? In Adventism, proponents of the “old view” of the *daily* have interpreted *hattamid* to mean “the continual *paganism*” of imperial Rome, while proponents of the “new view” have interpreted it to mean “the continual *heavenly ministry*” of Christ.¹⁹ But in our view, neither of these interpretations has sufficient exegetical support. It is true that the sanctuary context of Daniel 8 lends a degree of credibility to the “new view,” but is this context by itself sufficient to identify Daniel’s *hattamid* as the heavenly ministry of Christ?

The two uniquely Adventist views of *hattamid* contrast sharply with the consistent view of Bible translators who, nearly without exception, supply either the word “sacrifice” or the words “burnt offering” to Daniel’s elliptic. The *SDA Encyclopedia* comments on two such examples:

The KJV translators supplied the English word “sacrifice”: for example, “the daily *sacrifice* was taken away” (ch 8:11). The RSV renders the corresponding clause: “The continual *burnt offering* was taken away.” The KJV and RSV renderings are identical in meaning, the translators holding that in Daniel *tamid* referred to the “daily” or “continual” sacrifice offered in the Jewish temple every morning and every evening. *SDA Encyclopedia*, 367.

The reason Bible translators are so consistent in their renderings of *hattamid* is because, outside the Millerite and Adventist movements, the word “sacrifice” has *always* been the understood context of Daniel’s elliptic. As a very early example, the first century Jewish historian Josephus, in his eyewitness account of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70, included this parenthetical comment:

¹⁷ Num. 28:3, 6, 10, 15, 23, 24, 31; 29:6 (“daily burnt offering”), 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38.

¹⁸ E.g. ESV, NAS, NRS, BBE (Bible in Basic English), CJB (Common Jewish Bible).

¹⁹ Cf. 4BC 843.

. . . (for he [*Titus*] had been informed that on that very day, which was the seventeenth day of Panemus [*Tamuz*], the sacrifice called “the Daily Sacrifice” had failed, and had not been offered to God for want of men to offer it, and that the people were grievously troubled at it) . . .
The Wars of the Jews, 6.2.1.²⁰

The sacrifice that Josephus tells us was then commonly called “the Daily Sacrifice” is what virtually all Bible translators have equated with Daniel’s *hattamid*. Obviously, this is the temple sacrifice of the morning and evening which, several decades after Josephus, the Jews referred to in the Mishnah with just the word *Tamid*. We will call this literal view of *hattamid*, then, the “*Jewish view*.”²¹ But because Christianity was born out of Judaism, the Jewish view became the default view of Christians all the way to the late 13th century when Arnold of Villanova and Pierre Jean d’Olivi continued to identify *hattamid* as “the continual sacrifice” in the literal sense.²² The principal difference between the views of these two men being that Villanova located the starting point for the 1290 days²³ [in the words of LeRoy Froom] “from the taking away of the Jewish sacrifices after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans,”²⁴ while Olivi believed the literal sacrifice in view was the antitypical sacrifice of Christ Himself, and therefore he dated the 1290 days from [in his own words] the “continual sacrifice in the holy death of Christ.”²⁵ Following the 13th century, however, a significant change was in the offing.

Interest in the meaning of the “daily” (Dan. 8:11–14), or “continual,” began during pre-Reformation days and continued on through Reformation times. This interest developed when the papacy was clearly identified as the prophesied “falling away,” or mystery of iniquity, and great perverter of the fundamental verities and provisions of salvation — particularly the atoning sacrifice and heavenly priesthood of Christ and the true worship of God. In the 14th century John Wyclif defined the papacy as the “abomination” that had defiled the sanctuary, or church, and expressly declared that the papal doctrine of transubstantiation and its attendant “heresy about the host” had taken away the “continual.” With this position Walter Brute, contemporary Lolland scholar, definitely agreed, tying it in with the 1260 and 1290 year-days. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:60–61.

When prophecy students at last came to see that the papacy/pope was the “man of sin” and “mystery of iniquity” that Paul spoke of in 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 7 as well as the “abomination” of Daniel’s prophecies, the Christian world was shaken. LeRoy Froom has noted that:

. . .nothing in this old world is more powerful than a prophetic truth whose time has come. It has impelling force and power within it. Thus it was with the Reformation which was really born of a twofold discovery — first, the rediscovery of Christ and His salvation; and second, the discovery of the identity of Antichrist and his subversions.

This fact is of epochal importance. Luther discovered “Christ and His salvation” before 1517. And before 1520 he had discovered the identity of “Antichrist and his damnation.” The entire Reformation rested on this twofold testimony. The reformers were unanimous in its acceptance. And it was this interpretation of prophecy that lent emphasis to their reformatory action. It led them to protest against Rome with extraordinary strength and undaunted courage. It nerved them to resist to the utmost the claims of the apostate church. It sustained them at

²⁰ *The Works of Josephus: New Updated Edition*, 731 (Hendrickson Publishers, 1987).

²¹ Apparently, it was associating *hattamid* with the daily morning and evening temple sacrifices that persuaded the KJV translators to translate *hattamid* as “the daily” rather than as some variation of “the continual” or “the regular.”

²² Cf. LeRoy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers (PFF)* 1:753, 758, 773 (Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1948).

²³ Dan. 12:11 (quoted on p. 39).

²⁴ *PFF* 1:752.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:773.

the martyrs' stake. Verily, this was the rallying point and the battle cry that made the Reformation unconquerable. *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 2:243–244.²⁶

We will add that the Reformer's identification of the antichrist had profound implications affecting virtually every other aspect of apocalyptic prophecy as well, not the least of which was the identity of *hattamid*. That is, because the antichrist can be identified as Daniel's little horn, the Reformer's identification of the papacy as antichrist necessarily required a change in the identification of *hattamid*, as the papacy could in no way be seen as being responsible for the taking away of the Jewish *Tamid* sacrifices or for the death of Christ, both of which occurred in the first century.²⁷ And it was in the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century and following that the new view of the little horn and *hattamid* became the new standard.²⁸ Nevertheless, rather than, as one might expect, change the assumed noun "sacrifice" in Daniel's elliptic to an entirely different noun, the Reformers, apparently for lack of an alternative consistent with valid exegesis, retained the word "sacrifice" and simply gave it, consistent with valid apocalyptic exegesis, a symbolic meaning. And the symbolic meaning they gave it was that it was the "sacrifice" of "true worship."²⁹ Thomas Beverley wrote a treatise in 1684 on Daniel's 2300-day prophecy entitled *A Scripture-Line of Time*, regarding which Froom comments:

Beverley insists that the "Daily" or "continual" is not to be limited to the Jewish sacrifices, as the word is "applicable either to sacrifice, or service and worship in general," and to "tyrannous taking away the daily Worship of the Saints." He applies the expression to the latter. *Ibid.*, 2:584.

²⁶ Actually, identifying the papacy or the pope as the antichrist preceded the Reformation. Perhaps the first to do so was Arnulf, bishop of Orleans, at a synod near Rheims in 991 (*PFF* 1:540–542). However, it wasn't until the 16th century Reformation that this identification became the settled position of discerning theologians. Regarding Arnulf's identification of the papacy as the Antichrist, Froom comments:

The significance of the Synod of Rheims, on prophetic interpretation, is that we find here the echo of Gregory's cry against Antichristian pride, leveled now, however, at the overweening pride of the Papacy itself. And it is the forerunner of other voices, identifying the Papacy with the Antichrist, voices that will be seen to multiply until the chorus reaches a grand crescendo in the Reformation. *PFF* 1:543.

²⁷ Prior to the Reformation view of antichrist those Christian expositors who attempted to specifically identify the little horn held that it was Antiochus IV Epiphanes (cf. Froom's charts "Early Church Period" and "Early Medieval Period: Leading Positions of Principal Expositors of Daniel" in *PFF* 1:456–457; 894–895). Modern evangelical Christian scholars for the most part continue to hold to the preterist Antiochus Epiphanes theory. For the tainted origin of this theory back in the 3rd century by Porphyry, who "became one of the most determined pagan opponents of Christianity of his time" (*PFF* 1:327), see *PFF* 1:326–330.

²⁸ Identifying the papacy as the little horn also preceded the Reformation. The first to do so was Eberhard II, Catholic Archbishop of Salzburg, at the Regensburg Council in 1240 or 1241 when he applied the little horn of Dan. 7 to the papacy (*PFF* 1:797). But again, this was just the germination of an idea that reached maturity in the Reformation. Froom explains:

. . . the position taken by Eberhard in 1240 — that the breakup of Rome gave rise to a group of smaller kingdoms, among whom afterward came up the religio-political power of the historical Papacy as the Little Horn — became the standard interpretation of fourteenth-century Wyclif in Britain, then of sixteenth-century Luther and most of his associates, and next of Cranmer, Knox, and the bulk of the British Reformers. Practically all the post-Reformation writers on the Continent and in Britain and America declared the same. Even the Jewish expositor Don Isaac Abravanel of Spain, in 1496, made a like explanation.

This Reformation view was the sort of belief which helped to nerve men to withstand the powerful forces under the command of the Papacy, and to go to the stake rather than yield to her spiritual despotism; for Protestant martyrs dared not obey her injunctions or follow in her apostasies, and thus incur the displeasure of Heaven. Therefore they no longer feared her anathemas. *PFF* 1:805–806.

²⁹ Cf. the article "Five Centuries of Exposition of the 'Daily'" in *4BC* 60–65, quoted in large part in Appendix A. This period covered the time from John Wycliffe ("The Morning Star of the Reformation") in the 14th century up to the Millerite movement in the 19th century. Also cf. Froom's charts "Reformation Era" and "Post-Reformation Era: Leading Positions of Principal Expositors of Daniel" in *PFF* 2:528–529; 784–785.

The symbolic view of “sacrifice” in *hattamid* not only became the settled view of Protestant expositors, it was likewise adopted by Catholics in the Counter Reformation;³⁰ and thus, in harmony with the Reformer’s identification of the antichrist and the little horn, we will call this view of *hattamid* the “Reformation view.” And if the Reformation identification of the antichrist with its attendant theological ramifications was and remains correct, then, just as we have determined that identifying Daniel’s *hattamid* must be done with the *sanctuary* in view,³¹ so now, given the link between *tamid* and the Old Testament sacrifices, identifying *hattamid* must be done with the *sacrifices* in view. This being the case, let’s consider the Jewish view of *hattamid* to see what the *literal* application of sacrifices might teach us about the *symbolic* application of sacrifices held in the Reformation view. After all, any symbolic application of a prophetic term must be interpreted in light of its historic literal application.

The Old Testament sacrifices can be divided into various categories: there were sacrifices offered on behalf of the entire congregation of Israel vs. those offered on behalf of individuals; there were sacrifices offered at unchanging appointed times vs. those offered on special occasions on a “when needed” basis. The Old Testament sacrifices can also be divided by purpose into three main categories: burnt offerings,³² sin offerings,³³ and peace offerings.³⁴ Now a quote from the *SDA Bible Dictionary*:

A distinction was made between sacrifices offered for the entire nation and those for individuals. (1) Those representing the entire congregation included: the *regular* burnt offerings (that is, those offered upon regularly recurring occasions); all *regular* sin offerings; and those presented for specific instances of sin on the part of the entire congregation; *special* burnt offerings that were presented with the sin offering for the congregation; the *regular* peace offering offered with the bread at Pentecost. (2) Those offered by individuals included: all the *special* burnt offerings and sin offerings (those required by specific circumstances), with the exception of the *special* burnt offerings and sin offerings for congregational sin; all trespass, or guilt, offerings; and all *special* peace offerings. *SDA Bible Dictionary*, 963 (italics original).

Given Strong’s specific definition that “the daily” means “the regular sacrifice,” and given the historic link between *tamid* and the Old Testament sanctuary sacrifices, it is particularly noteworthy that the category of sacrifices offered at unchanging appointed times are here called “regular” offerings offered upon “regularly recurring occasions” while those offered on a “when needed” basis

³⁰ While the Catholics agreed that “sacrifice” was the proper context of *hattamid*, they, of course, held an opposite perspective on how this “sacrifice” was taken away. The *SDA Bible Commentary*:

Reverse Application Under Manning. — During the 19-century advent awakening another Roman Catholic cardinal, Henry Edward Manning, when asked the question, “What is the taking away of the continual sacrifice of Dan. 8:11–14?” replied that it is the taking away of “the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, . . . the sacrifice of Jesus Himself on Calvary, renewed perpetually and continued for ever in the [Catholic] sacrifice on the altar.” He then charged Protestantism with having taken away the sacrifice of the mass in the West, and called this the forerunner of a futurist Jewish Antichrist, who, just before world’s end, will cause the daily sacrifice of the mass to “cease” altogether for a little time. He chided the various Protestant lands for “suppression” of the “continual sacrifice,” that is, the “rejection of the Mass,” castigating such suppression as the “mark and characteristic of the Protestant Reformation” (*The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ*, pp. 158–161).

Thus, irrespective of opposing views, the issue of the “daily” ever revolved around the sacrifice of Christ and the priesthood and the proper, or true, worship of God. 4BC 63 (ellipsis original; larger quote in Appendix A).

³¹ Cf. pp. 36–37.

³² “The ‘burnt’ offering expressed worship, gratitude, and dedication. It represented the unbroken, uninterrupted adoration, worship, and devotion of the entire congregation to the Lord.” *SDABD* 963.

³³ “‘Sin’ offerings represented the confession of, and atonement for, what have been termed Godward sins, while the ‘trespass’ or ‘guilt’ offering represented the confession of what have been termed manward sins, and restitution for injury or loss, though the precise difference is not always clear.” *Ibid.*

³⁴ “‘Peace’ offerings expressed gratitude, good will, brotherhood, or the fulfillment of vows.” *Ibid.*

are called “special” offerings. It is also significant that *all* the various *regular* offerings were *congregational* or *corporate* offerings, and *all* the various *individual* offerings were in the *special* category.³⁵ Now let’s focus on just the “regular” sacrifices:

A regular, or daily, burnt offering was offered morning and evening throughout the year, including days when other offerings were prescribed. Additional burnt offerings were required on Sabbaths, on new moons, at the 3 great annual festivals . . . and on New Year’s Day and the Day of Atonement...

Regular sin offerings were specified for the entire congregation at the time of the new moon, on New Year’s Day, and the Day of Atonement; and at the 3 great national festivals...

Regular peace offerings were required at Pentecost. *Ibid.*, 966.

The appointed times for the “regular” sacrifices are delineated in 1 Chronicles 23:27–31:³⁶

27 For by the last words of David the Levites were numbered from twenty years old and above; 28 because their duty was to help the sons of Aaron [the priests] in the service of the house of the Lord, in the courts and in the chambers, in the purifying of all holy things and the work of the service of the house of God, 29 both with the showbread and the fine flour for the grain offering, with the unleavened cakes and what is baked in the pan, with what is mixed and with all kinds of measures and sizes; 30 to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at evening; 31 and at every presentation of a burnt offering to the Lord on the Sabbaths and on the New Moons and on the set feasts, by number according to the ordinance governing them, regularly [hattamid] before the Lord;

Ancient Israel’s “regular” sacrifices were indeed offered on a regularly recurring basis; that is, they were offered at *regularly scheduled divine appointments* wherein the priests and Levites, acting on behalf of the corporate body of ancient Israel, met with God at the “tabernacle of meeting” or Temple sanctuary. As indicated above, these appointments were every morning and evening daily, every Sabbath, every New Moon, and at the three annual feasts. Thus we have specific “regular” sacrifices in the historic and literal context of ancient Israel’s sanctuary services that correspond with the “regular” context of *hattamid*.

Our last two observations support Strong’s definition of Daniel’s elliptic and indicate that *hattamid* is best translated “the regular sacrifice.” And this is precisely how the NAS translates *hattamid* in each of the five verses it is found in Daniel. For example, Daniel 8:11–13:

11 It even magnified itself to be equal with the Commander of the host; and it removed the regular sacrifice from Him, and the place of His sanctuary was thrown down.

12 And on account of transgression the host will be given over to the horn along with the regular sacrifice; and it will fling truth to the ground and perform its will and prosper.

13 Then I heard a holy one speaking, and another holy one said to that particular one who was speaking, “How long will the vision about the regular sacrifice apply, while the transgression causes horror, so as to allow both the holy place and the host to be trampled?”

We will note that the word “sacrifice” is not in italics in the NAS and this indicates that the translators did not regard the word “sacrifice” as being supplied. That is, they apparently regarded “sacrifice” as being intrinsic to the elliptical expression *hattamid*. In other words, in harmony with Strong’s definition, they regarded the assumed noun “sacrifice” as being inherent in the Hebrew elliptic. Thus, when the elliptic is *defined* this way, when translating *hattamid* into English, to supply the word “sacrifice” is not merely an assumption in interpretation; instead, it could be called an assumption in translation and the word “sacrifice” becomes part and parcel of the elliptic itself.³⁷

³⁵ The “Table of Sacrifices and Offerings” in *SDABD* 964–965 is helpful.

³⁶ Also 2 Chron. 8:12–13.

³⁷ Regarding the assumed noun in Daniel’s elliptic, we make a distinction between *who* supplies the word. If it is the interpreter, the assumption is highly subjective in that it requires a degree of assuming what the writer meant. If it is the

Understood this way, when considering the historic Jewish literal application of *hattamid* it is probable that any Jewish reader in Daniel's day would have immediately understood that "the regular sacrifice" was the meaning of Daniel's elliptic and he would have been at a loss to understand how anyone could read any noun other than "sacrifice" into the expression. This is made particularly evident by the fact that, as noted in the *SDABD* 258 quote on p. 36, the section of the Mishnah that describes how the morning and evening sacrifices were carried out is entitled simply *Tamid*.³⁸

translator, the assumption is more objective in that it relies on precise definitions. And once the translator has done his job and a definition is determined, the interpreter need not make assumptions.

³⁸ Regarding Ellen White's *EW* 74 statement in 1850 that the word "sacrifice" was supplied ("I saw in relation to the 'daily' [Dan. 8:12] that the word 'sacrifice' was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text . . ."), we believe this should be understood in the same situational context as we should understand the last half of the same sentence (" . . . and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry"). The *SDA Encyclopedia* attempts to explain this context:

When questioned . . . on the meaning of the "daily," Mrs. White "usually said that she has no clear light on the subject, and that our brethren would have to study the matter for themselves" According to A. G. Daniell's report of an interview with her concerning the "daily," she made it clear that her 1850 statement was not intended to settle the identity of the "daily," which she did not profess to know, but to state that the Millerites had the right view of the "daily" as to that period of time (the 2300 days); that she had written with reference to the errors current at that time, especially the attempts to revise the dating of the 2300 days. . . . Time was the point at issue — as it had been between the Millerites and their opposers who made the "daily" the literal Jewish sacrifices — not the identity of the "daily." *SDAE* 369.

That the Encyclopedia has correctly identified the context of Ellen White's 1850 statement is evidenced by the last sentence of her paragraph: "Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test." And as the Encyclopedia notes, in order to understand the *EW* statement it is necessary to understand the context of the entire 1850 discussion. And one of the principal "errors current at that time" was that the supplied word "sacrifice" was being understood in its literal sense exclusively, and this required the 2300 days to also be understood literally. (For whatever reasons, the fact that the *daily* had been understood during the previous 500 years symbolically as the spiritual "sacrifice" of "true worship" [the Reformation view] was either forgotten or ignored [cf. *4BC* 60–63, quoted in Appendix A].) The Millerites, on the other hand, correctly understood the *daily* symbolically, and this totally ruled out literal sacrifices as a viable option for the *daily's* identity. Thus, because Ellen White "had written with reference to the errors current at that time," the Millerite "opposers who made the 'daily' the literal Jewish sacrifices" dictated the very narrow context of the *EW* 74–75 counsel.

Regarding the second half of the much misunderstood *EW* 74–75 sentence, because "time was the point at issue . . . not the identity of the 'daily,'" we can understand that the "correct view" of the Millerites was not their *specific* symbolic identity of the *daily* (paganism), but only that the *daily* should be understood in the *general* symbolic sense. In this context, *EW* 74–75 affirmed the Millerite view that the 2300 days were symbolic while *not* affirming the Millerite "paganism" view of the *daily*. This accords with Ellen White's appeal sixty years later when the controversy arose between the Adventist "old view" vs. "new view" of the *daily* — "I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question ["the daily"]; for I have had no instruction on the point under discussion" [*regarding which symbolic view is correct*] (*1SM* 164). But while it is critically important to recognize the situational context in 1850 in order to correctly understand the last half of the *EW* 74–75 sentence, it is equally important when it comes to understanding the first half of the same sentence.

Regarding the first half of the sentence, Ellen White was addressing the implications of the word "sacrifice" as it was understood in its literal context only — *i.e.* as it was understood by the Millerite "opposers who made the 'daily' the literal Jewish sacrifices." While a symbolic context of the *daily* was being considered, a symbolic context of the word "sacrifice" was *not* being considered. And recognizing that "the word 'sacrifice' was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text" at a time when all that man's wisdom could discern was the literal context of "sacrifice" was very important in correcting "the errors current at that time." It steered God's remnant people away from the error of *literalism*, and thus it was an endorsement of the symbolic application of the 2300 days (Inspiration's single concern at the time). And in our view, the *1SM* 164 appeal in 1910 for the brethren to "not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question" should be taken literally, and it should be applied just as much to the first half of the *EW* 74–75 sentence as to the second. And therefore the *EW* 74–75 comment should not be considered germane to a possible *symbolic* application of the word "sacrifice." Of course, such an application would harmonize with both a symbolic view of the *daily* and the symbolic view of the 2300 days; and consequently we suspect that had such an

We should note that though the blood sacrifice of a lamb was the principal element of the morning and evening sacrifice there were other elements of these services as well: the grain and drink offerings, servicing the altar of incense and the candlestick, the reciting of psalms, and singing. In our view, all of this together should be regarded as the cultic "sacrifice" of the Jewish *Tamid*. We will also note that, because the morning and evening *Tamid* service was the most common and basic element of all the sanctuary services, the direct connection between the word "sacrifice" and the *Tamid* makes "the regular *sacrifice*" view of *hattamid* fit the sanctuary context of Daniel 8 every bit as much as does "the continual *heavenly ministry*" of Christ view. Actually, if applying the words "regular" and "sacrifice" to *hattamid* is correct, this would arguably *rule out* the "heavenly ministry" view as a viable option for the meaning of the elliptic. Note Hebrews 7:24–27:

24 But He [Jesus], because He continues forever, has an unchangeable priesthood. 25 Therefore He is also able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him, since He always lives to make intercession for them.

26 For such a High Priest was fitting for us, *who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and has become higher than the heavens*; 27 who does not need daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the people's, for this He did once for all when He offered up Himself.

As we have seen, the principal element of the Old Testament sanctuary services that the Jews termed *Tamid* was the morning and evening offering of a lamb sacrifice, *repeated every day*. And this does not correspond with the heavenly ministry of Christ. That is, according to v. 27 above, the *sacrificial* element of Jesus' priestly ministry [in offering Himself as the Lamb of God] was necessary just *once, not every day*,³⁹ while according to v. 25 the *intercessory* element of Jesus' priestly ministry is *continuous, not periodic*.

Before ending our discussion of the word "sacrifice," we will note that the Reformation view of *hattamid* went essentially unchallenged until 1836 when William Miller came to the conclusion that *hattamid* was "the continual paganism" of imperial Rome that preceded the political rise of papal Rome. To Miller, this seemed logical given the fact that the paganism of imperial Rome was necessarily "taken away" in order to make room for the rise of papal Rome in the 6th century as the new unifying political authority in the Roman Empire.⁴⁰ This "Millerite view" of *hattamid* was the unique view of the brief Millerite movement of the 1830–40's. And because Seventh-day Adventism was born out of the Millerite movement, the Millerite view became the default view of Adventism for its first half-century, just as the Jewish view had become the default view of Christianity for its first 13 centuries. But as we also know, during the first decade of the 20th century the Millerite view in Adventism was superseded by "the continual heavenly ministry" of Christ view.⁴¹ And in the Christian world, this view is unique to Adventism, and thus we will call this view the "Adventist view."⁴² Now we have four views of Daniel's *hattamid* under consideration: the Jewish view, the Reformation view, the Millerite view, and the Adventist view.

In our investigation to discover the assumed noun in the Hebrew elliptic *hattamid*, we conclude that the only valid option we have is the word "sacrifice" (understood symbolically) or its equivalent

application been set forth in 1850 Ellen White would not have objected to it. That is, as long as the 2300 days were understood symbolically, Sister White would have been content.

In our suggested context of *EW* 74–75, what was missing from the 1850 discussion was that, because Daniel's *daily* is in an apocalyptic prophecy, the *daily* should be understood symbolically *including* the supplied noun "sacrifice."

³⁹ Also Heb. 9:23–28.

⁴⁰ Cf. *SDAE* 367.

⁴¹ Cf. *4BC* 65. For the origin of the Millerite view of the *daily* (which in Adventism is called the "old" view) and the problems with this view, see Appendix B.

⁴² For the origin of the Adventist view of the *daily* (which in Adventism is called the "new" view) and the problems with this view, see Appendix C. It should be noted that the Millerite view remains as a small minority view in Adventism.

(e.g. “offering” or “service”). Anything else (e.g. “paganism” or “heavenly ministry”) has no exegetical or historical basis and can be regarded as merely a “private interpretation.” Regarding the Millerite view, William Miller hardly followed sound principles of interpretation in coming to this view.⁴³ And regarding the Adventist view, we find no historical basis for this view, and the only exegetical basis that supports it is the fact that, contextually, *hattamid* is a sanctuary related term. But we have just noted that this context applies equally to “sacrifice.” All of this is to say that, in our view, supplying a noun to Daniel’s elliptic *hattamid* that is substantively different from “sacrifice” is eisegesis, not exegesis. Regardless of how we view this, however, if “sacrifice” is indeed the assumed noun that is part and parcel of the Hebrew elliptic *hattamid*, then this fact should weigh very heavily in any exegesis of the apocalyptic application of Daniel’s *hattamid*.

Finally, the fundamental difference between the Adventist view and the Reformation view of *hattamid* is this: the Adventist view holds that *hattamid* is a sanctuary function carried out by Christ in heaven; the Reformation view holds that *hattamid* is a sanctuary function carried out by God’s people on earth. The Adventist view holds that the “taking away” of *hattamid* is not literal and that it is merely taken away *in effect*; the Reformation view holds that the “taking away” of *hattamid* is indeed literal and that it is taken away *in substance*.

Worship

Our fifth and final observation has to do with the Reformation view of connecting *hattamid* with worship. According to the 4BC article “Five Centuries of Exposition of the ‘Daily,’”⁴⁴ for five hundred years both Protestants and Catholics understood that “the daily sacrifice” referred to the symbolic “sacrifice” of true Christian worship. After presenting both Reformation and Counter Reformation positions, the article summarizes:

Thus Reformation and Counter Reformation spokesmen alike, in charges and counter-charges, connected the “daily” with the true and false sacrifice and priesthood of Christ and the true worship of God. The contention of the one was the antithesis of the other, but both identified the “daily” as the worship of God. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:61.

We find the comments of one post-Reformation Protestant writing anonymously in 1787 under the initials “R. M.” to be especially astute:

“The taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of abomination, is the taking away of the true christian worship, as instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and the setting up of the doctrines and commandments of men. . . . The daily sacrifice is a Mosaic term for the true worship of God suited to the time in which Daniel lived” (*Observations on Certain Prophecies in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 8, 9). *Ibid.*, 62 (ellipsis original).⁴⁵

The view that Daniel’s elliptic *hattamid* refers to the sacrifice of true worship offered to God is supported by 1 Peter 2:5:

5 you also, as living stones, are being built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.

Here we see that the Christian church constitutes a “spiritual house” and a “holy priesthood” that is to offer up its own “spiritual sacrifices.”⁴⁶ The “holy priesthood” here is spiritual Israel’s equivalent of the “kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Ex. 19:6) God called ancient Israel to be. And

⁴³ Miller mistakenly believed that what was “taken out of the way” in 2 Thess. 2:7 was imperial Roman paganism, and he then, again mistakenly, assumed that this was the *daily* that is “taken away” in Daniel’s prophecies (cf. his own account of his rationale in the *SDAE* 367 quote in Appendix B, p. 104).

⁴⁴ 4BC 60–65. Cf. fn. 29 on p. 46.

⁴⁵ This quote, without the ellipsis, is in *PF* 2:691–692.

⁴⁶ Also cf. 1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6.

equating the "spiritual sacrifices" of the Christian church with the "true worship" the Reformers identified as "the daily sacrifice" of Daniel's prophecies affirms the basic correctness of the Reformation view. It shows that in the worship offered by the Christian "priesthood" there is a spiritual counterpart to the sanctuary sacrifices of ancient Israel. Actually, the "spiritual sacrifices" of the Christian church are but a continuation of what the Levites offered as their part of the Old Testament services. Though only the Aaronic priesthood was responsible for offering the sacrifices themselves, the role of the Levites was to help the priests, and according to 1 Chronicles 23:30–31 this included:

30 to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at evening; 31 and at every presentation of a burnt offering to the Lord on the Sabbaths and on the New Moons and on the set feasts, by number according to the ordinance governing them, regularly [*tamid*] before the Lord;⁴⁷

Certainly, "to thank and praise the Lord" continues as a fundamental element of worship in the Christian dispensation. Moreover, David even specifically likened his worship of God to the daily sacrifice. Psalm 141:2:

2 Let my prayer be set before You as incense, The lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.

Just as David equated his praying with the sanctuary incense, so he equated the lifting up of his hands in worship with the sanctuary evening sacrifice. And "lifting up hands" is indeed a sanctuary expression of worship. Psalm 134:2:

2 Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, And bless the LORD.

Because Paul desired that "men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands" (1 Tim. 2:8), it certainly seems that just as we equate Christian prayers with ancient Israel's sanctuary incense,⁴⁸ so we can equate Christian "spiritual sacrifices" with ancient Israel's sanctuary sacrifices. The Spirit of Prophecy affirms this view by associating the "spiritual sacrifices" of prayer and praise with ancient Israel's morning and evening sacrifices:

Like the patriarchs of old, those who profess to love God should erect an altar to the Lord wherever they pitch their tent. If ever there was a time when every house should be a house of prayer, it is now. Fathers and mothers should often lift up their hearts to God in humble supplication for themselves and their children. Let the father, as priest of the household, lay upon the altar of God the morning and evening sacrifice, while the wife and children unite in prayer and praise. In such a household Jesus will love to tarry. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 144.⁴⁹

Obviously, the context here is in respect to *tamid family* worship. But in precisely the same connection but in the context of Daniel's prophecies, the Reformation view of *hattamid* understands this expression to refer to the *tamid corporate* worship of the Christian church. We will cite another example of Reformation thinking:

Archibald Mason, of Scotland, well-known Presbyterian minister, who in 1820 fixed upon 457 B.C. and A.D. 1843 as the beginning and ending dates of the 2300 years, declared that the daily sacrifice signifies "the instituted worship of God in the church," and "the desolation and treading down of the sanctuary and the host, means the error, superstition and idolatry, that were established instead of that worship" (*Two Essays on Daniel's . . . Two Thousand Three Hundred Days*, p. 6). This, he adds, will end with the expiration of the 2300 years, when the "true worship of God shall be restored." *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:62.

⁴⁷ For greater context, cf. the quote of 1 Chron. 23:27–31 on p. 48.

⁴⁸ Also cf. *PP* 353–354.

⁴⁹ Also cf. *1T* 547; *2T* 701.

