

THE “DAILY”

Engel Yoder
eryoder1@lrmutual.com
May 2019

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 Dan 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 Dan 8, and this indicates that *hattamid* is itself a sanctuary related term. This relationship is further affirmed by the way the OT 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

¹ Dan 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11.

² All underlined emphasis throughout is supplied.

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

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.

Given these connections between the Hebrew word *tamid* and the OT 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 OT sanctuary.

The genesis of the OT sanctuary is found in Ex 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

⁴ All Scripture 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.

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 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 Dan 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 OT 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 Dan 8:19; 11:27, 29, 35 and “time” and “times” in 12:7.¹⁰ Therefore, we could understand that the OT 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 Dan 11:28–35:

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 Pet 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*.

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 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 Dan 12 we can safely bring the underlying context of Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 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.

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

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 Dan 8, we are told that some type of “transgression” is involved “to oppose *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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Deut 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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 8:13:

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.”

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 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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 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 NT theologian in 2 Thess 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 Dan 8, and it parallels the replacement of *hattamid* with "the abomination of desolation" in Dan 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 Dan 7 equates with the transgression against God's law-covenant by the little horn in Dan 8 that takes away *hattamid*. And we again see how this

¹⁴ *Truth and Terror*, 483 (larger quote on p. 6).

action of the little horn in Dan 7 accords with our observation that *hattamid* in Dan 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 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: – *always (-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 elliptical “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 Dan 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 under-

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).

stood to mean *perpetually periodic* or *regularly recurring*. This understanding of *tamid* connects *hattamid* with Dan 7:25 at yet another point. Let's look at Dan 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 *zimmīn*, 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 Dan 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 Dan 7 with the “regular” aspect of Daniel's *hattamid*.

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 show-bread (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 Num 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 Dan 8 lends a degree of credibil-

¹⁶ See his *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*, 122 quote on p. 6.

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.

ity 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:

. . . (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

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.

²³ Dan 12:11 (quoted on p. 4).

²⁴ *PFF* 1:752.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:773.

“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 Thess 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 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,

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.

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.

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 OT 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 OT 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"

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 *ABC* 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.

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. *ABC* 63 (ellipsis original; larger quote in Appendix A).

³¹ Cf. pp. 1–2.

basis. The OT 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 OT 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 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 Chron 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 [tamid] 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

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.*

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

³⁶ Also 2 Chron 8:12–13.

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, Dan 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 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. 1, the section of the Mishnah that describes how the morning and evening sacrifices were carried out is entitled simply *Tamid*.³⁸

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 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 “sacri-

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 Dan 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 Heb 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 OT 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*

“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 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.”

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 (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*.

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.

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. 38).

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 Pet 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 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 OT 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 Chron 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.

⁴⁴ 4BC 60–65. Cf. fn. 29 on p. 12.

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

⁴⁶ Also cf. 1 Pet 2:9; Rev 1:6.

⁴⁷ For greater context, cf. the quote of 1 Chron 23:27–31 on p. 13.

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.

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

⁴⁸ Also cf. *PP* 353–354.

⁴⁹ Also cf. *1T* 547; *2T* 701.

⁵⁰ Cf. the *SDAE* 369 quote in fn. 42 on p. 14. Also the *1SM* 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.

While Proebstle sets forth nine characteristics of the use of the term *hattamid* in Dan 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 are just two examples of this. And while his first consideration has been noted by other Bible scholars,⁵⁴ his observation regarding Dan 6 is quite unique.

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).

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. 5. See also LaRondelle’s *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible* 66–67 quote on p. 7. 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.

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 Dan 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 Dan 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 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 Dan 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 Dan 8’s little horn).

Though the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew word *tamid* (*t^ediyra*) is not employed elliptically in Dan 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 Dan 6, then, is itself suffi-

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

⁵⁶ *Truth and Terror*, 220.

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

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).

cient to equate the universal attack on *hattamid* in Dan 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 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 Dan 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 Dan 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 NT counterpart to the OT 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. 1–2, 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 Dan 8, (2) the Hebrew word *tamid* is frequently connected with the OT 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 Dan 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11, since its location in each prophecy puts it chronologically far into the NT 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 OT *Tamid*.

