

# The Daily Sacrifice

George Burnside

[www.CreationismOnline.com](http://www.CreationismOnline.com)

Does the “daily” in Daniel refer to the Mediatorial Work of Christ or to paganism?

“What does “Daily” Mean?”

What did the little horn take away?

“And by him the daily sacrifice was taken away!” Daniel 8:11. The translators have never attempted to interpret rather than merely translate this verse, for the word “sacrifice” does not appear in the text. They were justified in their interpretation, however, seeing that the word rendered ‘daily’ occurs no fewer than 102 times in the Old Testament and almost invariably has reference to the “daily” or “continual” sacrifices in the temple service. The expression is used in order to distinguish the regular services of the sanctuary from those which were offered once a year at the time of the special feasts. “Now this is that which you shall offer upon the altar”; Aaron was told, “two lambs of the first year day by day continually.” Exodus 29:38. (See also Numbers 28:3; 1 Chronicles 16:39, 40.) In the New Testament, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews draws attention to the fact that the priests of the ancient sanctuary needed to offer sacrifices “daily.” Hebrews 7:27.

The “daily” or “continual” offering symbolized the unbroken covenant relation between God and His people. If any break occurred in the continuity of the daily offerings as a result of man’s defection it would indicate apostasy from God; while if such a break were permitted by God in His providence, it would indicate His suspension of the covenant relationship by reason of their transgression.

Daniel 8:9-12, 23-25 is described the warfare of Rome against Christ, His holy people, His sanctuary, and His ministration. Following the Protestant principle of letting the Bible interpret itself, the following facts, gathered from Young’s Analytical Concordance, are presented in evidence of the truthfulness of the above proposition.

The Hebrew word translated here as “the daily” is Ha-tamid, and occurs in the following Scriptures translated by the words “continual,” and “daily”:

Numbers 4: 7 “the continual (ha-tamid) bread.”  
Numbers 4:16 “the daily meat offering.”  
Nehemiah 10:33 “the continual meat offering.”  
Numbers 28:10 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:15 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:24 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:31 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:6 “the daily burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:11 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:16 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:19 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:22 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:25 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:28 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:31 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:34 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 29:38 “the continual burnt offering.”  
Nehemiah 10:33 “the continual burnt offering.”

The same Hebrew word occurs without the definite article “the” and then stands as “tamid.” It is translated “continual,” “a continual,” or “perpetual,” as the following Scriptures will illustrate:

Exodus 29:42 “a continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:3 “a continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:6 “a continual burnt offering.”  
Numbers 28:23 “a continual burnt offering.”  
Ezra 3:5 “a continual burnt offering.”  
2 Chronicles 2:4 “continual show bread.”  
Exodus 30:8 “perpetual incense.”  
Leviticus 6:20 “a meat offering perpetual.”

“BROTHER CROSIER HAD THE TRUE LIGHT”.

## **WILLIAM MILLER WAS NOT INFALLIBLE**

1. He taught the sanctuary was this earth and hence the cleansing of the Sanctuary was the cleansing of the earth at “the last day.”
2. Miller’s second mistake was when he invented the theory that the “daily” was paganism.

A question has been raised. The facts are as follows. In the days-of the Millerite movement there were different views mainly within the ranks of the opponents of the Millerites. The popular view advocated by these opponents was that the “daily sacrifice” referred to the Jewish sacrifices. These would be restored when the Jews returned to Palestine and built the Temple in Jerusalem. Then the Old Testament sacrifices would again be restored. Thus their emphasis was on the word “sacrifice.” This explains Sister Whites repeated emphasis on the fact that the word “Sacrifice was not in the text, but was a supplied word.

Then I saw in relation to the “daily” Daniel 8:12, that the word “sacrifice” was supplied by man’s wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the “daily;” but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed. Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again-be a test. Early Writings, page 74-75.

The issue between the Millerites and their opponents was over the restoration of sacrifices. The Millerites opposed this view and denied that the prophecy taught a restoration of Blood sacrifices. The main discussion was not over whether the “daily” was dealing with the mediatorial work of Jesus or paganism. The clear truth was taught by some, namely that the “daily” referred to the mediatorial work of Jesus, as typified in the Old Testament Sanctuary service.

For instance we have:

“I believe the Sanctuary, to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is the minister. The Lord showed me in vision, more than one year ago that Brother Crosier had the true light on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, etc.; and that it was His will that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave to us in the Day-Star Extra, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that Extra to every saint.” Mrs. E. G. White, in a letter to Brother Eli Curtis, New York City, from Topsham, Maine, April 21, 1847. Printed in “A Word to the Little Flock,” Brunswick, Maine, May 30, 1847, page 12.

