

The 2300 Day
1844 Doctrine
Weighed and Found
Wanting

by John Easterly

FOREWORD

This little booklet on the 2300 days of Daniel Eight is sent out with the hope that it will help many honest in heart to find the answer to some of the perplexing questions surrounding the 2300 day sanctuary doctrine.

The author would be pleased to correspond with those who read the booklet and who are interested in the advancement of the light of truth.

Some have suggested that a small charge should be made for the booklets to help defray the expense, but it is felt that there are some who would like to take a number of them for distribution and who feel that they are not able to pay for them, and so they are sent out free. Such contributions as are received from those who feel they want to help the cause along will be used to pay the expense of getting out other literature equally as important and timely as this work.

It is believed that the booklet is free from error insofar as Biblical and historical facts are concerned. There are, however, a few misspelled words due to error on the part of the printer, such as "confussion" for "Confession", pg. 28; "pecable" for "peaceable", Par 30, pg. 31; "weak" for "weaken", 4th Par., pg. 37; "alter" for "altar", pgs. 48, 49, and one or two others. These errors will be corrected in future editions.

JOHN I. EASTERLY,
Healdsburg, Calif.

THE BIBLE

"Within this ample volume lies
The mystery of mysteries!
Happiest they of human race
To whom God has given grace
To read, to fear, to hope, to pray,
To lift the latch, to force the way.
And better had they ne'er been born
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn."
—Scott, Walter.

THE 2300 DAY SANCTUARY DOCTRINE AS TAUGHT BY SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS

Weighed And Found Wanting

By John I. Easterly, Healdsburg, Calif.

Perhaps there is no doctrine held by Seventh Day Adventists that has been the subject of as many controversies and misunderstandings as the denominational teaching concerning the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14. This doctrine is termed by the leaders of the denomination as the "Hub" of the movement, and most vigorously defended by them as being vital to the stability of the denominational creed.

It is believed that thousands have honestly accepted and believed this sanctuary doctrine without giving the matter a personal investigation and determining from the facts in the case if it would stand the Bible test. The writer finds no fault with those who have done this, but it is believed a richer experience in the things of God could be realized if we would always follow the example of the noble Bereans in our attitude toward things that we are taught as "Truth". Paul said of the Bereans that, "These were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Acts 17:11.

It is to be hoped that the reader of this article will emulate those Bereans, and go to the scriptures and history, for proof of every claim set forth herein. If the claims and propositions here presented are found to be true, then an appeal is made that the reader accept them, regardless of his past belief, and then pass the good news on to others. If they are not true, no greater service could be rendered the author than to have his attention called thereto.

The Christian cannot afford to have anything in his doctrine but the simple truth, for the Saviour clearly taught that the teaching of tradition and doctrines of men, or commandments of men, contrary to the Word, would only lead to destruction, "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15:9. And again, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." V. 13.

The Lord is seeking for men and women in these last days who have the courage and determination to find out what is true and then accept the truth regardless of the cost. Truth cannot be found out in its fullness without first a complete surrender to God, and the complete acceptance of the Holy Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. This takes courage and trust in God, but if we put our confidence in Him with a complete surrender, we never need fear the result, for He will take care of His own and lead them into all truth.

Since the Seventh Day Adventist Doctrine of the sanctuary must stand or fall, to a large extent--at least--upon whether or not the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14 started in 457 B. C. and ended in 1844, we shall make the central object of this study a review of Daniel 8:14. To do this, it is necessary to examine practically all of the eighth chapter, a part of the ninth, including the seventy week, and many claims and interpretations of the terms of the prophecy as held by Seventh Day Adventists.

We are in complete agreement with the denomination in its interpretation of the first eight verses of Daniel Eight, and so we shall only notice those verses briefly for the purpose of leading up to that part of the prophecy in verses 9-14.

The following proposition is herein set forth, which is contrary to the denominational teaching, namely: The 2300 days of the fourteenth verse of Dan. 8 do not signify literal years, and it is historically impossible to start them at 457 B. C., as claimed by Adventists. The proof of this proposition will involve: (a) The claims of Mrs. White and her teaching on this prophecy. (b) An examination of the meaning of certain words and terms in the text and the interpretations and denials of them by S. D. A.'s. (c) The presentation of certain historical facts that are either denied or ignored by S. D. A.'s.

The first verse of Daniel 8 is simply introductory, stating the time that the vision appeared unto Daniel.

Verse two states that Daniel was at Shushan in the Palace of the Province of Elam, and as he was in vision he appeared to be by the river Ulai. This river flowed by the city of Shushan.

In verse three, Daniel says that he saw a ram having two horns, which were high; "but the one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last." This verse was interpreted, by the angel, to Daniel, as recorded in the 20th verse. "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia."

