

## GUILT BY ASSOCIATION: WHY SABBATARIAN ADVENTISTS REJECTED O. R. L. CROSIER'S INTERPRETATION OF THE *TĀMĪḏ* IN DAN 8

DENIS KAISER, Ph.D. cand.  
Andrews University, USA

### 1. Introduction

The apocalyptic prophecies of the Bible and the understanding of Christ's heavenly sanctuary service have been, and still are, an inseparable part of Seventh-day Adventist theology. They shaped the church's self-understanding and mission. In Dan 8:9-14 both of these concepts are united. One of the keywords of that passage is the term תָּמִיד (*tāmīḏ*, daily/perpetual/ continual), which is described as having been taken away and replaced with another service by the little horn power and restored after 2300 evening-mornings.<sup>1</sup> The correct meaning of the term was at the core of a conflict during the first decades of the 20th century that could have split the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Some interpreted the *tāmīḏ* as Roman paganism, whereas others argued that it referred to Christ's ministration in the heavenly sanctuary. The topic itself did not seem to carry great weight, yet its potential ramifications for the authority of Ellen White's writings and the belief in the divine guidance of the Seventh-day Adventist movement seemed to attach much importance to the specific identification of the *tāmīḏ*.

While several scholars have attempted to clarify the factors that were involved in and contributed to the 20th century conflict over the meaning of the *tāmīḏ*,<sup>2</sup> only a few writers have wrestled with the question of how

<sup>1</sup> Daniel 8:11-13, 11:31, and 12:11.

<sup>2</sup> Bert Haloviak, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference," (paper presented at the meeting of Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Scholars in New York City, November 14, 1979), 18-59. See also Bert Haloviak and Gary Land, "Ellen White & Doctrinal Conflict: Context

Adventists initially viewed the term at the beginning of the movement in the nineteenth century.<sup>3</sup> The few who tried to answer that question unanimously assumed that O. R. L. Crosier's<sup>4</sup> article in the *Day-Star* Extra of February 7, 1846, promoted the interpretation of the *tāmīd* as Christ's continual high-priestly ministry in heaven, in contrast to the Millerite interpretation of the *tāmīd* as Roman Paganism.<sup>5</sup> Given that the article was recommended by Joseph Bates, James White, and his wife Ellen G. White,<sup>6</sup>

---

of the 1919 Bible Conference," *Spectrum* 12, no. 4 (1982): 25-27; Arthur L. White, *The Latter Elmshaven Years: 1905-1915*, vol. 6 of *Ellen G. White* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1982), 246-261; Gilbert M. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation*, Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2005), 214-238; Jerry Allen Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship Between the Prophet and Her Son*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 19 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1993), 415-427; Rolf J. Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching: A Case Study in Doctrinal Development*, Friedensauer Schriftenreihe, Reihe A, Theologie 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2000), 156-158; Denis Kaiser, "The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the 'Daily' in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2009), 40-57, 75-103, 113-121.

- <sup>3</sup> LeRoy Edwin Froom, "Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'" (unpublished paper, Washington, DC, 1 September 1940; Andrews University, Center for Adventist Research, Berrien Springs, MI); Francis D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7 vols. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1955), 4:63-65; Egerton Wilberforce Carnegie, "The Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'" (M.A. report, Andrews University, 1971); Heidi Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book* (Brushton, NY: TEACH Services, 2008); idem, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 2," *Our Firm Foundation* 22, no. 3 (2007): 4-11; idem, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 3," *Our Firm Foundation* 22, no. 4 (2007): 4-17; Kaiser, "History of the Adventist Interpretation of the 'Daily'," 11-39, 104-130.
- <sup>4</sup> On O. R. L. Crosier's life see "Death ends a life full of endeavor: Owen R. L. Crozier, Minister, Editor, Missionary, Teacher, and also a Business Man," *Evening Press*, September 16, 1912, 10; O. R. L. Crosier, "Early History of Ontario County Revealed in Story of Late Owen R. L. Crozier," *Daily Messenger*, November 22, 1923, 23; cf. Alberto R. Timm, "O. R. L. Crosier: A Biographical Introduction" (Term Paper, Andrews University, 1991). It is interesting that beginning in 1850, Crosier started to spell his name "Crozier."
- <sup>5</sup> Froom, "Historical Setting and Background," 6, 7; Richard W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1979), 397; Pedro Arano, "The Daily," (Term Paper, Andrews University, 1982), 3, 4; A. L. White, *The Latter Elmshaven Years*, 247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 22-28.
- <sup>6</sup> Joseph Bates, *The Opening of Heavens: Or a Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets and Apostles, Concerning the Opening Heavens, Compared with Astronomical*

that it was reprinted several times by James White, and that in 1854 Uriah Smith<sup>7</sup> expounded on Crosier's interpretation of the *tāmīd*, previous scholars have further reasoned that the Sabbatarian Adventists<sup>8</sup> of the mid-nineteenth century must have endorsed Crosier's redefinition of the *tāmīd*.<sup>9</sup>

However, the assumption that Crosier's view was widely embraced is problematic, as all acknowledge that the "old" Millerite view of the *tāmīd* as Pagan Romanism was the primary view several decades later at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when new controversy arose over the meaning of the term. If Adventists had already embraced Crosier's "new" view in the mid-nineteenth century, it is difficult to see how the denomination would have reverted back to the "old" view by the beginning of the new century. To account for this, some writers have suggested that both views were present in Adventism right from the beginning, with James White being the proponent of Crosier's view and Uriah Smith as the promoter of William Miller's interpretation.<sup>10</sup> According to this explanation, although a small pocket of Sabbatarian Adventist leadership embraced Crosier's views, Smith's *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (1873) had such a big impact on the wider Sabbatarian Adventist body that his

---

*Observations, and of the Present and Future Location of the New Jerusalem, the Paradise of God* (New Bedford, MA: Benjamin Lindsey, 1846), 25; James White, "Our Present Position," *Review and Herald*, January 1851, 28, 29; Ellen G. White, "Letter to Bro. Eli Curtis, New York City, from Topsham, April 21, 1847," *In A Word to the 'Little Flock'*, ed. James White (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1847), 11, 12.