Ellen White likened morning and evening family worship to “the morning and evening sacrifice,” and Archibald Mason, representative of Protestant Reformers, identified “the daily sacrifice” of Daniel’s prophecies as “the instituted worship of God in the church.” While the two statements were made in different contexts, both connect *worship* with *sacrifice*. And given the fact that Ellen White was never shown the specific identity of Daniel’s *hattamid* and never endorsed either of the Millerite or Adventist views,⁵⁰ Adventism should consider the Reformation view of *hattamid* as an entirely valid view. This said, more of Martin Proebstle’s comments will be helpful. This one in particular:

Since sacrifices or cultic acts are the most important outward expressions of worship, one could argue that it is possible to refer to the totality of worship by mentioning that term that would comprise all the regular cultic activities: [*hattamid*]. *Truth and Terror*, 226.

The Reformers not only argued for this possibility, they argued that this is the exclusive meaning of Daniel’s *hattamid*. They argued that papal Rome had taken away the true worship of God and that the Reformation had restored it.⁵¹

While Proebstle sets forth nine characteristics of the use of the term *hattamid* in Daniel 8:11–13,⁵² we will now go directly to his summary conclusion:

Conclusion. It is obvious that [*hattamid*] in Dan 8:11–13 should be regarded as a cultic term. Its nominal use, its definite article, and the shared context with other cultic terminology provide excellent support for this. It is simply too limited to interpret the meaning of [*hattamid*] in the book of Daniel as only the daily offering or as the daily burnt offering. To be sure, [*hattamid*] includes the regular daily offering — and thus to exclude the daily burnt offering from the cultic range expressed by [*hattamid*] is equally invalid — but it comprises much more than that. The cultic background of the term [*hattamid*] shows that it represents (1) the regular cultic activities performed by the (high) priest, and/or (2) the continual cultic worship of YHWH. To be specific, [*hattamid*] in Dan 8:11–13 designates (1) the cultic activities of the [*commander of the host*] as high priest, and/or (2) the continual cultic worship directed toward the [*commander of the host*] as divine being.

I suggest an intentional double meaning. Although the cultic background of [*hattamid*] favors the view that (high) priestly activity is meant, which is being part of the Israelite worship, two considerations from the book of Daniel itself provide enough reason to understand [*hattamid*] also as an expression for the true worship and service of YHWH, maybe even “the epitome of the cult.” First, the replacement of [*hattamid*] by false worship or false cult practices [*abominable thing*] in Dan 11:31 and 12:11 implies that [*hattamid*] designates the true worship of YHWH. Second the obvious lexical and thematic link to Dan 6 (“constant” in 6:17, 21) suggests that [*hattamid*] stands for the continual cultic worship and service of YHWH, which was expressed by Daniel short of sacrifices through his continual service in prayer. *Ibid.*, 231.⁵³

Proebstle has suggested an intentional double meaning of *hattamid* (*i.e.* he suggests the Adventist view and the Reformation view are *both* correct). But we suggest that there is but a single meaning, which is, in Proebstle’s words, “the continual cultic worship of YHWH,” though we prefer “the regular corporate worship of God.” We believe Proebstle has set forth stronger evidence favoring the Reformation view than he has for the Adventist view. His two considerations from the book of Daniel itself

⁵⁰ Cf. the *SDAE* 369 quote in fn. 42 on p. 49. Also the *ISM* 164 quote in the same footnote.

⁵¹ For what it’s worth, The Message paraphrase actually substitutes the word “worship” for “sacrifice” in each of the five times *hattamid* is found in Daniel.

⁵² *Truth and Terror*, 210–230.

⁵³ Proebstle’s source for the quote “the epitome of the cult” is Peter L. Trudinger, *The Psalms of the Tamid Service: A Liturgical Text from the Second Temple Period*, 36–38 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

are just two examples of this. And while his first consideration has been noted by other Bible scholars,⁵⁴ his observation regarding Daniel 6 is quite unique.

Daniel 6 relates the story of Daniel and the lions’ den, and the two relevant verses are vs. 16 and 20. For context, we will quote Daniel 6:16–20:⁵⁵

16 So the king gave the command, and they brought Daniel and cast *him* into the den of lions. *But* the king spoke, saying to Daniel, “Your God, whom you serve [*p^llach*] continually [*t^ediyra*], He will deliver you.” 17 Then a stone was brought and laid on the mouth of the den, and the king sealed it with his own signet ring and with the signets of his lords, that the purpose concerning Daniel might not be changed.

18 Now the king went to his palace and spent the night fasting; and no musicians were brought before him. Also his sleep went from him. 19 Then the king arose very early in the morning and went in haste to the den of lions. 20 And when he came to the den, he cried with a lamenting voice unto Daniel. The king spoke, saying to Daniel, “Daniel, servant of the living God, has your God, whom you serve [*p^llach*] continually [*t^ediyra*], been able to deliver you from the lions?”

The word “continually” in vs. 16 and 20 is translated from an Aramaic word that is, according to Proebstle, “a perfect one-to-one relation”⁵⁶ to the Hebrew word *tamid*. Strong’s definition:

8411. **t^ediyra** (Chald.), *ted-ee-raw’*; from 1753 in the orig. sense of *enduring; permanence*, i.e. (adv.) *constantly*:—*continually*.

Now Strong’s definition for the word “serve” in vs. 16 and 20:

6399. **p^llach** (Chald.), *pel-akh’*; corresp. to 6398; to *serve* or worship:—minister, serve.

It could be said that Daniel 6 describes Daniel worshiping God in a *tamid* way; and his *tamid* way, we are told in v. 10, was to kneel down facing Jerusalem and pray to God three times a day. “The regularity of the prayers exemplifies Daniel’s constant (*tamid*) worship and service of YHWH.”⁵⁷ Proebstle concludes his comments on Daniel’s worship routine with this:

The focal issue in chap. 6 is prayer and worship, or with one word: the *tamid*. Daniel’s commitment to continuous service to God and his uninterrupted worship practice stand diametrically opposed to the human, and inherently anti-divine, order. In this regard, the struggle involving the *tamid* in Dan 8 resembles the situation in chap. 6, albeit on a larger, universal

⁵⁴ As noted above, Proebstle’s first consideration is that “the replacement of [*hattamid*] by false worship or false cult practices [*abominable thing*] in Dan 11:31 and 12:11 implies that [*hattamid*] designates the true worship of YHWH.” Dr. Stefanovic made this same point regarding the replacement of *hattamid* by “the transgression of desolation” of Dan. 8:12–13 in his *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* 303 quote on p. 40. See also LaRondelle’s *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible* 66–67 quote on p. 41. The *SDA Bible Dictionary* has also made this point:

In ch 11:31 the additional information is given that “the abomination that maketh desolate” is substituted for “the daily.” Since “the daily” designates the divinely ordained system of worship, the power that removes it stands in opposition to God, and “the abomination that maketh desolate” represents a counterfeit system of worship. *SDABD* 258.

And the *SDA Encyclopedia*:

DAILY, THE. As used in the prophecy of Daniel, a cryptic term for what was taken away by a power described as “a little horn, which waxed exceeding great” in the vision of Dan 8 and as the “king of the north” in ch 11. In each instance an apostate form of worship variously designated “the transgression of desolation” (ch 8:13) or “the abomination that maketh desolate” (chs 11:31; 12:11) is set up in its place. *SDAE* 366.

⁵⁵ Proebstle uses a Bible version that numbers the relevant verses 17 and 21.

⁵⁶ *Truth and Terror*, 220.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 230 (parentheses original).

scale. In both chapters it becomes evident that “spiritual warfare on earth is an attack on the ritual observance of the people.” *Truth and Terror*, 230.⁵⁸

The whole scenario of Daniel 6 was that the reigning religio-political authority (Medo-Persia) was attempting to take away an important element of the true worship of God by God’s people (the people could still pray; they just had to redirect their prayers to the pagan king). And this is precisely how the Reformers understood the apocalyptic context of the taking away of *hattamid* in Daniel’s prophecies. Of course, the Reformers understood that the religio-political authority that takes away the true worship of God is the papal phase of the Roman Empire (the people could still worship; they just had to conform their worship to the pagan system of Daniel 8’s little horn).

Though the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew word *tamid* (*tʿdiyra*) is not employed elliptically in Daniel 6 (it is an adverb modifying the verb “serve,” which can mean *worship*), we believe that all of Daniel’s historical chapters (chaps. 1–6) relate historical events that have direct apocalyptic implications. The apocalyptic shadow-of-things-to-come context of the story in Daniel 6, then, is itself sufficient to equate the universal attack on *hattamid* in Daniel 8 (and Dan. 11, 12) with the local attack on the ritual observance of Daniel and his people in chapter 6.

Finally regarding sacrifice and worship, it is evident that God intended the principal activity in His “house of prayer” to be the offering of burnt offerings and sacrifices. Isaiah 56:6–7:

Also the sons of the foreigner Who join themselves to the LORD, to serve Him, And to love the name of the LORD, to be His servants – Everyone who keeps from defiling the Sabbath, And holds fast My covenant – 7 Even them I will bring to My holy mountain, And make them joyful in My house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices *Will be accepted on My altar*; For My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations.

Because offering sacrifices constituted an integral part of God’s house of prayer, it is only natural that God would also call His “house of prayer” His “house of sacrifice.” 2 Chronicles 7:12–16:

12 Then the LORD appeared to Solomon by night, and said to him: “I have heard your prayer, and have chosen this place [*Solomon’s newly built and dedicated Temple*] for Myself as a house of sacrifice. 13 When I shut up heaven and there is no rain, or command the locusts to devour the land, or send pestilence among My people, 14 if My people who are called by My name will humble themselves, and pray and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land. 15 Now My eyes will be open and My ears attentive to prayer made in this place. 16 For now I have chosen and sanctified this house, that My name may be there forever; and My eyes and My heart will be there perpetually.”

God chose and sanctified Solomon’s Temple to be the place that He and His people would meet and interact. And for every appointed meeting, God’s people were not to come empty handed; and therefore God called this special place “a house of sacrifice.” And it is evident that God intended that a principal element of the offered “sacrifice” was to be the prayers of His people, whether they be joyful prayers of praise or sorrowful prayers of penitence. Of course, communicating with God for any reason is a central, if not *the* central, component of worship.

Synopsis

To summarize where we have come thus far, we have seen that, historically, there have been four principal views set forth regarding Daniel’s *hattamid*: the Jewish view (literal sacrifices of the *Tamid*), the Reformation view (spiritual sacrifices of true worship), the Millerite view (paganism of

⁵⁸ Proebstle’s source for the quote cited here is Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, “The Book of Daniel: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” 113 (*The New Interpreter’s Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996).

imperial Rome), and the Adventist view (heavenly ministry of Christ). In our own exegesis of *hattamid*, we have concluded that the taking away of *hattamid* in Daniel 8 is set in the context of an attack on the sanctuary by the little horn. We have concluded that the taking away of *hattamid* in Daniel 11 and 12 is set in the context of an attack on the holy covenant by the same little-horn power. We have concluded that, in the Jewish view, the morning and evening *Tamid* was the standing "appointed time" for ancient Israel to meet with God in the sanctuary for the purpose of offering sacrifices. We have concluded that, in the context of sanctuary rituals, the Hebrew word *tamid* is properly translated "regular." We have concluded that the Hebrew elliptic *hattamid* is best translated "the regular sacrifice." We have concluded that the sacrifices which the Jews identified with their *Tamid* sanctuary services were specifically those sacrifices offered on a regular *corporate* basis. We have concluded that the New Testament counterpart to the Old Testament literal sacrifices is the spiritual sacrifices offered in the Christian worship of God. In view of these conclusions, we have also concluded that of the four historical views of *hattamid* the Reformation view alone is exegetically sound. And in this way we have come to our final conclusion that Daniel's *hattamid* is best understood to mean "the regular corporate worship of God." We might call this the *enhanced* Reformation view.

Now we will note that one prominent Adventist theologian has come to a conclusion regarding Daniel's *hattamid* that is very close to ours. Dr. Roy Gane has expressed his view in his book *Who's Afraid of the Judgment?*

In verse 11 [of Dan. 8], the little horn removes the *tamid*, the "regular/continual" (the so-called "daily")—that is, regular worship. The Hebrew word *tamid*, "regularity/regular," qualifies a cluster of regular worship activities performed at the Israelite sanctuary, including weekly renewal of the "bread of the Presence" (Exodus 25:30; Leviticus 24:8), daily maintenance of the lamps on the lamp stand so that they could burn nightly (Exodus 27:20; Leviticus 24:2–4), daily/continual mediation by the high priest, as represented by his unique garments (Exodus 28:29, 30, 38), the daily burnt offering (Exodus 29:38, 42), daily burning of incense (Exodus 30:8), regular/continual maintenance of fire on the outer altar (Leviticus 6:13), and the high priest's regular grain offering (Leviticus 6:20). . . .

Daniel 8:12 refers to rebellion/transgression against the regular worship of God. *Who's Afraid of the Judgment?*, 39.

Dr. Gane identifies Daniel's *hattamid* as "the regular worship of God," meaning "worship that takes place regularly" (*ibid.*, 84). This view differs with the Reformation view only in the addition of the word "regular," and our view differs with Dr. Gane's view only in the addition of the word "corporate." And while Dr. Gane does not offer a suggestion as to what specifically constitutes the Christian "regular worship of God" or what specific prophetic event constitutes the *taking away* of this "worship that takes place regularly," in light of our current study we will attempt to take this next step.

Application

As noted on pp. 36–37, Daniel's elliptical expression *hattamid* is a sanctuary related term because (1) it first appears as an important element in Daniel's sanctuary related vision of Daniel 8, (2) the Hebrew word *tamid* is frequently connected with the Old Testament sanctuary rituals, and (3) the Jewish Mishnah employs the term *Tamid* in specific reference to the daily morning and evening sanctuary service. It naturally follows, then, that the elliptic *hattamid* ("the *tamid*") of Daniel 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11, since its location in each prophecy puts it chronologically far into the New Testament era where it can no longer refer to the literal *Tamid* sanctuary service of ancient Israel, refers to that element of *spiritual* Israel's *sanctuary related* services that corresponds with the Old Testament *Tamid*.

As noted on pp. 37–38, when God instructed His people to make a sanctuary His stated purpose for it was to provide a place “that I may dwell among them” (Ex. 25:8); and God’s presence was then, naturally, visibly manifested in this sanctuary. Of course, God’s presence in the sanctuary was an unceasing and uninterrupted one, and to signify this the *Tamid* fire on the altar was never to go out. And if our line of thought that Daniel’s *hattamid* connects with the morning and evening *Tamid* of ancient Israel is valid, it follows that Daniel’s *hattamid* would in some way also connect with God’s perpetual presence among His people. And though we concur with the Reformation view that *hattamid* is the true worship of God, we believe it is more precisely the specific component of true worship that is offered in response to God’s continuous presence. That is, God’s continuous presence *with* His people demands acknowledgment *from* His people, and this need is met for both ancient Israel and spiritual Israel in the form of *hattamid*.

As noted on p. 38, the Old Testament sanctuary served a *second* purpose. It served as the “tabernacle of meeting” where God would *meet* His people, and each “appointed time” for meeting was *not* continuous or unceasing. *All* the appointments were very specific, and for all the *corporate* sacrifices and meetings, very regular — every daily morning and evening, every weekly Sabbath, every monthly New Moon, and every annual set feast.⁵⁹ And herein we have what we believe is the most fundamental meaning of the Hebrew expression *hattamid*, “the *tamid*,” “the regular,” “the daily” in the book of Daniel. In our view, *hattamid* is an abbreviated expression referring to the regularly recurring divine appointment that God enjoins upon His people, regardless of covenant dispensations, to come before Him to offer up their sacrifices of worship: an “appointed time” wherein God’s people *corporately* come into God’s dedicated “sanctuary” to meet with Him. And while there is no longer a sanctuary on earth dedicated for this purpose, there is indeed a dedicated sanctuary in heaven that God invites His covenant people to enter by faith.

God’s two sanctuaries can be called the *earthly* sanctuary and the *heavenly* sanctuary, the *typical* sanctuary and the *antitypical* sanctuary, the *old covenant* sanctuary and the *new covenant* sanctuary. These related but distinctly separate sanctuaries are spoken of in Hebrews 8 and 9. Consider Hebrews 9:11–12, 23–24:

11 But Christ came as High Priest of the good things to come, with the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation. 12 Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place [better: “into the holy places” (Young’s Literal Translation) referring to the entire sanctuary] **once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.**

23 Therefore it was necessary that the copies [on earth] of the things in the heavens should be purified with these [animal sacrifices], but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. 24 For Christ has not entered the holy places made with hands, which are copies of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us;

Just as the Israelites did not enter into God’s presence in the earthly sanctuary themselves but only entered by proxy through priests and Levites (the High Priest only in the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement),⁶⁰ so spiritual Israel enters into God’s presence in the heavenly sanctuary by proxy through the heavenly, antitypical, new-covenant High Priest — Jesus Christ. Regarding the aftermath of the Millerite disappointment in 1844 and the subsequent attempt to understand what really happened at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, we have this account:

But clearer light came with the investigation of the sanctuary question. They now saw that they were correct in believing that the end of the 2300 days in 1844 marked an important crisis. But while it was true that that door of hope and mercy by which men had for eighteen

⁵⁹ Cf. again the quote of 1 Chron. 23:30–31 on p. 52.

⁶⁰ Lev. 16; Heb. 9:6–7, 25.

hundred years found access to God, was closed, another door was opened, and forgiveness of sins was offered to men through the intercession of Christ in the most holy. One part of His ministration had closed, only to give place to another. There was still an "open door" to the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ was ministering in the sinner's behalf. *The Great Controversy*, 429.⁶¹

Though we have been in the antitypical Day of Atonement since 1844, we will note that the Old Testament *Tamid* sacrifices that were offered every day of the year were offered on the Day of Atonement as well.⁶² Thus, we would expect that any corresponding New Testament *Tamid* "spiritual sacrifices" would be offered from the beginning of the New Testament dispensation and that they would continue to be offered throughout the antitypical Day of Atonement as well.

Also, the New Testament *Tamid* must be that element of Christian worship that occurs on a God-appointed regular (*tamid*) time schedule. While Daniel's personal *tamid* worship of God described in Daniel 6 was to pray three times a day, he was under no divine obligation to do so. This was merely his personal practice.⁶³ And while Christians have the Old Testament morning and evening sacrifices as a worthy example for morning and evening personal prayer and family worship,⁶⁴ they also are under no divine obligation to do so. Though personal prayer and worship is indispensable in the Christian life, its timing is not under any divine regulation, and this corresponds with the "special" sacrifices of ancient Israel offered by *individuals* on the irregular "when needed" basis. But Christians *do* have a standing appointment to meet with God, and this appointment corresponds with the corporate "regular" sacrifices of ancient Israel offered at standing appointed times.⁶⁵ This is their appointment to come before God in corporate worship every seventh-day Sabbath.

To review once more, we have concluded that the *Tamid* sanctuary service of ancient Israel was a "divine appointment" for God's people to meet with God. We have concluded that, in the sanctuary context, *tamid* means "regular." We have concluded that Daniel's *hattamid* means "the regular sacrifice." We have seen that all the Old Testament *regular* sacrifices were *corporate* sacrifices. We have concluded that the New Testament equivalent of the Old Testament sacrifices are the "spiritual sacrifices" that make up the "true worship" of God. And therefore we have concluded that Daniel's *hattamid* is best understood to mean "the regular corporate worship of God." To all of this we now add that the *only* New Testament expression of Christian worship that comports with *all* of these conclusions is indeed the *corporate Sabbath worship* of the "holy priesthood" who "offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus" (1 Pet. 2:5); the "royal priesthood" who "proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light" (v. 9).

We will note that, besides Sabbath worship, there are other expressions of corporate worship in the Christian church. There is the ordinance of the Lord's Supper (which is not necessarily observed on the Sabbath), and there are various dedications and services for special occasions. But none of these are standing, *regular* appointments. It is the Sabbath and the Sabbath alone that God has retained as the "appointed time" He meets and speaks with His New Testament people on a *divinely appointed regularly recurring* basis.

We will also recall that while the Old Testament *Tamid* sacrifice was offered twice daily, it burned perpetually, signifying God's perpetual presence. In the same way, while the New Testament "spiritual sacrifice" of corporate Sabbath worship is offered by the "holy priesthood" of God's people but once weekly, each such "sacrifice" is really an acknowledgment by this "priesthood" that God's presence has been in their midst continually throughout the preceding six days.

⁶¹ Also cf. *EW* 254–255.

⁶² Num. 29:11.

⁶³ Perhaps Daniel was following the example of David: "Evening and morning and at noon will I pray" (Ps. 55:17). Cf. our comments regarding Dan. 6 on p. 54.

⁶⁴ Cf. *PP* 353–354.

⁶⁵ See again the *SDABD* 963 quote on p. 47.

We are not merely to observe the Sabbath as a legal matter. We are to understand its spiritual bearing upon all the transactions of life. All who regard the Sabbath as a sign between them and God, showing that He is the God who sanctifies them, will represent the principles of His government. They will bring into daily practice the laws of His kingdom. Daily it will be their prayer that the sanctification of the Sabbath may rest upon them. Every day they will have the companionship of Christ and will exemplify the perfection of His character. Every day their light will shine forth to others in good works. *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:353–354.

Though the Sabbath itself embraces but the seventh day of each week, the “sanctification of the Sabbath” is continuous and unceasing. And as the original Sabbath was but a celebrative memorial of God’s creative acts during each of the preceding six days,⁶⁶ so in the context of covenant redemption each Sabbath is but a celebrative memorial of God’s re-creative acts during each of the preceding six days. Clearly, Sabbathkeeping is not just a *weekly* experience; it is a *daily* experience. Let’s now focus on the daily sanctification aspect of the Sabbath.

The Sabbath is a sign of the relationship existing between God and His people, a sign that they honor His law. It distinguishes between His loyal subjects and transgressors.

From the pillar of cloud Christ declared concerning the Sabbath: “Verily My Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” Exodus 31:13. The Sabbath given to the world as a sign of God as the Creator is also the sign of Him as the Sanctifier. The power that created all things is the power that re-creates the soul in His own likeness. To those who keep holy the Sabbath day it is the sign of sanctification. True sanctification is harmony with God, oneness with Him in character. *Ibid.*, 349–350.

Since the Sabbath is at once “the sign of sanctification” and “a sign of the relationship existing between God and His people,” perhaps we could say that sanctification is simply experiencing the continuous presence of God. And because “our God is a consuming fire” (Heb. 12:29),⁶⁷ God’s presence in a child of God is evidenced by a life of sin consumed—which is, of course, a life sanctified. And as God’s presence in a bush can burn the bush without consuming it,⁶⁸ His presence in a believer can purge the sin inherent in the flesh without consuming the flesh itself. Moreover, we know that the “glory” of God is His character;⁶⁹ and as the Old Testament tabernacle was sanctified by the glory of God’s presence,⁷⁰ the tabernacle of the believer (his body) is sanctified the same way. 1 Corinthians 3:16–17:⁷¹

16 Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? 17 If anyone defiles the temple of God, God will destroy him, For the temple of God is holy, which temple you are.

But anyone attempting to sanctify his body temple by producing his own holiness is like Nadab and Abihu offering “profane fire” before the Lord. And the ultimate consequence will be the same.⁷² The fire that sanctifies can only be the fire *God* kindles with *His own* presence. And in our view, each corporate Sabbath worship appointment is but an appointment for God’s people to celebrate the fact that the continually indwelling presence of God has re-created the soul in His own likeness throughout the preceding six days. In this way God’s people imitate the divine pattern of creation week. Dr. Meredith Kline has commented on this point:

⁶⁶ Gen. 2:1–3.

⁶⁷ Cf. fn. 10 on p. 38.

⁶⁸ Ex. 3:2.

⁶⁹ Ex. 33:18–23; 34:5–8.

⁷⁰ Ex. 29:43 (quoted on p. 37).

⁷¹ Also cf. 1 Cor. 6:19–20.

⁷² Cf. the story in Lev. 10:1–7 (compare 9:23–24).

By means of the Sabbath, God's image-bearer, as a pledge of covenant consecration, images the pattern of the divine act of creation which proclaims God's absolute sovereignty over man. God has stamped on world history the sign of the Sabbath as his seal of ownership and authority. *Westminster Theological Journal* 22 (1960), "The Two Tables of the Covenant," 139.

When God's people image "the pattern of the divine act of creation" by imitating the Creator in Sabbath rest, God's seal of ownership and authority is stamped on world history time and time again. In this way each Sabbath observance signifies God's completed work of sanctifying His people by His continuous presence in their midst throughout each respective week, and thus each Sabbath observance seals a week of completed Sabbath sanctification. But not only does each Sabbath "pledge of covenant consecration" stamp on world history the sign of the Sabbath, it stamps on each believer the seal of God's ownership and authority. That is, by imaging "the pattern of the divine act of creation" believers assume upon themselves this element of the image of God, thereby making the Sabbath, in its covenant context, the image-bearing seal of God. And God's covenant people are called to restore the seal of God.

The seal of God's law is found in the fourth commandment. This only, of all the ten, brings to view both the name and the title of the Lawgiver. It declares Him to be the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and thus shows His claim to reverence and worship above all others. Aside from this precept, there is nothing in the Decalogue to show by whose authority the law is given. When the Sabbath was changed by the papal power, the seal was taken from the law. The disciples of Jesus are called upon to restore it by exalting the Sabbath of the fourth commandment to its rightful position as the Creator's memorial and the sign of His authority. *The Great Controversy*, 452.

We suggest that the "rightful position" of the Sabbath "as the Creator's memorial and the sign of His authority" is actually the position it held before the "abomination/transgression of desolation" usurped the position of *hattamid*. If so, then the restoration of the Sabbath must, in turn, displace the position the "abomination/transgression" illegitimately holds. And as we know, apocalyptic prophecy informs us that in the spiritual warfare between Christ and Satan it is over this position in particular — the position that "distinguishes between His loyal subjects and transgressors" (6T 350)⁷³ — that the main battle is fought.⁷⁴ And when God, through His 144,000 "servants of God," restores the sign and seal of His law-covenant to its rightful position in His church on earth, the four angels of Revelation 7:1–3 will be permitted to let the "four winds" blow on the earth.⁷⁵ At that time corporate Sabbath worship (in our view, *hattamid*) will be a corporate testament, or sign, of the *24/7 covenant relationship* existing between God and His people.⁷⁶ This will be an end-time corporate equivalent of Abel's testimony.⁷⁷ Hebrews 11:4:

4 By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and through it he being dead still speaks.

When Abel offered to God a sacrifice according to God's specifications, "he obtained witness that he was righteous." And just as the choice of literal sacrifices was the dividing issue between Cain and Abel, so the choice of "Sabbath vs. Sunday" spiritual sacrifices will be the dividing issue for the final generation. Those who offer to God the spiritual sacrifice of Sabbath worship when

⁷³ Larger quote on p. 59.

⁷⁴ This is most clearly evident in Rev. 13.

⁷⁵ See Rev. 7:1–8; *TM* 444–445.

⁷⁶ Cf. again the first sentence of the 6T 349–350 quote on p. 59.

⁷⁷ Cf. Gen. 4:1–15.

doing so may disenfranchise them from all commerce,⁷⁸ or may even cost them, as in Abel's case, life itself *obtain witness that they are righteous*. And naturally this *witness* is the object of Satan's most intense hatred; it is the witness Satan has from the very beginning sought to silence (*i.e.* to *take away*) because, when it finally becomes a *corporate* witness, it will evince the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and will clear the way for the second coming of Christ. Daniel 8:13–14:

13 Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said to that certain one who was speaking, “How long will the vision be, concerning the daily sacrifices [hattamid] and the transgression of desolation, the giving of both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled under foot?”

14 And he said to me, “For two thousand three hundred days; then the sanctuary shall be cleansed.”

We will elaborate on the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in the next chapter; nevertheless, we will focus here on just this “cleansing’s” connection with *hattamid*. It seems that the questioner of Daniel 8:13 is asking, “How long will the vision be concerning the *taking away* of *hattamid*?” This implies that the questioner is also asking, “When will *hattamid* be *restored*?”⁷⁹ The answer is, “For two thousand three hundred days” to October 22, 1844. Proponents of the Adventist view of *hattamid* understand this to mean that the *truth about* the heavenly ministry of Christ was restored at the end of the 2300 days; and this is precisely what happened when Hiram Edson was given a revelation of the heavenly sanctuary on October 23, 1844.⁸⁰ On our part, however, we understand that the implied restoration of *hattamid* means that the *appropriate response of God’s people to the holy covenant* was restored by virtue of their having received the new light about the heavenly sanctuary initially given Hiram Edson; and this is *also* precisely what happened when this new light drew attention to God’s law and God’s people responded accordingly — by keeping the Sabbath, and keeping it in the context of this new light.⁸¹

Keeping the Sabbath in the context of the sanctuary is significantly different from keeping it outside this context; it is what distinguishes God’s remnant people from Sabbathkeepers left behind in Babylon. Sabbath observance can only be the sign of covenant sanctification when it is offered in the context of the sanctuary, as the sanctuary provides the dedicated time and place where God meets and speaks with His people. And as noted on p. 59, it is only in experiencing the continuous presence of God that sanctification takes place. Theologically correct Sabbath observance, then, does not feign *to produce* sanctification; rather, it is the *evidence of* sanctification.

According to Daniel 8:13–14, at the end of the 2300 days in 1844 “both the sanctuary and the host” would no longer “be trampled under foot” as both were lifted back up to their rightful positions in the framework of the holy covenant. The sanctuary with its law-covenant was lifted back up to the platform of truth in the church (from which the little horn had cast it down [vs. 11–12]); and as a result, God’s people were lifted back up from the darkness of ignorance regarding the legitimate place of the law-covenant in the everlasting gospel. They were then no longer enslaved to ignorant sin as “the perfect law of liberty” (Jms. 1:25) had set them free. Of course, as we know, God’s people then demonstrated this newfound freedom by keeping the Sabbath accordingly. This development, we believe, was the striking fulfillment of Archibald Mason’s prediction in 1820 that the “true worship of God” would be restored at the expiration of the 2300 years. We looked at this prediction on p. 52 but it warrants a second look:

⁷⁸ Cf. Rev. 13:17.

⁷⁹ Proebstle addresses the implications in the question “How long?” of Dan. 8:13 in his *Truth and Terror* 483 quote on p. 40.

⁸⁰ Cf. the account in *SDAE* 412–413.

⁸¹ Cf. *EW* 254–256; *GC* 434–435.

Archibald Mason, of Scotland, well-known Presbyterian minister, who in 1820 fixed up on 457 B.C. and A.D. 1843 as the beginning and ending dates of the 2300 years, declared that the daily sacrifice signifies "the instituted worship of God in the church," and "the desolation and treading down of the sanctuary and the host, means the error, superstition and idolatry, that were established instead of that worship" (*Two Essays on Daniel's . . . Two Thousand Three Hundred Days*, p. 6). This, he adds, will end with the expiration of the 2300 years, when the "true worship of God shall be restored." *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:62.⁸²

History bears record that with the expiration of the 2300 years in 1844 the "true worship of God" was indeed restored as the sanctuary and Sabbath truths soon became foundational pillars in the remnant church. This dovetails perfectly with a comment in the *SDA Bible Dictionary*:

In ch 8:11–14 the power symbolized by the little horn desolates the sanctuary and halts its regular ritual services, but after a period of 2300 "days" the sanctuary is to be "cleansed" (KJV), or "restored to its rightful state" (RSV). *SDA Bible Dictionary*, 258.

While it can rightly be understood that the sanctuary will be "cleansed" or "restored to its rightful state" after the 2300 days of its being trampled under foot and desolated by the little horn, we add that it can also be rightly understood that the "regular ritual services" (*i.e. hattamid*) of this sanctuary will be reinstated at the same time. Of course, the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days is specifically the *heavenly* sanctuary, and the *only* "regular ritual service" associated with the heavenly sanctuary is the cultic service prescribed in the law-covenant of this sanctuary — the regular Sabbath worship offered to God by God's people who have entered by faith into this sanctuary.