In verse four, Daniel says that he saw the ram pushing in different directions and no beast could stand before him, but he did according to his will and became great. We know, of course, that this happened, for Medo-Persia became the second world power following the overthrow of Babylon.

Verse five introduces the goat with the notable horn between his eyes, coming from the west with great swiftness.

Verse five is interpreted in the 21st verse. "And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king."

Verse six introduces the conflict between the ram and the goat (Medo-Persia and Grecia), and verse seven tells of the complete vic-

tory of the goat over the ram. The final victory was at Arbela 331 B.C. when Alexander the Great, who was the first king of Grecia, completely overthrew the Medo-Persian empire. The date of this battle should be kept in mind, for it has some bearing on the question under discussion.

It is stated in verse eight that, as a result of the victory of the goat over the ram, the goat waxed very great, "Therefore the he-goat waxed very great; and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven."

The reader is asked to carefully consider the sequence of events throughout this prophecy. It is necessary to do this in order to arrive at a correct understanding of the 2300 days. First, we are introduced to the ram. Next came the goat. We noted that the goat had a horn between his eyes. We also saw that the Lord said that the horn was the first king of Grecia. This horn, we know, is that which is universally conceded to be Alexander the Great. Now, the prophecy says that when the horn was strong it would be broken. It is universally agreed that the breaking of the horn represented the death of Alexander. His death was in 323 B. C. This date should not be forgotten. By it, we shall establish certain fundamental facts that have a tremendous bearing upon a correct interpretation of the 2300 days of verse 14.

We noticed in the last part of verse eight that when the great horn was broken (Alexander died) there were four other horns which came up in the place of the great horn. The angel, in interpreting this to Daniel, said that these four horns represented four kingdoms that would arise on the ruins, or in the place of, Alexander's empire. We know that this actually happened upon the death of Alexander, and it is generally considered that the four kingdoms that arose out of Alexander's kingdom were Syria, Thrace, Macedonia, and Egypt. It should be remembered that these horns, the four, have nothing to do with the prophecy until after Alexander died, and from that point on they arose, took shape, and did their share in the fulfilling of the prophecy. Read verse 22 on this point.

Verse nine says that out of one of the four horns which arose out of Alexander's kingdom, a little horn came forth. "And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." V. 9. Verse 23 says that this little horn would come forth in the latter time of the four kingdoms. "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up."

Now the reader is asked to candidly and seriously consider the significance of this last statement in connection with what is to follow. Up to this point we have the sequence of events in the prophecy and

their fulfillment to be as follows: (1). Medo-Persia was seen pushing its conquests, and enlarging its dominion. (2). The goat, Grecia, was seen coming from the west and engaging the ram in conflict finally vanquishing the ram at Arbela 331 B. C. (3). The goat became great and the Great Horn was broken. Alexander's death was in 323 B. C. (4). In the place of Alexander's kingdom, four kingdoms came up, represented by the four horns. (5). In the latter time of these four kingdoms a little horn came out of one of them. Note that there is a positive statement that the little horn came forth from one of the four horns. It did not come forth from some other territory and then just "appear" to come forth from one of the four, but God says explicitly that it came forth from, or came out of, one of the four. In other words, this little horn had its inception, its beginning, or its birth if you please, from and in one of those four horns. Any other theory or admission simply makes out the statement of the prophecy to be in error, and this is exactly what the S. D. A. denomination does do, as we shall show, in process of time. It does not matter what the identity of this little horn is, or was, for the time being. We first desire to show, from the scriptures, what this little horn was to do.

It was shown, in the simplest terms possible, and by the plainest statements that it seems possible for the Lord to have given us, that the little horn never came forth from any source, or had anything to do with the fulfillment of this prophecy until in the latter time of the four horns. And we have shown that the latter horns did not exist as such until after Alexander died in 323 B. C. This being true, the little horn did not have a thing to do with this eighth chapter prophecy until a considerable length of time this side of 323 B. C. This latter point is so obvious that it should not require any argument in its defence. It is assumed that the reader is fair with the Lord's word and willing to accept it as he finds it, and so we leave this point for the time being without further comment.

We now take up that phase of the prophecy that was fulfilled by the little horn that came forth and started its work in the latter time of the four kingdoms that arose on the ruins of Alexander's empire.

The S. D. A. denomination teaches that the little horn, in its various "phases" fulfilled the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14. It also teaches that the little horn fulfilled all of the things described in verses 9-12 inclusive, and that the question of the 13th verse was with reference to how long a time this little horn in its different "phases" was to continue doing the things described in verses 9-12, and that the question of the 13th verse had its answer in the answer of the 14th verse. Proof follows:

"This little horn must be understood to symbolize Rome in its entire history, including its two phases, pagan and papal. These two

signifying the pagan form, and the transgression of desolation, the phases are elsewhere spoken of as the "daily" (sacrifice is a supplied word) and the "transgression of desolation"; the daily (desolation) papal In the actions ascribed to this power sometimes one form is spoken of, sometimes the other. "By Him" (the papal form) "the daily" (the pagan form) "was taken away." D. R. 176, 177, by Smith.