<sup>7</sup> Uriah Smith, "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, March 28, 1854, 78.

<sup>8</sup> The term "Sabbatarian Adventism" refers to Seventh-day Adventism before the formal organization of the church in 1863. Although the name "Seventh-day Adventists" had been used since 1853, it was not applied unanimously to the body of believers until 1861. See S. T. Cranson to James White, March 20, 1853; printed in S. T. Cranson, "From Bro. Cranson," *Review and Herald*, April 14, 1853, 191. That is why in this article the first term is used for Seventh-day Adventists before 1863 and the second term is employed for the church after 1863.

<sup>9</sup> Froom, "Historical Setting and Background," 8, 9; Walter E. Straw, *Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, MI: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1943), 54, 55; George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955), 174; Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:64; Carnegie, "The Historical Setting," 22-24, 54; G. Burnside, "Daily?" s.l., n.d., 3, 4; Arano, "The Daily," 4; A. L. White, *The Latter Elmshaven Years*, 247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 25-28, 30; idem, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 1," *Our Firm Foundation* 22, no. 2 (2007): 10, 11.

<sup>10</sup> Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:65; Carnegie, "The Historical Setting," 26, 27; A. L. White, *The Latter Elmshaven Years*, 247.

view remained the dominant position within the movement until the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>11</sup>

The question that remains, then, is to what degree Sabbatarian Adventists embraced Crosier's view of the *tāmîd* in the mid-nineteenth century. This article will first study closely both Crosier's ambiguous and explicit statements regarding the *tāmîd* of Dan 8:11-13. Afterwards it will examine statements from Sabbatarian Adventists that are the clearest on the *tāmîd* and then move to the statements that are more ambiguous. Finally, the writings of "Age to Come" Adventists will play a major role in this investigation. The last section will point out the close association between Crosier and "Age to Come" Adventists and how Sabbatarian Adventist reacted to "Age to Come" Adventism and Crosier's interpretations of the *tāmîd*. It is the purpose of this article to understand the statements in their original context, and to put them into the wider context of the time from 1845 to 1855 in order to evaluate the suggestions made by former researchers on the topic.<sup>12</sup> This article shows that Sabbatarian Adventists disregarded the *tāmîd* aspect of Crosier's sanctuary view of Dan 8:11-14 because it seemed to be associated too closely with "Age to Come" Adventism, a ground for refusal that was no longer present by the turn of the century.

## 2. O. R. L. Crosier's Views on the *Tāmîd*

Most of the confusion regarding Sabbatarian Adventist acceptance of Crosier's views on the *tāmîd* stems from the article he published in the *Day-Star* Extra on February 7, 1846. In this article, titled, "The Law of Moses," Crosier first presented his new interpretation of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 that differed from the common Millerite view: specifically, he identified it as the heavenly sanctuary and not as the earth or the church. This was significant because it helped explain what had happened at the end of the 2300 evening-mornings (namely, the sanctuary in heaven was cleansed). Thus, his interpretation brought together the Sabbatarian Adventist understanding of the apocalyptic prophecies with their understanding of Christ's heavenly sanctuary service.

<sup>11</sup> A. L. White, *The Latter Elmshaven Years*, 247.

<sup>12</sup> Since the focus of this article is on the early Sabbatarian Adventist period, I will regard mainly publications from 1845 to 1879 to show the continuance of the interpretations, although after 1863 it should be called the Seventh-day Adventist period.

Upon the publication of the article, Sabbatarian Adventist readers were quickly persuaded of the legitimacy of Crosier's view. Because of their ready embrace of the article and its new doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary, scholars have assumed that Sabbatarian Adventists embraced Crosier's view of the *tāmîd* as well. A closer examination, however, will show that this assumption is not valid.

## 2.1. Ambiguous Statements in the Day-Star Extra

Crosier's *Day-Star* article is very clear on the extended atonement in the heavenly sanctuary,<sup>13</sup> but it fails to provide an explicit and exact definition of the *tāmîd*. Modern readers, however, may find remarks that suggest an interpretation from the OT sacrificial context. Crosier considered the sanctuary of Dan 11:30, 31 to be Jesus' sanctuary of the covenant that was cast down from heaven and polluted by the Roman church. In fact, said Crosier, "in the counterfeit 'temple of God,'" the Pope professed "to do what Jesus actually does in his Sanctuary."<sup>14</sup> Through these statements he deviated from the Millerite interpretation, indicating that the taking away of the *tāmîd* could be a vertical activity (earth-heaven) rather than a horizontal activity (earth-earth).<sup>15</sup> Yet, this view posed almost no problem to Sabbatarian Adventists who saw some room for papal activities in Dan 8:13c. Since the article did not mention the "daily" or the "daily sacrifice" even once, it remained ambiguous regarding the *tāmîd* so that it constituted no offense to either view. This does not mean that Crosier had no clear view of the *tāmîd* or that he did not intend to refer to Christ's heavenly ministration with those remarks; I argue that the opposite is true. But his view was not obvious in this particular article. Sabbatarian Adventist readers (who would not have automatically read every reference to the mediation of Christ and to the cultic activities of the Papacy as connected to the