This article was reprinted in the Advent Review of September, 1850. His comments on Daniel 8:11,12, are as follows: “And the place of his Sanctuary was cast down; Daniel 8:11. This casting down was in the days and by the means of the Roman power; therefore, the Sanctuary of this text was not the Earth, nor Palestine, because the former was cast down at the fall, more than 4,000 years, and the latter at the captivity, more than 700 years previous to the event of this passage, and neither by Roman agency. The Sanctuary cast down is His against whom Rome magnified himself, which was the prince of the host, Jesus Christ; and Paul teaches that His Sanctuary is in heaven.

Again, Daniel 11:30,31 (Quoted). What was this that Rome and the apostles of Christianity should jointly pollute? This combination was formed against the ‘holy covenant,’ and it was the Sanctuary of that covenant they polluted; which they could do as well as to pollute the name of God; Jeremiah 34:16; Ezekiel 20; Malachi 1:7. This was the same as profaning or blaspheming His name. In this sense this ‘politico-religious’

beast polluted the Sanctuary, (Revelation 13:6) and cast it down from its place in heaven, (Psalm 102:19; Jeremiah 17:12; Hebrews 8:1,2) when they called Rome the holy city, (Revelation 21:2) and installed the Pope there with the titles ‘Lord God the Pope,’ ‘Holy Father,’ ‘Head of the Church.’ etc.; and there. in the counterfeit ‘temple of God’ he professed to do what Jesus actually does in His

Sanctuary; 2 Thessalonians 2:1-8. The Sanctuary has been trodden under foot (Daniel 8:13), the same as the Son of God has;" Hebrews 10:39. O. R. L. Crosier.

Away back in 1843 Crosier had written: "The very heart of the gospel was removed when the little horn took away the daily, or continual mediation of Jesus Christ, and cast down the place of His gospel sanctuary and made It a den of thieves. He cast down the sacraments and gospel truth to the ground and 'practiced' the mystery of iniquity and prospered in his sacreligious perversions." Midnight Cry, October 4, 1843, O. R. L. Crosier.

Thus it is clear that before the great "Disappointment" some Adventists were clear on the "daily."

However, in the very beginning a suggestion was made in a new direction, when R. L. Crosier, after joint study with Hiram Edson and F. B. Hahn wrote out the first expositions of the sanctuary doctrine. Crosier's first article, appearing in The Day-Down (in the spring of 1845; reprinted in Review and Herald, 1:78-80, May 5, 1851), did not mention the "daily" but it pointed out the heavenly sanctuary, the place of Christ's mediatorial ministry, as the sanctuary to be cleansed (Daniel 8:14). His later expanded article in the Day-Star (Extra, February 7, 1846) expressly stated that Daniel's various references to the sanctuary as being cast (town (Daniel 8:11), polluted (Daniel 11:31), trodden underfoot (Daniel 8:13), and cleansed (Daniel 8:14) applied to the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant. This, he said, can be trodden underfoot figuratively, in the same way as the Son of God has been.

This "politico-religious" beast polluted the Sanctuary, (Revelation 13:6) and cast it down from its place in heaven. (Psalm 102:19; Jeremiah 17:12; Hebrews 8:1, 2) when they called Rome the holy city (Revelation 21:2) and installed the Pope there with the titles. "Lord God the Pope," "Holy Father," "Head of the Church." and there, in the counterfeit "temple of God" he professes to do what Jesus actually does in his Sanctuary: 2 Thessalonians. 2:1-8. The Sanctuary has been trodden underfoot (Daniel 8:13) the same as, the Son of God has: Hebrews 10:29. (Day-Star Extra, February 7, 1846, page 39).

This makes clear what was the "correct view." Read again:

A. T. Jones in the 1888 Message was clear on this great truth and it was a part of the 1888 message. Note his words:

"Now let us read verses 11 and 12 of Daniel 8, and it will be plainly seen that here is exactly the place where Paul found the scripture from which he taught the Thessalonians concerning the 'man of sin' and the 'mystery of iniquity:' 'Yea, he magnified himself even to the Prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced and prospered.'"

"This plainly points out that which took away the priesthood, the ministry, and the sanctuary of God, and of Christianity.

"Let us read it again. 'Yes, he (the little horn the man of sin) magnified himself even to the Prince of the host ('against the Prince of princes' - Christ), and by him (the man of sin) the daily sacrifice (the continual service, the ministry, and the priesthood of Christ) was taken away, and the place of His sanctuary (the sanctuary of the prince of the host, of the Prince of princes - Christ) was cast down.

