

## **Exploring Revelation 18b:**

### **Time No Longer**

THE ANGEL OF TIME!

The key to the Great Disappointment of 1844!

How False Prophetic interpretation has Blurred the Advent Message!

### **Thoughts On The 'Tamid' [Daily in Daniel]**

By David Linn

Cornerstone News Mar 2011

Laws Changed? The fact is, God's times and laws have never been changed. No matter how powerful he may be in his own sight and in the eyes of his admirers, this apostate majesty, the Roman pontiff is just going through the senseless motions of a big farce. But God never speaks of a farce as fact. The papacy can make the boastful claim of having changed the Sabbath, and millions of Catholics and Protestants may faithfully keep Sunday as the "Christian Sabbath," but as far as God is concerned, it is a bogus Sabbath; His true Sabbath remains in full force.

[The same principle applies in the matter of Christ's work as our Mediator in heaven. It has never been 'taken away', because no earthly power can possibly take it away. The Eucharist, the confessional and the worship of Mary are all farces. The continual ministry of Christ has always been highly effectual through all ages for millions of true saints of God. The fact that Catholic devotees attend Mass, confess their sins to their priests, and pray to Mary cannot take away Christ's ministry any more than Sunday can supplant the Sabbath. The Pope may speak great words against the most High and claim to have changed the Sabbath and publish books [such as Jesuits counterfeiting D.A., G.C., etc in China] citing historical evidence that the Sabbath has been changed to Sunday, but let not the people of God say so! Neither let them say that the pope has "taken away" the ministry of Christ. Rather, we should tell the world that the Sabbath of God has never been changed and the ministry of Christ in heaven has never been "taken away". Said our Lord, "Every plant, which My Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." Let's begin today to root them up from our thinking and our preaching.]

In the first decade of the 20th century, the Advent movement was threatened with rupture over the topic of the "daily" (An English rendering of the Hebrew word tamid in Daniel.)

Arthur White's *Elmshaven Years*, chapter 19, gives an account of the issues involved and Ellen White's attitude toward them. The main impression one gathers from it is that the topic is not a vital issue and should no longer be debated under the circumstances prevailing at that time. Open discussion on it in the *Review* ceased, but Bible teachers in our schools continued to teach what they held to be correct.

Today, the majority of Adventist interpreters hold to the "new" view as we commonly call it, although it is historically older than the view held by William Miller, Uriah Smith and others. That the "daily" question is a minor one, we agree, yet it is unavoidable that many Bible students will be deciding upon its meaning. And since a difference of opinion will not now cause such strong feelings as it did 75 years ago, it would not be out of order to express a few thoughts on it.

On page 256f of the book mentioned above, A. G. Daniels reports an interview with Ellen White on what she wrote in *Early Writings* 74f, as it says: "The Lord revealed to her, she said, that the view that had been held

and presented regarding the dates was correct, and that there must never be another time set, nor another time message. I then asked her to tell what had been revealed to her about the rest of the 'daily' – the Prince, the host, the taking away of the 'daily' and the casting down of the sanctuary. She replied that these features were not placed before her in vision as the time-part was. She would not be led out to make an explanation of those points of prophecy."

Before proceeding with a discussion of the "daily" we should pause here to observe how Ellen White was consistently honest in matters relating to her work as the 'Lord's messenger.' She never affected to know more than she did. On the "daily," she did not fall back on Uriah Smith or any other writer whom she is alleged to have depended on for her doctrinal teachings. Nor did she pose as an authority on doctrinal questions. We need to point this out to help every honest reader to gain a fair and objective answer to the question: Was Ellen White a fraud? Did she rely on Smith for her interpretations on Daniel?

If so, here was a test. She could have easily settled the question by saying, "I once saw an angel stand by Uriah Smith when he wrote his book, and the Lord affirmed in 1850 that his view on the "daily" was correct." That would have been the simplest way to end the debate if she had intended to deceive. For the one thought paramount in a religious cheat in every crisis is: How can I uphold my assumed supernatural authority? The last thing to do would be to say that she had no light on this point. Especially when S. N. Haskell had said so many flattering things about guarding "the integrity of the testimonies and loyalty to the Spirit of Prophecy." Instead, Ellen White wrote: "I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question; for I have had no instruction on the point under discussion, and I see no need for the controversy. Regarding this matter under present conditions, silence is eloquence." Ms 11,1910. (Quoted by A. L. White, op. cit., p.258.

