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1. Introduction

The apocalyptic prophecies of the Bible and the understanding of Christ’s heavenly sanctuary service 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 (tāmîḏ, daily/perpetual/ continual), which is described in that passage as having been taken away and replaced with another service by the little horn power and restored after 2300 evening-mornings. 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 tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ.

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 tāmîḏ, only a few writers have wrestled with the question of how

---

1 Daniel 8:11-13, 11:31, and 12:11.
Adventists initially viewed the term at the beginning of the movement back in the nineteenth century. The few who tried to answer that question unanimously assumed that O. R. L. Crosier’s article in the Day-Star Extra of February 7, 1846, promoted the interpretation of the ṭāmîḏ as Christ’s continual high-priestly ministry in heaven, in contrast to the Millerite interpretation of the ṭāmîḏ as Roman Paganism. Given that the article was recommended


by Joseph Bates, James White, and his wife Ellen G. White, that it was reprinted several times by James White, and that in 1854 Uriah Smith expounded on Crosier’s interpretation of the tāmîḏ, previous scholars have further reasoned that the Sabbatarian Adventists of the mid-nineteenth century must have endorsed Crosier’s redefinition of the tāmîḏ.

However, the assumption that Crosier’s view was widely embraced is problematic, for all acknowledge that the “old” Millerite view of the tāmîḏ as Pagan Romanism was the primary view several decades later at the beginning of the 20th 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 point, 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. 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


8. 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 already 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 & 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.


(1873) had such a big impact on the wider Sabbatarian Adventist body that his view remained the dominant position within the movement until the 20th century.\(^\text{11}\)

The question that remains, then, is to what degree Sabbatarian Adventists embraced Crosier’s view of the '].' in the mid-nineteenth century.

The present article will first take a close look at both Crosier’s ambiguous and explicit statements regarding the '].' of Dan 8:11-13. Afterwards it will examine statements from Sabbatarian Adventists that are the clearest in regard to the ).'</ 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. That 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 ).'</. 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.\(^\text{12}\) This article shows that Sabbatarian Adventists disregarded the ).'</ 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 Ŧemid

Most of the confusion regarding Sabbatarian Adventist acceptance of Crosier’s views on the Ŧemid 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 to 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.

Upon the publication of the article, Sabbatarian Adventist readers were quickly persuaded of the legitimacy of Crosier’s view. Because of their

\(^{11}\) A. L. White, The Latter Elmshaven Years, 247.

\(^{12}\) 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 rather be called Seventh-day Adventist period.
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 tāmîḏ 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, but it fails to provide an explicit and exact definition of the tāmîḏ. 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.”14 Through these statements he deviated from the Millerite interpretation, indicating that the taking away of the tāmîḏ could be a vertical activity (earth-heaven) rather than a horizontal activity (earth-earth).15 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 tāmîḏ so that it constituted no offense for either view. This does not mean that Crosier had no clear view of the tāmîḏ or that he did not intend to refer to Christ’s heavenly ministration with those remarks; I argue that the opposite is true as will become clear below. 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 being connected to the tāmîḏ) most likely did not perceive from this article that Crosier understood the tāmîḏ as referring to Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.


15 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.
2.2. Explicit Statements in the Day-Dawn

As already mentioned above, most researchers\(^\text{16}\) have overlooked other articles written by Crosier and published in the *Day-Dawn* which promote clearly a view on the tāmîd that is different from the Millerite and Sabbatarian Adventist view.\(^\text{17}\)

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 tāmîd 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 tāmîd 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 tāmîd 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.\(^\text{18}\)

---

\(^{16}\) P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: 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 tāmîd.

\(^{17}\) 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 tāmîd as a “Christian Institution,” desired his readers “to examine the meaning of Daily Sacrifice in Daniel.” Unfortunately, that issue of the *Day-Dawn* has not been discovered yet.

\(^{18}\) Crosier, “Response to J. Weston,” 2 (emphasis in original).
3. Sabbatarian Adventists on the Tāmīḏ

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. And 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. But 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 tāmīḏ.

3.1. Explicit Statements on the Tāmīḏ

At the inception of their movement, Sabbatarian Adventists left no doubt on how they defined the tāmīḏ 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.”

19 Otis Nichols, John N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and others shared these convictions.

20 That the word “sacrifice” did not exist in

---


the Hebrew text and was inappropriately added in the English translation was a vital part of their argumentation. While the adverb tāmîḏ usually goes together with a verb or noun, thus taking an adjectival function, in Dan 8:13 (“the daily and the abomination of desolation”) tāmîḏ is not directly succeeded by a noun although it is prefixed by an article. Looking for a noun that may be qualified by tāmîḏ, they concluded that “desolation” is that noun that is qualified by both daily and abomination: the daily desolation and the abomination of desolation, referring to two “desolating powers” that desolated the sanctuary and the host.