That God originally called His covenant people to keep the Sabbath in the context of the sanctuary is evident from the way God connected the Sabbath with the sanctuary in His initial instructions concerning the sanctuary. The *Andrews Study Bible* note on Exodus 25–40 points out this connection:

These chapters contain the detailed description of the construction and function of the tabernacle, broken up by the golden calf episode (chaps. 32–34). Worship lies at the heart of the exodus experience and the last sixteen chapters of Exodus provide the appropriate theology of worship. While chaps. 25–31 contain the divine prescription for the construction of the tabernacle, its utensils and its personnel, chaps. 35–40 describe the actual implementation of these orders. The first section closes with a special focus on the Sabbath (31:12–17) while the second section opens with a reminder of the important Sabbath regulations (35:1–3). *Andrews Study Bible*, 104.

But keeping the Sabbath in the context of the sanctuary is not the only context in which the Sabbath is to be kept. Because it is in the heavenly sanctuary that the everlasting covenant is administered, the sanctuary and the everlasting covenant are inextricably bound together and an attack on one is an attack on the other. In this relationship we see that the Sabbath is also to be kept in the context of God's covenant with His people. And by equating *hattamid* with Sabbath worship as we have proposed, we would now expect the context in which *hattamid* is found in Daniel's prophecies to be that of both sanctuary and covenant. Of course, as we saw in the sections "sanctuary context" and "covenant context" on pp. 36–42, this is precisely case.

Just as keeping the Sabbath in the context of God's sanctuary is different from keeping it outside this context, so keeping the Sabbath in the context of God's covenant is different from keeping it outside this context (*i.e. merely as a legal matter*).⁸³ As just noted, God's sanctuary and God's covenant are inextricably bound together as the sanctuary provides the structure for the administration of the covenant. The covenant promises reconciliation between God and His people, and the

⁸² A larger quotation of Mason's comments cited here is in *PPF* 3:401.

⁸³ Cf. again the *6T* 353–354 quote on p. 59.

sanctuary provides the *place* for this reconciliation to occur; after all, the sanctuary is the place *Where God and I Meet*.⁸⁴ The sanctuary, then, gives the Sabbath, as the divinely appointed *time* of meeting, the significance of being the sign of sanctification — the outward sign of the *continuous covenant relationship* God and His people have with each other. In this way the Sabbath also constitutes the sign of the covenant itself.⁸⁵ And thus the covenant sanctuary not only provides the appropriate “theology of worship,”⁸⁶ it provides the appropriate theology of the Sabbath. The “spiritual sacrifice” of Sabbath worship offered by the “holy priesthood” of spiritual Israel, then, is indeed a *covenant sanctuary sacrifice*, even constituting, because of its divinely prescribed regularity, its core element.

When God’s people finally come to corporately keep the Sabbath in accordance with its covenant theology, their Sabbathkeeping will indeed evidence their entire sanctification. God’s people will then constitute the “wise” of Daniel 12:10 who have been “purified, made white, and refined” and who “understand” through experience the covenant theology that is proclaimed in “the words [*of this prophecy*]” (v. 9)⁸⁷ and so beautifully illustrated in the sanctuary. And when God’s people reach this state in their corporate journey through the sanctuary, the heavenly sanctuary will no longer be continually defiled with sin and there will no longer be need for a covenant Intercessor.

Because keeping the Sabbath is the sign of God’s covenant, equating *hattamid* with Sabbath worship accords with the implication in Daniel 8:12 that *hattamid* is an act of covenant keeping,⁸⁸ as keeping the Sabbath is the quintessential act of covenant keeping. Equating *hattamid* with Sabbath worship also accords with our contention in the section “Covenant Context” that the *taking away* of *hattamid* constitutes a direct attack by the little horn on God’s holy covenant. Certainly, there could be no more direct attack on the holy covenant than *forcibly taking away* the sign of this covenant *and forcibly setting up* in its place the sign of a counterfeit covenant. It is comparable to removing the flag from a nation’s capital and raising in its place the flag of an archenemy.

Likening the Sabbath sign of the covenant to a flag flying over the “holy nation” (Ex. 19:6; 1 Pet. 2:9) of God’s covenant people, let’s now consider the flag of God’s archenemy. We will note again that ancient Israel’s golden calf episode (Ex. 32–34) came in the middle of the detailed description of the construction and function of the wilderness sanctuary (Ex. 25–40).⁸⁹ And as the sanctuary provided the theology of true worship, the golden calf demonstrated the theology of false worship, which is, in a word, *idolatry*. The idolatrous worship of the golden calf, then, constituted the antithesis of the worship prescribed in the covenant sanctuary. Note this relevant insight:

No other institution which was committed to the Jews tended so fully to distinguish them from surrounding nations as did the Sabbath. God designed that its observance should designate them as His worshipers. It was to be a token of their separation from idolatry, and their connection with the true God. *The Desire of Ages*, 283.

“The observance of the Sabbath would have preserved the world from idolatry” (1T 76). But the Sabbath has its own comparable antithesis. Though the following likens this antithesis to the golden image of Daniel 3, it seems it could just as well be likened to the golden calf of Exodus 32:

⁸⁴ Cf. our comments and fn. 11 on p. 38.

⁸⁵ Cf. again the 6T 350 quote on p. 42.

⁸⁶ *Andrews Study Bible* quote above.

⁸⁷ Cf. again our quote of Dan. 12:9–10 on p. 39. In our view, “the words” that were “closed up and sealed till the time of the end” in v. 9 are the words of “the book” that was shut up and sealed “until the time of the end” in v. 4. This book is specifically the sanctuary related book of Dan. 8–12, as Dan. 8–12 forms one vision with three following explanations (cf. again the first segment of “The Interrelationship Between Daniel’s Visions” in Part 1, pp. 5–8).

⁸⁸ Cf. our comments and related quotes on p. 40.

⁸⁹ Cf. again the *Andrews Study Bible*, 104 quote above.

The Sunday idol is set up as was this [*Nebuchadnezzar's golden*] image. Human laws demand that it be worshiped as sacred and holy, thus putting it where God's holy Sabbath should be. . . .

. . . The Protestant world has set up an idol sabbath in the place where God's Sabbath should be, and they are treading in the footsteps of the Papacy. *Manuscript Release*, 12:219–220.

When God's professed but apostate people come to bow before the Sunday idol even when they know it to be in direct opposition to the word of God, they will be worshiping a god of their own making. They will then manifest their spiritual nakedness before God as verily as did the apostates at Sinai; and in fulfillment of Daniel 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11 they will have purposefully replaced *hattamid* with its own antithesis — the idolatrous “abomination/transgression of desolation,” the eschatological “golden calf.”⁹⁰

In our view, setting up “an idol sabbath in the place where God's Sabbath should be” (quote above) constitutes the setting up of the “abomination of desolation” in the place of *hattamid* in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, and it constitutes the replacement of the “transgression of desolation” for *hattamid* in Daniel 8:11–13. Sunday elevated to sacred status is itself the abomination/transgression — the idol that causes God's people to transgress. This idolatry results in an “army” of God's people being “given over to the horn to oppose *hattamid*” (Dan. 8:12);⁹¹ and because the horn casts down God's sanctuary, the “army” that is “given over to the horn” is no longer associated with the sanctuary, thereby making the sanctuary desolate of worshipers. This situation hearkens back to the same scenario during the 70-year Babylonian exile of ancient Israel when God's earthly sanctuary was desolate. Daniel prayed about this in Daniel 9:17:

17 Now therefore, our God, hear the prayer of Your servant, and his supplications, and for the Lord's sake cause Your face to shine on Your sanctuary, which is desolate.

The parallel eschatological situation was predicted a few verses later when in answer to Daniel's prayer Gabriel foretold that:

27 . . . on the wing of abominations will come one [the antichrist little horn] who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate. (NAS)

But as we inferred on pp. 61–62, the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14 point to the limit God permits the abominable Sunday idol to make God's sanctuary desolate. And while the Reformers were unable to connect the Sunday idol with the abomination that desolates in Daniel's prophecies, they did discern how long the desolation would continue. For example:

In the 17th century Anglican bishop George Downham, of England, continued to stress that the pope had taken away the “daily,” which he defined as the “true Doctrine and Worship of God according to his Word.” This desolation, he said, would continue till the close of the 2300 evening-mornings. . . . *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:61.

In view of equating *hattamid* with Sabbath worship and of equating Sunday sanctity with the abomination of idolatry, we will repeat yet another statement by a post-Reformation Protestant. We quoted this on p. 51, and as noted there it was written anonymously in 1787 under the initials “R. M.”:

“The taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of abomination, is the taking away of the true christian worship, as instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and the setting up of the doctrines and commandments of men. . . . The daily sacrifice is a Mosaic term for the

⁹⁰ Regarding the replacement of *hattamid* with the abomination/transgression, cf. again fn. 54 on p. 54.

⁹¹ Cf. the quote of Dan. 8:12 on p. 48.

true worship of God suited to the time in which Daniel lived” (*Observations on Certain Prophecies in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 8, 9). *Ibid.*, 4:62 (ellipsis original).

There could hardly be a more striking fulfillment of “the taking away of the true Christian worship” and “the setting up of the doctrines and commandments of men” than the substitution of man’s first-day sabbath for God’s seventh-day Sabbath. And that “R. M.” had, no doubt, no knowledge that the Sabbath–Sunday issue would be the great test that separates eschatological remnant Israel from eschatological Babylon highlights all the more the fact that, when it comes to Daniel’s *hattamid*, historic Protestants were considerably more discerning than today’s Protestants.

Regarding the great test that separates remnant Israel from spiritual Babylon in the last days, we have this warning:

The Sabbath question is to be the issue in the great final conflict, in which all the world will act a part. Men have honored Satan’s principles above the principles that rule in the heavens. They have accepted the spurious sabbath, which Satan has exalted as the sign of his authority. But God has set His seal upon His royal requirement. Each Sabbath institution, both true and false, bears the name of its author, an ineffaceable mark that shows the authority of each.

The great decision now to be made by every one is, whether he will receive the mark of the beast and his image, or the seal of the living and true God. *Signs of the Times*, 3-22-1910 (7BC 977).

In all of this we see that the great controversy between Christ and Satan has ever interfaced with mankind at the issue of true and false *worship*. And both Sinai and the apocalyptic prophecies instruct that only God’s covenant sanctuary provides the correct theology of worship. This being the case, when, as anticipated by the Reformers, the *daily* (the “true worship of God”) was restored at the end of the 2300 days,⁹² and when, as understood in Adventism, the heavenly sanctuary was restored at the end of the 2300 days,⁹³ it should not be surprising that the highly significant prophetic development of restoring true worship within the context of the sanctuary was not only accomplished at the end of the 2300 days but was specifically foretold by the first angel of Revelation 14:

6 And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

7 Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

Clearly, accepting the Reformation view of the *daily*, Revelation 14’s first angel’s worldwide call to return to the true worship of God as Creator [and all that that entails] was and is a prophetic call at the end of the 2300 days to restore the *daily* of Daniel’s prophecies to its original and rightful place. Of course, this call continues to go out till the end of time. But comparing God’s last-day worldwide *call to worship Him* in Revelation 14:7 with Satan’s last-day universal *coercion to worship him* in Revelation 13:15 —

15 And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

— reveals that *worship* will be the *central issue* in the controversy between Christ and Satan in the last days.⁹⁴ Thus, we find that the *daily* as the Reformers understood it in Daniel’s prophecies — the true worship of God — will be at the very crux of the spiritual controversy in last-day events and is of

⁹² See the 4BC 62 quote on p. 62.

⁹³ See the SDABD 258 quote on p. 62.

⁹⁴ Also cf. Rev. 13:4, 8, 12.

vital relevance to God's remnant people. This can be said despite counsel inferring that the *daily* is "a subject of minor importance" and "not a test question" (1SM 164–165).⁹⁵ In our view, the *daily* is of minor importance only as it remains a divinely sealed truth. Only when it is unsealed by God and understood by God's people can its importance be determined, and this clearly had not occurred at the time this counsel was given in 1910. Furthermore, even after identifying the *daily* for what it is, this identification by itself is still not a "test question" as is the *choice* between *true* and *false worship* that will have the entire world polarized just before Jesus comes again.

Summation

While the covenant sanctuary context of Sabbathkeeping is, according to Exodus 31:12–17, the sign of sanctification, in our view this sign in itself does not constitute Daniel's *hattamid*. As Proebstle has concluded, *hattamid* "should be regarded as a cultic term,"⁹⁶ and this associates the term with religious ritual. We understand, then, that the Sabbath as the *sign of sanctification* relates to the "perpetual presence of God" aspect of the sanctuary *Tamid*,⁹⁷ while the Sabbath as *hattamid* relates to the cultic "regularly recurring meeting with God" aspect of the sanctuary *Tamid*.⁹⁸ We also understand that the Sabbath as the *sign of sanctification* applies to God's people on an *individual* basis, while the Sabbath as *hattamid* applies to God's people on a *corporate* basis. Again, in our view Daniel's *hattamid* is specifically the *corporate "spiritual sacrifice" of regular Sabbath worship* offered to God by God's people. And while it is possible for one individual by himself to keep the Sabbath as the *sign of sanctification* alone and isolated, it is not possible for one individual by himself to keep the Sabbath as *hattamid* together and corporately.

To be sure, God's holy covenant holds preeminently high the standard of corporate unity in the body of Christ. In fact, it seems that corporate unity is tied to character development, and character development in God's people is the principal prerequisite for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and the Second Coming.⁹⁹ It is no wonder, then, that God would consider corporate unity important. This is seen in a segment of the prayer Jesus offered as the benediction to His earthly ministry. John 17:20–23:

20 "I do not pray for these alone, but also for those who will believe in Me through their word; 21 that they all may be one, as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You; that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that You sent Me. 22 And the glory which You gave Me I have given them, that they may be one just as We are one: 23 I in them, and You in Me; that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that You have sent Me, and have loved them as You have loved Me.

Because "The glory of Jesus is His divine character,"¹⁰⁰ we see that imparting divine character to believers is the prerequisite for unity in the body of Christ: "the glory which You gave Me I have given them, that they may be one just as We are one" (v. 22). Thus, unity in the body of Christ is the principal evidence of divine character in believers. Moreover, unity in the body of Christ is the principal witness to the world that the gospel of Christ is genuine and true: "I in them, and You in

⁹⁵ "The enemy of our work is pleased when a subject of minor importance [*such as that of "the daily"*] can be used to divert the minds of our brethren from the great questions that should be the burden of our message. As this is not a test question, I entreat of my brethren that they shall not allow the enemy to triumph by having it treated as such." 1SM 164–165.

⁹⁶ *Truth and Terror*, 231 (quoted on p. 53).

⁹⁷ Cf. p. 37.

⁹⁸ Cf. p. 38.

⁹⁹ "When the character of Christ shall be perfectly reproduced in His people, then He will come to claim them as His own" (COL 69; underlined emphasis supplied). "True sanctification is harmony with God, oneness with Him in character" (6T 350; larger quote on p. 59).

¹⁰⁰ *Andrews Study Bible*, 1381 (note on John 2:11).

Me; that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that You have sent Me, and have loved them as you have loved Me” (v. 23). We would expect, then, that the enemy of God would give particular attention to attacking the unity in the body of Christ; and we believe this is his principal motivation in the taking away of Daniel’s *hattamid* in that the corporate oneness in worshipping God within the context of the covenant sanctuary evidences, more than anything else, the divine goal of the holy covenant. This goal is most definitively articulated in its “new covenant” expression. Hebrews 8:10–12:

10 “For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: 11 And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. 12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.”¹⁰¹

Without going into detail we will just point out that, according to v. 10b here, the new covenant remains a *law*-covenant, just as the covenant at Sinai was a law-covenant.¹⁰² And because the Sabbath is part of the everlasting law-covenant, the Sabbath remains entirely relevant in the new covenant. Dr. Roy Gane has observed:

Rather than doing away with seventh day Sabbath rest, the “new covenant” restores the heart of true Sabbath observance, which is for the benefit of human beings and celebrates the way God makes them holy by making them like himself, whose character is love. “The Role of God’s Moral Law, Including Sabbath, in the ‘New Covenant,’” 19 [2003].¹⁰³

To be sure, a holy covenant by a holy God produces a holy people, the ultimate reality of which is celebrated on a *tamid* basis by the observance of each holy Sabbath.

We will also point out that, according to Hebrews 8:10c above, the new covenant remains a *relationship* covenant, just as was the covenant God made with the children of Israel when He delivered them from Egyptian bondage. Exodus 6:7:

7 I will take you as My people, and I will be your God. Then you shall know that I am the LORD your God who brings you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.

And we will point out that, according to Hebrews 8:11 above, the new covenant is a covenant whereby God’s people can come to “know” God. And the covenant goal that God’s people would “know” God is the context, we believe, of Daniel 11:32 regarding “the people who know their God [by keeping the covenant].”¹⁰⁴

Given our “enhanced Reformation view” of Daniel’s *hattamid*, when it comes to the specific prophetic event that takes *hattamid* away, we understand this event to be the civil prohibition of corporate Sabbath worship. While this was accomplished historically in the Middle Ages by the little horn of Daniel 8, it will also be accomplished in the future by the second beast of Revelation 13 speaking as a dragon.¹⁰⁵ Of course, this is entirely consistent with SDA eschatology.¹⁰⁶

While it is impossible to take away the Sabbath as the sign of sanctification (because it is impossible to prohibit individual or private worship),¹⁰⁷ it *is* possible to take away the Sabbath as *hattamid*, because it is entirely possible for a state-enforced civil law to prohibit corporate or public worship.

¹⁰¹ The writer of Hebrews here quotes Jer. 31:31–34.

¹⁰² See again Dr. Kline’s quote on p. 40.

¹⁰³ This paper can be accessed at <https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org>.

¹⁰⁴ See again our quote of Dan. 11:32 on p. 39.

¹⁰⁵ Rev. 13:11–18.

¹⁰⁶ GC 442; 5T 451.

¹⁰⁷ As was the case with the 7000 in Elijah’s day who did not bow the knee to Baal (cf. 1 Kings 19:18).

This can easily be accomplished by simply taking away the religious liberty to do so, then monitoring all Sabbathkeeping public places of worship. Thus, though the Sabbath as the sign of sanctification will continue to be in effect throughout earth's history all the way to the Second Coming, the opportunity for God's people to offer to God the cultic "spiritual sacrifice" of corporate Sabbath worship will be taken away for the second time in church history at some unknown future point before the Second Coming. And we believe that any civil prohibition of *corporate* Sabbath worship would effectively bring an end to the *corporate organization* of God's covenant people, and this would constitute a direct attack on both the corporate *unity* of God's people and the public *witness* of this unity. God will then deem this attack on His holy covenant as the "last straw" in the spiritual warfare Satan and his rebel forces wage with Christ and His people.

The substitution of the laws of men for the law of God, the exaltation, by merely human authority, of Sunday in place of the Bible Sabbath, is the last act in the drama. When this substitution becomes universal, God will reveal Himself. He will arise in His majesty to shake terribly the earth. He will come out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the world for their iniquity, and the earth shall disclose her blood and shall no more cover her slain. *Testimonies for the Church*, 7:141.

In closing this chapter, because God instituted the Sabbath on the very first full day of human existence,¹⁰⁸ and because this Sabbath appointment has not been annulled and will continue throughout eternity according to Isaiah 66:23—

23 And it shall come to pass *That from one New Moon to another, And from one Sabbath to another, All flesh* [corporately] *shall come to worship before Me,*" says the LORD.

—there is *nothing*, nor could there *ever be anything*, more *perpetually periodic* or *regularly recurring* than the Sabbath worship appointment God has enjoined upon His people. Keeping this covenant sanctuary appointment is, therefore, the epitome of spiritual Israel's "regular worship of God," and thus it is the epitome of spiritual Israel's "spiritual sacrifices," and thus it could even be called "the epitome of the cult" of spiritual Israel.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, the divine Sabbath appointment wherein spiritual Israel, as the "holy priesthood" of God's "spiritual house," formally meets with God for the purpose of offering corporate "spiritual sacrifices" (2 Pet. 2:5)¹¹⁰ within the context of the holy-covenant sanctuary is the epitome of the Christian *Tamid*; and therefore we identify this covenant appointment as "the regular sacrifice" of Daniel 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11—Daniel's *hattamid*.

¹⁰⁸ Gen. 2:2–3.

¹⁰⁹ For the source of the terminology "the epitome of the cult," see fn. 53 on p. 53.

¹¹⁰ Quoted on p. 51.

5. THE “DAILY” IN DANIEL 8

The heart of both the Millerite and Adventist movements is in the 2300-day prophecy of Daniel 8:13–14.¹ Because this time prophecy is directly connected to the taking away of the *daily* in v. 11, and if we want to understand the *daily* in Daniel 11–12, it is imperative that we take a close look at the relevant verses of Daniel 8 — the ones dealing with the little horn. After all, the prophecy of Daniel 11–12 is the final explanation of the prophecy of Daniel 8;² thus, all of Daniel 8–12 is interconnected and must be understood as a single prophecy.

We looked at Daniel 8 in Part 1, pp. 9–10 and 12 when we considered the interrelationship between Daniel’s visions. Now we will take another look at Daniel 8:9–14, beginning with vs. 9–11:³

9 And out of one of them (out of one of the four winds of the heavens of v. 8)⁴ **came forth a little horn** (pagan Rome, manifested here in its imperial form),⁵ **which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.**

10 And it (pagan Rome, beginning here to manifest itself in its papal form) **waxed great, even to the host of heaven** (God’s people); **and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them** (physical persecution).

11 Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host (Christ), **and from [margin] him** (Christ) **the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his** (Christ’s) **sanctuary was cast down.**

We can note from vs. 10–11 that the little horn accomplished four things: (1) it cast down and stamped on the host; (2) it magnified itself; (3) it took away the *daily*; and (4) it cast down the place of Christ’s sanctuary. Among Adventist commentators, just how the first two of these actions were accomplished is generally agreed; regarding the last two, however, it is not. Therefore, let’s take a close look at v. 11.

He Magnified Himself

Determining how papal Rome came to magnify herself is easy enough. Paul commented on this in 2 Thessalonians 2:4:

4 Who (papal Rome) **opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.**

The utterly revolting fulfillment of this has been described thus:

It is one of the leading doctrines of Romanism that the pope is the visible head of the universal church of Christ, invested with supreme authority over bishops and pastors in all parts of the world. More than this, the pope has been given the very titles of Deity. He has been styled “Lord God the Pope” (see Appendix), and has been declared infallible. He demands the homage of all men. *The Great Controversy*, 50.

In a passage which is included in the Roman Catholic Canon Law, or *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Pope Innocent III declares that the Roman pontiff is “the vicegerent upon earth, not of a mere man, but of very God;” and in a gloss on the passage it is explained that this is because he is the vicegerent of Christ, who is “very God and very man.” Appendix to *ibid.*, 679.

¹ “The scripture which above all others had been both the foundation and the central pillar of the advent faith was the declaration: ‘Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.’ Daniel 8:14.” *GC* 409.

² See “The Interrelationship Between Daniel’s Visions” in Part 1, pp. 6–8.

³ With this chapter we return to our use of the KJV.

⁴ Regarding why the little horn came out of one of the four *winds* instead of the four *horns*, see fn. 35 in Part 1, p. 64.

⁵ Cf. “Paganism’s New Face” in Part 1, pp. 90–92.

Clearly, the little horn's magnification of itself "even to the prince of the host" has been fulfilled by the papacy's exaltation of the pope to the place reserved only for God Himself—His throne. But the papacy *has* presumed to place the bishop of Rome on God's throne, there to assume the prerogatives of God; and there, by Paul's description, they most proudly boast him to the world "that he is God." We can note that no other world-dominate power has proposed any such thing. No, the papacy has acted alone, and by so doing has magnified and exalted *herself* in fulfillment of Daniel 8:11 and 2 Thessalonians 2:4. And of course, once the pope presumed to be in "the temple of God" and seated on God's throne, he had positioned himself to receive worship. The following quotes well describe how the transfer of worship from Christ to the papacy manifested itself:

The papacy has attempted to change the law of God. . . . An intentional, deliberate change is presented: "He shall *think* to change the times and the law" [Dan. 7:25]. The change in the fourth commandment exactly fulfills the prophecy. For this the only authority claimed is that of the church. Here the papal power openly sets itself above God. *Ibid.*, 446.

There is one pointed out in prophecy as the man of sin. He is the representative of Satan. Taking the suggestions of Satan concerning the law of God, which is as unchangeable as His throne, this man of sin comes in and represents to the world that he has changed that law, and that the first day of the week instead of the seventh is now the Sabbath. Professing infallibility, he claims the right to change the law of God to suit his own purposes. By so doing, he exalts himself above God, and leaves the world to infer that God is fallible. If it were indeed true that God had made a rule of government that needed to be changed, it would certainly show fallibility.

But Christ declared that not one jot or tittle of the law should fail until heaven and earth should pass away. The very work that He came to do was to exalt that law, and show to the created worlds and to heaven that God is just, and that His law need not be changed. But here is Satan's right-hand man ready to carry on the work that Satan commenced in heaven, that of trying to amend the law of God. And the Christian world has sanctioned his efforts by adopting this child of the Papacy—the Sunday institution. They have nourished it, and will continue to nourish it, until Protestantism shall give the hand of fellowship to the Roman Power. *Review and Herald*, March 9, 1886 (7BC 910).

Romanists declare that "the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] Church."—Mgr. Segur, *Plain Talk About the Protestantism of Today*, page 213. *The Great Controversy*, 448.

Christians should pay homage to the authority of Christ, not the Catholic Church. And as the quote immediately above intimates, the best way to pay homage is by obedience. Romans 6:16:

16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

The first angel's message of Revelation 14 is an end-time call to honor and respect God by acknowledging His authority as God and to worship Him as Creator.⁶ Of course, the obvious way to do this is to submit to God's law, which includes, as a significant means of worshipping the Creator, keeping the memorial of Creation—the Sabbath—holy, in obedience to His expressed holy-covenant law.

By the first angel, men are called upon to "fear God, and give glory to Him" and to worship Him as the Creator of the heavens and the earth. In order to do this, they must obey His law. Says the wise man: "Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." Ecclesiastes 12:13. Without obedience to His commandments no worship can be pleasing to God. *The Great Controversy*, 436.

⁶ The first angel's message was quoted on p. 65.

To the extent papal Rome’s pretensions deceived God’s people, the true worship of God and Christ ceased. And since this extent was, again by the papacy’s own boast, universal (catholic), the prophecy of Daniel 8 foretold that the little horn would literally *take away* the *daily* from Christ and figuratively *cast down* the truth of Christ’s heavenly sanctuary ministry.

When the sinless Christ presented Himself before the religious leaders of His day as the Son of God, they conspired to kill Him, and eventually succeeded. But today, when a sinner comes along and is blasphemously hailed as “Lord God the Pope” and the institution he heads blasphemously thinks to change God’s moral law on no authority but its own, the religious leaders around the world, most noticeably the *Protestant* leaders, lift nary an eyebrow. Sadly, today the “protestors” have forgotten what and why they doth protest, and in the age of religious enlightenment the little horn of Daniel 8 continues to “magnify himself even to the prince of the host” with hardly a word of reproof from the rest of the Christian world. It is abundantly clear that the non-Catholic Christian world today is, for the most part, Protestant in name only, and that it is now the Protestant world that is in need of a Reformation.

He Took Away the “Daily”

The prevailing view in Adventism regarding the difficult part of Daniel 8:11 is the following interpretation held by *daily* new-view proponents:

11 . . . and from [margin] **him** (the Prince of the host — Christ) **the daily sacrifice** (Christ’s heavenly ministry) **was taken away** (*rum*), **and the place of his** (Christ’s) **sanctuary**⁴⁷²⁰ **was cast down.**

Our own view of this text is identical with this *except* for the identification of “the daily sacrifice.” Since we accept the Reformation view of the *daily*, instead of “Christ’s heavenly ministry” we would insert “the true worship of God,” but we would also add “in the specific form of our regular Sabbath appointment with God.” Now comments on Daniel 8:11 by Martin Proebstle:

. . . the *tamid* is noted to be taken away “from him.” The referent of the pronominal suffix has been identified as the “commander of the host” (vs. 11a). There is obviously a relationship between the commander of the host and the *tamid*. How can this relationship be further defined? Two possibilities present themselves. First, the *tamid* is for the commander of the host, or it belongs to him. The commander receives the *tamid* as it is presented to him, or it is already in his possession. The horn removing the *tamid* from him would then signify that the horn hinders the commander of the host from receiving the *tamid*. In other words, the horn “steals” the *tamid* from him. In this particular interpretation the *tamid* would represent the regular cultic activities of the regular worship directed toward the commander of the host, whose divine character is thus being emphasized. The horn’s attack on the host and the trampling of some of its members (vs. 10) supports this view since by this action the horn obstructs the host in serving its leader. At the same time another host is being installed (vs. 12a), which does not serve the commander of the host but the horn. A second possible relationship between the *tamid* and the [*commander of the host*] is one in which the commander of the host is performing the *tamid* and the *tamid* is part of his responsibility. In this interpretation the [*commander of the host*] is attributed a more priestly function, or possibly a high priestly function, all the more so since the expression [*commander of the host*] denotes the highest status of a being. The horn removing the *tamid* from him would then signify that the horn tries to take control of the (high) priestly activity of the [*commander of the host*], possibly even assuming the (high) priestly role itself. The verb [*was taken away*] already indicates in an ironic way that the horn is acting like a (high) priest usurping the (high) priestly role of the [*commander of the host*] for itself. The mention of “his sanctuary” would fit both possible interpretations. It could hint at the (high) priestly function of the [*commander of the host*] who serves in his sanctuary and/or, since a sanctuary belongs to God, it could indicate the divine status of the

[*commander of the host*] who is then worthy to be worshiped. In summary, both options concur with the text and it seems wise to suggest that both are valid at the same time. The ambiguity may be intentional so that both dimensions of the *tamid* would find expression: the worship and cultic activities directed toward the [*commander of the host*] as well as the cultic activities of the [*commander of the host*] as (high) priest himself. *Truth and Terror*, 215–217 (underlined emphasis supplied).

In his first suggested possible relationship between the “commander of the host” (*i.e.* the Prince of the host) and the *tamid* Proebstle describes the Reformation view, and in his second he describes the Adventist “new view.” Once again, Proebstle suggests that both views “are valid at the same time.”⁷ And once again, we believe that only the Reformation view is valid.

Understanding Daniel 8:11 as we do—that the sanctuary is Christ’s heavenly sanctuary and that the *daily* is the divine Sabbath worship appointment God’s people have with God—we believe Moffatt’s translation conveys the true meaning of the verse:

11 It (the little horn) even magnified itself to match the Prince of the starry host, and deprived him of the daily sacrifice

When papal Rome came to maturity by magnifying herself even to the level of Christ and [by political pressure] imposing her false sanctuary and worship service into the Christian church, she indeed deprived Christ of the true worship due only to Him by adulterating and redirecting this worship to the supposed “Vicar of Christ.” This was accomplished most strikingly by the change in the fourth commandment.