It will be noticed from the above that there are two claims set forth by Smith with reference to this little horn which he says symbolized Rome, namely: The little horn is said to have two phases. One phase is the "daily form" and the other phase is said to be the "transgression of desolation." These two phases are said, by Smith, to desolate the church for a long period of time, or the 2300 days. "It appears, therefore, more in accordance with both the construction and the context, to suppose that the word **daily** refers to a desolating power, like the "transgression of desolation", with which it is connected. Then we have two desolating powers, which for a long period oppress, or desolate the church. Literally, the text may be rendered, "How long the vision (concerning) the continuance and transgression," as though it were expressed in full thus: "The continuance of desolation and the transgression of desolation." By the "continuance of desolation," or the perpetual desolation, we must understand that paganism, through all its long history is meant." D. R. 179, 180.

From the above we see it is claimed that the "Daily" was one form of the little horn, and the "transgression of desolation" was the other form. In other words, the little horn symbolized, according to Smith, two desolating powers, one Pagan Rome and the other Papal. Some will attempt to deny that they claim the little horn fulfilled all of the 2300 days, but we shall show from published literature that this is the standard and accepted teaching of our 1844 proponents. In the first place, the Bible clearly indicates that the little horn fulfilled all of verses 9-12 inclusive, and the things it did as there recorded led to the question of the 13th verse. It does not matter whether we look at this little horn in one "phase", two "phases", or any other number of "phases", the fact still remains that the little horn did the work covered by the whole period mentioned in the 14th verse, and the S. D. A. denomination admits and teaches the little horn did it, and nothing else did do it.

We have shown that the little horn, according to Smith, symbolized Rome, and that he claims it had two phases, and that these two phases constituted two desolating powers which were to desolate the church for a long period of time. We shall now show that this long period of time was understood to mean the 2300 days, and nothing else. Quoting from Smith again, we read:

"From a religious point of view, the world has presented only these two phases of opposition against the Lord's work in the earth. Hence

little horn of Daniel 8 actually came forth from one of the four horns that came up on the remains of Alexander's empire, as the Lord said it would, and history proves it did, but they take the position that this little horn only "appeared" to come out of one of the four. In other words, the position taken is that Daniel was mistaken in what he said God revealed to him. Of course, some will not admit that this is their doctrine, but it will be shown that it is, and that they have been teaching it during the whole course of their history. The proof is as follows:

"Rome is therefore introduced into the prophecy just as, from the conquered Macedonian horn of the goat, it is going forth to new conquests in other directions. It THEREFORE,* APPEARED to the prophet, or may be properly spoken of in this prophecy, as coming forth from one of the horns of the goat." Daniel and Rev. By Smith, page 175--6.

Further proof that the denomination teaches that the prophet did not mean what he said is to be found in some of their prophetic charts that depict the Grecian four horned goat. One of these charts is to be found on page 173 of Daniel and Rev. At the top of the page is shown the head of the goat having four large horns, and out of them is shown a little horn coming forth. (From the Macedonian horn). Now the horns in this picture are as Daniel said he saw them, except he did not say the little horn was Rome. It would never do, however, for the church to admit that that little horn actually came forth from one of the four horns as Daniel said he saw it, for in that case it would not be possible to apply the symbol to Rome, for every informed person knows that Rome was founded about 753 B. C. and that she became a republic in 510 B. C. and that she was a mighty power centuries before the prophet said the little horn would come forth. To get out of this difficulty, another picture of the goat head with its horns is shown at the bottom of the chart. Here we find the four horns on the head of the goat, but instead of a little horn coming out of one of them there is a great horn, Rome, shown coming from far off and overshadowing the Macedonian horn. That such a depiction and teaching is done to force the prophecy to fit the denominational teaching cannot be denied. Nowhere in the prophecy, or in the Scriptures can a shadow of an intimation be found that the little horn came from any other source than one of the four horns, as Daniel recorded that it would. It is perfectly evident to one familiar with the facts in this case that the denominational writers have deliberately selected Rome as the power symbolized by the little horn for the following reason: 1. The four horns did not exist until 134 years this side of 457 B. C., and 2. If the scriptural truth that the little horn came from one of the four be admitted, then there is no way to start the 2300 day fulfillment, by the little horn, at 457 B. C. and make the time end at 1844.