While Sabbatarian Adventists maintained the Millerite interpretation of tāmîḏ, 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 the earth or the church as William Miller had done it. Thus, they saw striking terminological, chronological, and topical parallels between 2 Thess 2 and Dan


They recognized the same change and transfer of power in Rev 17.24 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.26 The year A.D. 508 as the time when the tāmîḏ was taken away was maintained as the beginning point for the 1290 and 1335 year prophesies in Dan 12:11, 12.27 These prophecies 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 Christian and paganism was removed.28 The “daily abomination,” or “the spirit of paganism,” was at work during the whole time of the 2300 days/years, namely during the

24 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.


reigns of Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, and imperial Rome. 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. 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 *tāmîḏ*.

Like his fellow Sabbatarian Adventists, Uriah Smith also maintained that the *tāmîḏ* 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.” Certainly, Smith’s *Daniel and Revelation* became the classic source for the interpretation of the *tāmîḏ*, and his interpretation was thus influential. 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 of the *tāmîḏ* as pagan Rome. Rather, they were simply maintaining the preexisting Millerite position.

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

Despite clear statements from early Sabbatarian Adventist writers demonstrating that they interpreted the *tāmîḏ* 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

---


31 Smith, “Papal Supremacy,” 12.

32 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 1884, 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 *tāmîḏ* interpretation was carried to the next generation.

33 Kaiser, “History of the Adventist Interpretation of the ‘Daily’,” 11-39; 72, 73, 75-86.
view on the tāmîḏ. However, the background of plain and explicit statements on the tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ 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.” Similar statements were made by other Adventist writers such as James White, Uriah Smith, W. H. Littlejohn, and others. At first glance, such statements appear to equate the tāmîḏ 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 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 tāmîḏ in Dan 8:11-13b.

35 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 tāmîḏ as Christ’s heavenly ministration. Yet, Arnold did not talk about the tāmîḏ of Dan 8:11-13 but just about the fulfillment of the type of the OT sanctuary services.
36 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 & 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.
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 āmîḏ. Yet, Sabbatarian Adventists apparently never drew that linkage between the āmîḏ and the idea of the heavenly sanctuary.


As for why Crosier’s view of the āmîḏ 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. The adherents of these ideas later established the 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).


Interpreting the term ṭāmîḏ in the light of its usage in the OT, “Age to Come” Adventists concluded that the noun intended to be qualified by the term ṭāmîḏ should be the word “sacrifice.” The “place of his sanctuary” in Dan 8:11 was considered to be the temple in Jerusalem since the terms מָכוֹן (māḵôn, place) and מִקְדָּשׁ (miqdāš, sanctuary) are both generally used in the sanctuary context. The 2300 evening-mornings were split into two periods, the time of the “daily sacrifice” and the time of “abomination of desolation.” The 2300 years together with the “daily sacrifice” commenced at about 446 B.C. when the Jewish worship was restored in Palestine. While one writer considered the Jewish sacrificial services as finally being terminated at the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, 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 ṭāmîḏ was no longer the bloody animal sacrifices but it was to be considered as 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.” 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

---


41 “Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c,” 36.

42 Jonathan Cummings, Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and the Application of the Truth (Concord, N.H.: 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.”

43 Cummings, Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, 3, 7.

44 “Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c,” 36.

45 Cummings, Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, 3, 7.
its train Christ’s second coming, the resurrection of the faithful dead, and the millennium on earth.\(^{46}\)

By April 1847, Crosier’s interpretation of the ‪tāmīṣ‬ 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).\(^{47}\) Then, during the 1850s, Crosier’s affiliation with the “Age to Come” movement became more obvious.\(^{48}\) He openly joined Joseph


\(^{48}\) 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.
Marsh in the movement, became the “principal promoter” of their society, and “was appointed its general agent.”

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 tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ had to occur over a series of years. Smith argued for a total exclusion of the OT background of the term tāmîḏ — 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. 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.

Sabbatarian Adventists did not republish or refer to the articles of Crosier’s in which he promoted his views on the tāmîḏ. 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. A comparison of the reprints of his article in the Advent


51 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.


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 tāmîḏ. 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 tāmîḏ. His interpretation of the tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ 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 tāmîḏ 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

the original article shows that several passages were omitted in the reprinted 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. And in the third reprint only a small part of the original article was left with no indication to his views on Dan 8:11-13 at all. See O. R. L. Crozier, “The Sanctuary,” Review & Herald, September 2, 1852, 68, 69.

this as the interpretation of the āmîḏ (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 āmîḏ. Crosier’s argumentation on the āmîḏ, 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 āmîḏ, 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 āmîḏ and the “Age to Come” views and continued time setting waned between the 1870s and the 1890s.55 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 threatening. The process of time and the disappearance of the harmful context often allow for reconsiderations and reevaluations.