He Cast Down the Sanctuary

How the little horn cast down the place of Christ’s sanctuary in Daniel 8:11 is best understood in light of v. 12; however, the first part of v. 12 has also been difficult to translate. Let’s look first at the main text of the KJV:

12 And an host⁶⁶³⁵ was given *him* against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression

Now how the margin translates it:

12 And the host was given over for the transgression against the daily sacrifice

Of the two, we prefer the translation of the margin, but we believe the idea the margin conveys would be more clearly expressed by retaining the phrase of the main text “by reason of.” This conveys the idea that it was “by reason of” the “transgression against the daily” that a host was “given over.” We also believe that the “host” of v. 12 is not the same “host” of vs. 10–11. We believe there are two “hosts” in view in these verses and we understand that the host of vs. 10–11 is loyal to God, whereas the host of v. 12 is loyal to the little horn.⁸ But perhaps it would be more accurate to understand that the host loyal to God in vs. 10–11 is in large part induced in v. 12 to shift their loyalty to the little horn. In this way we have a single host divided into two opposing ones. And we propose that the natural conflict between these two hosts is the subject of the prophecy of Daniel 11–12. Indeed, it is the “great conflict” (NAS) of Daniel 10:1.⁹ The Hebrew word translated “great conflict” (“time appointed,” KJV) in Daniel 10:1 is the same word translated “host” in Daniel 8:10–13. It could be understood, then, that to a significant extent the opposing hosts of Daniel 8 form the opposing sides of the North–South “great conflict” of Daniel 11–12. But regarding Daniel 8:12, we believe the NKJV comes closer to the intended meaning:

⁷ Cf. his conclusion regarding the *tamid* which we quoted on p. 53.

⁸ See Proebstle, *Truth and Terror*, 262–309.

⁹ Cf. our comments on Dan. 10:1 in Part 1, pp. 3–4.

12 Because of transgression, an army⁶⁶³⁵ was given over to the horn to oppose the daily sacrifices

It appears that the host/army of v. 12 both opposes the *daily* and is “given over” to the little horn because the little horn induced the host to transgress. The meaning of this will become clearer when we understand the last part of v. 12, and here we also discover how the little horn cast down the place of Christ’s sanctuary:

12 . . . and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.

Because “the truth” is here said to be cast down, we can understand the casting down of the sanctuary in v. 11 to mean that it was the *specific truth about* the sanctuary that was there cast down. This being the case, the truth cast down in v. 12 can be understood to be truth regarding something other than just the sanctuary. Now let’s go to Jacques Doukhan who provides this relevant insight into v. 12:

“Truth was thrown to the ground” (literally “trampled,” verse 12). The word *emeth* rendered here by “truth” is synonymous with “law” (see Ps. 43:3; 119:43, etc). In Hebrew, truth is a concrete action of obedience to God and has nothing to do with our abstract conception of truth. It is anything in accordance with the law. The word *emeth* derives from the root *aman* (the source of our expression “Amen”), which means “to obey,” “to be faithful,” and implies a reference to a higher authority. Jewish commentators (Ibn Ezra, Rashi) interpreted the verse to mean that “the little horn shall annul the Law [Torah] and the observance of the commandments.” *Secrets of Daniel*, 124.

Now let’s note the following Spirit of Prophecy statement:

As foretold by prophecy, the papal power cast down the truth to the ground. The law of God was trampled in the dust, while the traditions of men were exalted. The churches that were under the rule of the papacy were early compelled to honor the Sunday as a holy day. Amid the prevailing error and superstition, many, even of the true people of God, became so bewildered that while they observed the Sabbath, they refrained from labor also on the Sunday. But this did not satisfy the papal leaders. They demanded not only that *Sunday be hallowed*, but that the *Sabbath be profaned*; and they denounced in the strongest language those who dared to show it honor. It was only by fleeing from the power of Rome that any could obey God’s law in peace. *The Great Controversy*, 65 (emphasis supplied).

The prophecy referred to in the first sentence here can be none other than the prophecy of Daniel 8:12. Therefore, we conclude that the specific “truth” mentioned in 8:12 is the truth of the law of God with the Sabbath being the special object of the law that was “cast down.” And with the “truth” of v. 12 so clearly defined, we will now note that the two fundamental truths spoken of as being “cast down” in Daniel 8:11–12 — the sanctuary and the law of God — have ever been inextricably bound together; an attack on one is an attack on the other, and to cast down one is to cast down the other.

Understanding the *daily* to be the standing Sabbath appointment wherein God meets with His people, we should now understand the “transgression against the daily” of Daniel 8:12 to be Sabbath profanation/Sunday exaltation. Also, that many of “the true people of God” became “bewildered” by the tactics of papal Rome in changing the law of God and were gradually either seduced or threatened into “transgression against the daily” is precisely how “the host was given over.” Furthermore, we should now also understand that it was primarily by means of presumptuously exalting the false sabbath and profaning the true Sabbath (*i.e.* by the “transgression against the daily”) that papal Rome accomplished to take away the true Sabbath worship experience of the host and thus to take away the Christian *tamid* offering from Christ.¹⁰

¹⁰ We will elaborate on this in the next chapter.

We have noted that, in our view, Daniel 8:12 reads: "the host was given over by reason of the transgression against the daily." We have also noted that we believe "the transgression against the daily" was Sabbath profanation/Sunday exaltation. Thus, it was by virtue of the removal of the Sabbath experience from God's people (*i.e.* by virtue of the taking away of the *daily*) that God's people were "cast down," "trodden under foot," and "given over." And thus the restoration of the host at the end of the 2300 days (according to vs. 13–14) assumes the restoration of the *daily*; that is, the restoration of the host at the end of the 2300 days assumes the restoration of their Sabbathkeeping. And as we noted on p. 62, history bears record that this is precisely what happened.

Now note this observation about Daniel 8:10–12: In v. 10 the little horn "cast down" God's people; in v. 11 it "cast down" the truth concerning Christ's sanctuary; and in v. 12 it "cast down" the truth concerning God's law. It seems reasonable to understand that all of these negative actions by the little horn are interrelated. The law of God was cast down by virtue of the sanctuary truth being cast down; take away the sanctuary and you take away the law of God. And it now seems to naturally follow, particularly if we equate the host being "given over" in v. 12 with their being "cast down" in v. 10, that God's people were cast down by virtue of the law of God being cast down; take away the law of God and you take away God's exalted standard of righteousness and leave His people in the dust of the ground and the filthiness of their ignorant sins. And to add insult to injury, v. 10 not only tells us that the little horn would take from God's people their great standard of righteousness but that it would "stamp" those who resisted with physical persecution.

Understanding that it is by virtue of the fact that the host is no longer bound by ignorant sins that they are no longer "trodden under foot" (v. 13) precludes the view that the host is trodden under foot from mere physical persecution. Because the first papal supremacy ended in 1798, and because the persecution of the saints that characterized this period ended even sooner in that it was "shortened" (Matt. 24:22),¹¹ the physical persecution of the saints cannot be what is meant by the host being "trodden under foot" as it was not the physical persecution that was reversed at the end of the 2300 days in 1844. Daniel 8:13–14 clearly depicts the trodding under foot of the host by the little horn as continuing *all the way to the end* of the 2300 days. And in our view, papal Rome's physical persecution of the saints is described in the phrase "stamped on them" in v. 10, and this particular action of the little horn is not a consideration in the question and answer of vs. 13–14.

The way the little horn removed the fundamental truths of the heavenly sanctuary service and the true Sabbath from the minds of the host was by the gradual institution of a man-made sanctuary service with its accompanying man-made law and man-made sabbath. While this caused the host to be "given over" (v. 12; margin), at the same time it caused the little horn to practice and prosper. How the papacy has prospered is astonishing, but her phenomenal growth should not be surprising as the theology she espouses both in doctrine and ceremony caters to the carnal nature.

A prayerful study of the Bible would show Protestants the real character of the papacy and would cause them to abhor and to shun it; but many are so wise in their own conceit that they feel no need of humbly seeking God that they may be led into the truth. Although priding themselves on their enlightenment, they are ignorant both of the Scriptures and of the power of God. They must have some means of quieting their consciences, and they seek that which is least spiritual and humiliating. What they desire is a method of forgetting God which shall pass as a method of remembering Him. The papacy is well adapted to meet the wants of all these. It is prepared for two classes of mankind, embracing nearly the whole world—those who would be saved by their merits, and those who would be saved in their sins. Here is the secret of its power. *Ibid.*, 572.

Of a certainty, here is the secret of the success of any form of paganism. But aside from this, the most effective means of making the saving intercessory ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary

¹¹ Cf. the GC 266–267 quote on p. 19.

of no-effect was to take away the true knowledge of it (cast down the place of Christ's sanctuary) from the minds of God's people. The most effective means of accomplishing this was to (1) take from the experience of God's people the true form of worship (take away the *daily*), which was a continual reminder to them as well as a continual witness to the world of Christ's all-important intercessory ministry, and (2) establish a false form of worship (establish the "transgression against the daily"), which would be a continual witness to the world of a grossly erroneous substitute of Christ's heavenly ministry.

The Interrelationship of Faith and the Form of Worship

It is important to understand that, just as in Old Testament times, the form of worship one observes graphically portrays the gospel one believes. The different aspects of the true form of worship accurately depict different aspects of the true plan of salvation and the true covenant God has with His people. Conversely, the different aspects of a false form of worship depict different aspects of a false plan of salvation and a false covenant. And we should be able to see that the true form of worship enjoined by the Lord is one that in the infinite wisdom of God points the world to the true gospel and the true covenant. While this was particularly apparent in the Old Testament Jewish economy it is also true in the New Testament Christian one. Referring to the primary change in the true form of worship that Christ instituted in the Upper Room at the transition point between the old and new testaments, we are told:

Christ was standing at the point of transition between two economies and their two festivals. He, the spotless Lamb of God, was about to present Himself as a sin offering, that He would thus bring to an end the system of types and ceremonies that for four thousand years had pointed to His death. As He ate the Passover with His disciples, He instituted in its place the service that was to be the memorial of His great sacrifice. The national festival of the Jews was to pass away forever. The service which Christ established was to be observed by His followers in all lands and through all ages.

The Passover was ordained as a commemoration of the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. God had directed that, year by year, as the children should ask the meaning of this ordinance, the history should be repeated. Thus the wonderful deliverance was to be kept fresh in the minds of all. The ordinance of the Lord's Supper was given to commemorate the great deliverance wrought out as the result of the death of Christ. Till He shall come the second time in power and glory, this ordinance is to be celebrated. It is the means by which His great work for us is to be kept fresh in our minds. *The Desire of Ages*, 652–653.¹²

Because the Lord's Supper "is the means by which His great work for us is to be kept fresh in our minds," Satan found it essential in his plans of countering the work of God to subvert the Lord's Supper. This, of course, he accomplished through employment of the little-horn papacy.

The scriptural ordinance of the Lord's supper had been supplanted by the idolatrous sacrifice of the mass. Papist priests pretended, by their senseless mummery, to convert the simple bread and wine into the actual "body and blood of Christ." — Cardinal Wiseman, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, Proved From Scripture*, lecture 8, sec. 3, par. 26. With blasphemous presumption, they openly claimed the power of creating God, the Creator of all things. Christians were required, on pain of death, to avow their faith in this horrible, Heaven-insulting heresy. Multitudes who refused were given to the flames. *The Great Controversy*, 59.

Going further, let us consider the primary element God has established in the true form of worship. This element is so fundamental to worship that it transcends both testaments.

¹² Cf. Mark 14:12–26.

“The importance of *the Sabbath* as the memorial of creation is that it *keeps ever present the true reason why worship is due to God*” —because He is the Creator, and we are His creatures. “*The Sabbath therefore lies at the very foundation of divine worship*, for it teaches this great truth in the most impressive manner, and no other institution does this. The true ground of divine worship, not of that on the seventh day merely, but of all worship, is found in the distinction between the Creator and His creatures. This great fact can never become obsolete, and must never be forgotten.”—J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*, chapter 27. It was to keep this truth ever before the minds of men, that God instituted the Sabbath in Eden; and so long as the fact that He is our Creator continues to be a reason why we should worship Him, so long the Sabbath will continue as its sign and memorial. *Had the Sabbath been universally kept*, man’s thoughts and affections would have been led to the Creator as the object of reverence and worship, and *there would never have been an idolater, an atheist, or an infidel.* *Ibid.*, 437–438 (emphasis supplied).

Because “had the Sabbath been universally kept . . . there would never have been an idolater, an atheist, or an infidel,” and because “the Sabbath . . . keeps ever present the true reason why worship is due to God,” Satan also found it essential to subvert the Sabbath. Again, the papacy was employed.

The great apostate [*the pope*] had succeeded in exalting himself “above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.” 2 Thessalonians 2:4. He had dared to change the only precept of the divine law that unmistakably points all mankind to the true and living God. In the fourth commandment, God is revealed as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and is thereby distinguished from all false gods. It was as a memorial of the work of creation that the seventh day was sanctified as a rest day for man. It was designed to keep the living God ever before the minds of men as the source of being and the object of reverence and worship. Satan strives to turn men from their allegiance to God, and from rendering obedience to His law; therefore he directs his efforts especially against that commandment which points to God as Creator. *Ibid.*, 53–54.

It is clear that the form of worship offered by the papacy is a masterpiece of deceitful form and ceremony that points the world to a false gospel and a false hope.

The accession of the Roman Church to power marked the beginning of the Dark Ages. As her power increased, the darkness deepened. Faith was transferred from Christ, the true foundation, to the pope of Rome. Instead of trusting in the Son of God for forgiveness of sins and for eternal salvation, the people looked to the pope, and to the priests and prelates to whom he delegated authority. They were taught that the pope was their earthly mediator and that none could approach God except through him; and, further, that he stood *in the place of God* to them and was therefore to be implicitly obeyed. . . . Thus the minds of the people were turned away from God to fallible, erring, and cruel men, nay, more, to the prince of darkness himself, who exercised his power through them. *Sin was disguised in a garb of sanctity.* *Ibid.*, 55 (emphasis supplied).

As the pope presumed to stand “in the place of God” to the people, we see again how the little horn of Daniel 8 “magnified himself even to the prince of the host” (v. 11) and “exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (2 Thess. 2:4). And when this “little horn” imposed on the subjects of the Roman Empire a nearly universal false and earthly sanctuary atonement service complete with its earthly mediator and counterfeit sabbath, the true form of worship on earth was literally removed and replaced by the false form of worship. Because the true and intelligent form of worship by God’s people by design gives praise and glory to Christ, it could then be said that “from [*Christ*] the daily was taken away.” But because the true and intelligent form of worship is also meaningful to God’s people in that it gives expression to their devotion to God as well as to their sanctification and holiness, it could just as well be said that “from [*God’s people*] the daily was taken away.” After all,

the Sabbath is God’s divine appointment for Him to meet with His people, and when this appointment is broken, both God and His people are negatively affected. And because the false papal form of worship includes a direct affront to the fourth commandment of God’s law and is described in Daniel 8:12 with the word “transgression,” and because this false form of worship gives only a showy pretense of sanctification and holiness, when this false worship usurped itself into the place of the true it could well be said that “sin was disguised in a garb of sanctity.” Such are the tactics of Satan.

Having noted the direct relationship between the true gospel and the true form of worship, let’s note again the first angel’s message of Revelation 14:

6 And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

7 Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

This “first angel” has “the everlasting gospel,” and with this gospel he preaches to the inhabitants of earth that they should *worship* Him who “made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” That is, the everlasting gospel of the first angel is at its essence an appeal to the inhabitants of earth to return to what God had given the seventh-day Sabbath as a perpetual reminder for in the first place.¹³ And thus again we see that true worship goes hand-in-hand with the gospel of Christ as the preaching of the gospel is indeed a call to worship God intelligently—that is, within the sphere of divine truth. And when the first angel completes his mission—when “this gospel . . . is preached in all the world” (Matt. 24:14a) and the commission Christ gave His church to go and “teach all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:19–20) is ultimately accomplished—“then shall the end come” (Matt. 24:14b).

The Trodding Under of the Sanctuary and Host and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary

Daniel 8:13–14 is generally understood to be the defining text of Seventh-day Adventism, and because these verses deal with a very significant time period connected with the *daily* we will comment on them here. Daniel 8:13:

13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain *saint* which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?

As noted previously, we understand the trodding under foot of the sanctuary to refer to the casting down of the truth about the heavenly sanctuary as described in v. 11. We also understand the trodding under foot of the host to refer to the effect the casting down of the truth about the sanctuary had on God’s people; and this effect was the taking from God’s people the knowledge of God’s law, thus leading them into ignorant sin. Therefore, perhaps the question of v. 13 could be asked this way: In the vision of the *daily* and the transgression of desolation, how long will it be before both the truth about the heavenly sanctuary is made known to God’s people and God’s people are no longer in ignorance of God’s law and enslaved to ignorant sin? The answer is given in the next verse:

14 And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed (or “justified”; margin).

It is evident that the answer goes beyond the question. The question is, “How long?” And the answer is, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days.” The context of the question is clear enough:

¹³ See Ex. 20:8–11.

in the prophecy just given, both the sanctuary and host are being trodden under foot and the questioner wants to know how much time will pass *before* these wrongs are made right. The answer is just as clear: "to 2300 days." But then the one answering gives additional information regarding what will happen *after* the 2300 days: "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Thus, implied in the answer is the idea that the cleansing of the sanctuary is entirely dependent on the sanctuary and host no longer being trodden under foot. Therefore, it seems the question and answer could be restated in the positive: When both the sanctuary and host are no longer trodden under foot, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

As we know, at the end of the 2300 days on October 22, 1844 Christ moved from the Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary into the Most Holy Place and the antitypical cleansing of the antitypical sanctuary began.¹⁴ We can be sure that this significant event in the plan of salvation occurred precisely on time schedule. Once the 2300 days were accomplished, only "then" would "the sanctuary [*begin to*] be cleansed." But along with the change in heaven marking the *beginning* of a new *heavenly* phase of the spiritual controversy ("then shall the sanctuary be cleansed") there were corresponding changes on earth marking the *end* of an old *earthly* phase ("unto two thousand and three hundred days"). That is, as Christ moved in the sanctuary above, the "place of his sanctuary" on earth began to be lifted back up to its rightful place in the platform of truth in God's church as the basic truth concerning the heavenly sanctuary was shown to Hiram Edson on the morning of October 23.¹⁵ This revelation sparked God's people into an intensive Bible study on the typical sanctuary service of ancient Israel, and this led to a comprehensive understanding of the antitypical sanctuary service in heaven—and no longer would "the sanctuary . . . be trodden under foot."

Those who by faith followed their great High Priest as He entered upon His ministry in the most holy place, beheld the ark of His testament. As they had studied the subject of the sanctuary they had come to understand the Saviour's change of ministration, and they saw that He was now officiating before the ark of God, pleading His blood in behalf of sinners. *The Great Controversy*, 433.

But this was not all these studies resulted in. As knowledge of the sanctuary service increased, it became readily apparent that at the very heart of the sanctuary was the ark of the covenant in which was located the Ten-Commandment tables of stone. Since it was noted that the sanctuary service dealt exclusively with the atonement for sin because of the transgression of this Ten-Commandment law, it became apparent that the transgression of this law was the root cause of man's alienation from God and was, in fact, the very definition of sin.¹⁶

The law of God in the sanctuary in heaven is the great original, of which the precepts inscribed upon the tables of stone and recorded by Moses in the Pentateuch were an unerring transcript. *Those who arrived at an understanding of this important point were thus led to see the sacred, unchanging character of the divine law.* They saw, as never before, the force of the Saviour's words: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." Matthew 5:18. The law of God, being a revelation of His will, a transcript of His character, must forever endure, "as a faithful witness in heaven." Not one command has been annulled; not a jot or tittle has been changed. Says the psalmist: "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." "All His commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever." Psalms 119:89; 111:7–8. *Ibid.*, 434 (emphasis supplied).

While the Millerites had been aware of God's law, they had failed to appreciate its sacred and holy character. But in light of the sanctuary truth the early Adventists could now fully understand Paul's statement in Romans 7:12:

¹⁴ Cf. *GC* 422.

¹⁵ See *GC* chs. 23–24. Also cf. the account of how this light was given in *SDAE* 412–413.

¹⁶ 1 John 3:4.

12 Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

Recognizing the sacredness of God’s law in its incomparably exalted position in the sanctuary, God’s people could now see this law as a succinct expression of God’s will and the divine and eternal standard of virtue and morality. They now saw God’s moral law to be as enduring and unchanging as God Himself; that is, the moral law was most definitely *not* done away with at the Cross. This, then, put an entirely new light on how God’s people saw *themselves* standing before God as God had revealed to them His clear and unfailing moral standard to which to compare their lives. To them, then, the law did precisely what God had purposed for it. Romans 7:13:

13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

This new revelation of God’s law exposed sin; consequently, the door was now open for *all* sin, including previously *unknown* sin, to be thoroughly purged from the camp of God’s people. This unknown sin, we will remember, was brought on because the truth of God’s law was previously cast down [because God’s sanctuary had been cast down], causing God’s people themselves to be cast down into the mire of spiritual ignorance. But now God’s people are being brought back up, because God’s law has been brought back up [because God’s sanctuary has been brought back up].

Though the purifying experience of the Great Advent Awakening leading up to the Great Disappointment in 1844 did much to cleanse the camp of spiritual Israel, its work in this regard, because the sanctuary was still cast down and being trodden under foot, could not be complete. Following the end of the 2300 days, however, the moral law of God—the “law of [moral] liberty” (James 1:25)—now polished and clearly defined in light of the newly revealed sanctuary truth, clearly mirrored the sin still present.¹⁷ This brought to spiritual Israel the painful awareness of her true condition before God; but it also made possible the heartfelt desire of spiritual Israel to *not* sin against God full freedom of expression. This new and significant purifying condition of the church was then appropriately signified by the reintroduction of the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath—the sign of sanctification¹⁸—into the worship experience of the host.

The Spirit of God impressed the hearts of those students of His word. The conviction was urged upon them that they had *ignorantly transgressed* this precept by disregarding the Creator’s rest day. They began to examine the reasons for observing the first day of the week instead of the day which God had sanctified. They could find no evidence in the Scriptures that the fourth commandment had been abolished, or that the Sabbath had been changed; the blessing which first hallowed the seventh day had never been removed. They had been honestly seeking to know and to do God’s will; now, as they saw themselves transgressors of His law, sorrow filled their hearts, and they manifested their loyalty to God by keeping His Sabbath holy. *The Great Controversy*, 434–435 (emphasis supplied).¹⁹

Thus, the study of the typical sanctuary service by the early Adventists also led to a comprehensive knowledge of God’s moral law which, when applied to the life, freed God’s people from the last binding cords of ignorant transgression—and no longer would “the host . . . be trodden under foot.” Moreover, that the host was no longer “trodden under foot” was evidenced when, as we understand it, the *daily*—the corporate Sabbath observance of the host—was restored to its rightful place in the camp of the host.

Because at the end of the 2300 days the sanctuary truth was revealed to God’s people, the sanctuary was no longer “cast down” and “trodden under foot.” Once the sanctuary was no longer

¹⁷ Cf. James 1:23–25.

¹⁸ Ex. 31:13.

¹⁹ Also cf. *EW* 254–256.

“trodden under foot,” God’s people could see the rightful place of God’s law in the everlasting gospel of Christ. Bringing their lives into harmony with this new light, God’s people were no longer in subjugation to Satan’s lies and, consequently, the *daily* was returned to its rightful place and the host was no longer “cast down” and “trodden under foot.” Once the *daily* was returned and the host was no longer “trodden under foot,” then, in fulfilling the very purpose of the antitypical Day of Atonement the heavenly sanctuary could, through the mediation of our heavenly High Priest, begin to “be cleansed” of the ever-accumulating sins figuratively transferred from the camp of Israel on earth.

For eighteen centuries this work of [*Christ’s intercessory*] ministration continued in the first apartment of the sanctuary. The blood of Christ, pleaded in behalf of penitent believers, secured their pardon and acceptance with the Father, yet their sins still remained upon the books of record. As in the typical service there was a work of atonement at the close of the year, so before Christ’s work for the redemption of men is completed there is a work of atonement for the removal of sin from the sanctuary. This is the service which began when the 2300 days ended. At that time, as foretold by Daniel the prophet, our High Priest entered the most holy, to perform the last division of His solemn work—to cleanse the sanctuary. *Ibid.*, 421.

We can understand that the degree to which the host is trodden under foot is the same degree to which the sanctuary is trodden under foot. Thus we conclude that there is a direct correlation between the degree to which God’s people are freed from sin and the degree to which they understand the sanctuary truth. And thus the questioner of Daniel 8:13 speaks of both of these elements of God’s people as going hand-in-hand. At the same time, the degree to which God’s people are freed from sin is the same degree to which the heavenly sanctuary is cleansed. And thus we see that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is not a process isolated to heaven, for it requires the direct involvement of God’s people on earth.

While the investigative judgment is going forward in heaven [*since 1844*], while the sins of penitent believers are being removed from the sanctuary, there is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God’s people upon earth. *Ibid.*, 425.

Our Day In the Light of the Sanctuary Truth

God has purposed for His truth regarding Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary to have special relevance and application to His people living just before Christ’s second coming; thus, God reserved the revelation of this truth to when its intended result was especially needed. God also, not surprisingly, gave evidence of His intentions in His word.

Those who had accepted the light concerning the mediation of Christ and the perpetuity of the law of God found that these were the truths presented in Revelation 14. The messages of this chapter constitute a threefold warning which is *to prepare the inhabitants of the earth for the Lord’s second coming*. The announcement, “The hour of His judgment is come,” points to the closing work of Christ’s ministration for the salvation of men. It heralds a truth which must be proclaimed until the Saviour’s intercession shall cease and He shall return to the earth to take His people to Himself. . . . *That men may be prepared to stand in the judgment*, the message commands them to “fear God, and give glory to Him,” “and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” *The result of an acceptance of these messages is given in the word*: “Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus” [Rev. 14:12]. *In order to be prepared for the judgment, it is necessary that men should keep the law of God*. That law will be the standard of character in the judgment. *Ibid.*, 435–436 (emphasis supplied).

Because the understanding of the sanctuary truth by God’s remnant people is a gradual process that actually did not begin until the end of the 2300 days, we can understand that the final “putting away of sin” (*GC* 425 above) from the camp of God’s people on earth is likewise a gradual process that did not begin until the end of the 2300 days. As we will see later, this process was purposed by God to have been accomplished over a period of just a few years immediately following 1844. However, for reasons we will also consider later, it remains to this day an ongoing process and, consequently, the heavenly sanctuary remains in the process of being cleansed. That this process should be the special interest of God’s people is found in the fact that it is only when this process is complete that Christ can cease His intercessory ministry in the heavenly Most Holy Place and return to earth to gather His people once and for all unto Himself. Though we quoted the following in part above, let’s look at the larger passage:

Those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the sanctuary above are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator. Their robes must be spotless, their characters must be purified from sin by the blood of sprinkling. Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort they must be conquerors in the battle with evil. While the investigative judgment is going forward in heaven, while the sins of penitent believers are being removed from the sanctuary, there is to be a *special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God’s people upon earth*. This work is more clearly presented in the messages of Revelation 14.

When this work shall have been accomplished, the followers of Christ will be ready for His appearing. *Ibid.*, 425 (emphasis supplied).

And when this work shall have been accomplished, the heavenly sanctuary will be finally and thoroughly cleansed. We also believe that the “special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God’s people upon earth” is specifically referred to later in the prophecy of Daniel 11–12 and we will address this “special work” at length when we get to that point. But for now we will note that the truth regarding the 2300 days and the heavenly sanctuary ministry of Christ gave God’s people a new revelation of their true place and purpose in the final acts of the great controversy.

The subject of the sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people. *Ibid.*, 423.

We will be elaborating on the “present duty” and “work” of God’s remnant people in subsequent chapters. But now that we have considered the *daily* as it is found in the context of Daniel 8, we will next consider it as it is found in the context of Daniel 11.

6. THE “DAILY” IN DANIEL 11

We noted on p. 34 that, in light of the context provided by the chronological flow of the prophecy, we believe the “arms” of Daniel 11:31 are apostate Protestants in the last days who stand in the interest of the papacy. We have associated these “arms” with those whom the papacy has “intelligence” with and who “forsake the holy covenant” in v. 30. And after this unholy alliance is made, v. 31 then tells us that the “arms” of papal Rome will accomplish three things: (1) they will pollute the “sanctuary of strength”; (2) they will take away the *daily*; and (3) they will “place” or “set up” the abomination of desolation. We have already identified the *daily*; now we will consider the *pollution* of the “sanctuary of strength,” the *setting up* of the abomination of desolation, and precisely how the *daily* is taken away.

The Pollution of the Sanctuary of Strength

We noted on p. 35 that, in our view, the term “sanctuary of strength” is better translated “asylum fortress” or, as in the NKJV, “sanctuary fortress.” We now understand that the “asylum fortress” is controlled by the “arms” who act on the papacy’s behalf, and therefore they are able to pollute it. Specifically, we have concluded that the “arms” are apostate Protestants and the “asylum fortress” is the United States.¹ We also understand that the pollution of the “asylum fortress” is a gradual process that, when complete, is finally marked by the accomplishment of the taking away of the *daily* and the setting up of the “abomination that maketh desolate.” Understanding the *daily* to be the regularly recurring Sabbath appointment God has with His people,² it is now interesting to note what the *SDA Bible Commentary* has to say regarding the word “pollute” in Daniel 11:31:

Pollute. Heb. *chahal*, “to profane.” Although the translation “pollute” has the implication of uncleanness, the Hebrew word indicates, rather, that something sacred has been made common. Thus the word is used of profaning a stone altar by using a tool upon it (Ex. 20:25), and of desecrating the Sabbath (Ex. 31:14). *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:873.

As noted, the Hebrew word “pollute” in Daniel 11:31 is also found in Exodus 31:14. Let’s look at Exodus 31:12–14:

12 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

13 Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the LORD that doth sanctify you.

14 Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth [*chahal*] it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth *any* work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.

For further context, see our quote of Exodus 31:16–18 on p. 42 where we identified Sabbath-keeping as the sign of God’s everlasting covenant.³ Because this sign is also the identifying mark of the true worship of God and, indeed, the identifying mark of the true worshipers of God,⁴ and because Daniel 11:31 clearly indicates a connection between the pollution of the “asylum fortress” and the taking away of the *daily*, it is in perfect harmony with our conclusions that the words “pollute” in Daniel 11:31 and “defileth” in Exodus 31:14 are translated from the same Hebrew word that “indicates . . . that something sacred has been made common.” And while the United States is not

¹ Cf. “The Introduction of Apostate Protestants, the United States, and the ‘Daily’” on pp. 33–35.

² Cf. our brief review on p. 58 and our closing comments on p. 68.

³ Also note the 6T 350 quote on p. 42.

⁴ “No other institution which was committed to the Jews tended so fully to distinguish them from surrounding nations as did the Sabbath. God designed that its observance should designate them as *His worshipers*. It was to be a token of their *separation from idolatry*, and their *connection with the true God*.” DA 283 (emphasis supplied).

and has never been “sacred” in the true sense of the word, God has indeed blessed the United States with a lamblike disposition as she fulfills His purpose in providing a safe sanctuary for His people.⁵ Nevertheless, when apostasy carries the day and the character of the United States changes and she speaks “as a dragon” (Rev. 13:11),⁶ this “sanctuary” will be altogether polluted as the United States will then be fulfilling *not* God’s purpose, but Satan’s.

The Setting Up of the Abomination of Desolation

The Hebrew word *nathan*, translated “place” by the King James translators in Daniel 11:31, is commonly translated “set up” in the newer versions;⁷ and the King James translators themselves translated this same word (in the same context) “set up” in Daniel 12:11. For the sake of consistency, then, we prefer the translation “set up” in Daniel 11:31. Now a quote from Martin Proebstle regarding the “abomination” (Proebstle translates *nathan* as “given”):

In Dan 11:31 and 12:11, the *tamid* is replaced by an abomination of desolation . . . the noun “abominable thing,” used here in Daniel, refers to idolatry and denotes idols and foreign gods or idolatrous rites and practices; it is always strongly condemned by the prophets. During the time of the prophets, Israelites even introduced false gods into the temple and defiled the sanctuary through idolatrous worship. [*Abominable thing*] therefore occurs in the context of ill-directed worship and the worship of idols and false gods. It denotes “everything detestable from the perspective of Yahweh worship.” It is in this context in which [*abominable thing*] is used here in Daniel. After the *tamid* is taken away, a devastating [*abominable thing*], a false worship, is “given.” Assuming there is a congruency between the replaced item and the substitute, the replacement of [*the tamid*] by [*abominable thing*] is another indication that [*the tamid*] refers to true worship. True worship and service of YHWH is removed and replaced by false, abominable worship. *Truth and Terror*, 217–219 (underlined emphasis supplied).