* "Emphasis Ours"

The fact that the denominational writers have selected Rome as the power fulfilling the little horn symbol does not help them in the least. If we were to admit that it was Rome, we would still be forced to acknowledge the Bible statement that it came forth and fulfilled the prophecy in the latter time of the four horns, not at 457 B. C., but actually almost three hundred years this side of 457 B. C. This will be shown when we discuss the power that actually fulfilled the prophecy. In the meantime it will be shown how the very words of the prophecy have been distorted out of all semblance to their meaning as given by Daniel. There are three words that we shall particularly take note of, as follows:

“DAILY” “SACRIFICE” “TRANSGRESSION”

The words “daily”, “sacrifice”, and “transgression” are found in the 11-13 verses, “daily sacrifice” occurring in all three verses and “transgression, or “transgression of desolation”, occurring in the last two verses above given.

We shall take the word “sacrifice” first, for this word has been eliminated altogether from the text by the denomination. It was desired that the word “daily” be considered as a noun in order to make it apply to Rome. Now, the word “sacrifice”, which, in the text, is qualified by the adjective “daily”, could not be admitted by the proponents of this sanctuary doctrine if the word “daily” was to be defined as a noun. It became necessary, therefore, to find some pretext to get rid of this very important word. It was found, or observed, that the word, as given in the King James version, is a supplied word. Here was the excuse of getting rid of it. Being a supplied word, it was said that it did not belong to the text. The evidences, however, were not quite strong enough, and so Mrs. E. G. White had what is purported to be a vision in order to show that the word “sacrifice” did not belong to the text. This purported vision is found on page 74 of Early Writings, and reads as follows:

“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.”

The test of all inspiration, false and true, is the Bible. It will be shown from Scriptures that the above claim is decidedly out of harmony with the Bible and therefore its source was not divine.

We have in our possession a copy of the Septuagint Version of the Scriptures. It is generally understood that this version is the oldest in existence, having been written in the third century B. C. Christ and the Apostles freely quoted from the Septuagint, and to this day it is freely used by the Eastern orthodox churches, none other being accepted by some members. We herewith reproduce Daniel 8:11-13 incl. of the Septuagint:

Verse 11. “And this shall be until the chief captain shall have de-

livered the captivity: and by reason of him the sacrifice WAS disturbed, and he prospered; and the holy place shall be made desolate. (12) And a sin offering was given for the sacrifice, and righteousness was cast down to the ground; and it practised and prospered. (13) And I heard one saint speaking, and a saint said to a certain one speaking; How long shall the vision continue even the removal of the sacrifice, and the bringing in of the sin of desolation; and how long shall the sanctuary and the host be trampled?"

It will be noticed that the word "sacrifice" occurs in the above rendering three times, and each time it takes the place of the words "daily sacrifice" as used in the King James Version. This word sacrifice, as used in the Septuagint, is not a supplied word and it will be noted that there are no qualifying adjectives. Take away the word "sacrifice" from the above rendering and the sense would be completely destroyed.

It should be remembered that the Septuagint was translated from the Hebrew into the Greek by Jewish scholars. Since this is true, there is not a shadow of doubt but that the word "sacrifice" belongs to the text.

Uriah Smith, in commenting on the prophecy of Daniel 8, has this to say concerning the word "sacrifice":

"The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word at all. Nor is there any word in the text which signifies sacrifice. That is wholly a supplied word, the translators putting in that word which their understanding of the text seemed to demand. But they evidently entertained an erroneous view, the sacrifice of the Jews not being referred to at all. It APPEARS,* therefore more in accordance with both the construction and the context to Suppose* that the word "daily" refers to a desolating power, like the "transgression of desolation", with which it is connected." Dan. and Rev. page 179.

It is only too evident, as previously stated, it was necessary to get rid of that word "sacrifice" in order to pave the way for the erroneous interpretation of the word "daily". The above quotation, and others that will follow, show conclusively that undue liberties have been taken with the Word and a wretched interpretation been given which does not have an iota of evidence in its favor. We desire to be charitable, and it is not intended any unjust criticism be offered, but when error is discovered, and it is seen that men and women are being deceived by that error, it is then time to speak plainly in order that some may turn from it and take the Bible only as their rule of Doctrine, and thus remove a grave reproach against the sufficiency of the Atonement at the cross of Christ our Saviour which this sanctuary--1844 doctrine places upon it.

"Daily"

We now turn from a discussion of the word "sacrifice" for the present and take up an investigation of the word "daily" which is

associated with "sacrifice". We have shown that the word "sacrifice" has been disowned in order that the word "daily" might be changed from an adjective into a noun. We have also shown that Smith, in commenting on the word "sacrifice", says of "daily" that, "It appears, therefore, more in accordance with both the construction and the context, to suppose that the word "daily" refers to a desolating power, like "The transgression of desolation", with which it is connected. Then we have two desolating powers, which for a long period oppress, or desolate the church. Literally, the text may be rendered, "How long the vision (concerning) the continuance and the transgression of desolation?" Dan. and Rev. page 179.