Now compare this portrait of Ellen White with the picture painted by Walter Rea and company who have resorted to every means to put her in the worst possible light. Such silly questions as "Why does she do her writing in the early morning hours?" and scores of similar insinuations 'aimed at 'sowing seeds of 'doubt and suspicion into the hearts of the gullible.

The passage quoted above testifies to the fact that Ellen White was as honest and as humble a woman as ever walked on the face of the earth, and no amount of smearing by Walter Rea or any other traitor can change that fact. God has placed His signet of approval on these writings, and every true child of God will recognize it. The charge that Ellen White copied her material on the sanctuary from Uriah Smith is countered by the fact that she wrote the chapter "The sanctuary" in Early Writings, page 250-253 about twenty years before Uriah Smith published his book on Daniel and Revelation.

So it is closer to the truth to state that he drew on Ellen, light for some of the contents of his book. Today, we can have a better perspective of the "daily" issue, and can see that Ellen White took the right position - and requiring more than human wisdom. We see her doing the work of a wise counselor - not of a deceiver. Every one who doubts her honesty can ask this question: In such a crisis, what would have been the natural course for a deceiver to follow?

If she was scheming for a place of influence in the church, here was an excellent opportunity for her to draw to herself a group of supporters to overthrow those who doubted her written testimony. An open-minded observer can see by the way she handled the situation that Ellen White was not only an honest woman, but also an unselfish character who had the cause of God at heart.

Every time we study her writings, we should note the nobility of soul that shines from every page. The consistency and urgency of her words will, in themselves, convince us this writer is true.

WISE COUNSEL: Returning to the topic of the tamid, we ask, What did Ellen White mean when she said, "I have no instruction on the lint under discussion?" Did she mean to deny what she wrote in EW74f? As far as we know, she never denied anything she had written as a message from God. So these words should not be taken as detracting from the force of the testimony in EW 74f. What she meant here was that no light had been given with regard to the details not stated in that particular testimony.

To fully grasp the intent of these words, let us first review a delicate situation Ellen White found herself in. A single word in Daniel was the focus of attention, and a testimony she had written sixty years earlier was being used by one group of church leaders to oppose another group, among whom were the president, president and secretary of the General Conference. She herself enjoyed the respect and confidence of both sides.

There were two courses open to her. She could affirm the correctness of Haskell et al. who upheld the authority of her testimonies or she could remain neutral and entreat all to devote their attention to more urgent tasks. The Lord led her to take the second course. And we believe it was, indeed, the Lord who led her. A short-sighted human being would have taken the first course, for that would have halted the discussions most effectively. It would also have boosted the authority of Ellen White. This experience not only showed that she was a self-possessed woman not easily swayed by men of strong minds but more important than that, it preserved church unity and kept the door open for free investigation of the true meaning of the "daily."

If she had committed herself against the new view, it would have dealt a serious blow to the church leaders who held that view. They would have lost, to a considerable degree, the confidence of our people and the cause as a whole would have suffered.

Another question remains to be answered: What about Haskell's honest concern about the integrity of the Spirit of Prophecy? Why did not Ellen White give her approval to this apparently well-made point? Was she ready to lower her flag? To let Haskell down and suffer new-view advocates to brush aside her written testimony? That's the conclusion some have drawn from her words. But it is a wrong conclusion. She did not want people to use that testimony to settle the "daily" controversy. Not because it has nothing to contribute to an understanding of the "daily," but because God wanted people to use their heads and dig the evidence out from the Bible.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON: The only plausible argument the new-view advocates put forth is based on a linguistic study of tamid in its uses in connection with daily services in the sanctuary. But the fact that it is also used in other places not in connection with the sanctuary, but connection with evil forces, should receive equal attention. Such a balanced picture helps us to see that the linguistic argument is not conclusive.

The following arguments help us to see that the tamid in Daniel cannot refer to the continual ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. With the new view, the 1290 and 1335 days have no meaning and contribute nothing to corroborate other time prophecies.

Thus, God is made to appear as mocking us by the words: "Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the 1335 days." When taken together, these two time periods point to AD 508 as the only rational date for the taking away of the tamid.

Since no definite event is given as the terminus of the 1290 days, we have no choice but to understand that they terminate in the same year as the 1260 days – in AD 1798, and therefore must begin in AD 508. Since the first of the two events mentioned in Daniel 12:11 commenced in AD 508, and no starting point is given for the 1335 days, there is no alternative but to begin this period also in AD 508 - thus bringing us up to 1843.