This is precisely the context of our view of the taking away of the *daily* and the setting up of the abomination of desolation. Now coupling this context of the “setting up” of the abomination with our view of the chronological flow of Daniel 11, we believe the “setting up” of the abomination in v. 31 is the future unqualified union of church and state in the Protestant sanctuary of the United States manifested by the papacy, through the “arms” of apostate Protestantism, utilizing the powers of the state to compel national compliance to her false form of worship.

The idolatrous little-horn power of Daniel 8—the world power of Rome—is itself the abomination-of-desolation power. In the case of the state power of imperial Rome, Satan used pure civil and military clout (described in Dan. 11:17–19) in an overt attempt to destroy God’s people. Since this tactic backfired in that God caused it to turn upon Rome herself (v. 18), Satan altered the abomination-of-desolation power into the form of papal Rome (v. 21). With this he was more successful. Rather than attempting to destroy God’s people outright by force, now he attempted to destroy them covertly by imposing into the Christian church a false and characteristically pagan form of worship for the true, and by so doing to adulterate the holy covenant and corrupt the pure religion of God’s people from within with the idolatrous practices of paganism.⁸ This was the old “Balaam” tactic.⁹ But since implementing a false form of worship by itself is not sufficient to coerce God’s true and undeceived people in the “strong holds” (as in v. 24)¹⁰ to conform to it, Satan is obliged to resort once again to the strong arm of the state to intimidate and compel universal compliance. Actually, it would seem that the papal Roman organization and hierarchy should not even be considered the

⁵ Cf. the GC 441 quote on p. 34.

⁶ Cf. GC 442.

⁷ E.g. AB, ASV, NAS, NIV, RSV.

⁸ See again Haskell’s quote in Part 1, p. 93.

⁹ Cf. Num. 25; 31:1–16, especially v. 16.

¹⁰ Cf. p. 6.

abomination-of-desolation power as long as she is divested of political authority. But once her political authority is officially instated or reinstated, and once the state both sanctions and enforces the papacy's false form of worship, then it can be said that the abomination of desolation has been "set up."

The abomination of desolation in its papal form is not a direct threat to God's people as long as they enjoy religious liberty. But even though Satan is successful in deceiving most of the Christian world by the subtle untruths he employs through papal Rome, he is still not satisfied until he has the entire world worshipping at his feet; therefore, for those he cannot deceive by tact he attempts to compel by force. This he can only accomplish by taking away their religious liberty; and this he can also only accomplish by utilizing the political powers of the state. Once Satan, through the papacy and/or apostate Protestantism, has successfully coerced a state power into establishing a civil mandate enforcing the papacy's particular false form of worship, then the abomination of desolation will be "set up."

The Taking Away of the "Daily"

It should be made clear that it is not the institution of the Sabbath that Daniel's prophecies tell us is taken away, as the Sabbath institution, like the heavenly ministry of Christ or, for that matter, the holy covenant, cannot be taken away. Neither is it the Sabbath rest experience by God's people that is taken away, even though this will happen for those wavering in faith. Rather, we understand that it is the taking away of the religious liberty to keep the corporate Sabbath worship experience that, specifically, constitutes the *daily* being taken away. And as we know from Bible prophecy,¹¹ "the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation" (GC 295) will, in the United States, one day be vehemently denied and attacked, and in the very way the framers of the U.S. Constitution purposefully sought to prevent.

Because we understand the "asylum fortress" in Daniel 11:31 to be the United States, we understand that the events constituting the taking away of the *daily* and the setting up of the abomination of desolation both take place within the United States. We also understand that the *daily* — the regular appointment *for* and the identifying mark *of* true worship — is "taken away" as a result of the false form of worship being "set up," and therefore we understand that these two events occur not only at the same place but at the same time. Actually, we do not consider these as two separate events at all but rather as two results of but one event. We now conclude that this single event is specifically the papacy's substitution, through apostate Protestantism in the United States and the civil enactment that is the product of apostate Protestant union with the state, of the first-day Sunday for the seventh-day Sabbath.

Now we ask the fundamental question: What single event, designed by the papacy but effected through apostate Protestants, occurring in the United States, resulting from the union of church and state, will constitute both the political taking away of the true form of worship (by the prohibition of the Sabbath appointment) and the political setting up of a false form of worship (by the enforcement of a Sunday appointment)? The answer is so obvious it hardly needs mentioning — the coming *national Sunday law* (NSL).

In the movements now in progress in the United States to secure for the institutions and usages of the church the support of the state, *Protestants* are following in the steps of papists. Nay, more, they are opening the door for the papacy to regain in Protestant America the supremacy which she has lost in the Old World. And that which gives greater significance to this movement is the fact that the principal object contemplated is the enforcement of Sunday observance — the custom which originated with Rome, and which she claims as the sign of her authority. It is the spirit of the papacy — the spirit of conformity to worldly customs, the

¹¹ Principally Rev. 13.

eneration for human traditions above the commandments of God — that is permeating the Protestant churches and leading them on to do the same work of Sunday exaltation which the papacy has done before them. *The Great Controversy*, 573 (emphasis supplied).

“Protestants . . . are opening the door for the papacy to regain in Protestant America the supremacy which she has lost in the Old World.” Clearly, to witness the fulfillment of prophecy in the last days our immediate attention should be focused on events in the United States.¹² And should there be any doubt that the United States—the “land of the free”—would ever deny her citizens the religious freedom guaranteed by her Constitution, we need only look at where the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States have propelled us. Within days of these attacks there were calls for every U.S. citizen to be issued a national ID card, and these cards, should they indeed ever be issued, could easily be subsequently used to control who “buys and sells.”¹³ Moreover, the growing U.S. illegal immigration problem has also been set forth as a reason to issue national ID cards. Regardless, the need to restrict civil liberties for the sake of national security is a legitimate one; the problem lies in knowing where to draw the line, and having the presence of mind to draw it. With more terrorist attacks sure to come which will undoubtedly be even greater in scope, it is now easy to see how the United States, in a time of national crisis and in fulfillment of Revelation 13:11–17, will indeed lose her constitutional bearings and cross the liberty/security line.

In our view, identifying the specific event that constitutes the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 11:31 helps explain what ultimately caused the papacy to “have indignation against the holy covenant” in v. 30—it was the *restoration* of the *daily* (*i.e.* the restoration of corporate Sabbath worship following its *first* “taking away.” That is, the restoration of Sabbath observance was the natural end-result of the Great Advent Awakening in the early part of the 19th century as this Awakening, we believe, fulfilled the prophetic role of the ships of Chittim of Daniel 11:30;¹⁴ and for those who took it, the restoration of Sabbath observance in Adventism essentially marked the final step of the Protestant Reformation. Because corporate Sabbath observance by God’s church is the visible sign of God’s holy covenant, those who accepted this sign publicly showed that they had disentangled themselves from the last tentacles of Roman paganism and had fully embraced the true worship prescribed in the true covenant of God. And this, of course, caused Rome to have “indignation”; and this also, of course, restored the *daily* following its first taking away.

Two Fulfillments of the Taking Away of the “Daily”

Because the papacy is the power behind the taking away of the *daily*, and because prophecy depicts two separate and distinct periods of papal supremacy, we should expect there to be two separate and distinct fulfillments of the papacy taking the *daily* away—the first taking place in association with the historic period of papal supremacy and the second taking place after the papal deadly wound is healed¹⁵ and in association with the future period of papal supremacy. And in our view, the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 8:11 is in specific reference to its first fulfillment while that of Daniel 11:31 is in specific reference to its second. Daniel 8:11 refers to the taking away of the *daily* as it occurred historically in the Old World and in association with the first beast of Revelation 13, and Daniel 11:31 refers to the taking away of the *daily* as it will occur in the future in the New World and in association with the second [image-making] beast of Revelation 13.¹⁶ Obviously, the second “taking away” can only occur after the *daily* has first been restored to its rightful place following its first “taking away.” And this, as noted on p. 74, occurred soon after the end of the 2300 days in 1844

¹² As we shall see from our study of portions of Revelation later, our attention should also be on events in Europe.

¹³ See Rev. 13:17.

¹⁴ Cf. our comments on pp. 31–32.

¹⁵ See Rev. 13:3.

¹⁶ See Rev. 13:14–15.

when, according to Daniel 8:13–14, “the sanctuary and the host” would no longer “be trodden under foot.” Each prophetic reference (in Dan. 8 and 11) to the taking away of the *daily*, then, finds its fulfillment in its own unique time and place.

We will note that the plural pronoun “they” in Daniel 11:31 is used to describe who it is who would set up the “abomination that maketh desolate.” These are the same “they” who would “pollute the sanctuary of strength, and . . . take away the daily” and the same “arms” (plural) who would “stand on his [*singular*] part.” The use of the plural pronouns in v. 31 is in distinct contrast to the use of the singular pronoun “he” in Daniel 8:11 that describes the little-horn papacy who, it is clearly implied, takes away the *daily* there. Certainly, as Daniel 11 demonstrates time and again, reference to the power of Rome in Daniel’s prophecies is always with a singular masculine pronoun. But in Daniel 11:31 it is not a “he” who takes away the *daily* and sets up the “abomination that maketh desolate,” it is “they” who stand on “his” part who do so. And this describes perfectly the historic SDA view of how Sunday will one day come to be politically substituted for the true Sabbath in the United States as the “they” of Daniel 11:31 refers to the many and varied groups of apostate Protestants who, knowingly or unknowingly, stand in the United States in the interest of the papacy.¹⁷ It also provides clear exegetical evidence that the two references to the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 8:11 and 11:31 are actually references to two separate events.

Understanding that the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 11:31 is its second fulfillment as it is associated with and, we believe, begins the second papal supremacy, and having identified the NSL in the United States as the specific event constituting this second fulfillment, to be consistent we would now expect to find a correspondingly similar historical event (a Sunday law) that would have constituted the first fulfillment of the taking away of the *daily* as it was associated with and, we believe, would have begun the first papal supremacy as it is depicted in Daniel 8:11.

Most Adventists should be familiar with Constantine’s Sunday law that came in A.D. 321. While this law was a milestone in the long period of gradual suppression of the Sabbath and the exaltation of Sunday in that it was the very first Sunday law,¹⁸ it still came over 200 years before the beginning of the first papal supremacy in A.D. 538. Thus, this Sunday law does not provide the consistency we would expect. But now let’s go to C. Mervyn Maxwell who offers this most interesting observation as it relates to our study here:

The emperor Constantine issued the *very* first Sunday law, on March 7, 321. But even though Constantine is known as the first Christian emperor, his first Sunday law was basically secular. It did not set up a “Christian Sabbath.” Sunday had become popular among his sun-worshipping pagan subjects, and he apparently hoped that making the day a holiday would be appreciated by pagans and Christians alike and would help unite the populace in support of his administration.

His law was couched in non-Christian language. “On the venerable day of the Sun,” it began, “let magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed.”

Farmers, however, were excluded from Sunday rest on the ground that farm procedures have to be taken care of at “the proper moment.”

By contrast, the first *religious* Sunday law in Western Europe did come from the Catholics. And, for rather obvious reasons, it was considerably more severe than Constantine’s; for it insisted that on “Sunday . . . agricultural labor ought to be laid aside, in order that people may not be prevented from attending church.”

This significant regulation is known as the 28th canon (or church law) of the Third Council of Orleans, France. This Third Council of Orleans met in 538, the same year that the power of the Ostrogoths was broken and the 1260-year prophecy began. *God Cares*, 1:129–130 (underlined emphasis supplied).

¹⁷ Cf. again the GC 573 quote above.

¹⁸ Cf. GC 53.

Maxwell notes the distinction between secular and religious Sunday laws, and this distinction is significant in that a secular Sunday law is not professed to change or be a substitute for the Sabbath of God's holy law, while a religious Sunday law is intended to do just that. The distinction between the Sunday laws Maxwell speaks of is clear: Constantine issued his Sunday law for purely *political* reasons while the Catholics issued their Sunday law for purely *religious* reasons; and it is not so much the wicked act itself but the intent and purpose of the act that is abomination in the sight of God. But beyond this, Constantine's Sunday law, as Maxwell notes, "did not set up a 'Christian Sabbath.'" In fact, on its very surface it was entirely pagan. Though it was politically motivated, it venerated "the venerable day of the Sun"; and anything blatantly associated with the veneration of the sun can hardly be called Christian. Clearly, what Constantine did with his Sunday law was make Sunday an official holiday for pagan sun worship,¹⁹ and whatever supposed benefit Christians derived from it was secondary. Thus, when it comes to corresponding with the end-time NSL, Constantine's Sunday law fails in both its timing and nature.

But now let's look at the Sunday law of 538. Maxwell informs us that this law was the first *religious* Sunday law and that it was, not surprisingly, of Catholic origin. And while one wonders, from Maxwell's description, just what was so severe about it, it came, seemingly very coincidentally, in the very year the 1260-year prophecy began. Of course, it is the 1260-year prophecy that measures the first papal supremacy; and thus this Sunday law corresponds with the end-time NSL in every respect. In light of our present study, then, this discovery definitely requires further investigation.

It is important now to note that, though the Spirit of Prophecy repeatedly identifies the *beginning and ending dates* of the first papal supremacy as A.D. 538 and 1798, and though the Spirit of Prophecy repeatedly identifies the *ending event* of this prophetic period as being a French general taking the pope captive and inflicting the deadly wound to the papacy,²⁰ the Spirit of Prophecy does *not* identify the specific *beginning event* of this period.²¹ This being the case, to suggest as we do that the event in 538 that marks the beginning of the 1260 years is not the abandoning of the siege of Rome by the Ostrogoths is not inconsistent with Spirit of Prophecy counsel.²²

The Sunday Law of A.D. 538

According to Charles J. Hefele²³ in *History of the Councils of the Church*,²⁴ the 28th canon of the Third Council of Orleans forbade agricultural labor, and in doing so it was considerably more severe than how Maxwell described it.²⁵ Let's look at the entire canon:

It is a Jewish superstition that it is unlawful to ride or drive on Sunday, or do anything for the decoration of house or person. But field labours are forbidden, so that people may be able to come to church and worship. If anyone acts otherwise, he is to be punished, not by the laity, but by the bishop. *History of the Councils of the Church*, 4:208–209.

This is a different English translation than the one Maxwell used; rather than merely saying that agricultural labor "ought to be laid aside," according to Hefele this canon flatly states that field

¹⁹ See A. H. Lewis, *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation From 321 To 1888 A.D.* (D. Appleton and Co., NY, 1888) ch. 2 for documentation substantiating this point.

²⁰ For an example of both of these points, see the *GC* 439 quote on p. 16.

²¹ The most detailed Spirit of Prophecy account of events at the beginning of the 1260 years is in the *GC* 54–55 quote on p. 7. However, the only specific event cited was that "the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church." Of course, we know this was done by Emperor Justinian in 533 (see the *4BC* 827 quote on p. 4) and therefore this event could not have been considered by Ellen White to be the event marking the beginning of the 1260 years since she endorsed the 538 starting date for this period.

²² Regarding the abandoning of the siege of Rome by the Ostrogoths, see the *4BC* 834 quote on p. 4.

²³ Also known as Karl Joseph von Hefele.

²⁴ As translated from German by William R. Clark.

²⁵ See the *God Cares* 129–130 quote on p. 86.

labors “are forbidden.” More significantly, the canon states, “If anyone acts otherwise, he is to be punished . . . by the bishop.” But Hefele’s rendering of the canon seems to be an abbreviated version. A more comprehensive English translation is provided by A. H. Lewis in his *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation from 321 to 1888 A.D.*:

Whereas the people are persuaded that they ought not to travel on the Lord’s day with the horses, or oxen and carriages, or to prepare anything for food, or to do anything conducive to the cleanliness of houses or men, things which belong to Jewish rather than Christian observances; we have ordained that on the Lord’s day what was before lawful to be done may still be done. But from rural work, i.e., plowing, cultivating vines, reaping, mowing, thrashing, clearing away thorns or hedging, we judge it better to abstain, that the people may the more readily come to the churches and have leisure for prayers. If any one be found doing the works *forbidden* above, let him be *punished, not as the civil authorities may direct, but as the ecclesiastical powers may determine*. “Council of Orleans III,” can. xxviii; Binius, tome xi, p. 496; or Labbe, ix, p. 19. *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation from 321 to 1888 A.D.*, 64 (emphasis supplied).

This rendering also tells us that agricultural labor was “forbidden” and that violators were to be “punished, not as the *civil authorities* may direct, but as the *ecclesiastical powers* may determine” (emphasis supplied). Clearly, while the move to Sunday observance was made through incremental steps that included previous canons²⁶ and secular or pagan Sunday laws,²⁷ the Sunday canon of 538 was the first full-fledged *religious* Sunday law that *required* punishment to violators. And this is *precisely* what we would expect to find in our search for a historical event at the beginning of the first papal supremacy that corresponds with our suggested future Sunday law of Daniel 11:31 that we believe begins the second papal supremacy.

According to Hefele, the specific date given the Third Council of Orleans was “the year 538, and probably the 7th of May.” However, he adds this footnote:

The 7th of May as the date of our Synod is adopted by Sirmond, *Concilia Galliae*, t. i. p. 247; Mansi, t. ix. p. 19; Remi Ceillier, *Hist. des auteurs sacrés*, t. xvi. p. 725. On the other hand, the authors of the *Hist. littéraire de la France* (t. iii. p. 178) decide for the 7th of March, but have incorrectly printed 558 for 538. *History of the Councils of the Church*, 4:205.

While we have discounted the events at Rome on March 10, 538 as being prophetically significant, we now find it interesting that one of the two possible dates historians have given the Third Council of Orleans is March 7, 538—a mere *three days before* the Ostrogoths abandoned their siege of Rome and the date Adventism has historically identified as the beginning point of the prophetic 1260 years. But, of course, May 7 was just 58 days after. Now we will consider how the prophecies themselves describe the time of papal supremacy. Daniel 7:25:

25 And he (papal Rome) **shall speak great words against the most High** (blasphemy against God), **and shall wear out the saints of the most High** (persecution of God’s people), **and think to change times and laws** (better, “times and law” [NKJV]; deign to change God’s law dealing

²⁶ Prime example of a previous Sunday canon is described in the *SDABC*: “The first official action of the Catholic Church expressing preference for Sunday was taken at the Council of Laodicea, in the 4th century. Canon 29 of this council stipulates that ‘Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Sabbath], but shall work on that day; but the Lord’s day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ’” (4BC 832). This canon hardly posed a threat to God’s true people in that it merely called for Sunday rest “if possible,” no punishment for violators was called for, and any papal exercise of “shutting out from Christ” was meaningless.

²⁷ Such as Constantine’s in A.D. 321. Cf. Maxwell’s *God Cares* quote and our associated comments on Constantine’s Sunday law on p. 86.

with time, thereby taking away, by our definition, the *daily*)²⁸: **and they (the saints) shall be given into his [persecuting] hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.**

Revelation 13:5–7:

5 And there was given unto him (the beast out of the sea in the form of the second phase of Rome — papal Rome)²⁹ a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to make war [margin] forty and two months.³⁰

6 And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

7 And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.

We will note that nothing is said in either of these passages that alludes to the elimination of a political rival to the papacy. Rather, the period of papal supremacy is biblically characterized by (1) papal blasphemies in speech, (2) papal persecution of God’s people, and (3) papal change of God’s times and law. The uprooting of the Ostrogoths in and of itself, regardless of when it came, is unrelated to any of these characteristics; the Sunday law of 538, however, is directly related to each one.

Regarding blasphemous speech: Revelation 13:11 tells us that the two-horned beast *speaks* “as a dragon,” which we understand refers to the United States legislating a future Sunday law.³¹ This interpretation of blasphemous speech in prophecy, then, can consistently be applied to the blasphemous speech referred to in the above texts and can be understood to be fulfilled, along with a myriad of other church laws in the form of papal canons, by the papal Sunday law of 538.

Regarding persecution of the saints: The Sunday law of 538 required punishment to transgressors; and as both of the above texts indicate, papal supremacy is characterized by the fact that the papacy *persecutes* the saints, not by the mere fact that the papacy *could* persecute the saints if she wanted to. Thus, while it is necessary for papal Rome to be free from political rivals in order to enforce her cultic peculiarities, this freedom by itself is not a direct threat to God’s people, and thus by itself is not a defining characteristic of papal supremacy. The Sunday law of 538 with its demand for punishment to violators, however, *was* a direct persecuting threat to God’s people.

We also understand the Sunday law of 538 to be the papacy’s official *declaration of war* against the “saints”³² in that it mandated obeisance to the mark of papal authority (in direct challenge to God’s authority) and thereby, under the newly acquired political authority Justinian had vested the papacy just five years earlier, placed all “heretics” at the papacy’s judicial mercy. And while Justinian’s decree of 533 politically and legally confirmed the bishop of Rome as “head of all the holy churches” and formally recognized him as the corrector of heretics throughout the Roman Empire,³³ we believe this political move would also have been adopted by the Frank Kingdom, as Clovis, King of the Franks (481–511), had previously followed the Byzantine lead and had made Catholicism the state-endorsed religion of his kingdom; moreover, he had even adopted Roman law into his own government in Gaul.³⁴ Thus, the papal Sunday law of 538 which was issued by a church council in Orleans (in Gaul) would likely have been given state recognition by *both* the Frank Kingdom *and* the Roman Empire. The issuing of this church law by the papacy, then, provided the papacy with a *legal*

²⁸ Cf. again “Application” and “Summation” on pp. 56–68.

²⁹ Cf. vs. 1, 3.

³⁰ Regarding the 42 months here and the 3½ “times” of Dan. 7:25, see the GC 439 quote on p. 16.

³¹ Commenting on Rev. 13:11: “The lamblike horns and dragon voice of the symbol point to a striking contradiction between the professions and the practice of the nation thus represented. The ‘speaking’ of the nation is the action of its legislative and judicial authorities” (GC 442).

³² See Rev. 13:5, 7 above.

³³ See again the 4BC 827 quote on p. 4.

³⁴ We will elaborate on this later. Also, Gaul was essentially the area of France today.

basis to indeed “make war” and “correct” the so-called “heretics” throughout *both* empires during the following 42 prophetic months.

Regarding the changing of God’s times and law: The Sunday law of 538 is the self-evident fulfillment of this in that previous secular Sunday laws, like Constantine’s, did not feign to change God’s law, and previous papal Sunday laws, like the 29th canon of the Council of Laodicea, merely *encouraged* Sunday observance rather than *requiring* it on pain of corporal punishment. This lack of “teeth” in the law can be attributed to the fact that, prior to Justinian overseeing the union of church and state in 533, the papacy lacked the political and legal authority to enforce such a law.

The Sunday law of 538 is also the logical starting point of the 1260 years of papal supremacy in terms of the duration and nature of the period—*i.e.* because the end is marked by the end of papal political authority in 1798, the beginning should correspondingly be marked by the beginning of papal political authority. The Sunday law of 538, in contrast to the uprooting of the Ostrogoths, did this in that, for the first time in the Christian era, a church law subverting God’s law had the political authority of a state behind it. That is, the Sunday law of 538 demonstrated that the papacy’s political involvement was now fully engaged, and it demonstrated the papacy’s arrogant pretense that her authority over God’s people, even in the highest realm of law, is above that of God’s.

Yet another significant characteristic of the apocalyptic beast’s 42-month war with the saints is related in the next verse of Revelation 13:

8 And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him (papal Rome), whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Worship. Worshipping the prophetic beast. Let’s look again at a portion of the Sunday canon of 538 (according to Hefele):

But field labours are forbidden, so that the people may be able to come to church to *worship*. If anyone acts otherwise, he is to be punished . . . by the bishop. *History of the Councils of the Church*, 4:209 (emphasis supplied).

Such a motivation to worship God! To avoid some unspecified punishment administered by the clergy! And where is the biblical authority that rest should be taken on the first day of the week rather than on the day God commanded to rest—the seventh? Does this form of worship have the mark of God upon it? And just who is it who is being worshiped in this charade of worship anyway? It is none other than the authority behind the law that demands such worship. It is none other than the satanic beast of Bible prophecy, and what is true in respect to one papal supremacy is true in respect to the other. Regarding the future Sunday law:

. . . when Sunday observance shall be enforced by law, and the world shall be enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath, then whoever shall transgress the command of God, to obey a precept which has no higher authority than that of Rome, will thereby honor popery above God. He is paying homage to Rome and to the power which enforces the institution ordained by Rome. He is worshipping the beast and his image. *The Great Controversy*, 449.

But thanks be to God and the Lamb, not “all that dwell on the earth shall worship him,” but, as Revelation 13:8 goes on to say, only those “whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” The seriousness of being beguiled or coerced into worshipping the prophetic beast is then indicated by v. 9: “If any man have an ear, let him hear.” And just when, we ask, did God’s people first begin to be coerced into worshipping the prophetic beast of Bible prophecy? In our view, the answer can be found in this statement:

In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. Its seat of power was fixed in the imperial city, and the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church. Paganism had given place to the papacy. The dragon had given to the beast “his pow-

er, and his seat, and great authority.” Revelation 13:2. And now began the 1260 years of papal oppression foretold in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Daniel 7:25; Revelation 13:5–7. Christians were *forced to choose* either to yield their integrity and *accept the papal ceremonies and worship*, or to wear away their lives in dungeons or suffer death by the rack, the fagot, or the headsman’s ax. . . . Persecution opened upon the faithful with greater fury than ever before, and the world became a vast battlefield. *Ibid.*, 54–55 (emphasis supplied).

We have noted that the Spirit of Prophecy has confirmed the *year* but not the *event* that marked the beginning of the 1260 years. Nevertheless, the following statement harmonizes perfectly with what *we* identify as the event that marked the beginning of this prophetic period:

It was in behalf of the Sunday that popery first asserted its arrogant claims; and its first resort to the power of the state was to compel the observance of Sunday as “the Lord’s day.” *Ibid.*, 446.

It was the year 538 when, by virtue of the 28th canon of the Third Council of Orleans, Christians were *forced to choose* between God’s appointed time He meets with His people (as it is embraced by Daniel’s prophetic term *daily*) and papal Rome’s substitute for this appointment (the “transgression against the daily”). This choice, then, as the *GC* 449 quote above notes, forced “the host” to declare their side in the ongoing “great conflict” (Dan. 10:1; NAS) of the spiritual warfare.³⁵ And depressing as it is, the above *GC* 54–55 quote describes what was, or at least what came to be, the unspecified form of punishment called for in the Sunday law of 538.

We will now note that we are not the only ones who connect the Sunday law of 538 with the beginning of the 1260-year prophecy. Heidi Heiks has also recognized this:

The 1260-year prophecy of Daniel 7:25 began in A.D. 538 when the “supremacy of the papacy” was manifested in the ecclesiastical canon mandating a change from the fourth commandment, and the state, under Justinian’s *Corpus Juris Civilis*, compelled mankind to worship the papacy (the beast) by obeying the altered law. Then ascended those blasphemous words unto heaven:

“And he shall speak [by legislation] great words against the most High . . .” [Dan. 7:25]

“The change in the fourth commandment exactly fulfills the prophecy. For this the only authority claimed is that of the church. Here the papal power sets itself above God.” [GC 446] *508 538 1798 1843 Source Book (Preliminary)*, 76.³⁶

Though Heiks continues to recognize the abandoning of the siege of Rome by the Ostrogoths as being relevant to the beginning point of the 1260 years of papal supremacy, we believe there was but a single event that began the 1260 years—the *Sunday law of 538*. And we believe that, in view of the larger history of the Ostrogoth–Roman war in the mid-6th century, the Goths abandoning their siege of Rome in 538 was of no prophetic consequence.³⁷

Two Requirements For Papal Supremacy

In our view, there are two requirements necessary for papal supremacy: (1) a religious law requiring the observance of the peculiar papal form of worship; and (2) the political authority to enforce such a

³⁵ See Dan. 8:12 and our comments on p. 72.

³⁶ Published by Hope International in 2005 and revised in 2007. This book received the endorsements of Dr. William Shea, Dr. Herbert Douglass, Dr. Jerry Moon, and Joe Olson. Also cf. Heiks: *AD 538 Source Book*, 266, 285, 313 and *The “Daily” Source Book*, 122.

³⁷ Our detailed assessment of what Adventism has historically identified as marking the beginning of the prophetic 1260 years is in Appendix D.

law. These two requirements, we will now note, are essentially what would be the necessary requirements for what we have identified as the taking away of the *daily*.³⁸

It has been the historic Adventist belief that it was the withdrawal of the Ostrogoths from Rome in A.D. 538 that gave papal Rome freedom to exercise the political authority that Justinian had vested in her five years before. But though we recognize that Justinian's decree in 533 provided the papacy with the necessary political authority to reign autonomous in religious matters, we note in Appendix D that the final uprooting of the Ostrogoths from Rome did not occur until 552. However, we have also seen that the Catholic Sunday law of 538 was issued in Orleans, not Rome, and Orleans is in France. Thus, we find that for the papacy to have political authority in Italy was not even necessary in this case, for Gaul in 538 was, thanks to Clovis' previous leadership, staunchly pro-Catholic. Let's now take a closer look at Clovis.

Clovis founded the Frankish Empire,³⁹ which began when Clovis ended Roman domination over Gaul in 486 at Soissons. Ten years later (as traditionally understood) he became the first of the barbarian kings to convert to orthodox Christianity; the remaining pagans among the Franks, for the most part, then dutifully followed their leader into the Church. In response, the Pope gave Clovis the title "Eldest Son of the Church" while the nation he founded that is still existent today — France — became known as the "Eldest Daughter of the Church." Thus, Clovis became as much the political champion of Catholicism in the West as was the Roman emperor in the East.

After Clovis defeated the Arian Visigoths in the southern part of Gaul in 507, the Eastern emperor Anastasius I, in appreciation of this accomplishment and with the purpose of allying the two Catholic powers against the Arian Ostrogoths occupying Italy, conferred on Clovis in 508 the title "Proconsul," thereby making him a fellow [honorary] emperor. And while the Eastern Empire and the Franks still had serious differences regarding their own territorial borders (even to the point that on several occasions the Franks betrayed their tenuous alliance with Constantinople and allied themselves with the Goths over the three-way disputed lands of Italy), from 508 onward the Roman Empire, it seems, considered the Frankish kingdom in Gaul a full partner in advancing Catholicism.

Looking more closely at this mutual cause, Clovis went so far as to convene the First National [Church] Council of Orleans in July of 511,⁴⁰ just as Constantine did with the very first state-convened Council of Nicea [in Italy] in 325.⁴¹ At this First Council of Orleans, 32 bishops enacted 31 canons and, upon receiving Clovis' approval, "settled many questions pertaining to the relations between Church and state."⁴² Nevertheless, it was by virtue of Clovis receiving the honorary insignia of Proconsul in 508 that Clovis' kingdom became an acknowledged extension of the Roman Empire in championing the Catholic cause; and we already know the extent the Roman Empire championed the Catholic cause.