<sup>13</sup> Regarding Crosier's views on the extended atonement in the heavenly sanctuary see O. R. L. Crosier, "Letters from Bro. O. R. L. Crosier," *Day-Star*, November 15, 1845, 23; idem, "The Law of Moses," *Day-Star*, February 7, 1846, 37-44; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 3; Merlin D. Burt, "The Day-Dawn of Canandaigua, New York: Reprint of a Significant Millerite Adventist Journal," *AUSS* 44 (2006): 318-329. See also idem, "The Extended Atonement View in the Day-Dawn and the Emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism," *AUSS* 44 (2006): 335-338.

<sup>14</sup> Crosier, "The Law of Moses," 38.

<sup>15</sup> According to Straw, *Studies in Daniel*, 55, "It is clear from the above that Crosier believed the Daily had reference to the daily mediatorial work of Christ." Cf. Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, 174.

*tāmīd*) most likely did not perceive from this article that Crosier understood the *tāmīd* as referring to Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

## 2.2. Explicit Statements in the Day-Dawn

As already mentioned above, most researchers<sup>16</sup> have overlooked other articles written by Crosier and published in the *Day-Dawn* which promote clearly a view on the *tāmīd* that is different from the Millerite and Sabbatarian Adventist view.<sup>17</sup>

Crosier ranked the "true understanding of the Daily Sacrifice and the Sanctuary and the proper adjustment of the prophetic numbers" among the fundamental principles he and others had discovered. He understood the taking away of the *tāmīd* as an "act of violence against the party from whom it was taken," which did not happen at "the transition from the Pagan to the Papal form of Rome." By defining the *tāmīd* as Roman Paganism, William Miller, in Crosier's view, had departed from his own rules of interpretation. The key for the correct understanding of the *tāmīd* was to be found in its OT usage. Since in the OT the term is always used in connection with the Israelite temple, thereby being a "Jewish institution," its antitype during the Christian period "must be a Christian institution." Crosier never acknowledged that the term "sacrifice" had been added to the biblical text; he always used the phrase "daily sacrifice." In his view, the "daily sacrifice" in Dan 8 pointed to Christ's sacrifice that would be "taken from Christ by the little horn" when the Papacy had put "human merit, intercessions[,] and institutions in place of Christ" who was the antitype of all the Jewish sacrifices.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 126; is the only exception. In a footnote, he referred to another article by Crosier in which he made an explicit statement on the *tāmīd*.

<sup>17</sup> O. R. L. Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2. This article is a response to J. Weston who had reacted to one of Crosier's previous articles on the same topic. See J. Weston, "Letter to Bro. Crosier," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 1, 2. The article Weston criticized, had appeared in the *Day-Dawn*, vol. 1, no. 12, in which Crosier, viewing the *tāmīd* as a "Christian Institution," desired his readers "to examine the meaning of *Daily Sacrifice* in Daniel." Unfortunately, no known copies exist of this issue of the *Day-Dawn*.

<sup>18</sup> Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," 2 (emphasis in original).

### 3. Sabbatarian Adventists on the *Tāmîd*

When the Sabbatarian Adventist movement eventually emerged from the chaos and confusion following the great disappointment of October 22, 1844, they adopted several new beliefs, namely, a new understanding of the seventh-day Sabbath, the prophetic gift, and the conditional immortality of the soul. Although they continued to consider October 22, 1844 as the end of the 2300 evening-mornings, they reinterpreted the meaning of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 and adopted a new view (one first proposed by Crosier) of the heavenly sanctuary service with its extended atonement. With the exception of these new doctrines, Sabbatarian Adventists generally held fast to the beliefs of their former denominations and the Millerite movement, including on the subject of the *tāmîd*.

#### 3.1. Explicit Statements on the *Tāmîd*

At the inception of their movement, Sabbatarian Adventists left no doubt on how they defined the *tāmîd* in Dan 8:11-13. Joseph Bates defined it as Roman paganism, on the grounds that the dual aspects of Roman power (pagan and papal) seemed to mirror the "two desolating powers" seen in 2 Thess 2; Rev 12-13; and Dan 8:11-13—that is, the daily desolation and the transgression of desolation. In the same vein, James White argued that "the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation represent Rome in its pagan and papal forms."<sup>19</sup> Otis Nichols, John N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and others shared these convictions.<sup>20</sup> That the word "sacrifice" did

<sup>19</sup> James White, *Bible Adventism: Or, Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ: Our Faith and Hope, No. 1* (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, n.d.), 127; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel: The Four Kingdoms, the Sanctuary, and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1863), 73; idem, *Our Faith and Hope, No. 1* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1870), 116, 117; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve--The Time," *Review and Herald*, February 15, 1870, 57-59.