Now apply these dates to the new view. Is there any way to pin down the beginning of the "taking away" of Christ's mediatorial work in AD. 508?

No matter what you choose - the Eucharist, the confessional or the worship of the virgin Mary as the "supplanter" of the tamid, there is no feasible way to fix the date for it anywhere near AD 508. That is why proponents of the new view must ignore these two time periods. Yet their very sidestepping exposes a serious weakness in their interpretation.

Secondly, the wording of Daniel 7:25 furnishes indirect proof, that the tamid in Daniel cannot refer to the continual ministry of Christ in heaven. Note that Daniel 7:25 reveals the words of the same angel who spoke the lines in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11. Notice also his insertion of the word "think" in Daniel 7:25. Here the little horn "shall speak great words against the most High (a fact) and shall wear out the saints of the most High (which is also a fact)."

But when the angel comes to the changing of times and laws, he does not say, "He shall change times and laws." Why? Because it is not a fact. The fact is, God's times and laws have never been changed. And no earthly power can possibly change them. This wicked power mentioned in Daniel only imagined he could change them. So the angel chose the right word: "and think to change times and laws."

Read the paragraph on page one again. Our main point is this: If the angel speaking in Daniel 8:31 was referring to the papal power "taking away" the continual ministry of Christ, he would not have spoken of it as a fact, but as an unsuccessful attempt. He would not have said, "and shall take away the daily," but rather, "and think to take away the daily. For this angel sent from God is very careful in his choice of words.

At this point we might inject this thought: Why did Ellen White write in EW 74 that the word sacrifice was supplied by human wisdom? The inference is that this word is an erroneous insertion and that the tamid does not refer to the daily sacrifice. Yet the new view had no objections to this supplied word, for the continual ministry of Christ was symbolized in the daily sacrifice. Might we not gather from this that the new view is also a product of human wisdom?

**SIGNIFICANCE AND RELEVANCY:** Advocates of the new view have stressed its significance and relevancy with respect to the sanctuary doctrine as far outweighing that of the old view. They claim William Miller had not have the true light on the cleansing of the sanctuary and therefore did not see its connection with the tamid.

We grant that the new view is quite attractive, and this is the only argument that carries any weight. But when the Bible [provides the exact meaning] the question of continual relevancy must occupy a secondary place. If an accurate exegesis is that the tamid cannot be interpreted as referring to the continual ministry of Christ, then no matter how significant relevant such a view may appear to be, it cannot be the correct one.

Furthermore, after ascertaining the correct referent of the tamid, we shall find its significance and relevancy is fully equal to that of the new view, if not more so. R.J. Wieland, in his outline pamphlet, "Have We Followed Cunningly Devised Fables?" calls our attention to the fact that "take away" in Daniel 8:11 is *rum*, but in Daniel 11:31 and 12-11, it is *sur*, which word does mean to "take away." But *rum* the sense of "take up." Thus, these words used in connection with the tamid bring out the two significant changes which took place when the papal abomination replaced the pagan one. The *rum* in Daniel 8:11 stresses that the papacy "took up" all the pagan abominations by incorporating them into the papal system. Thus *sur*, on the other hand, points to 2 Thessalonians 2:7 where Paul speaks of a restraining power that was to be "taken out of the way." Thus the *rum* and the *sur* of the tamid bespeak a double significance. And though not directly related to Christ's

continual ministry, are nonetheless highly relevant to the calculable time period and also to an important New Testament writing.

These two points comprise the true relevancy, for the angel says that the taking away of the tamid is connected with the days. The old view takes this into account, whereas the new ignores it. Moreover, the new view sees no great significance in the difference between rum and sur. So in the last analysis, the old view has true contextual relevancy while the new view ignores the context and so has a false relevancy.

See Wieland's Dec 09. To develop the idea of paganism being "taken up" (absorbed) by the papal teachings and practices, RJ. Wieland cites a passage from *The History of the World*, 617: "The more Christianity supplanted the heathen worship, the more it did absorb the elements of paganism."

He also quotes the following lines from GC 49: "The work of corruption rapidly progressed. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ."