Now an interesting aside: In our view the first papal supremacy began with the Sunday law issued in Gaul in 538, while it was through none other than the power of France that God brought about the end of this same prophetic period exactly 1260 years later when Napoleon's General Berthier took the Pope captive, declared papal political authority ended, and declared the establishment of a new Republic. And interestingly enough, the revolutionary French did not forget Clovis' role in bringing Christianity to the Franks; their hatred of their Christian roots burned so great that they exhumed Clovis' remains from a church south of Paris and scattered them to the winds. But all of this should come as no surprise as it merely reinforces our interpretation of Daniel 11:26.⁴³

³⁸ See again "The Taking Away of the 'Daily'" on pp. 84–85.

³⁹ The Frankish Empire (6th–9th centuries) consisted essentially of what today is France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, and sometimes parts of Italy and Spain. Its greatest king was Charlemagne in the 9th century.

⁴⁰ This was just four months before Clovis' death. Altogether there were six national councils held at Orleans from 511 to 549.

⁴¹ Friedrich Gontard described the Council of Nicea for us in his quote in Part 1, p. 91.

⁴² *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 4 (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04070a.htm>), article "Clovis."

⁴³ See "The Deadly Wound" on pp. 16–18.

We will point out that as the papal Sunday law of 538 could not be enforced universally throughout the Roman Empire due to the still existing Arian power of the Ostrogoths in Italy, neither will the end-time Sunday law be at first universal, but will initially come, we believe, from the “asylum fortress” (Dan. 11:31)⁴⁴ of the United States and only later will it become universal.⁴⁵ Clearly, in both periods of papal supremacy it is merely the initial precedence of a Sunday law that demarks the period’s beginning point; at that time the bulwark of religious liberty is breached and it is then only a matter of time before the imposition of religious tyranny in the Christian world becomes universal.

As we know, the prophetic 1260 days, 42 months, and 3½ “times” all measure the same period of the first papal supremacy of A.D. 538–1798.⁴⁶ Because we have concluded that there is no merit in the historic Adventist view regarding the beginning *event* of the 1260 years, and because we have discovered that there was a significant Sunday law that came at the precise beginning point of this period, and because we have previously concluded that the second papal supremacy will begin with the coming NSL in the United States, we now conclude that there is perfect harmony and consistency in understanding that the issuing of the 28th canon of the Third Council of Orleans was the actual event that marked the beginning of the first papal supremacy and that the coming NSL will be to the *second* papal supremacy as the Sunday law of 538 was to the *first*. We also identify the Sunday law of 538 as the specific fulfillment of the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 8:11, whereas, as we have also already concluded, the coming NSL in the United States will constitute the fulfillment of the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 11:31.⁴⁷

In the event God’s people today wonder just how significant a threat the Sunday law of 538 was, we believe they will soon find out when, after the deadly wound of Revelation 13:3 is healed, the beast of Bible prophecy again declares spiritual war on the saints and God’s remnant people come face-to-face with their own Sunday law. Perhaps there will then be full appreciation for the significance of the Sunday law of 538, as well as for the idea that it is indeed *a religious Sunday law with the civil authority of the state behind it* that legitimately marks the beginning of *any* papal supremacy.

With this thought in mind, we can see that papal political authority must come first, and then the law, as the law is dependent on an enforcing political authority. In respect to the first papal supremacy, Catholicism was formally recognized as the Roman state religion by Constantine (by his convening the Council of Nicea) in 325, and this was followed by Catholicism being formally recognized as the Frankish state religion by Clovis (by his convening the First National Council of Orleans) in 511. Then Justinian officially recognized the political authority of the papacy by his decree of 533; and this papal political authority, we believe, would have also been recognized by what was formally, since 508, the Roman Empire’s pro-Catholic ally — the Frankish Empire. The period of the first papal supremacy then officially began in 538 when the *daily* was politically taken away by virtue of the issuing of the papal Sunday law in Gaul. The end of the period then came when papal political authority was formally removed in 1798 when revolutionary France inflicted a deadly wound to the papacy, rendering all papal religio-political laws mute. Now let us consider the view of one prophecy student of 200 years ago:

... Capt. Charles D. Maitland, of the Royal Artillery, wrote in 1814:

“The daily sacrifice of spiritual worship was taken out of the Gentile church, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up therein, in the year of our Lord 533. From this period the saints were given into the hands of the Papal power, and *permission was granted* to that

⁴⁴ Our translation (see p. 35).

⁴⁵ Cf. 6T 18; 7T 141.

⁴⁶ The 1260 days of Rev. 11:3; 12:6; the 42 months of Rev. 11:2; 13:5; the 3½ “times” of Dan. 7:25; Rev. 12:14.

⁴⁷ See again “Two Fulfillments of the Taking Away of the ‘Daily’” on pp. 85–87.

power to exercise dominion and tyrannize over them 1260 years” (*A Brief and Connected View of Prophecy*, p. 27). *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:62 (emphasis supplied).⁴⁸

While we concur with Capt. Maitland that in 533 permission was formally granted the papacy to exercise political power in the way of dominion and tyranny over the saints, we believe a distinction should be made between when this political power was *granted* and when this power was *exercised*: it was granted by Justinian in 533 and it was exercised by the papacy in 538 with the issuing of the first religious Sunday law. Thus, since we have seen that papal supremacy is principally characterized by the blasphemous papal change of God’s law, resulting in papal persecution of God’s people, the 1260 years of the first papal supremacy should be measured from 538, not 533.

In respect to the second papal supremacy, the *daily* must first be restored, then both criteria for papal supremacy must be met again — first political authority must be given the papacy (deadly wound healed), then the *daily* will again be taken away by virtue of another Sunday law. However, as prophecy depicts and as we shall elaborate on later, this time the papal Sunday law emanating from “the beast” will be preempted by a Sunday law coming from the formation of an end-time “image to the beast” (Rev. 13:14–15). Thus, the second papal supremacy will actually begin with the NSL proffered by “arms” who “stand on his [*the papacy’s*] part” (Dan. 11:31) in what the prophecy of Daniel 11 describes as an “asylum fortress” — the United States. The end of this period will then come, we believe, when papal political authority is again formally removed, this time by yet *another* revolutionary political power inflicting a *second* deadly wound to the papacy.⁴⁹

Of course, whereas the beginning of each papal supremacy is marked by the taking away of the *daily* via a state-enforceable religious Sunday law, sometime following the conclusion of each papal supremacy the *daily* is, in due course, restored. Respecting the first papal supremacy, it took 50 years from the end of this period for the *daily* to be formally restored (1798–1848).⁵⁰ But after the end of the *second* papal supremacy, we believe the *daily* will be formally restored when Christ establishes His kingdom at His second coming.

When it comes to Daniel 11:31 and the beginning of the second papal supremacy, in our view the Sunday law itself is described as the taking away of the *daily* and the setting up of the abomination of desolation, while the state’s willing partnership in the coming adulterous church–state union is described as the pollution of the “asylum fortress.”

Recognizing the consistency in identifying a Sunday law at the beginning of both the historic and future periods of papal supremacy and that these Sunday laws officially and *legally* take away the *daily*, we are now led to ask both the SDA old and new-view proponents of the *daily*: Since there is coming a second papal supremacy and we can logically expect the *daily* to be taken away by the little-horn papacy once again, how do you expect this event to occur that harmonizes with your view of the *daily*?

We now cannot help but note again the degree to which our understanding of the taking away of the *daily* harmonizes with the view long held by historic Protestants. We cited specific examples of the Reformers’ belief above and previously on p. 52, but for sake of our discussion here we will do it again. In 1787 an anonymous prophecy student wrote:

“The taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of abomination, is *the taking away of the true christian [sic] worship*, as instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and *the setting up of the doctrines and commandments of men*. . . . The daily sacrifice is a Mosaic term for the true worship of God suited to the time in which Daniel lived” (*Observations on Certain Prophecies in the Book of Daniel*, 8, 9). *Ibid.* (emphasis supplied).

⁴⁸ Larger quote on p. 102.

⁴⁹ We will identify the different last-day world political powers and how they relate to each other and the papacy in a later chapter. We will also elaborate later on the sequencing of the healing of the deadly wound, the second papal supremacy, and the second deadly wound.

⁵⁰ We will explain how the restoration of the *daily* came about in 1848 later.

Clearly, there could hardly be a more striking fulfillment of “the taking away of the true Christian worship” and “the setting up of the doctrines and commandments of men” than the political substitution of the first-day Sunday for the seventh-day Sabbath, whether it be in its historic fulfillment of Daniel 8:11 or its future fulfillment of Daniel 11:31. And that the writer of the above quote had, no doubt, no knowledge that the Sabbath–Sunday issue would be the great test that separates pure from dross in the last days highlights all the more the fact that, when it comes to the question of Daniel’s *daily*, the Reformers and historic Protestants had far greater insight than present-day theologians. Now let’s take a look at this last-day test.

The Great Last-Day Test

In the greatest part of the Christian world today the true worship of God has been supplanted by the specific species of creature worship that is visibly signified by the false sanctification of Sunday — historically, the pagan day of the sun. And paganism, we have seen, is the common root of the imperial/papal little horn of Daniel 8.⁵¹ Thus, because Sunday sanctity is the child of the little-horn papacy and but a carryover from former days of pagan sun worship, Sunday observance can actually be considered to be the visible sign and badge of paganism; and any Sundaykeeper *who has knowledge of God’s true Sabbath* shows, by his continued Sundaykeeping in spite of his knowledge of God’s expressed will to the contrary, that he is less a Christian than a pagan. He shows that he has *chosen* to bow before the altar of sun worship. And we can be sure that by the time the NSL in the United States is effected a national debate concerning its constitutionality will be in full swing and there will be few still ignorant of God’s true Sabbath.

Of course, in the mind of an informed Sundaykeeper he is not actually worshiping the sun; he merely happens to be employing the sign of pagan sun worship in honor of the resurrection of Christ. And this would be fine, if God had actually given us liberty to alter His expressed commands so as to fit our own preferences, or if He had removed the sanctity of the Sabbath. But nothing of the sort can be found in God’s word. And when this inconvenient truth becomes universally recognized in the last days, any stubborn clinging to pagan practices will manifest the same spirit of King Saul when he was rebuked in 1 Samuel 15:22:

22 And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

We conclude, then, that Sunday observance, *after* Sunday is *again* formally and officially hailed and legislated by the political powers that be as the “new” day of worship, as the “Christian” sabbath, and as the New Testament “Lord’s Day,” will become in fact an appropriate formal and official sign of a false (“baptized paganism”) form of worship, a false gospel, a false covenant, and indeed it will become the “mark of the [*apocalyptic abomination-of-desolation*] beast.”⁵²

As men then reject the institution which God has declared to be *the sign of His authority [the seventh-day Sabbath]*, and honor in its stead that which Rome has chosen as the token of her supremacy [*Sunday*], they will thereby accept the sign of allegiance to Rome — “the mark of the beast.” *The Great Controversy*, 449 (emphasis supplied).

That true Sabbath observance is the identifying mark that is to be placed upon God’s true people is just as clear.

There is to be a mark placed upon God’s people, and that mark is the keeping of His holy Sabbath. *Historical Sketches of SDA Missions*, 217 (7BC 981).

⁵¹ See “Paganism’s New Face” in Part 1, pp. 90–92.

⁵² Cf. Rev. 13:16–17.

Therefore, when the *daily* is taken away for the second time in history and the abomination of desolation is "set up," there will be two clear and distinct "marks" from which to choose.

The Sabbath question is to be the issue in the great final conflict, in which all the world will act a part. Men have honored Satan's principles above the principles that rule in the heavens. They have accepted the spurious sabbath, which Satan has exalted as the sign of his authority. But God has set His seal upon His royal requirement. Each Sabbath institution, both true and false, bears the name of its author, an ineffaceable mark that shows the authority of each.

The great decision now to be made by every one is, whether he will receive the mark of the beast and his image, or the seal of the living and true God. *Signs of the Times*, March 22, 1910 (7BC 977; emphasis supplied).

"The great decision now to be made by every one" is not merely choosing one day over another; the choice of the day is merely the natural result of a previous decision going much deeper.

Every soul who fastens himself to the divine, everlasting covenant, made and presented to us as a sign and mark of God's government, fastens himself to the golden chain of obedience, every link of which is a promise. He shows that he regards God's Word as above the word of man, God's love as preferable to the love of man. And those who repent of transgression, and return to their loyalty by accepting God's mark, show themselves to be true subjects, ready to do His will, to obey His commandments. *True observance of the Sabbath is the sign of loyalty to God.* MS 63, 1899 (7BC 981; emphasis supplied).

The third angel's message has been sent forth to the world, warning men against receiving the mark of the beast or of his image in their foreheads or in their hands. To receive this mark means to come to the same decision as the beast has done, and to advocate the same ideas, in direct opposition to the Word of God. *Review and Herald*, July 13, 1897 (7BC 979).

In the GC 573 quote on p. 84 we are told that the papacy considers Sunday observance "the sign of her authority"; and in the 7BC 977 quote above we are told that Satan also considers Sunday "the sign of his authority." But in the GC 449 quote above we see that God has declared the *Sabbath* to be "the sign of His authority." And because the Sabbath–Sunday issue will be the great last-day test "in which all the world will act a part" (7BC 977 above), and because it will be impossible to sidestep this issue or hide one's position on it, whichever choice one ultimately makes between Sabbath and Sunday will be (just as it was in the sixth century)⁵³ an unavoidable *public declaration of loyalty to the authority one holds supreme*. And it is man's *loyalty to God* that has *always* been put to the test, though not always in the same way.

Every man has been placed on trial, as were Adam and Eve in Eden. As the tree of knowledge was placed in the midst of the garden of Eden, so the Sabbath command is placed in the midst of the decalogue. In regard to the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the restriction was made, "Ye shall not eat of it, . . . lest ye die" [Gen. 3:3]. Of the Sabbath, God said, Ye shall not defile it, but keep it holy. . . . As the tree of knowledge was the test of Adam's obedience, so the fourth command is the test that God has given to prove the loyalty of all His people. *Review and Herald*, Aug. 30, 1898 (1BC 1106).

With the last-day Sabbath–Sunday issue placed in light of the loyalty issue, we can readily see why Sunday legislation is the great object by which Satan strives to bring the entire world under his banner. His banner? The sign of allegiance to him — *Sunday* observance. But because not everyone in the world will voluntarily come under this banner, Satan resorts to the unsubtle coercion of Sunday legislation to arm-twist as many as possible to bow down and worship him and at the same time dishonor God by trampling on *God's* banner — *Sabbath* observance.

⁵³ Cf. the GC 54–55 quote on p. 90.

All who prove their loyalty to God by observing His law, and refusing to accept a spurious sabbath, will rank under the banner of the Lord God Jehovah, and will receive the seal of the living God. Letter 11, 1890 (7BC 976).

The significance of the end-time Sunday legislation can also be seen in Paul's timeless question of Romans 6:16:

16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

This question highlights the fact that the issue of *authority* goes hand-in-hand with the issue of *loyalty*; and the coming Sunday legislation will serve to force the world's ultimate authority/loyalty showdown as satanically inspired men attempt to subvert God's authority by legislating a law contrary to the unchanging law of God. And while we know what the final outcome of this ultimate spiritual contest will be,⁵⁴ it remains to be seen who will be loyal to whom when the test comes, for when push comes to shove "company after company from the Lord's army" will join "the foe and tribe after tribe from the ranks of the enemy" will unite "with the commandment-keeping people of God" (8T 41). Nevertheless, for anyone with *current* knowledge of these prophetic events to acknowledge God's authority in his life and show his loyalty to Him when in the face of the serpent at the end of time, he must be acknowledging and showing it even *now* in this time of relative ease and prosperity. After all, since when is loyalty occasioned only when it is difficult to do so? Our loyalty to God is *now* being tested, whether it comes easily or otherwise and regardless of circumstances, and it is only the *disloyal* who think obedience to God of little consequence. The last-day test is thus set before us, and in pointed words of stern truth the following well describes the experience of many who fail the test:

How strange it is that the church and the world are joined together in a confederacy to do a work that God has especially prohibited! They disobey the commandments of God with impunity. The prohibition of God in the Garden of Eden was disregarded by Adam and Eve, and the most terrible consequences resulted. *The Lord is placing the same test upon the human family today, and proving them by bringing to their attention the Sabbath, which is a memorial of God's creative power.* In this memorial God testifies to the world and to heavenly intelligences that he made the world in six days, and rested — on the first day? — No, but on the seventh day. The same instruction comes to us today as when the Lord spoke to the children of Israel, saying, "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations."

The Lord sends messengers of truth to the people; but when he brings words of stern truth to bear upon their consciences, there are many who are in no way pleased or grateful. The message of truth disturbs them in their ease-loving service of God, and they do not like the rugged, thorny path that is pointed out to them. They do not wish to separate from the world, to practice self-denial and self-sacrifice, and to attain unto the likeness of Christ. They desire to live at peace, and glorify self, and do not wish to identify their interest with that of Jesus Christ. They count that separation from the pleasures of the world, separation from the world's careless neglect of piety and devotion, is too heavy a cross for them to bear.

In rejection of light the hearts of men are hardened, and they finally unite with the agencies of apostasy in a work of compelling the conscience of those who do not agree with them, in persecuting and putting to death those who love God and keep his commandments. *Signs of the Times*, June 18, 1894 (emphasis supplied).

Daniel 11:31 In Larger Perspective

Now let's look at Daniel 11:31 again, this time applying all that we have learned thus far:

⁵⁴ Cf. the 8T 41–42 quote in Part 1, p. 46.

31 And arms (apostate Protestants) **shall stand on his** (papal Rome’s) **part, and they shall pollute** (by virtue of the “taking away” and “setting up”) **the sanctuary of strength** (the “asylum fortress” of the United States), **and shall take away the daily sacrifice** (they shall politically take away the Sabbath as God’s regular weekly appointment wherein God formally meets with and receives the worship of His church and as Sabbath observance constitutes the sign of the everlasting covenant, the mark of God’s authority, and the seal of God), **and they shall place** (“set up”) **the abomination that maketh desolate** (they shall politically set up Sunday as the papal antichrist’s counterfeit weekly appointment wherein Satan meets with and receives the worship of his church and as Sunday observance constitutes the sign of a counterfeit covenant, the mark of Satan’s authority, and the mark of the beast).⁵⁵

It is interesting how this verse, according to our view, speaks directly to the undoing of the establishment and free-exercise clauses of the first amendment to the United States’ Constitution. That is, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion [*i.e. Congress shall not ‘set up the abomination that maketh desolate’*], or prohibiting the free exercise thereof [*i.e. Congress shall not ‘take away the daily sacrifice’*].” Without applying it to Daniel 11:31, the Spirit of Prophecy speaks of the coming violation of the U.S. Constitution:

By the decree enforcing the institution of the papacy [*i.e. the Sunday law*] in violation of the law of God, our nation will disconnect herself fully from righteousness. When Protestantism shall stretch her hand across the gulf to grasp the hand of the Roman power, . . . our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government, and shall make provision for the propagation of papal falsehoods and delusions, then we may know that the time has come for the marvelous working of Satan and that the end is near. *Testimonies for the Church*, 5:451.

The founders of the nation [*the United States*] wisely sought to guard against the employment of secular power on the part of the church, with its inevitable result—intolerance and persecution. The Constitution provides that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” and that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States.” Only in flagrant violation of these safeguards to the nation’s liberty, can any religious observance be enforced by civil authority. But the inconsistency of such action is no greater than is represented in the symbol [*of Rev. 13:11*]. It is the beast with lamblike horns—in profession pure, gentle, and harmless—that speaks as a dragon. *The Great Controversy*, 442.

In our view, the single event of Daniel 11:31 is the same event that constitutes the making of the image to the beast in Revelation 13:14–15. That is, the *first* beast to which the image is made in Revelation 13 is the authority behind the “abomination of desolation,” and the *second* beast in which the image to the first beast is made in Revelation 13 is the “asylum fortress” in Daniel 11:31—the United States. Thus, the “setting up” of the abomination of desolation in the “asylum fortress” describes the same event as the *making of the image* to the first beast by the second beast. Also, because the first beast to which the image is made is the union of the papal church with the state in the Old World,⁵⁶ and because the United States is composed for the most part of Protestants, it follows that the making of the image to the beast is the union of apostate Protestantism with the state in the United States. And because it is the “arms” of apostate Protestantism in the “asylum fortress” of the United States who “set up” the “abomination that maketh desolate” in Daniel 11:31, it is evident that this, like the making of the image to the beast in Revelation 13, describes the union of apostate Protestantism with the state in the United States.

⁵⁵ For those offended by the bluntness of this interpretation of Dan. 11:31, we will point out that Jesus Himself was at times very blunt in stating truth. “But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men” (Matt. 15:9). “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do” (John 8:44). Jesus was not swayed by political correctness, and God’s people will not be offended when confronted with words of stern truth.

⁵⁶ Cf. *GC* 439.

Our View and the Spirit of Prophecy

To conclude our comments on Daniel 11:31, we will consider this Spirit of Prophecy statement written ten years before the outbreak of World War 1:

We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be *repeated*. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that “shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.” [*Dan. 11:31–36 quoted*].

Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them. Let all read and understand the prophecies of this book, for we are now entering upon the time of trouble spoken of: [*Dan. 12:1–4 quoted*]. Letter 103, 1904 (13MR 394; emphasis supplied).

We noted on p. 33 that we place our present-day location in the chronological sequence of Daniel 11 in the last part of v. 30, and the above statement clearly identifies those events of Daniel 11:30b–36 as having a *future* fulfillment. But while this harmonizes with our view of the chronology of this prophecy, we recognize that God’s end-time messenger places the future fulfillment of vs. 30b–36 in the context of history being “repeated.” Thus it can be understood, as it always has in Adventism, that these verses describe the historic fulfillment of papal supremacy and that this historic fulfillment will merely be *repeated* in the future. This understanding then places our present-day location in the prophecy at some point after v. 36.

Despite the apparent validity of the historic Adventist view of these verses, in our view the history vs. 30b–36 repeat is actually the history vs. 23–24 describe. That is, we see the two periods of papal supremacy as being described separately in Daniel 11 as opposed to being described one time and then given two applications. And as insignificant as this view of Daniel 11 may appear at first glance, we will discover later that it is every bit as significant as our conclusion that Adventism has been entirely wrong on both counts regarding her historic views of the *daily* and that the true view, at its fundamental level, is the view formulated by the Protestant Reformers. We also acknowledge that Ellen White did not understand Daniel 11 the way we do, but we can be sure that God’s last-day messenger would have included her own experience in this observation:

Even the prophets who were favored with the special illumination of the Spirit did not fully comprehend the import of the revelations committed to them. The meaning was to be unfolded from age to age, as the people of God should need the instruction therein contained. *The Great Controversy*, 344.

We indeed apply this observation to Ellen White’s own role as God’s end-time “messenger.”⁵⁷ And in respect to the above statement concerning Daniel 11, the context in which this was written is significant. It was a personal letter to a Brother Craw which began: “I write to ask you if you can

⁵⁷ Said Ellen White: “I am not . . . a prophet. I do not claim to be a leader; I claim to be simply a messenger of God, and that is all I have ever claimed” (5BIO 354). However, in explanation she also wrote, “. . . what I had in mind to say was that *I do not claim* the title of prophet or prophetess” (1SM 35, emphasis supplied). “To claim to be a prophetess is something that I have never done. If others call me by that name, I have no controversy with them” (1SM 34). “My work includes much more than this name signifies. I regard myself as a messenger, entrusted by the Lord with messages for His people” (1SM 36). “I have had no claims to make, only that *I am instructed that I am the Lord’s messenger*; that He called me in my youth to be His messenger, to receive His word, and to give a clear and decided message in the name of the Lord Jesus” (1SM 32; emphasis original). Cf. 5BIO 354–358.

lend me one or two thousand dollars at a low rate of interest”⁵⁸ for the purpose of preparing and publishing manuscripts on Old and New Testament history. After further appeal she brings her letter to conclusion with the quote above: “We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. . . .” Clearly, it was Ellen White’s intent to use Daniel 11 as a means to impress upon Brother Craw the urgency of the hour, and she was *not* expounding on the specific application of the text. Evidence supporting this is in her following statement: “we are now entering upon the time of trouble spoken of” in Daniel 12:1–4. Since the “time of trouble” spoken of follows the standing up of Michael (indicating the close of probation), if we take her statement literally we would have to conclude that probation had at that time already closed. But, of course, we can be sure that this was not the message she intended to convey.⁵⁹ The message she was conveying to Brother Craw was only that time is short and that God’s people need to invest their means in God’s work.

Given the fund-raising context of Ellen White’s letter, we should not make the mistake of giving her statement concerning Daniel 11 more weight than it deserves. In our view, to make this letter an authoritative basis for interpreting Daniel 11 is to misunderstand and misapply the prophetic gift. Nevertheless, we will point out again that though we believe Sister White did not understand the chronological flow of Daniel 11 the way we do, her comments regarding Daniel 11:30b–36 are in perfect harmony with our view of these verses — *i.e.*, “Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place” future to 1904. We also believe that, in accordance with the above *Great Controversy* statement and now well into the 21st century, the time has come that the people of God need the instruction contained in all of Daniel 10–12.

In our view, from Daniel 11:31 onward we are looking at future prophetic events; consequently, we have had to shift our study from the analyzation of historical fulfillment to the anticipation of future fulfillment. As always, this must be done cautiously lest our wrong expectations mislead us.

⁵⁸ Equivalent to \$28,000 and \$56,000 today.

⁵⁹ Ellen White (speaking of herself in the third person): “If you desire to know what the Lord has revealed through her, read her published works” (5T 696). And her published works give the true picture of what is entailed in Dan. 12:1. *E.g.*: “I saw . . . that Michael had not stood up, and that the time of trouble, such as never was, had not yet commenced. The nations are now getting angry, but when our High Priest has finished His work in the sanctuary, He will stand up, put on the garments of vengeance, and then the seven last plagues will be poured out” (EW 36).

APPENDIX A: THE REFORMATION VIEW OF THE “DAILY”

The *SDA Bible Commentary* presents a very enlightening historical sketch of the Reformation view of the *daily* that covers a period of five centuries. Surprisingly, according to this account the Protestant reformers were in almost total agreement on the subject. In order to convey their unanimity a number of segments of this sketch will be quoted here. Please note the repeated references to the “true worship of God.”

V. Five Centuries of Exposition of the “Daily”

Views in Pre-Reformation Days. . . . In the 14th century John Wyclif defined the papacy as the “abomination” that had defiled the sanctuary, or church, and expressly declared that the papal doctrine of transubstantiation and its attendant “heresy about the host” had taken away the “continual.” . . .

Defined by Protestant Reformers. Nicolaus von Amsdorf, first Protestant bishop of Naumburg, close associate of Luther, similarly asserted the “daily” to be the “undefiled preaching of the gospel,” which had been nullified and supplanted by the desolating human traditions of the papal apostasy. At the same time Johann Funck, of Nurnberg . . . who in 1564 dated the 70 weeks from 457 B.C. to A.D. 34, likewise expounded the “daily” as the “true worship” of God.

In the 17th century Anglican bishop George Downham, of England, continued to stress that the pope had taken away the “daily,” which he defined as the “true Doctrine and Worship of God according to his Word.” This desolation, he said, would continue till the close of the 2300 evening-mornings. With this Thomas Beverley . . . was in accord, insisting that the papacy had taken away the “daily Worship of the Saints.”

Among parallel expositors in America, the first two systematic Colonial commentators on Daniel, Ephraim Huit and Thomas Parker, in 1644 and 1646, expounded the “daily” respectively as “the daily worship of God,” and “the daily sacrifice, or true Worship” removed by the papacy.

Counterpart in Counter Reformation. — In the Counter Reformation, after the Council of Trent, both Cardinal Bellarmine (1542–1621) and Blasius Viegas (1554–1599), Portuguese Jesuit, gave as their counter interpretation the view that the abolishing, or taking away, of the “daily” was, instead, the Protestant abrogation of the mass. Cardinal Bellarmine added that an individual Jewish Antichrist, yet to come, would further abolish the daily, or continual, sacrifice of the mass.

Thus Reformation and Counter Reformation spokesmen alike, in charges and countercharges, connected the “daily” with the true and false sacrifice and priesthood of Christ and the true worship of God. The contention of the one was the antithesis of the other, but both identified the “daily” as the worship of God.

Views Persist in 18th Century. — In post-Reformation times Dr. Sayer Rudd, Baptist of Britain (d. 1757), explicitly stated that by the “daily sacrifice” he understood —

“the pure worship of God under the gospel; and by its being *taken away*, the suppression or corruption of that worship, by the antichristian tyranny taking place on the rise of the papal apostacy [sic]” (*An Essay Towards a New Explication of the Doctrines of the Resurrection, Millennium, and Judgment*, p. 14).

In the Methodist movement Jean G. de la Flechere, Wesley’s close associate, asserted that, in taking away the “daily,” the bishop of Rome had “abolished or quite disfigured the true worship of God and Jesus, and cut down the truth to the ground.” And many of these expositors looked for this prophesied perversion to be rectified when the sanctuary would be cleansed at the end of the 2300 year-days. In an anonymous work in 1787, “R. M.” connects the “daily” with the sanctuary in these words:

“The taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of abomination, is the taking away of the true christian [sic] worship, as instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and the setting up of

the doctrines and commandments of men. . . . The daily sacrifice is a Mosaic term for the true worship of God suited to the time in which Daniel lived” (*Observations on Certain Prophecies in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 8, 9).

Hans Wood, of Ireland, one of the earliest to declare the 70 weeks to be the first part of the 2300 days, in 1787 defined the taking away of the “daily” as the substituted innovations in “divine worship” introduced by the papal little horn, and resulting in the “profanation of the temple,” or church. . . .

Views in the 19th-Century Advent Awakening. — In the 19th-century Old World advent awakening, William Cuninghame of Scotland, writing in 1808, observed that Mohammedanism had neither taken away the “daily” nor cast down the place of Christ’s sanctuary, and declared, “the *church of Christ* is the temple, or *sanctuary*; and the worship of this church the *daily sacrifice*.” Commenting on 2 Thess. 2, he added:

“Of this temple, the daily sacrifice is taken away when this form of sound words no longer remains, and when the worship of God, through Christ alone, is corrupted and obscured, by superstitious veneration for the Virgin Mary and the saints, or by any species of creature worship. It then ceases to be the daily sacrifice ordained of God” (*The Christian Observer*, April, 1808, p. 211).

He held that the “*daily sacrifice*” of the “eastern church” was taken away nearly a century before the appearance of Mohammed, that is, in the 6th century, and the abomination of desolation was established through acts of the Roman emperors in establishing the spiritual authority of the papal little horn and the idolatrous veneration of the virgin Mary and the saints.

. . . Capt. Charles D. Maitland, of the Royal Artillery, wrote in 1814:

“The daily sacrifice of spiritual worship was taken out of the Gentile church, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up therein, in the year of our Lord 533. From this period the saints were given into the hands of the Papal power, and permission was granted to that power to exercise dominion and tyrannize over them 1260 years” (*A Brief and Connected View of Prophecy*, p. 27).

Archibald Mason, of Scotland, well-known Presbyterian minister, who in 1820 fixed upon 457 B.C. and A.D. 1843 as the beginning and ending dates of the 2300 years, declared that the daily sacrifice signifies “the instituted worship of God in the church,” and “the desolation and treading down of the sanctuary and the host, means the error, superstition and idolatry, that were established instead of that worship” This, he adds, will end with the expiration of the 2300 years, when the “true worship of God shall be restored.”