<sup>20</sup> Otis Nichols, "The Signs of the End of the World," *Review and Herald*, December 9, 1852, 114; John N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days* (Rochester, NY: James White, 1853), 33, 34; Uriah Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth, No. 12: The 1290 and 1335 Days," *Review and Herald*, January 28, 1858, 92; idem, "Short Interviews with Correspondents," *Review and Herald*, February 24, 1863, 100; idem, "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered," *Review and Herald*, November 1, 1864, 180; idem, "Papal Supremacy: When Did It Commence?" *Review and Herald*, December 6, 1864, 12; idem, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," *Review and Her-*

not exist in the Hebrew text and was inappropriately added in the English translation was a vital part of their argument.<sup>21</sup> While the adverb *tāmîd* usually goes together with a verb or noun, thus taking an adjectival function, in Dan 8:13 ("the daily and the abomination of desolation") *tāmîd* is not directly succeeded by a noun although it is prefixed by an article. Looking for a noun that may be qualified by *tāmîd*, they concluded that "desolation" had to be the noun that was qualified by both daily and abomination: the daily desolation and the abomination of desolation, referring to two "desolating powers" that laid waste the sanctuary and the host.<sup>22</sup>

While Sabbatarian Adventists maintained the Millerite interpretation of *tāmîd*, they modified some aspects in their interpretation of Dan 8:11-14, especially in verses 13c and 14. Although "the place of his sanctuary" (Dan 8:11) was still considered as the city of Rome, in harmony with the Millerite interpretation, Adventists now redefined the "sanctuary" in Dan 8:14 as the heavenly sanctuary (as Crosier did) and viewed it no longer as

---

*ald*, April 3, 1866, 139; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review and Herald*, June 28, 1870, 12; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review and Herald*, July 5, 1870, 20; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI," *Review and Herald*, February 28, 1871, 84; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1873), 158, 160; idem, "The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper—Daniel 8," *Review and Herald*, January 27, 1876, 28; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8,14* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1877), 41, 42; "Historical Gleanings: By Reason of Transgression," *Review and Herald*, March 4, 1873, 92; Goodloe H. Bell, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII—Pagan and Papal Dominion," *Review and Herald*, August 29, 1878, 75; idem, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII—The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, September 5, 1878, 83.

<sup>21</sup> J. White, *Bible Adventism*, 127; idem, *Our Faith and Hope*, No. 1, 116, 117; Andrews, *The Sanctuary*, 33; Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; idem, "Prophecy," *Review and Herald*, May 29, 1860, 3; idem, "Short Interviews with Correspondents," 100; idem, "The Sanctuary—An Objection Considered," 180; idem, "Papal Supremacy," 12; idem, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," 139; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," June 28, 1870, 12; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," July 5, 1870, 20; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI," 84; idem, "The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper," 28; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8,14*, 41; A. C. Bourdeau, "Our Present Position," *Review and Herald*, May 14, 1867, 266; Bell, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XII," 75.

<sup>22</sup> Nichols, "The Signs of the End," 114; Andrews, *The Sanctuary*, 33; Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160.



the earth or the church as William Miller had done it.<sup>23</sup> Thus, they saw striking terminological, chronological, and topical parallels between 2 Thess 2 and Dan 8, showing one power that had to be removed in order to be replaced by a second power, i.e. papal Rome replacing pagan Rome.<sup>24</sup> They recognized the same change and transfer of power in Rev 17.<sup>25</sup> The references to the "abomination of desolation" as spoken of in Matt 24:15 and Luke 21:20 were considered to refer to the desolating power of pagan Rome as described in Dan 8:13a-b.<sup>26</sup> The year A.D. 508 as the time when the *tāmīd* was taken away was maintained as the beginning point for the 1290 and 1335 year prophesies in Dan 12:11, 12.<sup>27</sup> These prophesies accordingly found their fulfillment when the pagan Germanic tribes that had conquered Rome converted to a corrupted form of Christianity and bowed their knees to the Roman pontiff so that pagan Rome became

<sup>23</sup> J. White, "Our Present Position," January 1851, 28, 29; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 43-72, 75-95; idem, "Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, July 14, 1863, 52, 53; idem, "Saving Faith," *Review and Herald*, February 16, 1869, 58; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve," 57-59; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Fourteen--The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, March 1, 1870, 81, 82; Smith, "Prophecy," 3, 4; idem, "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered," 181; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," June 28, 1870, 12; idem, "The Sanctuary: Fourth Paper," 28; John N. Andrews, "The Order of Events in the Judgment: Number Twelve," *Review and Herald*, January 25, 1870, 36; idem, "The Sanctuary of the Bible," *Review and Herald*, March 10, 1874, 97-99; Bell, "Lessons for Bible Classes: Lesson XIII," 83; "How Long the Vision?," *Review and Herald*, November 14, 1878, 156.

<sup>24</sup> J. White, *Bible Adventism*, 127; idem, *Our Faith and Hope*, No. 1, 116, 117; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve," 58; Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; Andrews, *The Sanctuary*, 34-36.

<sup>25</sup> Uriah Smith, "The Seven Heads of Revelation 12, 13, and 17" [ca. 1870s] unpublished manuscript, Center for Adventist Research, James White Library, Berrien Springs, MI, 27, 28.

<sup>26</sup> Smith, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," 139; Andrews, *The Sanctuary*, 35, 36.

<sup>27</sup> Nichols, "The Signs of the End," 114; Joseph Bates, "Voices of the Prophets, vol. 1, no. 1," *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1860, 90; Smith, "Short Interviews with Correspondents," 100; idem, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; idem, "Papal Supremacy," 12, 13; idem, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," 139; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI," 84; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XII," *Review and Herald*, July 18, 1871, 36, 37; James White, "The Time of the End," *Review and Herald*, July 15, 1880, 56. The setting up of the papacy occurred in A.D. 538, 30 years after the *tāmīd* had been taken away. See, e.g. Uriah Smith, "The 1290 Days," *Review and Herald*, December 10, 1895, 794.