Paganism had "given place" to the papacy. Wieland advances many other arguments in support of the old view, and his paper canvasses the problem in a more scholarly manner than any new view exegete can possibly attempt to do, for the simple reason that the new view can find little support in a thorough-going exegetical study. Its ignoring the uses of rum and sur, as well as its inability to give any significance to the 1290 and 1335 days, are but two of several indications of the vulnerability of the new view.

EXALTATION OF HA TAMID: While Wieland's observation regarding the "taking up" (incorporating) of pagan abominations by the papacy is historically true, it still should be pointed out that this is not the exact meaning of rum. The seven instances of this word being translated "take up" really means to "lift up," such as in Joshua 4:5, where Joshua instructed the twelve men, "take you up every man of you a stone upon his shoulder."

An examination of the 190-odd occurrences of this word (Young's Concordance gives 183, but another count places it at 192 – in its active, passive and reflexive forms) reveals that it is consistently given the meaning of exalt, set up, promote, lift up, hold up and offer up. The idea of up and high is back of this word, and of the 190-odd occurrences, it is only once translated "take away," and that is in Daniel 8:11 in connection with the tamid.

The reason the translators of the King James and other versions ignored the 190 examples in other parts of the Old Testament and chose to translate rum "take away" as the exception was evidently because of the fact that the tamid was "taken away" in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11. They apparently attached no significance to Daniel's use of another word in Daniel 8:11, but simply concluded that he used rum as a synonym for sur.

That is a misjudgment. Rum definitely is not a synonym for sur. A canvass of other Old Testament texts will reveal that about twenty different Hebrew words are often translated "take away" in the King James and other versions. But rum is translated "take away" only this once in the whole Bible. To be precise, in one other text, viz., Ezekiel 45:90, it says, "take away [rum] your exactions from My people ...." this is listed under "take up" in Young's Concordance because it actually means to "lift" the load of taxes off people.

Moreover, rum is used in four other places in Daniel, but not in the sense of "take away," which constitutes another argument against its being so translated in Daniel 8:11. Here are the other four uses of rum in Daniel: 5:20, "but his heart was lifted up \_\_\_ "; 11:12, "his heart shall be lifted up"; "he shall exalt himself .... "; 12:7, "he held up his right hand"

It is also of interest to note that Young's Concordance gives a definition for the rum in Daniel 8:11 under the "take away" heading - where rum occurs in the Hof'al causative passive form. Thus: "to be caused to go high." the average reader would be perplexed by this and ask, How can you derive "take away" from a word that means to "go high?" Indeed! Perhaps even some Bible translators were also puzzled and hesitated to give rum a signification which is so far removed from it's true meaning. Yet, despite the overwhelming testimony of 190 other uses of rum in the Old Testament, no version known to this writer ventures to use any other term than "take away."

Perhaps few have realized that rum and sur bring out two important aspects of the transition from pagan to papal supremacy. The form of paganism was removed, but its substance was appropriated and exalted by the papal system. That is, paganism reached a higher level of popularity and appeared in a more appealing form in the papacy. In the first century the cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" rang through the streets of Ephesus. But now the strains of "Ave Maria" are heard in all parts of the world.

The image of the virgin Mary is a great improvement over the goddess Diana. It is a concrete example of the exaltation of rum of paganism after it was taken away sur by the papal power. [in Daniel 11:31] In the light of historical facts, we may say that the rendering "taken away" for rum in Daniel 8:11 is a mistranslation. Its correct meaning is: **"Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the tamid [paganism] was exalted."**

We follow up this argument with a study of other words for "take away" used by Daniel. The fact that about twenty different words can be used in this sense multiplies the odds against his selecting rum. If Daniel indeed wanted to add some variety to his vocabulary, considering the wide range of words he could choose from, he would hardly pick a word which he used in other parts of his book in the sense of "lift up" and "exalt" as a synonym for sur. In fact, we have two places where he used "nasa"; 1:16, "Thus Melzar took away the portion of their meat, ... "; and 11:12, "And when he hath taken away the multitude... "

In summary, we note that all available evidence is in favor of the old view. Proponents of the new view can hardly see any significance in the use of rum in Daniel 8:11 because the papacy cannot be said to have exalted the continual mediation of Christ by her many farcical abominations. Add to this the fact that the 1290 and 1335 days cannot be well incorporated into the new view and it will show up to be practically untenable.