Reverse Application Under Manning. — During the 19-century advent awakening another Roman Catholic cardinal, Henry Edward Manning, when asked the question, “What is the taking away of the continual sacrifice of Dan. 8:11–14?” replied that it is the taking away of “the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, . . . the sacrifice of Jesus Himself on Calvary, renewed perpetually and continued for ever in the [Catholic] sacrifice on the altar.” He then charged Protestantism with having taken away the sacrifice of the mass in the West, and called this the forerunner of a futurist Jewish Antichrist, who, just before world’s end, will cause the daily sacrifice of the mass to “cease” altogether for a little time. He chided the various Protestant lands for “suppression” of the “continual sacrifice,” that is, the “rejection of the Mass,” castigating such suppression as the “mark and characteristic of the Protestant Reformation”

Thus, irrespective of opposing views, the issue of the “daily” ever revolved around the sacrifice of Christ and the priesthood and the proper, or true, worship of God.

There was no particular variation from the historic Protestant view among 19th-century North American pre- or non-Millerite expositors. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:60–63 (underlined emphasis supplied).

Thus we have the historic Protestant view, or what we prefer to call the Reformation view. It is interesting that both historic Protestants and historic Catholics concurred that the *daily* refers to the true worship of God; but, of course, they each claimed to possess the form of this “true worship” (the

Catholic form being the “daily sacrifice of the Mass”) and they each charged the other with taking it away.

In our view, the Reformers were fundamentally correct in identifying “the daily” [*hattamid*] as the true worship of God. They at least had a historical basis for identifying the *daily* [as they did] in that they were consistent with the Jewish view of the word. Indeed, they have been consistent with Bible translators who, almost without exception, supply either the word “sacrifice” or the words “burnt offering” following the word *hattamid* in Daniel, and this harkens back to the Jewish view. Of course, the difference between the Jewish view and the Reformation view is that the Jewish view of “sacrifice” was *literal* while the Reformation view was *symbolic*.¹ Thus, the Reformers’ identification of Daniel’s *daily* was not only consistent with the Jewish identification, it was consistent with the fact that apocalyptic prophecy is symbolic in nature, and thus it was consistent with the symbolic application of the 2300 days in year/day time.

Regarding the Reformation view—that the *daily* is the true worship of God by God’s people—we reaffirm our conclusion that their view was correct but only to the extent that they understood that the implied noun “sacrifice” of the Hebrew elliptic “the *tamid*” refers to *worship*, and that in the apocalyptic context of Daniel’s prophecies it refers to the worship offered by the New Testament *Christian* church. What they failed to recognize, however, is that the adjective *tamid* should be translated “regular,” not “daily” or “continual” or “perpetual,” and that this gives Daniel’s *hattamid* the meaning of “the *regular* worship” of God’s New Testament people. They also failed to recognize that there was only a specific element of the implied noun “sacrifice” that was connected with the Hebrew elliptic *hattamid*—*corporate* sacrifices (vs. individual sacrifices).² This, then, gives Daniel’s *hattamid* the meaning of “the regular corporate worship” of God.

¹ For a brief history of the literal and symbolic interpretations of the *daily*, see *SDAE* 367. Also cf. the section “Sacrifice” on pp 44–51.

² Cf. p. 47.

APPENDIX B: THE MILLERITE/ADVENTIST OLD VIEW OF THE “DAILY”

The *SDA Encyclopedia* gives William Miller’s personal account of how he came to his view of the *daily*:

Origin of the “Old” View. The identification of the “daily” as paganism originated with William Miller. Seeking the meaning of the term as he found it in Daniel, he searched, with the aid of a concordance, in the King James Version of the Bible for other occurrences of the English word “daily.” He described his search thus:

I read on and could find no other case in which it was found, but in Daniel. I then took those words which stood in connection with it, “*take away*.” He shall *take away* the daily, “from the time the daily shall be *taken away*,” &c. I read on, and thought I should find no light on the text; finally I came to 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8. “For the mystery of iniquity doth already work, only he who now letteth, will let, until he be *taken out of the way*, and then shall that wicked be revealed,” &c. And when I had come to that text, O, how clear and glorious the truth appeared. There it is! that is “the daily!” Well, now, what does Paul mean by “he who now letteth,” or hindereth? By “the man of sin,” and “the wicked,” Popery is meant. Well, what is it which hinders Popery from being revealed? Why, it is Paganism; well, then “the daily” must mean Paganism” (William Miller, quoted in Apollon Hale, *Second Advent Manual*, p. 66).

Protestants before Miller had applied this text in Thessalonians to the replacing of Roman paganism by apostate Christianity; he now applied it thus: The “daily” (Roman paganism) was taken away and the place of its (pagan) sanctuary (Rome) was cast down, or polluted; and in its place the abomination (the papal system) was set up in the church. Then God’s sanctuary, which was trodden down first by paganism and then by the Papacy, was to be cleansed. *SDA Encyclopedia*, 367 (underlined emphasis supplied).

The comments of the last paragraph here refer primarily to the *daily* of Daniel 8:11–13 and we commented on these verses in chapter 5. Nevertheless, in Miller’s comments above we have the origin and exegetical substance of the paganism view of the *daily*. It cannot be denied that the reasoning here is based on an interpretation of a text (2 Thess. 2:1–8) which is by its own account ambiguous. Because Paul noted (v. 5) that he had previously covered this subject with the Thessalonians previously, what he related in his epistle regarding the “man of sin” was not intended to be comprehensive or even understood by non-Thessalonians; therefore it must be read with a certain amount of reading between the lines; and therefore Miller’s exegesis regarding his identity of the *daily* is anything but conclusive. In fact, Miller based his conclusion on *two major assumptions*, of which he borrowed the first from Protestants preceding him and the second he originated himself: (1) that the *unnamed* entity that is “taken out of the way” in 2 Thessalonians 2:7 is Roman paganism; and (2) that this unnamed entity is *also* the *daily* that is “taken away” in Daniel 8:11, 11:31, 12:11. But Paul does not identify exactly what it is that he says is “taken out of the way,” and, even though he refers to Daniel’s prophecies in characterizing the “man of sin,” there is nothing in 2 Thessalonians 2 that specifically connects Paul’s comments to Daniel’s *daily*. Certainly, we would expect the Lord to provide more substantive evidence upon which to interpret apocalyptic prophecy than the mere inference Miller found in 2 Thessalonians 2:7–8.

Because we find the basis for the paganism view of the *daily* faulty at its very origin, it will now be beholden to us to provide our own interpretation of 2 Thessalonians 2:1–8. We will admit at the onset, however, that Paul’s purposeful ambiguity regarding what is “taken out of the way” *requires* making assumptions on our part. Thus, we do not fault Miller for making assumptions, but only that he, in our view, made the *wrong* assumptions and then used his assumptions to identify Daniel’s *daily*. Let’s consider 2 Thessalonians 2:1–8 for ourselves.

NOW we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him,

2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day* (the second coming of Christ) *shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin (the papacy) be revealed, the son of perdition;

4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.

5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

6 And now ye know what withholdeth²⁷²² that he might be revealed in his time.

7 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth²⁷²² *will let*, until he be taken out of the way.

8 And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:

It is evident that, according to v. 2, Paul is responding to a misunderstanding among the Thessalonians that the second coming of Christ was “at hand.” The “letter” Paul referred to was no doubt his previous epistle of 1 Thessalonians, with 1 Thessalonians 4:15–17 regarding the statement that “we [understood to mean Paul and the believers of his day] which are alive and remain shall be caught up . . . to meet the Lord in the air” being the source of the misunderstanding. Consequently, Paul finds it necessary to clarify himself, and he does so by reminding the Thessalonians that the final events of Daniel’s prophecies must yet be fulfilled before Christ can come again. And what, exactly, were the final events yet to be fulfilled? They were: those events of Daniel 7 associated with the little horn that would “wear out the saints of the most High” for 3½ “times” (v. 25); those events of Daniel 8 associated with the little horn “king of fierce countenance” (v. 23); and, in our view, those events of Daniel 11 associated with the “vile person” (v. 21) and “king” (v. 36).

With the advantage of hindsight in that this prophesied power that was still future in Paul’s day is now in large part history to us, it is easy for us to identify this power as the papacy.¹ But outside any direct divine revelation, Paul knew no more about this power than what Daniel’s prophecies foretold; and because the time element of these prophecies had not yet been revealed, it is doubtful that Paul or any of the other believers in his day had any real concept that the time to the second coming of Christ would actually be measured in millennia. Nevertheless, Paul knew it was not imminent and that prophecy foretold that a new world power would yet manifest itself in the world before Christ’s second coming. And from the information he had in the prophecies, he knew this power would be an apostate *religious* one.

Based on his knowledge of Daniel’s prophecies, Paul describes the coming apostate religious power in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–4. The “falling away” he speaks of in v. 3 refers to the apostasy that would be found among God’s people that was later to be manifested in the form of the Roman Catholic Church; and what this apostate church fell away from was the true and pure faith and practice of the apostolic church. In our view, Paul is not saying in v. 3 that the “man of sin” is to be “revealed” (or “manifested”) *after* the “falling away,” but rather *in conjunction with* it.

In v. 4 Paul is most descriptive: he states that the coming power will “exalt” (or “magnify”) himself above God, even to the point of presenting himself *as* God in fulfillment of Daniel 8:11, 25; 11:36–37. But in v. 5 he abruptly halts his explanation of unfulfilled prophecy, preferring instead to refer the Thessalonians to his previous oral explanation which he had given them when he was with them in person. In v. 6 Paul proceeds with his written explanation, but now under the mutually understood knowledge of his previous oral comments. And why, might we ask, did Paul rely on his

¹ Cf. the GC 355–356 quote on p. 31.

previous statements? Was it because he wanted to save himself the trouble to write out what he had already explained? We think not.

Essential to our understanding of Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2 is understanding what he means by the Greek word translated "withholdeth" and "letteth" (given the identifying number 2722 in *Strong's Concordance*) in vs. 6 and 7. The *SDA Bible Commentary*:

Withholdeth. Gr. *katecho*, "to detain," "to hold back," "to restrain." The phrase is, literally, "the restraining thing," or "the withholding thing," being of neuter gender in the Greek. In v. 7 Paul uses a similar expression, but employs the masculine gender, "the withholding one," or "he who withholds." *SDA Bible Commentary*, 7:271.

Letteth. Gr. *katecho* (see on v. 6). In Old English "let" meant "to restrain." Most commentators agree that the Greek construction calls for the addition of an explanatory phrase such as "will restrain," in order to complete the thought of the sentence. Some believe that the Roman Empire is referred to here as in v. 6; others, that God is the restrainer (see on v. 6). *Ibid.*, 272.

It is important to note that the words "withholdeth" and "letteth" are translated from the same Greek word *katecho*. This indicates that their use refers to the same "holding" or "restraining" process; and it seems clear that the one who "withholds" in v. 6 is the same one who "lets" in v. 7. Coupling this with the understanding that the "he" who is "revealed" in v. 6 is the "man of sin" who is "revealed" in v. 3, it is also clear that the one who "withholds," "withholds" until "that man of sin be revealed" (v. 3), and the one who "lets," "lets" until "that Wicked be revealed" (v. 8). Thus, while the one who "withholds" and the one who "lets" are one and the same power, the "man of sin" and "that Wicked" are also one and the same power. Since we have identified the "man of sin" as the little-horn papacy according to the description of v. 4, we are now left with identifying exactly who the restrainer is who "withholds" and "lets" and whom Paul *avoids* identifying in his letter to the Thessalonians but whom he *did* identify in his previous oral explanation. And it is identifying this "restrainer" that is at the crux of the problem with these verses as this is where we have no recourse but to make an assumption; and this is where the historic Protestants and William Miller assumed paganism as the restraining power.

In identifying who the restrainer is, it will help greatly to determine *how* the "man of sin" would be revealed and *when* he would be revealed. Let's go to *The Great Controversy*:

The apostle Paul warned the church not to look for the coming of Christ in his day. "That day shall not come," he says, "except there come a falling away first, and that *man of sin be revealed*." 2 Thessalonians 2:3. Not till after the great apostasy, and the long period of the reign of the "man of sin," can we look for the advent of our Lord. The "man of sin," which is also styled "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," and "that wicked," represents the papacy, which, as foretold in prophecy, was to maintain its supremacy for 1260 years. This period ended in 1798. The coming of Christ could not take place before that time. Paul covers with his caution the whole of the Christian dispensation down to the year 1798. It is this side of that time that the message of Christ's second coming is to be proclaimed. *The Great Controversy*, 356 (emphasis supplied).

Clearly, the Spirit of Prophecy associates the "revealing" of the "man of sin" with the 1260 years of papal supremacy of A.D. 538–1798 when the true nature of this prophesied power was manifested for all discerning prophecy students to behold. Thus, while the 1260-year prophecy puts the second coming of Christ sometime after the year 1798, it also puts the "taking away" of the "restrainer" sometime before the year 538.²

² There is a Spirit of Prophecy statement that the "mystery of iniquity" is "taken away" at the second coming of Christ: "The mystery of iniquity, which had already begun to work in Paul's day, will continue its work until it be taken out of the way at our Lord's second coming" (*ST*, June 12, 1893, par. 12). However, in our view, just because Ellen White

It seems safe to assume that Paul got his information about the “restrainer” from the same source that he got his information about the “man of sin” — Daniel’s prophecies. Therefore, we would expect the “restraining” power to have been mentioned in Daniel’s prophecies and that this power was the power immediately preceding that of the little-horn papacy. In the prophecy of Daniel 7, the power immediately preceding the little-horn papacy of v. 8 is the fourth beast of v. 7 — imperial Rome. In the prophecy of Daniel 8, the power immediately preceding the papacy is the *first phase* of the little horn that waxed great toward “the pleasant land” of v. 9 — also imperial Rome. And in the prophecy of Daniel 11, the power immediately preceding the “vile person” papacy of v. 21 is the power that superseded the Seleucids and then stood in “the glorious land” of v. 16 — also imperial Rome. It would seem, however, that Paul drew most of his information from Daniel 8. Let’s look at Daniel 8:23–25:

23 And in the latter time of their kingdom (after the time of the divided Greek Empire), **when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.**

24 And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.

25 And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

In our view, Paul understood the “transgressors” of v. 23 to be the Roman Christian apostates who were to form and develop the “mother” of all apostate Christian churches³ — the Roman Catholic Church. And when the papacy was fully developed and mature enough to enter the arena of world politics by superseding the Roman emperors — *i.e.* when “the transgressors are come to the full” — then it would be that “a king of fierce countenance . . . shall stand up.” That is, then it would be that the “man” of “sin” — the “king” of the “transgressors” — would be *revealed* by his *standing up* and publicly manifesting his true nature to all discerning prophecy students by becoming the state-endorsed religion of the Roman Empire.⁴ Thus, because in Paul’s day the true nature of the “man of sin” was not yet evident, but because Paul understood that the “transgressors” of Daniel 8:23 were in his day in the process of coming to the full (as John would later allude to in 1 John 2:18), Paul could say in 2 Thessalonians 2:7 that “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” in the early-stage form of the “transgressors” of Daniel 8:23.

From all of this it is clear that the power that “withholds,” “lets,” and “restrains” in 2 Thessalonians 2:6–7 is the power of *imperial* Rome. That is, as long as the power of imperial Rome maintained primacy, this power could be understood to be detaining or holding back the progress of Daniel’s prophecies. But once the “transgressors” came to the full in the sixth century, then papal Rome would come forward “in his [*predetermined and known-only-to-God*] time” (v. 6). Of course, papal Rome could only be “revealed” (vs. 3, 8) by coming to power *after* imperial Rome was “taken out of the way” (v. 7). And, logically, it was telling the Thessalonians that imperial Rome had to be “taken out of the way” that was precisely what Paul, writing in the first century, did *not* want to say in his letter, else he be accused by the ever-watchful Roman authorities of promoting an insurrection and he, as a Christian leader, inadvertently contribute to Christians throughout the Empire being subjected to yet greater state-sanctioned persecutions. Discretion being the better part of valor, Paul therefore merely referred his Thessalonian readers to his previous explanation of these things when he had explained it to them in a private meeting.

chose to use the expression “taken out of the way” to describe the final destruction of the “mystery of iniquity” (the “mystery of lawlessness” [NKJV]) at the Second Coming, this should not be regarded as an inspired commentary on 2 Thess. 2:7. Actually, in 2 Thess. 2:7 it is the “restrainer” that is taken away, not the “mystery of iniquity.”

³ Cf. Rev. 17:5.

⁴ See our verse comparison of Dan. 8:23–25 and 11:21–24 on p. 9. Also our comments on p. 24.

Now let’s look at 2 Thessalonians 2:1–8 again, this time inserting more between-the-lines comments and substituting the word “restrain/restraineth” for *katecho*:

NOW we beseech you, brethren, by the [second] coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him [when He comes],

2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us [of 1 Thess.], as that the day of Christ is at hand.

3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day* (the second coming of Christ) *shall not come*, except there come a falling away [in the Christian church] first, and that man of sin (the little horn “king of fierce countenance” of Dan. 8:23–25 — the papacy) be revealed (be manifested in the world), **the son of perdition;**

4 Who [according to Daniel’s prophecies will be revealed when he] **opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.**

5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

6 And now ye know what restraineth (what is holding up the fulfillment of Daniel’s prophecies—*i.e.* the fact that imperial Rome remains in power) **that he** (the “man of sin”) **might be revealed in his** [due and foreordained] **time** (the 3½ “times” of Dan. 7:25).

7 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work (the “transgressors” of Dan. 8:23 are already working, though not openly): **only he** (imperial Rome) **who now restraineth will restrain, until he** (imperial Rome) **be taken out of the way.**

8 And then shall that Wicked (the antichrist “man of sin”) be revealed [to discerning prophecy students], **whom the Lord shall [ultimately] consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:**

In v. 8 Paul goes from the “revealing” of “that Wicked” directly to the destruction of the papacy at the second coming of Christ, at which time, according to Paul, the Lord will “consume” and “destroy” the papacy. Daniel 7:26–27 seems to be the source for Paul’s information here, as after Gabriel describes the “revealing” of the little-horn papacy in the 3½ “times” of papal persecution of v. 25 he states:

26 But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his (the papacy’s) dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

27 And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

Obviously, v. 27 describes the ushering in of Christ’s eternal kingdom that begins with the second coming of Christ. And since Paul had no knowledge of John’s prophecies of the Apocalypse that had not yet been given, Paul was not aware that the little-horn power still to reveal itself was also going to receive a deadly wound, then the wound would be healed and he would be “revealed” yet a *second* time before the second coming of Christ.⁵ Therefore, in 2 Thessalonians 2 Paul described the second coming of Christ as occurring immediately after the initial “revealing” of the little-horn power, just as Gabriel described it in Daniel 7. We can also only wonder whether Paul understood the 3½ “times” of Daniel 7:25 as literal time or symbolic time. We suspect he simply didn’t know and thus did not teach either way; but he certainly did not teach the Thessalonians that it was symbolic year/day time.

Getting back to William Miller’s exegesis of the *daily*, his identification of the restraining power of 2 Thessalonians 2 that was “taken away” (paganism) was close in that imperial Rome was a pagan power, as noted under “paganism’s new face” in Part 1, p. 90, the imperial Roman Empire and paganism are by no means synonymous, and paganism survived the passing of imperial Rome. In fact, rather than paganism being *taken away* to make room for the papacy, as we saw in the *GC* 41–

⁵ Cf. Rev. 13:3.

43 and 49–50 quotes in Part 1, p. 89, paganism and apostate Christianity actually *united with each other* to form the papacy and *paganism* “became the *conqueror*” (*GC* 50).⁶ Therefore, Miller’s rationale on this point was faulty as well in that paganism in and of itself was *not* taken away to make room for the papacy; rather, paganism at this time merely “changed faces.”

Also, proponents of the Millerite and Adventist “old view” of the *daily* defend their view by asking: Where did Paul get his “taken away” idea in 2 Thessalonians 2:7 if it was not from the “taking away” of the *daily* in Daniel’s prophecies?⁷ Our answer: Paul was not quoting prophecy when he claimed the restrainer must be “taken away,” he was merely noting that Daniel’s prophecies relate events in chronological sequence and that before the “man of sin” could come to power the preceding and [in Paul’s day] current political power (imperial Rome) had to be taken out of the way. It requires no prophetic revelation to make this observation. And putting Paul’s “taking away” in this context totally disconnects it from the “taking away” that is specifically referred to in Daniel’s prophecies; and this, then, totally negates William Miller’s basis for identifying the *daily* as paganism. Thus, we find Miller’s first assumption regarding 2 Thessalonians 2:7 to be an erroneous one. And understanding that it was specifically imperial Rome that was to be taken away according to 2 Thessalonians 2:7 and not the practice of paganism, we find Miller’s second assumption to also be erroneous as the political power of imperial Rome by itself can in no way be identified as the *daily* of Daniel’s prophecies.⁸

While Miller followed the lead of other Protestants in his day in assuming Roman paganism as the restraining power of 2 Thessalonians 2:7, generally speaking Seventh-day Adventists have not. In fact, the *SDA Bible Commentary* doesn’t even mention paganism per se in its discussion of this verse; it offers but two possibilities for the restraining power that is “taken away”: (1) the imperial Roman Empire; and (2) God.⁹ Therefore, if we no longer accept Miller’s interpretation of 2 Thessalonians 2:7, on what basis can we continue to accept his identification of the *daily*? Now let’s consider more comments from the *SDA Encyclopedia*:

Opposition to Miller’s Interpretation. Miller’s explanation of the “daily” soon drew fire from his opponents on two scores: (1) his chronology and (2) his identification. His chronology was objected to on historical grounds and his identification of the “daily” on exegetical grounds—the latter especially from those who held the literal view that the “daily” and the time periods (1290 and 2300 days) meant literal sacrifices and literal days. *SDA Encyclopedia*, 368.

Miller’s weak exegesis provided the literalists of his day with plenty of ammunition to attack his symbolic view of the *daily*. Nevertheless, while the literalists were correct in finding fault with Miller’s exegetical defense of his symbolic identification of the *daily*, their own literal identification of the *daily*—the Jewish sacrifices—was likewise in error.

Given the manifest lack of biblical exegetical evidence to support the paganism view of the *daily*, it seems strange that this “old view” still survives, albeit in a limited way, in Adventism. And in our view the only reason it survives is because of a sincere but misinformed desire on the part of some to defend the integrity of the Spirit of Prophecy.

Stephen Haskell, for instance, admitted to Willie White (Haskell to White, 6 Dec. 1909) that the “daily” itself did not “amount to a hill of beans”; but he felt compelled to defend it because the authority of the Spirit of Prophecy was at stake. — Dennis Hokama in *Adventist Currents*, vol. 2, 4, 1987 as quoted by Calvin Harkey in *The Loud Cry*, 434.

⁶ Emphasis supplied.

⁷ E.g., Robert Wieland, *Have We Followed “Cunningly Devised Fables”?*, 17.

⁸ Regarding Miller’s assumptions and his basis for identifying the *daily* as paganism, see the *SDAE* 367 quote and our associated comments at the beginning of this appendix.

⁹ See the *7BC* 272 quote on p. 106.

David Lin, among other Adventist old-view proponents, continued to echo Haskell’s sentiments:

We are to test the truthfulness of Ellen White’s words by checking them against the scriptures. That is the way God wants us to deal with every question. He called for a halt to the debate [*concerning the “daily”*] in 1908, but He did not say that we are never to study the tamid [*i.e. the “daily”*]. True, we are not to make it a test question, but today it has become a test of truthfulness of Ellen White’s words. — David Lin in the article “Thoughts on the Tamid” as quoted in *ibid.*, 465–466.

Actually, from the standpoint of old-view proponents the question of the *daily* has essentially *always* been a test of truthfulness of Ellen White’s words; and in Adventism the truthfulness of Ellen White’s words has always been a test question. Thus, generally speaking SDA old-view proponents do not defend the old view itself as much as they defend the Spirit of Prophecy—a noble motivation indeed, but one that is, in our view, misguided. And this speaks directly to the heart of the loggerhead in the Adventist *daily* debate as the identification of the *daily* in no way involves a test of truthfulness of Ellen White. Ellen White, by her own clear admission, never spoke specifically to this subject.¹⁰

¹⁰ Cf. fn. 38 on p. 49, particularly the 1SM 164 quote.

APPENDIX C: THE ADVENTIST NEW VIEW OF THE “DAILY”

Though William Miller concluded in 1836 that the *daily* of Daniel’s prophecies was paganism taken away when pagan imperial Rome was replaced by papal Rome, in 1847 O. R. L. Crosier defined the *daily* as a doctrine—“that Christ was crucified for us”—which was taken away by the papacy “with its human merit, intercessions and institutions in place of Christ’s” (4BC 64). It seems, however, that Crosier stood nearly alone among early Adventist theologians in dissenting with Miller’s view. Joseph Bates had published his position that the *daily* was paganism in 1846; and from 1853 to 1870 J. N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and James White all wrote *Review and Herald* articles taking the same position.¹ Of course, this was the position Smith took in his widely distributed *Daniel and the Revelation*. Now comments from the *SDA Bible Commentary* and the *SDA Encyclopedia*:

The “New View.” — About the end of the century dissatisfaction with Smith’s exposition resulted in the rise of the view that the “daily” meant Christ’s priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, “taken away” by the substitution of an earthly priesthood and sacrifice. This “new view” was advocated by L. R. Conradi in Europe and by A. G. Daniells, W. W. Prescott, W. C. White, and others in America. Thus developed the two Seventh-day Adventist views of the “daily.” *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:65.

About 1900 L. R. Conradi, who soon thereafter became head of the SDA work in Europe, wrote to Mrs. White in Australia, asking her to give him any light she might have on the subject, and if not he would proceed to publish what he and his associates had arrived at. Since she had none, he issued his work on the book of Daniel, in German. . . . Conradi’s work, the first SDA book to offer a substitute for the “daily = paganism” interpretation, was *Die Weissagung Daniels*, which was later translated into several European languages and was recommended in 1905 for circulation in America among foreign-speaking readers. *SDA Encyclopedia*, 370.

This “new view” of the *daily* is now the solidly prevailing view in Adventism. So let’s look more closely at Conradi’s rationale that led him to develop this view.

In a letter to Mrs. White, April 17, 1906 . . . , Conradi recalled how he came to his conclusions that: (1) The word “sanctuary” meant “the sanctuary of God as it was in type on earth, and as it is in antitype now in heaven.” (2) The “daily,” or continual, was the true sanctuary service. (3) The *taking away* of the “daily” was the papal church’s *displacement of* “the true sanctuary service by its own human service,” the mass, setting “aside the true High Priest by placing the pope in His stead.” (4) The prophecy of the cleansing of the sanctuary assured Daniel, at a time when the Jerusalem temple lay in ruins, “that not only would the typical service in the earthly sanctuary be restored, but that there would be a true service in heaven which should be carried on unto the end.” *Ibid.* (emphasis supplied).

Conradi is here referring to the *daily* as it is found in Daniel 8:11–13 as opposed to 11:31 or 12:11. We looked at Daniel 8 ourselves in chapter 5, but now we will comment on each of Conradi’s four points as he presented them to Ellen White.

(1) We readily concur with this point.

(2) Conradi offers no basis for this conclusion as presented here.

(3) Daniel 8:11 specifically states that the *daily* would be “taken away.” Understanding the *daily* as did Conradi in point 2, the literal meaning of this would be that the papacy would take away the true sanctuary service in heaven as it is carried out by Christ our heavenly High Priest; that is, there would no longer be a heavenly ministry. Since this is impossible, Conradi interpreted the “taking away” to mean the “displacement of” Christ’s heavenly ministry by “setting ‘aside the true High

¹ Cf. 4BC 64–65.

Priest by placing the pope in His stead.” It is our view, however, that “taking away” does not mean “displacement of.”

If we take an object away, we remove the object itself from its location. Conradi’s interpretation of Daniel 8:11 understands that the object of the *daily* is not actually “taken away” but rather that the object of a counterfeit *daily* on earth interposes itself between God’s people and the true *daily* in heaven while the true *daily* ever remains securely in its place. No doubt, Conradi would have agreed that the heavenly sanctuary service cannot be literally taken away as we have the significant promise that Christ “ever liveth to make intercession” (Heb. 7:25) for us. But to understand the taking away of the *daily* in either Daniel 8 or Daniel 11–12 to be other than literal is to avoid the plain language of the texts.

While historic Protestants understood the “daily sacrifice” symbolically, they understood its being taken away literally. That is, they understood that the practice of true worship was literally taken away through the influence of the little horn of Daniel 8. Some might now maintain that because the *casting down* of “the place of his [Christ’s] sanctuary” in Daniel 8:11 and the *casting down* of “the truth” in v. 12 are figurative expressions, then we should understand the *taking away* of “the daily” in 8:11, and thus also in 11:31 and 12:11, to also be figurative and that it is not a literal taking away. We set forth our view of Daniel 8:9–14 in chapter 5, but let’s look at vs. 11–12 again, this time focusing on the literal vs. figurative question of the taking away of the *daily*.

11 Yea, he (the Roman little horn) magnified himself even to the prince of the host (Christ), and from [margin] him (Christ) the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his (Christ’s heavenly) sanctuary was cast down.

12 And the host was given over for the transgression against the daily sacrifice [margin], and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced, and prospered.

Regarding v. 12, because “truth” is an abstract it can *only* be *figuratively* “cast down.” Regarding v. 11, the “place of his sanctuary” can be understood literally (the literal place of the heavenly sanctuary in heaven) or figuratively (the figurative place of the heavenly sanctuary in God’s platform of truth in His church on earth), and therefore the casting down of the *place* of this sanctuary could be interpreted in either sense. However, because it is impossible for either the papacy or Satan himself to literally cast down the literal place of the heavenly sanctuary, we can understand the casting down of “the place of his sanctuary” in v. 11 to also *only* be in the *figurative* sense and that this refers to the casting down of the *specific truth about* the sanctuary, just as “the truth” in its broader application in v. 12 is also “cast down.” Therefore, both cases of “casting down” in these verses are in reference to abstract truth being figuratively “cast down.” Now we ask: Is the context of the taking away of the *daily* in v. 11 also in the abstract and figurative?

We have seen that the SDA new view of the *daily* recognizes the *daily* to be Christ’s heavenly ministry performed in the heavenly sanctuary. But understanding the *daily* of the vision of Daniel 8 to be the same *daily* of the vision’s third explanation of chapters 11–12, we will note that the taking away of the *daily* in 12:11 is actually a specific event that begins a definite time period of 1290 days. This being the case, how could the taking away of the heavenly ministry of Christ be abstract and figurative when it occurs at a definite point in time that marks the beginning of a definite prophetic time period?

Because all definite prophetic time periods begin and end at definite points in time that are typically marked by real and literal events, and because Daniel 12:11 depicts the taking away of the *daily* as being one of these events, we *must* understand the taking away of the *daily*, at least in the case of 12:11, to be a real and literal event that occurs at a definite point in time. And while there are Adventist *daily* new-view proponents who cite certain historical events as figuratively taking away the truth and effectiveness of the heavenly ministry of Christ, all such attempts at identifying the *daily* and its being “taken away” in this context are, to us, unconvincing. First, it seems inherently impossible to hold that the *daily* is *figuratively* taken away and at the same time hold that the specific

agent by which this *daily* is taken away is *real and literal*. Second, Adventist new-view proponents, despite repeated attempts, have never been able to identify a specific event in history, occurring at a specific time in history, that has figuratively taken away the heavenly ministry of Christ and that would therefore, according to their view, constitute the taking away of the *daily* in Daniel 12:11.² We will have much more to say about this particular weakness in the Adventist new view of the *daily* later, but now let's look at another portion of the comments on "Daily" from the *SDA Bible Dictionary*:

In ch 11:31 the additional information is given that "the abomination that maketh desolate" is substituted for "the daily." Since "the daily" designates *the divinely ordained system of worship*, the power that removes it stands in opposition to God, and "the abomination that maketh desolate" represents a counterfeit system of worship. *SDA Bible Dictionary*, 258 (emphasis supplied).