It may be seen from the above that the word "daily" is said to refer to an "evil transgressing power" instead of acting as an adjective to qualify "sacrifice". It may also be seen that "daily" is finally supplanted from the text altogether and in its place the noun "continuance" is substituted. It will also be observed that the meaning of the word "continuance", as given by Smith, is "desolating power", "the pagan form" of Rome. See at top of 177, D. R.

Scriptural proof will now be given to show that the word "daily" belongs in the Bible exactly as placed there by the translators, and that it is an adjective which qualifies the noun "sacrifice", either supplied or understood:

Any good analytical concordance will reveal that the original word, from which "daily" is derived is "tamid", meaning "continual", an adjective. Young's Analytical Concordance gives every reference where this word "tamid" is translated in the King James Version. There are 102 references and the word is translated as follows: Always (Always) 10 times; continual, 26 times; continually, 53 times; daily, 7 times; ever, 2 times; evermore, 1 time; of continual employment, 1 time; perpetual, 2.

Classifying the above according to the parts of speech they occupy, it is found that in every instance they are either adjectives or adverbs---never a noun. An attempt has been made by some denominational writers to show that the term "of continual employment", found in Eze. 39:14, is an instance where "tamid" has been translated as a noun, and the marginal reading is pointed to as their proof. If we carefully consider this marginal reading we shall find that no evidence whatever is found to justify the claim that "tamid" is used as a noun. The marginal reading is, "men of continuance", but this is a different construction altogether, and is no proof that the word "tamid" has been used as a noun. This is clearly borne out in the American Standard Version which reads as follows:

"And they shall set apart men of continual employment." No preference is given to any other word than "continual". The Septuagint version gives the best rendering as follows:

"And they shall appoint men continually."

Following is a list of texts covering all passages where the word "tamid" has been translated, and they are given that the reader may satisfy himself that there is no justification for the denomination in changing the meaning of the word "daily".

Always, (tamid) Eze. 25:30; Num. 9:16; 2 Sam. 9:10; Prov. 28:14.

Always (tamid), Ex. 27:20; 28:20; Deut. 11:12; Ps. 16:8; Prov. 5:19; Eze. 38:8.

Continual (tamid) Ex. 29:42; Num. 4:7; 28:3; 28:6; 28:10; Num. 28:15, 24; 28:23; 28:31; 29:11; 29:16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38. 2 Kings 25:30; 2 Chron. 2:4; Ezra 3:5; Neh. 10:33; (two times); Prov. 15:15; Jer. 52:34; Eze. 46:15.

Continually (tamid) Ex. 28:29, 30, 29, 38; Lev. 24:2, 3, 4, 8; 2 Sam. 9:7, 13; 2 Kings 4:9, 25:29; 1Chr. 16:6, 11, 37, 40; 23:31; 2 Chr. 9:7; 24:14; Ps. 34:1; 35:27; 38:17; 40:11, 16; 50:8; 69:23; 70:4; 71:3, 6, 14; 72:15; 73:23; 74:23; 109:19; 119:44, 109, 117. Prov. 6:21; Isa. 21:8; 49:16; 51:13; 52:5; 58:11; 60:11; 65:3; Jer. 6:7; 52:23; Eze. 46:14; Hos. 12:6; Obad. 16; Neh. 3:19; Hab. 1:17; 1 Kings 10:8; Ps. 109:15.

Daily (tamid), Num. 4:16; 29:6; Dan. 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:1.

Ever (tamid) Ps. 25:15; 51:3.

Evermore (tamid), Ps. 105:4. Continual (tamid), employment, Eze. 39:14. Perpetual (tamid), Ex. 3:8; Lev. 6:20.

The foregoing is proof that there is absolutely no scriptural authority for changing the word "daily" from an adjective as used in the text, into a noun. A comparison of different versions of the Bible will confirm the foregoing proofs. In the American Standard Version, the word "continual" is used instead of "daily", but it will be observed from what has been given as proof on "daily" (tamid) that the two words, daily and continual, mean identically the same thing.

Let us now examine some of the texts that have been given on the use of "tamid" and see how the term is used in connection with the "continual burnt offering", which is the same as "daily sacrifice", as used in Daniel 8. Turning to Ex. 29:38-42, we find the Lord's instructions concerning the continual burnt offering as follows:

V. 38. "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar: two lambs of the first year day by day continually. (39) The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even. (40) And with the one lamb a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil; and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink offering. (41) And the other lamb thou shalt offer at even, and shalt do thereto according to the meat offering of the morning and according to the drink offering thereof, for a sweet savour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord. (42) This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee." Ex. 29:38-42. See also Numbers 28.