It is argued that the new view lends support to the sanctuary doctrine; we answer that the sanctuary doctrine stands perfectly by itself and needs no such flimsy supports. A false interpretation of the tamid can only be a false argument which can give no real support. In contrast to this, old-view advocates have cited five significant incidents which took place in 508 (cf. Damsteegt, op. cit., p. 39, footnote).

Some may suppose that Ellen White's remark, "His hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until His hand was removed." has something to do with 508. That is an erroneous supposition. The footnote explains that the mistake has reference to 1843. In 1850, James White wrote: "It was necessary that 1843 should be the first published time in order that 'the vision' should 'tarry,' or that there should be a tarrying time, in which the virgin band was to slumber and sleep on the great subject of time, just before they were to be aroused by the Midnight Cry." A. L. White op. cit., p. 256) , A L. White does not tell us on which side James White stood on this question. The SDA Bible Commentary (V4 p. 64f) cites a passage written. by James White with regard to the sanctuary being "trodden under foot" by the papacy, and concludes that "James White virtually repeats the supposition made earlier by Crosier."

However, the passage quoted makes no mention of the "daily," so if there is no more conclusive evidence to show what James White believed, we cannot accept this quote as adequate proof that he espoused Crosier's "new" view on the tamid.

**THE DIVINE PURPOSE:** Since Ellen White stated that she had been instructed to take a position which later proved to be correct, we should now look into the purpose of God in withholding further light on the tamid and instructing her to call a halt to the discussions. Considering the fact that Satan was watching for an opportunity to create division, would not a fuller revelation on the tamid have brought unity to the church as well as halt the debate? Why did God choose this seemingly less conclusive course? Would it not leave the brethren divided and the question unsettled?

We should first recognize nature of the mooted subject. Ellen White pointed out that it was not a vital question. It did not involve basic principles. As far as the foundation truths are concerned, the new view did not threaten to undermine them. A L. White observes:

"How different was the situation brought to view here than in 1905 when Ellen White was called upon to meet decisively the views advocated by Elder A F. Ballenger, which involved the work of Christ in man's behalf in the heavenly sanctuary." Ibid. 251.

On the other hand, the fact that Ellen White did not say anything to buttress the testimony in **EW 74f**, did not imply that it should not be studied or brushed aside as meaningless. Yet today many of our scholars do so regard it. They ask, "If that testimony was right, why did she not say so in 1908?"

True, she did not reaffirm its truthfulness, but neither did she deny it. And because she never denied it, we have to believe it still stands. It is interesting to note what advocates of the new view [say] in order to evade EW 74f. One says that it is "incomplete" and "susceptible of interpretation."

But the fact is, it is quite complete and needs no interpretation. We take it at its face value. No amount of interpreting can make it say what it does not say.

The first part of the testimony points out a well-known fact: that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom. That needs no interpreting. "The Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry." Who can point out any "incompleteness" in this statement?

Can you interpret it to mean that the Lord gave them the wrong view? The third sentence says, "in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed." This, too, is a complete sentence, is historically true, and needs no interpreting.

**"To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20**

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 in 1908, but He did not say that we are never to study the tamid. True, we are not to make it a test question, but today it has become a test of truthfulness of Ellen White's words.

It is argued that EW 74f should be understood in the context of the central theme that "time has not been a test since 1844 and it will never again be a test." That is true,

but this context does not prove in any way that the new view is correct. New-view advocates must still face the critical passage in EW 74f and give us their "interpretation," by which they imply that it cannot be taken at face value.

Now after a brief exegetical study of the tamid, we propose that without doing violence to the context, EW 74f can be taken at face value. It needs no interpreting. We do not use it to settle the question of the tamid, but use our present exegesis of tamid to verify its truthfulness. We believe that is the way God wants us to handle the problem. On the other hand, if we accept the new view, we must cast doubt on EW 74f and try to "interpret" it.

Then what can prevent us from taking the same attitude towards other testimonies of the Spirit? The only safe course in every case is to study the Scripture for the true meaning of the difficult text, then use that to check what Ellen White wrote on it, not to imagine we can dispense with Bible study and find a shortcut to truth in her books.

This question keeps on intriguing us: Why did Ellen White take a neutral position and leave S. N. Haskell to struggle alone, as it were, in defense of the "integrity" of the Spirit of Prophecy? Haskell was apparently dismayed that she did not come out positively in support of her own words. He declared: "If Sister White does not give any explanation . . . to defend the testimonies for the sake of other, I shall defend them." (Ibid. 253).