And an host was given him (the man of sin) against the daily sacrifice (against the continual service, of the ministry of Christ, the Prince of the host) by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced, and prospered."

"It was 'by reason of transgression,' that is, by reason of sin, that this power gained 'the host' that was used to cast down the truth to the ground, to shut away from the church and the world Christ's priesthood, His ministry, and His sanctuary; and to cast it all down to the ground and tread it underfoot. It was by reason of transgression that this was accomplished. Transgression is sin, and this is the consideration and the revelation upon which the apostle in 2 Thessalonians defines this power as the 'man of sin' and the 'mystery of iniquity.'"

"In Daniel 8:11-13; 11:31; and 12:11, it will be noticed that the word 'sacrifice' is in every case supplied. And it is wholly supplied; for in its place in the original there is no word at all. In the original the only word that stands in this place, is the word tamid, that is here translated 'daily:' and in these places the expression 'daily' does not refer to the daily sacrifice any more than it refers to the whole daily ministry or continual service of the sanctuary, of which the sacrifice was only a part. The word tamid in itself signifies 'continuous or continual,' 'constant,' 'stable,' 'sure,' 'constantly,' 'evermore.' Only such words as these express the thought of the original word, which in the text under consideration, is translated 'daily.' In Numbers 28 and 29 alone, the word is used seventeen times, referring to the continual service in the sanctuary." "And this is how it is that this great Christian truth of the true priesthood, ministry, and sanctuary of Christ is not known to the Christian world to-day. The 'man of sin' has taken it away, and cast it down to the ground, and stamped upon it. The 'mystery of iniquity' has hid this great truth from the church and the world during all these

ages, in which the man of sin has held place in the world, and has passed itself off as God, and its iniquitous host as the church of God.” The Consecrated Way, page 98, 99, 100, 101.

The claim that this great truth originated with L. R. Conradi is clearly refuted by these facts. The facts just rebel against the claim. Conradi, while pioneering the Truth in Europe did write on “Daniel.” This was in German. He did this with the support and approval of A. G. Daniels, W. W. Prescott and W. A. Spicer. Conradi’s book on Daniel was published June 1, 1910. It was later translated into other European languages. So to sum up these facts:

1. This truth that the “Daily” referred to the mediatorial work of Jesus and was held by man in the Millerite movement, including O. R. L. Crosier.
2. The same truth was taught by A. T. Jones and it was part of the 1888 Message and therefore is part of God’s present truth for today.
3. There is nothing about the word “daily” or “continual” that would indicate that it referred to paganism.
4. While outwardly the papacy did eclipse paganism politically, in actual fact Paganism was not taken away but it entered into the church and swallowed up apostate-Christianity. The so-called Christian church became nothing more than “baptized paganism.” Inspiration states: “This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of the ‘man of sin’ foretold in prophecy as opposing and exalting himself above God. That gigantic system of false religion is a masterpiece of Satan’s power, a

monument of his efforts to seat himself upon the throne to rule the earth according to his will.” Great Controversy, page 50.

“The spirit of concession to paganism opened the way for a still further disregard of Heaven’s authority.” Great Controversy, page 52.

The origin of the so-called “Old View” of the “daily” is interesting and worthy of note and comment. The S. D. A. Encyclopaedia states:

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 he taken away,” etc. I read on, and thought I should find no light on the text; finally I came to 2 Thessalonians 2:7-8. “For the mystery of iniquity does already work only he who now lets, will let until he be taken out of the way, and then shall that wicked be revealed.” 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 lets,” or hinders? By man of sin, and “the wicked,” Pope is meant. Well what is it which hinders the Pope from being revealed? Why, it is Paganism; well, then, “the daily” must mean Paganism” (William Miller, quoted in Apollo Hale, Second Advent Manual, p. 66).

The misnamed “old view” originated with William Miller and was evidently accepted by many, but also rejected by others. To me, this interpretation has many weaknesses. It appears that Miller failed to notice that the verse he quotes is dealing with the establishing of the papacy, whereas Daniel 8:10-12 is dealing with the work that an established papacy would carry out.

Note clearly the Scriptures 2 THESSALONIANS 2:7 “For the mystery of iniquity does already work: only he who now lets will let, until he be taken out of the way.

The tragedy of apostasy was working in Paul’s day, but the “Man of Sin” would not be fully developed until “he who now lets (or hinders) be taken out of the way.”