Christian and paganism was removed.<sup>28</sup> The "daily abomination," or "the spirit of paganism," was at work during the whole time of the 2300 days/years, namely during the reigns of Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, and imperial Rome.<sup>29</sup> The heavenly sanctuary (Dan 8:13c, 14), or the heavenly city, was "trodden underfoot" by the fact that the city of Rome (Dan 8:11) was labeled in Christendom as the eternal and holy city, in which sins are pardoned by the Pope.<sup>30</sup> Thus, although the activities of the Papacy were seen in Dan 8:13c, Adventist interpreters could not identify it in vs. 11-13b. This hybrid interpretation of Dan 8:11-14, combining elements from the Millerite view and Crosier's new concept, may have been the cause for the modern confusion of ideas on the early Sabbatarian Adventist view of the *tāmîd*.

Like his fellow Sabbatarian Adventists, Uriah Smith also maintained that the *tāmîd* referred to pagan Rome. In 1864, Smith wrote, "This daily has often been shown through the *Review* to be not a sacrifice but an abomination, referring to Paganism."<sup>31</sup> Certainly, Smith's *Daniel and Revelation* became the classic source for the interpretation of the *tāmîd*, and his interpretation was thus influential.<sup>32</sup> However, the early references by Joseph Bates, James White, and others show that it was not because of Smith's influence, per se, that Seventh-day Adventists adopted the view

<sup>28</sup> Nichols, "The Signs of the End," 114; Bates, "Voices of the Prophets," 90; Smith, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XI," 84, 85; idem, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8:14*, 41, 42; cf. Uriah Smith and James White, *The Biblical Institute: A Synopsis of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House, 1878), 53.

<sup>29</sup> Smith, "The Daily and Abomination of Desolation," 139; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," July 5, 1870, 20.

<sup>30</sup> J. White, "Our Present Position," January 1851, 28, 29; idem, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 73-75; cf. Jewell, "Bishop Jewell on Antichrist," *Review and Herald*, November 29, 1870, 186. Uriah Smith also referred to the Pantheon as "the place of his sanctuary." See Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92.

<sup>31</sup> Smith, "Papal Supremacy," 12.

<sup>32</sup> A brief glance over the references during the first 50 years shows that Uriah Smith's articles and books appear more often than those of any other writer. It is certainly also due to Smith's longer lifespan and accordingly a longer working time. James White had died already in 1881 and Andrews in 1883, while Smith did not pass away until 1903. Given the prominence of Smith's *Daniel and Revelation* commentary, it is due to this work that the *tāmîd* interpretation was carried to the next generation.

of the *tāmîḡ* as pagan Rome. Rather, they were simply maintaining the preexisting Millerite position.<sup>33</sup>

### 3.2. Ambiguous Statements on Christ's Heavenly Ministration

Despite clear statements from early Sabbatarian Adventist writers demonstrating that they interpreted the *tāmîḡ* as referring to pagan Rome, certain other statements of these same writers are more ambiguous, leading some modern scholars to assume that Sabbatarian Adventists endorsed Crosier's view on the *tāmîḡ*.<sup>34</sup> However, the background of plain and explicit statements on the *tāmîḡ* by the early Sabbatarian Adventist writers helps to explain their more ambiguous remarks and demonstrates that they did not, in fact, embrace Crosier's view.

One of the more perplexing statements on the *tāmîḡ* in early Adventist literature was made by David Arnold, who was later a member of the publishing committee of the *Advent Review*. He wrote: "In the autumn of 1844, Christ did close his daily, or continual ministration or mediation in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary."<sup>35</sup> Similar statements were made by other Adventist writers such as James White, Uriah Smith, W. H. Littlejohn, and others.<sup>36</sup> At first glance, such statements appear to equate the *tāmîḡ* with Christ's heavenly ministration. Yet, these statements stand in connection with the events of October 22, 1844, and the new understanding of the heavenly sanctuary in Dan 8:13c, 14. They demonstrate their belief in the type-antitype correlation of the OT sanctuary service and the heavenly sanctuary ministry but have nothing whatsoever to do

<sup>33</sup> Kaiser, "History of the Adventist Interpretation of the 'Daily,'" 11-39; 72, 73, 75-86.

<sup>34</sup> Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:64, 65; Carnegie, "The Historical Setting," 23-25; Arano, "The Daily," 5; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 26-28.

<sup>35</sup> David Arnold, "The Shut Door Explained," *Present Truth*, December 1849, 45. Froom, "Historical Setting and Background," 8; and Heiks, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 2," 10, indicated that Arnold's statement was based on the interpretation of the *tāmîḡ* as Christ's heavenly ministration. Yet, Arnold did not talk about the *tāmîḡ* of Dan 8:11-13 but just about the fulfillment of the type of the OT sanctuary services.

<sup>36</sup> J. White, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Twelve," 57; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Thirteen--The Time," *Review and Herald*, February 22, 1870, 73-74; idem, "Our Faith and Hope, or Reasons Why We Believe as We Do: Number Fourteen," 81-82; Andrews, "The Order of Events in the Judgment," 36; Smith, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel: Chapter XII," 37; "How long the vision?," 156.

with Dan 8:11, 12. Although sometimes Adventist writers referred to the daily and yearly services of the OT sanctuary, they were making the connection to the cleansing of the sanctuary since 1844 (Dan 8:13, 14) in order to oppose renewed time setting, but not to define the *tāmīd* in Dan 8:11-13b.<sup>37</sup>

Sabbatarian Adventist statements on Christ's heavenly sanctuary service and the taking away of its knowledge in the mind of the people by the little horn power may cause modern interpreters to assume that Sabbatarian Adventists had also adopted Crosier's view of the *tāmīd*. Yet, Sabbatarian Adventists apparently never drew that linkage between the *tāmīd* and the idea of the heavenly sanctuary.