He was impatient with what he felt was a weak stand by Ellen White. She should, in his thinking, "defend the testimonies," and because she neglected this work, he would stand up to be the champion. Was Haskell right? Was Ellen White guilty of dereliction of duty? No. Because the position she took was taken under divine instruction.

There are two analogous situations in the Bible where God seemingly changed His mind and yielded to human insinuations. Once in answer to Balaam's desire to please Balak. Yet God's granting Balaam's second request did not mean that He reversed His decision not to curse Israel.

And the second instance is found in Elisha's first refusing, and then granting the request of the younger prophets to send men in search of Elijah. Ye shall not send.: ... And when they urged him till he was ashamed, he said, "send." They sent therefore fifty men and they sought three days, but found him not. And when they came again to him ... he said unto them, "Did I not say unto you, Go not?"

In both cases, men were not satisfied with the first answer, so God "gave in," as it were. And yet He did not really change His mind. He just let men have their own way until they found out for themselves the truthfulness of His first answer.

So it is with the tamid. Men were not satisfied with what Ellen White had written in EW 74f, so she did not insist that they accept it. They were and still are free to thrash out the problem independently. But in the end they will realize that products of human wisdom do not always stand up under close scrutiny.

That explains why God did not instruct Ellen White to side with Haskell. God wanted to give free rein to human initiative, let both sides study the tamid without "interference" from Ellen White. The debate must stop for a time, yet the topic must be left open for free and fair interchange of thought. So long as all are honestly in quest of the truth, God's people will at last see eye-to-eye. And when that day comes, we may hear Him say, "Did I not say so?"

**JAMES WHITE'S VIEW OF THE DAILY:** The traditional understanding of SDA historians is that James White held the view that the "daily" of Daniel 8:11 refers to the priesthood of Christ. In 7BC, 64 one subtitle reads, "Crosier Reverts to Reformation 'View.'" The next subtitle says, "White Follows Crosier's View." In Vol, IV of Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, p. 1119, is a table in which Crosier and White are both listed as believing that the "daily" refers to the ministry of Christ.

However, an examination of the excerpts from Crosier's Day Star Extra, Feb. 7, 1846 and White's RH, January 1851 article, both quoted in TBC 64, 65, yields no conclusive evidence that either writer held the view attributed to them. Both believed that the sanctuary in heaven, the Son of God and the "host" have been trodden underfoot by papal Rome. But not a word is said of the "daily." In the Jan. 1851 RH article, White dealt with the heavenly ministry of Christ in much detail, but did not even intimate that it might be antitype of the "daily sacrifice."

The following quote from an article by James White in the Feb. 15, 1870 issue of the RH tells what he believed about the daily: "The daily *sacrifice* and the transgression of desolation represent Rome in its pagan and papal forms. Leaving out the supplied words, the text would read, 'The daily and the transgression of desolation.'

These are two desolating powers; first, paganism, then, papacy. Of these, Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2:38, says: 'Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. 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, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.'

That which withheld the manifestation of papacy in Paul's day was paganism. These are the two powers which have desolated the people of God, of which the angel speaks in the vision of Dan. 8. That such a plain statement by James White could have been overlooked by our historians is hard to understand. David Linn.

Cornerstone Writes: David Linn's article is a most scholarly achievement and complements Robert Weiland's masterpiece we sent you in Dec of 2009. Our strong historical position that the daily is paganism cannot concede to the opponents "new view" that the tamid in Daniel 8:14 is the continual ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Adherents of the "new view" prior to and since 1900 as viewed by some Adventists is that the daily represents the papacy who took away Christ's mediatorial office. Instead, proven to be paganism. In a survey some time ago, about 50% of the Adventist ministerial staff bought into the evangelical takeover in 1956-57.

By association and new theology they are now classed with the Protestant churches. This lessens and even erases in some Adventist minds the literal 2300 year prophecy they once held (1844, our sanctuary message, and the investigative judgment).

Note that most leaders prior to 1900 who initially promoted the new view gave up the truth, which demonstrates we should not look to man but our prophet. The remnant will be ridiculed that we are at variance with the popular belief of Protestants and Adventists. But if we use the Bible and Bible only to prove our position, we will then have also proven the veracity of E. White's quote in EW 74f given under the inspiration of God, proved that man's "new view" was not inspired. No further attempt to interpret or question what she wrote will be necessary since her statement agrees with the Bible.