The word "continual" in verse 42 is derived from "tamid" the same

as "daily" in Daniel 8. The reader will observe that the continual burnt offering consisted of two sacrifices a day, one in the morning and one in the evening, and that it was to be a "day by day" sacrifice throughout the generations of the children of Israel. Therefore, being continual (tamid), or day by day, and also being a burnt offering, it was a "daily sacrifice" exactly as stated and understood from Daniel 8, but sometimes called a continual burnt offering as given in the above reference and in the American Standard Version.

Anyone as familiar with the daily sacrificial service as Daniel evidently was would naturally speak of it as "the daily" when speaking or writing to others equally familiar with that service, leaving the word "sacrifice" to be understood, and that is exactly what was done in Dan. 8 in our authorized Version, it being perfectly obvious that nothing else could be understood when we study the context.

Another absurdity, in connection with the word 'daily' is not called to the reader's attention. It is in connection with verse 11 of Daniel 8. In this verse we find that the little horn magnified himself "even to the prince of the host." Now it is claimed by the denomination that the "prince of the host" as mentioned in this verse, was none other than the Lord Jesus. Reading further in this 11th verse, we find that the little horn took away from the prince of the host the "daily sacrifice". See the marginal reading "Putting the marginal reading into the text we have, 'Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and from him the daily sacrifice was taken away.'" This rendering is in harmony with the American Standard Version and clearly indicates that the little horn took away from the prince of the host the daily sacrifice. Now, let us put the denominational definition of the word "daily" into the text and see what we have. "Yea, he magnified himself even to the Lord Jesus, and from him (the Lord Jesus) he took away the desolating power." Could anything be more ridiculous and absurd than such a rendering as the above? Yet, that is exactly what has been, and is being, taught by Seventh Day Adventists, and it cannot be denied for the evidences are abundant to prove it to all who care to read.

The obvious reason for eliminating the word "sacrifice" from the text, and changing the meaning of the word "daily", is clearly seen to be the necessity of finding some way to get the little horn to work at 457 B. C. and thus establish a starting point for the 2300 days at that time. That such methods of handling the word of God cannot bear the light of truth should be apparent to all open, and fair, minded Christians.

Transgression:

"And a host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression." Daniel 8:12.

Smith gives his definition of the word "transgression" in the above text as follows:

"This little horn must be understood to symbolize Rome in its entire history, including its two phases, pagan and papal. These two phases are elsewhere spoken of as the 'daily' (sacrifice is a supplied word) and the transgression of desolation, the papal D. R. 176. In other words, the word "transgression" is defined by Smith to be the papal phase of Rome. He refers to his notes on verse 13 for further proof on this point, which reads as follows: "By 'The transgression of desolation' is meant the papacy." D. R. 180.

These definitions by Smith, and the denomination in general, put the Church in a most ridiculous position as will be shown. First, however, let us look at the definition of the word "transgression", in this text of Daniel, 8 as given by well known authorities:

"Transgression, (pesha) rebellion, sin, trespass." Young's Analytical Concordance.

Strong's Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary gives the same definitions as Young, on the word "transgression".

The word "pesha" from which the word "transgression" in Dan.8 is derived, is used 93 times in the Bible, and in every instance it denotes a religious rebellion, transgression, or sin.

Let us now consider this word "transgression" in connection with its context. It will be noted that an host was given the little horn against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression. That is, as a result of, or because of, transgression by some one, the little horn received power to take away the daily sacrifice. Since (by the definition of the word "transgression") this was a religious transgression, the host that was given to the little horn was none other than the apostate Jews. This will be shown to have been the case when we come to show the fulfillment of Dan. 8 by the little horn.

THE RIDICULOUS POSITION OF THE CHURCH AS A RESULT OF WRONG INTERPRETATION

It has been shown that the word "daily", as defined by the S. D. A. Church (we say church because the doctrine as laid down by Smith and Mrs. White is accepted by the church as authoritative,) is said to mean, "an evil transgressing power". It has also been shown that the word "transgression" has been defined to mean, "the papacy", and that the word "sacrifice" has been eliminated from the text altogether. Still further proof along this line is to be found on pages 176-177 of D. and R. where we read: "In the action ascribed to this power, sometimes one form is spoken of, sometimes the other 'by Him' (the papal form) 'the daily' (the pagan form) 'was taken away' ". Pagan Rome was remodeled into papal Rome. And the place of his sanctuary, or worship, the city of Rome, was cast down." The

reader should also note that Smith says, in the above quotation, that the sanctuary that was cast down was the place of paganism's worship, or the city of Rome.

We are now ready to make an application of the definitions of the words "daily", ("sacrifice" eliminated) "transgression", and "sanctuary", as found to be given by Smith.