#### 4. "Age to Come" Adventism: O. R. L. Crosier vs. Sabbatarian Adventists

As for why Crosier's view of the *tāmīd* was not embraced by Sabbatarian Adventists in the 19th century, the best explanation lies in Crosier's connection to "Age to Come" Adventists. The "Age to Come" doctrine was advocated by Joseph Marsh and his periodical *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate* (formerly *Voice of Truth*). According to that doctrine, people who had not accepted Christ prior to his second coming could do so during "the age to come," the millennium on earth, and that at that time the Jews would return to Israel.<sup>38</sup> The adherents of these ideas later established the

<sup>37</sup> Ellen G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," *Present Truth*, November 1850, 87; Bourdeau, "Our Present Position," 266; John N. Andrews, "The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing," *Review and Herald*, December 15, 1868, 274; cf. Joseph Bates, "The Laodicean Church," *Review and Herald*, November 1850, 7. A thorough examination of J. White, "Our Present Position," January 1851, 28, 29; and Smith, "The Sanctuary," 78, also found in idem, *The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary*, vol. 5 of *Advent and Sabbath Tracts* (Rochester, NY: Advent Review Office, 1854), 22, shows that both accepted Crosier's understanding of the heavenly sanctuary and the counterfeit activities of the Papacy but not his identification of the *tāmīd*. For an extensive discussion of Ellen G. White's statement in the *Present Truth*, November 1850 (quoted above), see Kaiser, "History of the Adventist Interpretation of the 'Daily,'" 104-133; idem, "Ellen G. White and 'Daily' Conflict," *Ellen G. White and Current Issues Symposium 6* (2010): 6-34.

<sup>38</sup> Joseph Marsh, "The Millenium of Rev. XX," *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate*, November 17, 1849, 172; idem, "The Age to Come: Objections - Probation," *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate*, May 11, 1850, 372, 373; cf. Isaac C. Wellcome, *Second Advent History*, Adventist Classic Library (Yarmouth, ME: I. C. Wellcome, 1874; repr., Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2008), 592, 396; James Hastings, ed., *The Expository Times: October 1895 - September 1896* (Edinburgh: T&T

Church of God General Conference, while Sabbatarian Adventists who had been influenced by this doctrine founded, together with others, the Church of God (Seventh-day).<sup>39</sup>

#### 4.1. "Age to Come" Adventists and O. R. L. Crosier

Interpreting the term *tāmîd* in the light of its usage in the OT, "Age to Come" Adventists concluded that the noun intended to be qualified by the term *tāmîd* should be the word "sacrifice."<sup>40</sup> The "place of his sanctuary" in Dan 8:11 was considered to be the temple in Jerusalem since the terms מִקְדָּשׁ (*māḵōn*, place) and מִקְדָּשׁ (*miqdāš*, sanctuary) are both generally used in the sanctuary context.<sup>41</sup> The 2300 evening-mornings were split into two periods, the time of the "daily sacrifice" and the time of "abomination of desolation."<sup>42</sup> The 2300 years together with the "daily sacrifice"

---

Clark, 1896), 7:547; Henry King Carroll, "Adventists," *A Religious Encyclopaedia: or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology*, ed. Philip Schaff; rev. ed. (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889), 2581; David Tallmadge Arthur, "'Come out of Babylon': A Study of Millerite Separatism and Denominationalism, 1840-1865" (Ph.D. diss., University of Rochester, 1970), 225-227; Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1998), 50.

<sup>39</sup> Arthur, "'Come out of Babylon:,'" 360; George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World: A Study of Millerite Adventism* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1993), 288; Gary Land, *Historical Dictionary of Seventh-day Adventists*, vol. 56 of *Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2005), 63, 187.

<sup>40</sup> "Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c," *Advent Herald*, March 3, 1849, 36; F. H. Berick, *The Grand Crisis: The Lord Soon to Come* (Boston: n.p., 1854), 82. Wellcome, 471, 595, gives his name as F. H. Berrick. Later, Froom spelled his name as F. H. Berwick. See Froom, "Historical Setting and Background," 11. Other writers took over Froom's spelling. See Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 39; idem, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 3," 10; Kaiser, "History of the Adventist Interpretation of the 'Daily,'" 25, 88, 124, 127, 143. Both versions of the name are probably misspellings because other primary sources give his name as F. H. Berick. See Francis H. Berick, *The Grand Crisis in Human Affairs: The Lord Soon to Come* (Lowell, MA: J. E. Farwell, 1854).

<sup>41</sup> "Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c," 36.

<sup>42</sup> Jonathan Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and the Application of the Truth* (Concord, NH: Barton & Hadley, 1854), 3, 7; cf. Wellcome, *Second Advent History*, 485. The basic idea was common among the Millerites who considered the 2300 years as the reign of "two desolating powers," the first power being a "daily desolation" and the second an "abomination of desolation."

commenced at about 446 B.C. when the Jewish worship was restored in Palestine.<sup>43</sup> While one writer considered the Jewish sacrificial services as finally being terminated at the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70<sup>44</sup>, another writer argued that the "daily sacrifice" did not really cease but only "the manner of offering changed."