As noted on pp. 2–3, 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. 3, the OT 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 Heb 8 and 9. Consider Heb 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 Dan 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 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 OT *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 NT *Tamid* “spiritual sacrifices” would be offered from the beginning of the NT dispensation and that they would continue to be offered throughout the antitypical Day of Atonement as well.

⁵⁹ Cf. again the quote of 1 Chron 23:30–31 on p. 17.

⁶⁰ Lev 16; Heb 9:6–7, 25.

⁶¹ Also cf. *EW* 254–255.

⁶² Num 29:11.

Also, the NT *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 Dan 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 OT 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 OT *regular* sacrifices were *corporate* sacrifices. We have concluded that the NT equivalent of the OT 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* NT 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 NT people on a *divinely appointed regularly recurring* basis.

We will also recall that while the OT *Tamid* sacrifice was offered twice daily, it burned perpetually, signifying God's perpetual presence. In the same way, while the NT "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.

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

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. 20.

⁶⁴ Cf. *PP* 353–354.

⁶⁵ See again the *SDABD* 963 quote on p. 13.

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 OT 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:

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.

⁶⁶ Gen 2:1–3.

⁶⁷ Cf. fn. 10 on p. 3.

⁶⁸ Ex 3:2.

⁶⁹ Ex 33:18–23; 34:5–8.

⁷⁰ Ex 29:43 (quoted on p. 2).

⁷¹ Also cf. 1 Cor 6:19–20.

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

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 Rev 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 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:

⁷³ Larger quote on p. 25.

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. 25.

⁷⁷ Cf. Gen 4:1–15.

⁷⁸ Cf. Rev 13:17.

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.”

While much should be said regarding the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, we will focus here on just this “cleansing’s” connection with *hattamid*. It seems that the questioner of Dan 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. 25, 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 Dan 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. 18 but it warrants a second look:

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*

⁷⁹ Proebstle addresses the implications in the question “How long?” of Dan 8:13 in his *Truth and Terror* 483 quote on p. 6.

⁸⁰ Cf. the account in *SDAE* 412–413.

⁸¹ Cf. *EW* 254–256; *GC* 434–435.

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 by means of being represented there by their heavenly High Priest.

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 Ex 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. 1–8, 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 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*

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

⁸³ Cf. again the 6*T* 353–354 quote on p. 24.

⁸⁴ Cf. our comments and fn. 11 on p. 3.

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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 3, it seems it could just as well be likened to the golden calf of Ex 32:

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. . . .

⁸⁵ Cf. again the 6T 350 quote on p. 7.

⁸⁶ *Andrews Study Bible* quote above.

⁸⁷ Cf. again our quote of Dan 12:9–10 on p. 4. 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 subsequent explanations.

⁸⁸ Cf. our comments and related quotes on p. 5.

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

. . .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 Dan 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 Dan 11:31 and 12:11, and it constitutes the replacement of the “transgression of desolation” for *hattamid* in Dan 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 harkens 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 Dan 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. 27–28, the 2300 days of Dan 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. 17, 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 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).

⁹⁰ Regarding the replacement of *hattamid* with the abomination/transgression, cf. again fn. 54 on p. 19.

⁹¹ Cf. the quote of Dan 8:12 on p. 14.

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 Rev 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*, Rev 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 Rev 14:7 with Satan’s last-day universal *coercion to worship him* in Rev 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 *vital* relevance to God’s remnant people. This can be said despite counsel inferring that the *daily* is “a

⁹² See the 4BC 62 quote on p. 27.

⁹³ See the SDABD 258 quote on p. 28.

⁹⁴ Also cf. Rev 13:4, 8, 12.

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 Ex 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

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. 19).

⁹⁷ Cf. p. 2.

⁹⁸ Cf. p. 3.

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. 25).

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

principal witness to the world that the gospel of Christ is genuine and true: “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” (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 Heb 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 Heb 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 Dan 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 Dan 8, it will also be accomplished in the future by the second beast of Rev 13 speaking as a dragon.¹⁰⁵ Of course, this is entirely consistent with SDA eschatology.¹⁰⁶

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

¹⁰² See again Dr. Kline’s quote on p. 5.