For the word "daily" we shall use the word "Rome". For "transgression" we shall use "the papal form". For the word "sanctuary", we shall use "the place of paganism's worship, or the city of Rome."

Putting the above definitions in the place of their originals, we have the following revised translation of the prophecy by the church: Commencing at Verse 11.

"Yea, he magnified himself against the prince of the host, (a) Christ according to S. D. A's. (1) Or the marginal reading would be, "and from Him (Christ) the pagan form was taken away, and by the papal form the pagan form was taken away, and the place of paganism's worship (sanctuary), or city of Rome, was cast down. And an host was given the papal form against the pagan form by reason of the papal form, and the papal form cast down truth to the ground, and the papal form practised and prospered. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, "How long shall be the vision concerning the pagan form (evil transgressing power, or Rome,) and the papal form, to give both the place of paganism's worship, or city of Rome. and the host (the Lord's people) to be trampled under foot? And he said unto me, 'Unto two thousand three hundred days, then shall the place of paganism's worship (sanctuary) or city of Rome be cleansed.'"

That the above is the exact meaning or resultant of Smith's interpretation, and in no way magnified with false coloring, cannot be denied successfully. Some may reason that the sanctuary of paganism's worship is not referred to in the 14th verse. In answer, we reply that it demands a severe strain upon the imagination to find more than one sanctuary mentioned in the prophecy. In other words, the sanctuary that was cast down was the identical sanctuary that was to be cleansed.

Let us look again at the prophecy from the 9-14th verses incl. We find that the little horn arose, waxed exceeding great in certain directions, cast down some of the host and the stars to the ground, and even magnified himself to the prince of the host, and took away from the prince of the host the daily sacrifice, and cast down the sanctuary of the prince of the host. Also, it cast down the truth to the ground. Now when we consider what is recorded in the 9-12 verses, it is easy to see clearly that the question of the 13th verse is with reference to what has been given in the preceding verses. In other words, when it had been seen how the little horn did all of those terri-

ble acts against the people of God, the sanctuary, etc., the question was asked as recorded in the 13th verse, to find out how long those things would continue. Since the question of the 13th verse was with reference to what had taken place, it is equally certain that the answer of the 14th verse was to satisfy the conditions of the question of the 13th. So the question was asked: "How long, the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" And the answer, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days (evening, morning, margin) then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

What sanctuary was to be cleansed? The sanctuary that was cast down, as mentioned in verse 11. If the sanctuary of Verse 11 was the place of paganism's worship or the city of Rome, as claimed by Smith, and taught by the Church, then the sanctuary that was to be cleansed had to be the same. We shall show that the sanctuary that was to be cleansed was not the city of Rome, neither was it the heavenly sanctuary, as taught by the denomination, but the Lord's sanctuary on earth. Further proof will be given when we come to discuss the identity of the little horn.

Parallel Scriptures
Dan. 8:8-14

FROM THREE RECOGNIZED VERSIONS WHICH PROVE OUR ARGUMENTS, showing absolute agreement with reference to the "Daily Sacrifice", etc.

King James

"Therefore the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven.

"And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.

"And it waxed great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.

"Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was tak-

American Standard

"And the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the four winds of heaven.

"And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceedingly great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.

"And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host and of the stars it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them.

"Yea, it magnified itself, even to the prince of the host; and it took away from him the con-

en 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.

"Then I heard one saint speaking and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?

"And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

See the above verse with its marginal reading and notice that it reads, "evening morning."

tinual burnt offering, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.

"And the host was given over to it together with the continual burnt offering through transgression; and it cast down truth to the ground, and it did its pleasure and prospered.

"Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said unto that certain one who spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?

"And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

SEPTUAGINT VERSION DANIEL 8:8-14

V. 8. "And the he-goat grew exceeding great: and when he was strong, his great horn was broken; and four other horns rose up in its place toward the four winds of heaven.

9. And out of one of them came forth one strong horn, and it grew very great toward the south, and toward the host:

10. And it magnified itself to the host of heaven; and there fell to the earth some of the host of heaven and of the stars, and they trampled on them.

11. And this shall be until the chief captain shall have delivered the captivity: and by reason of him the sacrifice was disturbed, and he prospered, and the holy place shall be made desolate.

12. And a sin offering was given for the sacrifice, and righteousness was cast down to the ground; and it practised and prospered.

13. And I heard one saint speaking, and a saint said to a certain one speaking. "How long shall the vision continue, even the removal of the sacrifice, and the bringing of the sin of desolation; and how long shall the sanctuary and the host be trampled?"

14. And he said to him, "Evening and morning there shall be two thousand and four hundred days; and then the sanctuary shall be cleansed."

It will be noted that the Septuagint Version gives 2400 instead of 2300 as given in the K. J. Version. Another ancient Version mentioned by Jerome, the author of the Vulgate Version, gave 2200.