Both historic Protestants and all SDA's concur that "the abomination that maketh desolate" is the papacy. Where they differ is in the identity of the *daily* (described above as "the divinely ordained system of worship") which the papal counterfeit system of worship both removes and replaces. The historic Protestants understood the taking away of the *daily* to be the papacy's *real and literal* substitution of the divinely ordained system of worship as it is carried out by *God's people on earth*, while the SDA new-view proponents understand the taking away of the *daily* to be the papacy's *assumed and figurative* substitution of Christ's role as our High Priest in the divinely ordained system of worship as it is carried out by *Christ in heaven*.

(4) We question Conradi's fourth conclusion that the prophecy of the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 gave Daniel "assurance." On the contrary, because Daniel did not understand it, it made him "sick" (v. 27).³ But aside from this, it seems his point "that there would be a true service in heaven which should be carried on unto the end" is contradicted by his points 2 and 3 which state that the true service would be taken away (or "displaced") by the papacy. And as we are told that the papacy will continue unto the end⁴ and that, despite the last-day "cleansing of the sanctuary," the papal deadly wound will be healed and there is coming a second papal supremacy when the "man of sin" will again be revealed, so should we, logically and according to Conradi, understand the true service in heaven to be taken away/displaced unto the end. We must now ask: How can the true service be both "carried on" and "taken away/displaced" simultaneously?

Ignoring the following SDA Encyclopedia's reference to the papacy as the "king of the north,"⁵ we will now note how this source begins its discussion on the *daily*:

DAILY, THE. As used in the prophecy of Daniel, a cryptic term for what was taken away by a power described as "a little horn, which waxed exceeding great" in the vision of Dan 8 and as the "king of the north" in ch 11. In each instance an *apostate form of worship* variously designated "the transgression of desolation" (ch 8:13) or "the abomination that maketh desolate" (chs 11:31; 12:11) is set up in its place. *SDA Encyclopedia*, 366 (emphasis supplied).

Understanding that the terms "little horn," "transgression of desolation," and "abomination that maketh desolate" all designate the power of Rome in one or both of its imperial and papal phases, it is easy enough to understand that the papal phase takes away the *daily* and then places herself in the position the *daily* previously occupied. Understanding these terms to also designate an "apostate form of worship," it is but simple logic to understand that the object the papacy removes and then replaces with herself is the antithesis of the apostate form of worship — *i.e.* the true form of worship. Since

² This point holds equally true as it applies to the Adventist old view of the *daily*.

³ See our comments on Dan. 8:26–27 in Part 1, p. 10.

⁴ Dan. 11:36; 2 Thess. 2:7–8; *GC* 579.

⁵ We wish to ignore this reference because we do not identify the papacy as the "king of the north." Cf. our comments on the three principal characters in Dan. 11 on p. 20.

the papacy as the mother *apostate* church replaces the *daily* with her *apostate* form of worship as it exists only on earth, it is only logical to understand that the *daily* is in fact the *true* form of worship [by God’s *true* church] as it also exists *only on earth*. To be sure, the direct influence of the papacy does not transcend the bounds of this earth.

We repeat, there is no antichrist power on earth that can in any way, shape, or form take away anything God has established in heaven as an essential element in His provision for the atonement for the sins of fallen man. We know God has established His law as eternal; and we are told in Daniel 7:25 that the papal little horn of v. 8 would “intend to change times and law” (NKJV).⁶ The prophecy does not say that the little horn would *in fact* “change times and law,” but that it would “intend to change times and law.” Since it *could not* in fact change God’s times and law it could only make a *pretense* of doing so. But Daniel 8:11, 11:31, and 12:11 do not say that the papacy would “intend” or “think” to take away the *daily*, they respectively state plainly “the *daily* was taken away,” “they . . . shall take away the *daily*,” and “the *daily* shall be taken away.” There is no pretense implied in any case. These prophecies are clearly worded to say that the *daily* would be literally “taken away” *in substance*.

Those who hold that the *tamid* of Daniel refers to the heavenly ministry of Christ often cite Hebrews 7:21–25 as evidence for this. Let’s look at these verses:

21 (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)

22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

23 And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:

24 But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

The reasoning is this: because these verses describe the heavenly priesthood of Christ as being “for ever” and “unchangeable,” and because Christ “continueth ever” and “ever liveth to make intercession,” then the “continual” *tamid* of Daniel’s prophecies can be identified as the continual heavenly ministry of Christ. But these verses could be cited as evidence for just the opposite conclusion. Because Daniel 8:11, 11:31, and 12:11 all plainly tell us that the *tamid* is “taken away” for a period of time, the *tamid* should not be identified as something the book of Hebrews later describes as being “ever” continuous and unceasing.

We will now note that the Reformation view of the *daily* does not have the dichotomy of having to explain how the “true service” can be both “carried on” and “taken away/displaced” simultaneously. With the Reformers’ view there is a clear distinction between the true *heavenly* service and the true *earthly* service. Thus, the true service by Christ in heaven can be carried on continuously while the *daily* — the true form of worship carried out by God’s people on earth — can be literally taken away for as long as and to the degree the papacy is politically influential in the world.

Perhaps it could be argued that William Miller and his followers, prior to the end of the 2300 days in 1844, were at a disadvantage in that the light regarding Christ’s heavenly ministry was not imparted until the end of the 2300 days;⁷ and this would explain why they did not come to the Adventist new view themselves. However, it is interesting to note:

In 1843 a view at variance with Miller’s appeared in the *Midnight Cry* (5:52, 53, Oct. 4, 1843). This view, which was disclaimed in an editor’s note, identified the “daily” as the “continual mediation of Jesus Christ” taken away by the papal little horn, which “cast down the

⁶ KJV: “think to change times and laws.”

⁷ See fn. 15 on p. 78.

place of his gospel sanctuary” when it “cast down the sacraments and gospel truth” and “the true doctrine of the cross of Christ.” *SDA Encyclopedia*, 368.

Here we find the SDA “new view” being suggested by a Millerite (O. R. L. Crosier) a full year *before* the termination of the 2300 days in 1844.⁸ We will also note that, despite the special light regarding the heavenly ministry of Christ given immediately following the termination of the 2300 days when “the place of his [*Christ's*] sanctuary was” no longer figuratively “cast down” (Dan. 8:11), it was still not until the turn of the century over 50 years later that the new view of the *daily* actually entered Adventism. Therefore, because the significant revelation of the sanctuary truth following the Disappointment in 1844 did not present an obvious solution to the identity of the *daily*, perhaps we can conclude that [in respect to the lack of knowledge of Christ's heavenly ministry] the Millerites were not so disadvantaged after all.

⁸ Apparently, Crosier soon changed his view of the *daily*. See again our comments at the beginning of this appendix.

APPENDIX D: THE ADVENTIST VIEW OF EVENTS IN A.D. 538

The historic Adventist view of prophetic events in A.D. 538 was noted in the 4BC 827 and 834 quotes on p. 4. Let's look at one of these again:

The prophetic period of the little horn [of *Dan. 7*] began in A.D. 538, when the Ostrogoths abandoned the siege of Rome, and the bishop of Rome, released from Arian control, was free to exercise the prerogatives of Justinian's decree of 533, and thenceforth to increase the authority of the "Holy See." *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:834.

The idea is that the Ostrogoths were the last of the Arian powers to hold the influence of papal Rome in check; thus, when the Ostrogoths lost their hold on the city of Rome, the papal political authority that Justinian had formally recognized in 533 and the papal supremacy that characterized the Dark Ages began.¹ This view is then supported by understanding that the withdrawal of the Ostrogoths from Rome in 538 constituted the uprooting of the last of the three horns uprooted by the rising papal little horn of Daniel 7:8; thus, the period of unrivaled political supremacy of the little horn can be dated from that point in time. This idea has, in Adventism, been firmly connected to the beginning point of the 1260 years. More comments from the Commentary:

The "little horn" is a symbol of papal Rome. Hence the plucking up of three horns symbolizes the overthrow of three of the barbarian nations. Among the principal obstructions to the rise of papal Rome to political power were the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths. All three were supporters of Arianism, which was the most formidable rival of Catholicism. *Ibid.*, 826.

A review of history is necessary to get the picture. In A.D. 330 the Roman emperor Constantine moved the seat of Roman government from Rome east to the city of Byzantium, calling the rebuilt city Constantinople.² However, when Emperor Theodosius I died in 395 he left the Empire divided, having installed one of his two sons as Emperor of the East and the other Emperor of the West. Thereafter there were two emperors and two capitals; the Eastern (now also called Byzantine) Empire continued all the way to 1453 when it fell to the Turks and the Ottoman Empire, but the Western Empire fell early — in 476 when the Heruli mutinied and took Rome and Italy for themselves.

The Heruli were the first of the barbarian tribes to rule over Rome. They were German auxiliary troops in Rome who mutinied, and in 476 deposed the boy Romulus Augustus, the last emperor of the West. At the head of the Heruli and the other mercenary troops was Odovacar (Odoacer), who made himself king in Rome. Odovacar, an Arian, though tolerant toward the Catholics, was hated by the Italians. At the suggestion of the Emperor Zeno of the Eastern Empire, Theodoric, leader of the Ostrogoths, next invaded Italy. He arrived there in 489, and in 493 secured Odovacar's surrender and soon afterward killed him. *Ibid.*

When Theodoric (474–526) became leader of the Ostrogoths the Ostrogoths were, with the permission of the Eastern emperor Zeno (474–491), dwelling in Thrace³ as Zeno's friendly neighbors and allies; however, they soon revolted over the inadequacy of their territory. To avert war between the Eastern Empire and the Ostrogoths, Zeno suggested that Theodoric march against the Heruli and acquire Italy for the Goths. Theodoric was naturally pleased with the prospect of the Goths gaining all of Italy with the emperor's blessing, and this explains why one Arian nation was willing to

¹ For an explanation of Justinian's decree in 533 and an elaboration on the historic Adventist view of the relationship between the years 533 and 538, see the 4BC 827 quote on p. 4.

² Now Istanbul, Turkey.

³ The area immediately northwest of Constantinople.

destroy another by acting on behalf of the Roman emperor, who himself was ever the staunch proponent of Catholicism.⁴

After Theodoric's victory over the Heruli in 493 the Ostrogoths, having paid the price of war, naturally considered Italy now belong to them outright. However, the Eastern Empire did not renounce its claim as Italy's rightful owner; the Emperor's position, now Anastasius I (491–518), was that the Ostrogoths had won the West back for the Eastern Empire (thereby effectively reuniting the Roman Empire) and that the Goths were merely occupying Italy with the Emperor's permission. And it seems Theodoric acknowledged this arrangement in name, but in practice he clearly held autonomous power. And while the East was glad to be rid of the Heruli at no expense to themselves, as sympathizers with the Church of Rome they had gained little in that Italy had merely exchanged one Arian master for another.

So far as the position of the Roman Church was concerned the arrival of Theodoric marked no change for the better, but merely a change of leaders. Theodoric was as strong an Arian as his predecessor on the throne of Italy. Although he granted toleration to the various religions in his kingdom, the lofty ambitions of the Roman pontiff could not succeed under a system that granted only toleration. *Ibid.*, 826–827.

While Theodoric was tolerant toward Catholics, his tolerance went only as far as the tolerance the Eastern emperor showed Arians. After the Eastern emperor Justin I (518–527) issued an edict in 524 closing Arian churches in Constantinople and dismissing Arian civil servants, Theodoric directed Pope John I to go to Constantinople with the message that Justin must retract his edict and allow forced converts to Catholicism to freely return to Arianism or a like edict would be issued in the West against Catholics.⁵ The Pope spent five months in Constantinople, all the while being treated like he was the apostle Peter reincarnated. He returned to Italy with Justin's concession that the Arians could have their churches back, but nothing more; whereupon the Pope was summarily imprisoned, where he died, probably of starvation. And here we have a prime example of the animosity that existed in the sixth century between Arians and Catholics, and how the political authority of the papacy could not be freely exercised where Arians ruled.

In the meantime the Vandals, led by Gaiseric (Genseric), had settled in North Africa, having taken Carthage in 439. Being fanatically Arian and warlike, they posed a threat to the supremacy of the Catholic Church in the West. They were particularly intolerant toward the Catholics, whom they termed heretics. To help the cause of the Catholics in the West the Emperor Justinian, who ruled the Eastern half of the Roman Empire in Constantinople, dispatched Belisarius, the ablest of his generals. Belisarius completely vanquished the Vandals in 534. *Ibid.*, 827.

The Eastern emperor now was Justinian I (527–565), and the vanquishing of the Vandals in 534 avenged the Vandals vandalizing Rome in 456. And now, according to the historic Adventist view of history, we have two Arian horns down (Heruli and Vandals) with one to go (Ostrogoths).

This victory left the Ostrogoths in Italy as the sole surviving Arian power of significance to hinder the hegemony of the papacy in the West. Having wiped out the Vandals, Belisarius in 534 began his campaign against the Ostrogoths in Italy. Though this campaign lasted for twenty years before the imperial armies emerged completely victorious, *the decisive action occurred early in the campaign*. The Ostrogoths, who had been driven from Rome, returned and laid siege to it in 537. The siege lasted for a full year, but in 538 Justinian landed another army in Italy, and in March the Ostrogoths abandoned the siege. It is true that they re-entered the city for a very brief time in 540, but *their stand was short-lived. Their withdrawal from Rome in 538 marked the real end of Ostrogothic power*, though not of the Ostrogothic nation.

⁴ We noted the difference between Arianism and Catholicism in Part 1, fn. 5 on p. 91.

⁵ Cf. Uriah Smith's account of this in *DR* 126.

Thus was “plucked up” the third of the three horns that stood in the way of the little horn.
Ibid. (emphasis supplied).

We have emphasized two parts of this quote that highlight an aspect of the historic Adventist view of history which we now seriously call into question. In our view, the withdrawal of the Ostrogoths from Rome in 538 did *not* mark the real end of Ostrogothic power. Evidence suggesting this can even be found in the above statement itself: it is said that the Roman campaign against the Ostrogoths lasted 20 years, yet it is claimed that “the decisive action occurred early in the campaign.” We ask: If the action in 538 was decisive, why did it take another *sixteen years* to conclude the campaign? The fact is, the reason the campaign lasted 20 years was because the decisive action did not occur until, as would be expected, *late* in the campaign. Furthermore, what is this business about the Ostrogoths re-entering Rome in 540? Regardless of how long they held the city, if the “real end” of their power came in 538, is it not odd that they were able to succeed in 540 where they failed in 538?⁶ Let’s take a closer look at the historical record.⁷

According to Procopius, Belisarius first captured Sicily, with little resistance, securing it for the Emperor in December 535. He then crossed to the Italian mainland, took Naples, and with 5,000 troops marched to Rome. Procopius describes how, without a fight, the so-called Eternal City came again under Roman control for the first time since the fall of the Western Empire:

And it so happened on that day that at the very same time when Belisarius and the emperor’s army were entering Rome through the gate which they call the Asinarian Gate, the Goths were withdrawing from the city through another gate which bears the name Flaminian; and Rome became subject to the Romans again after a space of sixty years, on the ninth day of the last month, which is called “December” by the Romans, in the eleventh year of the reign of the Emperor Justinian. *History of the Wars*, V. xiv. 14.

It was December 536 — 60 years after the Heruli mutinied against the Romans in 476 and 43 years after the Ostrogoths overthrew the Heruli.

According to Procopius, the Goths immediately assembled their entire available army of 150,000⁸ and, departing from their capital city Ravenna (some 230 miles due north of Rome) under the leadership of their newly chosen king, Vitigis, marched south. Belisarius recruited 20,000 Roman civilians to help defend Rome’s wall, and the siege began on March 1, 537.⁹ Many battles ensued, usually with the Goths coming up on the short end of the stick, and the siege dragged on. In December a three-month truce was called as envoys were sent to Emperor Justinian in Constantinople for the purpose of reaching a negotiated settlement. During this truce the Goths, perhaps overoptimistic that the war would be settled at the bargaining table, not only allowed Rome to be resupplied but allowed a detachment of 2,000 of Belisarius’ horsemen to leave the city. This strategic blunder on the part of the Goths proved to be the decisive factor in the outcome of the siege. The truce began to unravel and Belisarius had his detachment of 2,000 plunder the east-coast cities. When the Goths learned that their beloved city Ravenna was threatened they gave up the siege and hurried to its defense.

⁶ The 540 date is incorrect and misleading: incorrect in that it was actually Dec. 546; misleading in that, as we shall note shortly, there was yet *another* occupation of Rome by the Goths following the “short-lived” one.

⁷ Primary source of our information regarding these events is the Roman historian Procopius — personal advisor and secretary to the Roman general Belisarius who commanded the war against the Ostrogoths. Procopius accompanied Belisarius on his campaign against the Goths, and his *History of the Wars* provides an eyewitness account of the uprooting of the Ostrogothic horn. Secondary sources, particularly helpful when it comes to dates, are Thomas Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, vol. 4: *The Imperial Restoration 535–553* and Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths*.

⁸ *History of the Wars*, V. xvi. 11. Historians say that Procopius is undoubtedly exaggerating here. Other accounts say it was more likely 50,000.

⁹ *Ibid.*, V. xxiv. 31. Other sources say March 2, or merely very early March.

Now it was about the spring equinox, and one year had been spent in the siege and nine days in addition, when the Goths, having burned all their camps, set out at daybreak. *Ibid.*, VI. x. 13.

It was now March 10, 538,¹⁰ and, according to the historic Adventist view of Bible prophecy, the 1260 years of papal supremacy began. But was this break of the siege of Rome the decisive action in the Italian campaign? Did this mark the end of Ostrogothic power and the uprooting of the third horn of Daniel 7:8? Were the Goths never to challenge the authority of the Roman Empire and its favored step-child—the papacy—again?

By May 540 it would have appeared that the answer to these questions was Yes. Another Roman army had arrived, the Goths retreated to Ravenna, and after a siege of the city the Goths surrendered on the condition that Belisarius betray Emperor Justinian by reviving the Western Empire and becoming leader of the Goths himself as the new Emperor of the West. While making no promise that he was accepting this condition of surrender, Belisarius let the Goths believe he was, and the Roman army walked into Ravenna. But once the Goths were securely under his control, Belisarius sent Vittigis as a captive to Constantinople; thus, rather than betraying the Emperor, Belisarius, in effect, betrayed the Goths. And if the story ended here, one might reasonably accept the historic Adventist date of 538 for the “plucking up” of the third of Daniel 7’s horns. But the story does not end here and there were still some fourteen years remaining in the Roman campaign against the Ostrogoths.

Belisarius returned to Constantinople in May of 540. It then happened that Belisarius’ so-called “betrayal” of the Goths, plus incompetent management on the part of the Roman commanders placed in charge of Italy, led in just a year’s time to an organized rebellion by the Goths. Beginning with a force of 1,000 men who had not surrendered the year before, this rebellion grew quickly; and though in 542 the Romans held Rome, Ravenna, and several other principal cities, under the leadership of their new king, Totila, the Goths ruled the countryside.

And since no hostile force was operating against him [*Totila*], he was constantly sending small detachments of the army round about and accomplishing results of great importance. . . . And he himself collected the public taxes and also received the revenues from land instead of those who owned the estates, and in all other matters he conducted himself as having become master of Italy. In consequence of this the Roman soldiers naturally did not receive their customary payments at the times appointed, and the emperor owed them great sums of money. Because of this situation the Italians, on the one hand, having been evicted from their property and finding themselves for the second time in very grave peril, were beginning to feel greatly dejected, while the soldiers, on the other hand, were shewing themselves increasing insubordinate to their commanders, and were glad to remain inside the cities. *Ibid.*, VII. vi. 4–8.

In 543 the Goths set their sights on the cities, first recapturing Naples. When they threatened Rome in 544 Justinian found it necessary to send Belisarius back to Italy for the purpose of subduing the Goths yet again; but due to personal jealousy and distrust, Justinian did not support his general with the resources of the Empire. Belisarius was required to assemble and finance his own army with, in large part, his own means, mustering an inadequate force of just 4,000 men. At this point the Ostrogoths, if they had been dead, were entirely resurrected. Indeed, they were alive and well enough to bring Rome under siege in 545 and for Procopius to record that “Belisarius became alarmed both for Rome and for the whole Roman cause” (*ibid.*, VII. xiii. 13). Clearly, what had been an outright victory for the Romans in 540 was again an all-out conflict, the outcome of which was entirely uncertain.

¹⁰ Some accounts say March 12.

Belisarius' alarm was soon proven justified by the fact that the Goths actually captured Rome in December 546.¹¹ While Totila's possession of Rome was indeed short-lived, his leaving Rome was an entirely voluntary move on his part. Desiring to conquer more Roman strongholds, Totila destroyed some of Rome's fortifications and moved on, literally abandoning the city, leaving not a single soldier or civilian in it. Belisarius took swift advantage of this; two months later he moved in and hastily repaired the fortifications before Totila returned and laid siege to the city yet again, this time failing in the attempt. But even having been repelled from Rome, Totila and the Goths still held an ever-strengthening upper hand. In recording events of 548 Procopius wrote:

At about this point in the war, the barbarians [*Ostrogoths*] became unquestionably masters of the whole West. Thus, though the Romans had been at first decisively victorious in the Gothic war, as I have previously said, the final result for them was that not only had they consumed money and lives in prodigal fashion to no advantage, but they had also lost Italy besides *Ibid.*, VII. xxxii. 1.

Belisarius returned to Constantinople in 549. The historian notes the occasion:

The journey of Belisarius to Byzantium was an inglorious one; for five years he had not disembarked anywhere on the soil of Italy, nor had he succeeded to making a single march there by land, but he had been obliged to conceal himself by flight during this whole time, always sailing without interruption from one fortified coast-town to some other stronghold along the shore. As a result of this the enemy, having now little to fear, had enslaved Rome and everything else, practically speaking. *Ibid.*, VII. xxxv. 1–2.

In the same year that Belisarius returned to Constantinople and primarily due to discontentment among the Imperial soldiers toward Constantinople regarding back arrears, Totila again captured Rome for the Goths. Determined not to embarrass himself with the same mistake he made nearly three years before, this time he stayed. The Imperial cause was now down to but one held fortress in the whole of central Italy. Thomas Hodgkin describes the new state of affairs:

There was no talk now [*on the part of the Ostrogoths*] of destroying, but only of keeping and embellishing Rome. Totila caused abundance of provisions to be brought into the City. The scattered remnants of the Senatorial families were brought back from their Campanian exile and bidden to inhabit their old homes without fear. As many as possible of the buildings which he himself had hewn down and burned with fire were raised up again. And when the Gothic King sat in the podium of the Circus Maximus, dressed in his royal robes, and gave the signal for the charioteers to start from the twelve *ostia*, he doubtless remembered the taunt of the Frankish King, and felt with pardonable triumph that he was now at least undoubted King of Italy. *Italy and Her Invaders*, 4:618.¹²

Totila was now seated in Rome as the virtually unchallenged King of Italy, and it would be apparent to any unbiased observer that Arian resistance to the papacy was as strong now as it ever had been. Totila now took the opportunity he had long waited for: he avenged the Sicilian ingratitude toward Theodoric's long and prosperous reign over Italy and Sicily, shown by their quick capitulation to Belisarius in 535. After all, it was this capitulation fourteen years earlier that gave the Eastern Empire the foothold it needed to press the war to the mainland. Thus, for the whole of the year 550 the Goths plundered Sicily.

¹¹ *History of the Wars*, VII. xx. 16. This, apparently, is what the *SDABC* states occurred in 540 (see the *4BC* 827 quote on p. 117).

¹² Reference to the "taunt" refers to a remark a Frank king made to Totila's recent request for the king's daughter's hand in marriage. According to Hodgkin, "The Frankish King refused the request, saying that that man neither was nor would ever be King of Italy who, having once been in possession of Rome, could not hold it, but destroyed a part of the city and abandoned the rest to his enemies." *Ibid.*, 613.

Since the time the Goths first lost their grip on Italy in the years 536–540, the years 550 and 551 were the pinnacle years of Gothic rule; they possessed Rome and had virtual total sway in Italy except for a few isolated strongholds of Romans. The last part of the year 551, however, brought a change: not only did the Franks claim northern Italy for themselves, but the Eastern Emperor sent Narses as the new Imperial commander-in-chief, along with a large and well-funded army. A decisive naval battle that went against the Goths was the turning point. On June 15, 552 Narses and his army of 20,000 left Ravenna and headed for Rome, and Totila and his army of 15,000 left Rome and went out to meet him, the two coming together 100 miles north of Rome at Taginae.¹³ The armies faced off two bowshots apart, and the words of exhortation of Totila to his men reveal the decisiveness of the hour:

“Fellow-soldiers, I have brought you together here with the purpose of making a final exhortation. For no other admonition will, I believe, be necessary after this battle, but the result will certainly be that *the war will be decided on one day*. For so thoroughly have both we and the Emperor Justinian become exhausted and stripped of all power through being subjected to toils and battles and hardships for an exceedingly long time, and so completely have we found ourselves unable to meet the demands of the war, that, if we shall overcome our opponents in this present engagement, they will be utterly unable to come back in the future, while if we meet with any reverse in this battle, no hope will be left the Goths of renewing the fight, but either side will have in defeat a thoroughly sufficient excuse for inaction. For when men once give up the fight against overwhelming obstacles, they no longer have the courage to return to them, but even when they are perhaps strongly impelled to do so by actual need, their hearts rebel, for the memory of their failure makes their spirit quail. Having heard this, my men, play the brave part with all your might, without holding any fighting power in reserve for some other occasion, and put your whole strength into the struggle without trying to save your bodies for another danger. And let there be on your part no sparing of arms or of horses, for they will never again be useful to you. For fortune, having demolished everything else, has preserved only *the ultimate hope for this day*. . . .” *History of the Wars*, VIII. xxx. 7–12 (emphasis supplied).

Totila correctly declared that the final outcome of this seventeen-year-old war would be decided by the events of the present day. And at the end of the day 6,000 Goths were dead, including Totila, while “great numbers” surrendered, only to be killed later; the rest were put to flight in panic. The garrison of Goths left to guard Rome was no match for the Roman army quick to arrive.

Narses now advanced against the fortress with his whole army in warlike array. But the barbarians became terrified, and, upon receiving pledges for their lives, surrendered both themselves and the fortress with all speed, in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of the Emperor Justinian. Thus Rome was captured for the fifth time during his reign; and Narses immediately sent the keys of its gates to the emperor. *Ibid.*, VIII. xxxiii. 25–27.

At last the contest over Rome was settled once and for all in favor of the Romans. Now let’s recount the five times Rome was captured during this campaign: (1) by the Romans (Belisarius) in December 536;¹⁴ siege by Goths (Vittigis) failed in March 538;¹⁵ (2) by the Goths (Totila) in December 546;¹⁶ (3) by the Romans (Belisarius) in February 547;¹⁷ siege by Goths (Totila) failed, probably May 547;¹⁸ (4) by the Goths (Totila) in January 550;¹⁹ (5) by the Romans (Narses), proba-

¹³ Near modern Gubbio.

¹⁴ Thomas Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, 4:95 and Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 344.

¹⁵ Hodgkin, 143; Wolfram, 345.

¹⁶ Hodgkin, 555; Wolfram, 356.

¹⁷ Hodgkin, 570; Wolfram, 356.

¹⁸ Hodgkin, 577; Wolfram, 357.

¹⁹ Hodgkin, 614–615; Wolfram, 358.

bly July 552.²⁰ There can be no mistake, it was the battle of Taginae in July of 552 and the reclaiming of Rome for the Empire immediately thereafter that was the decisive action of this campaign, and it was *not* the withdrawal of the Goths from their first siege of Rome in 538.

But to complete the history of the Ostrogoths: Those escaping retreated south and chose Teias their new king. The Romans followed and in 553 engaged them near Mt. Vesuvius on the Bay of Naples in yet another significant battle in which the Goths were “knowing well that they were fighting their last battle” (*ibid.*, VIII. xxxv. 32). Again their king was killed, and after a valiant struggle by both sides the Goths finally acknowledged defeat. Yet even then, in the midst of the surrender negotiations 1,000 Goths detached themselves from the main body and departed, paying no heed to the conditions of surrender. And though Procopius considered this the end of the Gothic war and therefore concluded his account of it, the remnant of the Goths continued their resistance until their last fortress fell in 555. And in the manner of speaking of Procopius: so much, then, for the Ostrogoths.

Now returning to our main point: To believe that the breaking of the Ostrogothic siege of Rome in 538 marked the end of Ostrogothic power and the uprooting of the third horn of Daniel 7:8 is to totally ignore the fact of history that the Ostrogoths not merely held Rome under siege on *three separate occasions subsequent to 538* but actually *captured* it on two of these occasions, abandoning it voluntarily the first time and then possessing it the second time for *two and one-half years* (Jan. 550–July 552) — a period that, in our view, was not a “short-lived stand.”²¹ In this light, it is our view that the historic Adventist understanding of what happened in 538 is not all that it is claimed to be in terms of marking the beginning of papal supremacy and the 1260-year prophecy; and it should now not be surprising that there is no Spirit of Prophecy affirmation of this view.

In our view, the final demise of the Ostrogoths was sealed in the battle near Mt. Vesuvius in 553; thus, if we were to put a date to the uprooting of the Ostrogoths we would concur with Uriah Smith and say it was 553.²² However, some could legitimately argue that it was the battle of Taginae in 552 that uprooted the Goths, and others that it was the final defeat of the remnant in 555. Nevertheless, also in our view and in light of Procopius’ historical record, no one could legitimately argue for 538. We also hold that it is flatly incorrect to assume that the beginning of the 1260 years is marked by the uprooting of the third of Daniel 7’s uprooted horns. While the little horn uproots three others, there is nothing in the 1260-year prophecy itself that connects its beginning point to the three uprooted horns.²³

Finally regarding the breaking of the power of the Ostrogoths, the breaking of the siege of Rome in 538 was by no means the significant event in the power struggle for the West between the Eastern Empire and the Ostrogoths, and therefore this event should not be considered prophetically significant. And in our view, this event was picked by our Adventist pioneers as marking the beginning of the 1260 years, not because it had historical or strategic significance in itself, but merely because it came at the prophetically significant time — in 538 exactly 1260 years before the deadly wound was inflicted to papal Rome in 1798. But given the lack of a more satisfactory event from which to date the 1260 years, perhaps this choice by our pioneers is excusable. What is not excusable, however, is the blatant omission by the *SDA Bible Commentary* of any reference to the fact that the Ostrogoths held Rome outright in the years 550–552 — a fact that clearly discredits the position that the year 538 marked the end of Ostrogothic power and Arian opposition to papal political authority.

²⁰ Hodgkin, 733; Wolfram, 359–360. H. H. Milman also concurs with all of these dates in his *Milman’s Gibbon’s Rome*, 4:272–273, with the exception of Totila’s capture of Rome in 550 which Milman puts in 549. According to Wolfram, Totila’s siege extended from “summer 549 to January 16, 550” (*ibid.* 358).

²¹ See again the second 4BC 827 quote on p. 117.

²² Cf. *DR* 128.

²³ For the three characteristics of the period of papal supremacy which we have identified, cf. our comments on p. 89.

Furthermore, if it is argued that it is the *beginning* of the Ostrogothic defeat in Italy from which the 1260 years are to be reckoned, it is clear that it is the date the Ostrogoths were initially driven *out* of Rome—December 536—that is the significant date, and it is not when they were merely forced to abandon their first siege in March 538. We ask: What influence did the Ostrogoths have over Rome and the papacy when they were outside the city and trying unsuccessfully to get in? It was when they were *driven out of Rome* in 536 that marked the *beginning* of the end of Ostrogothic political control over the papacy, and it was their unconditional *surrender of Rome* in 552 that marked the *end* of their political control over the papacy. In our view, the abandonment of the siege of Rome in 538 is not relevant in either case.