Under the new dispensation offerings looked different (Rom 12:1; Heb 13:15, 16; 1 Pet 2:5). The *tāmīd* was no longer the bloody animal sacrifices but rather the daily sacrifices of God's people or, in other words, their true worship. It was taken away in A.D. 519 and replaced by the "abomination of desolation."<sup>45</sup> The prophetic time periods of the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days had commenced at that point of time and would accordingly conclude in 1779, 1809, and 1854. The year 1854 would bring in its train Christ's second coming, the resurrection of the faithful dead, and the millennium on earth.<sup>46</sup>

By April 1847, Crosier's interpretation of the *tāmīd* as found in the *Day-Dawn* was already similar in some aspects to the view that would eventually be held by the "Age to Come" Adventists: specifically, Crosier's interpretation relied on the added word "sacrifice," interpreted the term from its OT sacrificial background, and set new times for Christ's second coming (Passover 1847).<sup>47</sup> Then, during the 1850s, Crosier's affilia-

<sup>43</sup> Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart*, 3, 7.

<sup>44</sup> "Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c," 36.

<sup>45</sup> Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart*, 3, 7.

<sup>46</sup> Marsh, "The Millenium of Rev. XX," 172; idem, "The Age to Come: Objections," 372, 373; idem, "The Age to Come," *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate*, January 5, 1850, 228; Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart*, 246; idem, "Letter from J. Cummings," *Advent Herald*, November 6, 1852, 358. However, the editor of the paper, Joshua V. Himes, showed his depreciation of Cummings remarks. See Joshua V. Himes, "Letter from J. Cummings: Remarks," *Advent Herald*, November 6, 1852, 358; cf. Wellcome, *Second Advent History*, 471, 584. The later Advent Christian Church "had its origin among the followers of Jonathan Cummings." See Arthur Whitefield Spalding, *Footprints of the Pioneers* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1947), 26. In the 1850s, much interaction existed between the "Age to Come" Adventists and those evolving into the Advent Christian Church. See Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World*, 288.

<sup>47</sup> See O. R. L. Crosier, "Letter from Bro. O. R. L. Crosier," *Day-Star*, October 11, 1845, 51; idem, "Response to J. Weston," 2; idem, "Volume 2," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2; idem, "Good Testimony on Time," 3; idem, "The Advent this Spring," *Day-Dawn*, April 2, 1847, 6, 7; cf. E. S. Blakeslee, "Correspondence: Bro. E. S. Blakeslee," *Day-Dawn*, April 2, 1847, 8; Henry E. Carver, "From Bro. H. E. Carver," *Day-Dawn*, April 2, 1847, 8; Aaron Ellis, "Calculation on the 2300 Days," *Day-Dawn*, April 2, 1847, 5; F. B. Hahn, "The Time is at Hand," *Day-Dawn*, April 2, 1847, 5, 6. In the summer of

tion with the "Age to Come" movement became more obvious.<sup>48</sup> He openly joined Joseph Marsh in the movement, became the "principal promoter" of their society, and "was appointed its general agent."<sup>49</sup>

#### 4.2. "Age to Come" Adventists and Sabbatarian Adventists

Beginning with the rise of the "Age to Come" doctrine, Sabbatarian Adventists opposed the view that the *tāmîd* could signify Jewish sacrifices, on the grounds that the taking away of these sacrifices in A.D. 70 had "occupied comparatively but an instant of time," while the taking away of the *tāmîd* had to occur over a series of years.<sup>50</sup> Smith argued for a total exclusion of the OT background of the term *tāmîd*—he nowhere found the term connected with sacrifices—although at other times he and Andrews recognized its sacrificial context when stating that the pagan priests, altars, and sacrifices resembled the form of the Levitical worship of God.<sup>51</sup>

---

1848, James White wrote that he had not seen Crosier for a while and had no desire to see him. He had given up the Sabbath and did apparently expect the Second Coming not to happen before 1877. See James White to [Leonard] and [Elvira] Hastings, August 26, 1848; DF 718a, Center for Adventist Research, James White Library, Berrien Springs, MI; cf. Timm, "O. R. L. Crosier," 27.

- <sup>48</sup> In "Death ends a life full of endeavor," 10, it is stated concerning Crosier that "in 1847 he became editor of the *Advent Harbinger*, published in Rochester, N.Y." This periodical was first called the *Voice of Truth* (1844 – June 1847), and then named *Advent Harbinger* (July 1847 – June 1849). Then the name was changed to *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate* (July 1849 – June 1854) only to be changed later to *Prophetic Expositor and Bible Advocate* (July 1854 – May 1855), and *Bible Expositor* (June 1860 – Aug 1860). Joseph Marsh asked him to help him in the editorial work. This shows, however, his early involvement with Joseph Marsh who fathered the "Age to Come" ideas. He worked for the *Harbinger* until 1853. See Crosier, "Early History of Ontario County," 23; cf. Timm, "O. R. L. Crosier," 17, 18.
- <sup>49</sup> O. R. L. Crozier et al., "The Evangelical Society," *Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate*, July 16, 1853, 37; cf. Arthur, "'Come out of Babylon:,'" 352, 354, 356, 357, 365; Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World*, 288.
- <sup>50</sup> Uriah Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1897), 179, 341. See also Nichols, "The Signs of the End," 114; Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; idem, "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered," 180; idem, "Papal Supremacy," 12; idem, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," July 5, 1870, 20.
- <sup>51</sup> Smith, "The Sanctuary--An Objection Considered," 180; idem, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical*, 160. For statements where Smith and Andrews recognized the connection to the OT sacrificial services see Smith, "Synopsis of the Present Truth," 92; Andrews, *The Sanctuary*, 34, 35.