Note: “He be taken away.” Some human power, “he”, was to be taken away, this would prepare the way and “then shall that Wicked (the Papacy, or Man of Sin) be revealed.” I see no objection to applying this hindering power to paganism, for with the professed conversion of the emperor and nation of Rome, paganism at least outwardly, gave place to the full revealing of the “Man of Sin,” the power that would think to change the times and the Law of God. As sin is the breaking of God’s law, so the “Man of Sin” is the power that would attempt this very blasphemous work. Now note carefully the contrast:

DANIEL 8:11 “Yes, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.”

Here is an established papacy. He has “cast down some of the host and stamped upon them.” He had magnified himself against (margin) “the prince of the host,” Christ.

He had “cast down” the place of the Sanctuary of our Lord and “By him the daily sacrifice was taken away.”

The “taken out of the way” of 2 Thessalonians 2:7 was to be done to open the way for the “Man of Sin.” This is dealing with the origin of the papacy whereas Daniel is dealing with the work of this power. The contrast is further revealed by the difference in language.

2 THESSALONIANS 2:7 “He be taken out of the way.”

DANIEL 8:11 “By him the daily sacrifice was taken away.”

In one passage “he” is taken out of the way whereas in the other he takes away the daily. It seems strange that William Miller should have missed this clear contrast, but we know he missed other truths too. Miller made mistakes. He was a good man, but he was not infallible.

He demands our respect. This mistake of Miller’s led to much waste of time in discussion on points that are of “minor importance.” Uriah Smith followed Miller’s view. He wrote his “Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation in 1897. However, Crosier upheld the truth on the daily away back in 1843. Fifty-four years before Smith was born in 1832. When Smith was but a babe in arms the “true view” of the “daily” was taught. Because Smith applied the “daily” to paganism, it can hardly be termed the “old view” when these plain facts are brought to our attention.

It has further been claimed that the “taking away” of paganism occurred when Clovis, the Catholic king of the Franks gained a victory over the Visigoths in 508 AD. The grave weakness in this claim is revealed in the fact that the Visigoths were also professed Christians.

They were Arians. They believed as do the Jehovah Witnesses of today, that Christ was a created being and hence was not eternal.

Therefore Clovis’ victory was not a victory over paganism at all. It was a victory over Arianism.

However, the main evidence on this question is found in the Scriptures. The Translators indicated that the word “sacrifice” was a supplied word. They evidently added this word, although it is not found in the original Scriptures, because they could see that the word translated “daily” was linked with the Sanctuary. This is true. Turn to Numbers and note the continued use of the word “continual” and note how it is linked with the sacrifices and the Sanctuary which as we all know had a unique application to the work of our Lord.

NUMBERS 28:3, 6, 10, 15, 23, 24, 31;

NUMBERS 29:11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 31, 34, 38.

The word translated “continual,” is used some fifteen times in these two chapters. It is the word translated “daily” in Daniel 8:11. This typified the daily or continual mediation of our Lord. Further this word is never linked with paganism. May we settle this issue, not on the question as to which man taught it, but on what said the Scriptures.

## WHAT ABOUT DANIEL 12:11-12?

DANIEL 12:11,12 “And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.”

There are two periods that both began at the same time. This is clearly stated. “From the time” that the:

1. “Daily sacrifice shall be taken away.”

2. And “the abomination that makes desolate set up.”

## THE FOUNDATION TIME PERIOD

Daniel 12:11. 1290 years. This period in 30 years longer than the 1260. Thirty years prior to 538 AD was 508 AD. This was the time of the overthrow of the Arian powers - the three horns plucked up by the little horn. Daniel 7:8,24. In 508 AD Clovis, the Catholic king of the Franks, triumphed over his Arian rivals. "It was decided that the Franks, and not the Goths, were to direct the future destinies of Gaul and Germany, and that the Catholic faith, and not Arianism, was to be the religion of these great realms." Richard W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, pages 38,39.

## THE BEGINNING

AD 508 "And such was the event of the first of the religious wars which have been waged in the name and by the disciples of the God of peace." *Decline and Fall*, by Gibbon, Volume 4, page 526.

AD 508 Began War;  
AD 533 Justinian's decree  
AD 538 Decree enforced by sword.

RISE OF "LITTLE HORN."

DANIEL 7:8 "Came up" - slowly rising.

AN INTERESTING PARALLEL

Halley's Comet, hung like a sword of doom over Jerusalem in AD 66. This was the first year of the wars that finally led to the final destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.

So AD 508 was the first of the wars that led to the final overthrow of Arianism - NOT PAGANISM - that led to the final and full rule of the Papacy for 1260 years.

(For more on this see A.T. Jones the champion of 1888.)

[www.CreationismOnline.com](http://www.CreationismOnline.com)