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

¹⁰⁴ See again our quote of Dan 11:32 on p. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Rev 13:11–18.

¹⁰⁶ GC 442; 5T 451.

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. 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 our study of Daniel's "daily," 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 Isa 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 Dan 8:11–13; 11:31; 12:11—Daniel's *hattamid*.

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).

¹⁰⁸ Gen 2:2–3.

¹⁰⁹ For the source of the terminology "the epitome of the cult," see fn. 53 on p. 19.

¹¹⁰ Quoted on p. 17.

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 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.

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, of the “daily.” 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 NT *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 NT 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 9–16.

² Cf. p. 13.

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 Apollos 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).

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 Thess 2:7 is Roman paganism; and (2) that this unnamed entity is *also* the *daily* that is “taken away” in Dan 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 Thess 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 Thess 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 Thess 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 Thess 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 Thess, with 1 Thess 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 Dan 7 associated with the little horn that would “wear out the saints of the most High” for 3½ “times” (v. 25); those events of Dan 8 associated with the little horn “king of fierce countenance” (v. 23); and, in our view, those events of Dan 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 Thess 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 Dan 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. GC 355–356.

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 Thess 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

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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 8. Let’s look at Dan 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. 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 Dan 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 Thess 2:7 that “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” in the early-stage form of the “transgressors” of Dan 8:23.

From all of this it is clear that the power that “withholds,” “lets,” and “restrains” in 2 Thess 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

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 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.

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.

Now let’s look at 2 Thess 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.⁴ Therefore, in 2 Thess 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 Dan 7. We can also only wonder whether Paul understood the 3½ “times”

⁴ Cf. Rev 13:3.

of Dan 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 Thess 2 that was "taken away" (paganism) was close in that imperial Rome was a pagan power, 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, paganism and apostate Christianity actually *united with each other* to form the papacy and "Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the *conqueror*" (GC 50).⁵ 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 Thess 2:7 if it was not from the "taking away" of the *daily* in Daniel's prophecies?⁶ 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 Thess 2:7 to be an erroneous one. And understanding that it was specifically imperial Rome that was to be taken away according to 2 Thess 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.⁷

While Miller followed the lead of other Protestants in his day in assuming Roman paganism as the restraining power of 2 Thess 2:7, generally speaking SDAs 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.⁸ Therefore, if we no longer accept Miller's interpretation of 2 Thess 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

⁵ Emphasis supplied.

⁶ E.g., Robert Wieland, *Have We Followed "Cunningly Devised Fables"?*, 17.

⁷ 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.

⁸ See the *7BC* 272 quote on p. 40.

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.

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.⁹ But, of course, we see the fundamental problem in the apparent impasse in the century-long Adventist old-view/new-view debate as involving much more than the question of what Ellen White said on the subject. In our view, the most basic problem is simply that both views are wrong.

⁹ Cf. fn. 38 on pp. 14–15, particularly the *ISM* 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).

We will now 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 Dan 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 Dan 8 or Dan 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 Dan 8. Some might now maintain that because the *casting down* of “the place of his [*Christ’s*] sanctuary” in Dan 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 to also be figurative and that it is not a literal taking away. Let’s focus on the literal vs. figurative question of the taking away of the *daily* as it applies to Dan 8:11–12:

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 Dan 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 Dan 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 Dan 12:11.² Now 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 Dan 8:14 gave Daniel “assurance.” On the contrary, because Daniel did not understand it, it made him “sick” (v. 27). 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 end³ 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?

We will now note how the *SDA Encyclopedia* 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 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

² This point holds equally true as it applies to the Adventist old view of the *daily*.

³ Dan 11:36; 2 Thess 2:7–8; *GC* 579.

[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 Dan 7:25 that the papal little horn of v. 8 would “intend to change times and law” (NKJV).⁴ 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 Dan 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 Heb 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 Dan 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; 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 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.

⁴ KJV: “think to change times and laws.”

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 1844.⁵ 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.

⁵ Apparently, Crosier soon changed his view of the *daily*. See again our comments at the beginning of this appendix.