They argued against continued time setting and the idea that the Jews should return to Palestine, since both views were based on the erroneously supplied word "sacrifice" in Dan 8:11-13.<sup>52</sup>

Sabbatarian Adventists did not republish or refer to the articles of Crosier's in which he promoted his views on the *tāmīd*. Even his article from the *Day-Star* Extra of February 7, 1846, was not republished in its entirety; for example, some passages which outlined the "Age to Come" were left out in the reprints.<sup>53</sup> A comparison of the reprints of his article in the *Advent Review*, September 1850, nos. 3-4, and in the *Advent Review Special*, September 1850, shows that the Special issue differs slightly from the other two numbers because one paragraph was left out—a paragraph dealing with a brief but ambiguous explanation of Dan 11:30, 31; 8:13; Rev 13:6; and 2 Thess 2:1-8 and which could have been understood as a redefinition of the *tāmīd*.<sup>54</sup> Although it is not clear why James White retained this passage in the first instance in nos. 3 and 4 of the *Advent Review* in 1850, one could surmise that he left this paragraph out of the Special because he differed with Crosier in his explanation of the *tāmīd*. His interpretation of the

<sup>52</sup> James White, "Comments on Brother Miller's Dream," *Present Truth*, May 1850, 74; idem, "Our Present Position," *Review and Herald*, December 1850, 13; E. G. White, "Letter to Brethren and Sisters," 87; Bates, "The Laodicean Church," 7; Bourdeau, "Our Present Position," 266; Andrews, "The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing," 274; cf. John N. Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," *Review and Herald*, April 4, 1907, 10.

<sup>53</sup> O. R. L. Crosier, "The Sanctuary," *Advent Review*, no. 3, September 1850, 42-47; idem, "The Priesthood," *Advent Review*, no. 4, September 1850, 57-63. A comparison with the original article shows that several passages were omitted in the republished version. See idem, "The Law of Moses," the whole page 37, on page 42 the 2nd paragraph to the (including) 2nd sentence in the 6th paragraph, on page 43 in the middle column in the 3rd paragraph the passage beginning with "The antitype of the legal tenth day . . ." till the end of the paragraph, as well as in the right column in the first paragraph the passage beginning with "This indignation is the Lord's staff . . ." till the end of the paragraph, and the rest of the article starting with the subheading "The Transition." Cf. Kurt Bangert, "A Summary and Appraisal of O. R. L. Crosier's Article in the Day-Star Extra" (Term Paper, Andrews University, 1974), 11-13. Heiks, "Understanding Aright the 'Daily' Scripturally and Historically: Part 2," 10, stated that James White had reprinted Crosier's article "in full" in the *Advent Review*, September 1850. Yet, as was already pointed out above, even in the first reprint several paragraphs had been left out. Furthermore, in the third reprint only a small part of the original article was left with no indication of his views on Dan 8:11-13 at all. See O. R. L. Crosier, "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, September 2, 1852, 68, 69.

<sup>54</sup> See Crosier, "The Sanctuary," September 1850, 43; and idem, "The Sanctuary," *Advent Review*, Special, September 1850, 38.



*tāmîd* as the daily sacrifice and his adjustment of the prophetic date for Christ's second coming, seemed to represent a movement toward "Age to Come" Adventists and would have certainly made Sabbatarian Adventists wary.

## 5. Summary and Conclusion

It has been shown that O. R. L. Crosier interpreted the *tāmîd* as Christ's heavenly ministration whereas early Sabbatarian Adventism continued to interpret the term, as the Millerites had done before, as Roman paganism. While modern writers have correctly recognized Crosier's intention regarding the topic of the *tāmîd* in his *Day-Star* article, they have too quickly assumed that Sabbatarian Adventist readers of Crosier's own day would have accurately understood his view on the *tāmîd* in that article. They have rightly perceived that Crosier's explanation of the heavenly sanctuary and the Papacy's actions shares some similarities with the Sabbatarian Adventists' recognition of Christ's heavenly ministration and the cultic activities of the Pope; however, they have overlooked the fact that Crosier considered this as the interpretation of the *tāmîd* (Dan 8:11-14) while Sabbatarian Adventists saw Christ's ministration and the papal activities just in Dan 8:13c, 14 and refrained from connecting it to the definition of the *tāmîd*. Crosier's argumentation on the *tāmîd*, his setting of new times, and his association with the "Age to Come" movement made him and his views suspicious in Sabbatarian Adventist eyes (i.e. guilt by association).

Thus, although Sabbatarian Adventists embraced Crosier's ideas on the meaning of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14, its cleansing, and the extended atonement, they rejected his view of the *tāmîd*, clinging instead to the Millerite interpretation of the term, which ensured their prophetic framework with the fixed date October 22, 1844. In this sense, it may be argued that the Sabbatarian Adventist interpretation of Dan. 8:11-14 was a hybrid between the former Millerite view (Dan 8:11-13b) and Crosier's reinterpretation (Dan 8:13c-14). Seventh-day Adventists' reconsideration of Dan 8:11-13b and their eventual embrace of Crosier's view of that portion of the text in the 20th century became possible only after the connection between the *tāmîd* and the "Age to Come" views and continued time setting waned between the 1870s and the 1890s.<sup>55</sup> This historical episode suggests that while a specific interpretation may not be inaccurate in and of itself, it is often the connotations and associations with other harmful ideas and views that let this interpretation appear less appealing or even threaten-

<sup>55</sup> Kaiser, "Ellen G. White and 'Daily' Conflict," 12, 13.

ing. The process of time and the disappearance of the harmful context often allow for reconsiderations and reevaluations.