This leaves the quandary as to which number is correct. History is the only source of appeal in a case of this kind as two out of the three numbers given must be wrong, and if history shows an exact fulfillment of either one of these given periods, the other two should be rejected. **Positive Proof** will be given in this article showing which is the correct version, but we must leave that point for the present.

A comparison of the three foregoing versions will reveal some very interesting facts, some of which follow, and establish forever the fact that the 1844 sanctuary doctrine is false, exceedingly deceptive in its nature and a most wretched and shameful reproach upon the cause of God.

1. There is complete agreement in the three versions in all of the essential facts except the time period.
2. The little horn of verse nine actually came forth from one of the four horns of Alexander's divided kingdom, and from no other place or source. There was no "appearance" about it but it was an actuality.
3. The little horn grew great in certain directions only, not in all directions as Rome did.
4. The little horn magnified itself to the host and of the stars and trampled upon them.
5. The little horn cast down truth to the ground.
6. The little horn took away the sacrifice (daily) from the prince of the host, (said to be the "chief captain" in the Septuagint).
7. The sanctuary of verse eleven, instead of being the 'place of paganism's worship, or the city of Rome' was a holy place, according to the Septuagint Version, and the only sanctuary that actually had a holy place was the sanctuary where the people of God worshipped. This sanctuary was the sanctuary of the prince of the host.
8. A sin offering was placed, or given for the sacrifice, and the word sacrifice cannot be eliminated from the text in any manner, unless its equivalent "burnt offering" is substituted, without doing violence to the text.
9. The question of the 13th verse was with reference to all that the little horn had done, or was to do, as recorded in the 9-12th verses, namely: "How long shall the vision continue?" (that which is recorded in verse 9-12); The removal of the sacrifice, trampling of host, transgression, etc.
10. The answer in verse 14 was given to satisfy the question of the thirteenth verse and nothing else.
11. The time period was with reference to "evening morning", or evening morning sacrifices (two a day).

Some may argue that the record given in Gen 1 where it is said, "The evening and the morning were the first day" is proof that 2300 days are meant in Daniel 8, but the original does not indicate this to be true; also, a careful analysis of the text in Gen. 1 will show that such is not the case. It should be observed that the verb "were", in the reference in Gen. is in the plural, and the subject, to be in agreement, must also be in the plural, that is, there must be two or more things mentioned or understood. The subject is "evening . . . morning", two distinct periods of time, two of these periods constituted one whole of something, and that whole was "one day". If we were to count 2300 of those evening, morning periods as mentioned in Gen., we would have 1150 literal days, and that is exactly what we have in Daniel 8, according to K. J. Version, or 1100 according to the Ancient Version mentioned by Jerome. There is absolutely nothing in those 2300 days of Daniel 8 to indicate that symbolical time is meant, and if the translators had been true to the original, they never would have occurred in the text. The day for a year cannot be applied. We might just as well insist in applying a day for a year in the case of Nebuchadnezzar where the Lord told him that seven times would pass over him and that during that time he would eat grass with the beasts of the field until he had learned that God rules over the kingdoms of men.

If we insist in applying this day--year principle to all periods of time mentioned in prophecy we are bound to get into all kinds of difficulty. In Nebuchadnezzar's case we would have Nebuchadnezzar eating grass for 2520 years, for 7--times multiplied by 360, and counting each day for a year would equal 2520 years. This kind of an application would be absurd, and yet there is more reason to apply that principle to the seven times of Nebuchadnezzar than to apply it to the 2300 evening morning prophecy of Daniel 8.

Before taking up the fulfillment of the prophecy a few other important points should be noticed. It is claimed that the prophecy was to have its culmination in the last days, which reached to 1844, and that the statement of the prophecy requires this conclusion. Such is nowhere indicated in any part of the chapter. In the 17th verse of Daniel 8, the statement is made by Gabriel to Daniel that "at the close of the end shall be the vision". K. J. Version. The A. M. S. Version reads, "Understand, O son of man; for the vision belongeth to the time of the end." The Septuagint Version reads as follows: "Understand, son of man: for yet the vision is for an appointed time." and the footnote reads, "an end of time."

This latter reference gives us altogether a different understanding of the meaning of the text, altho it is still in harmony with the other versions. In other words, the thought is not that the vision would

have its fulfillment down in the end of the history of the world, but that at an appointed time of the end of something, the vision would be fulfilled. If we will take the statement of the angel Gabriel, and compare it with all the facts in the case, we can readily see the meaning of the statement in the 17th verse. For instance, in the 19th verse we read, "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed the end shall be."

Now the angel told Daniel that he would make him to know what would be in the end of the indignation and he immediately started in to tell him what would take place at that time, or at the appointed time. And what was it that he told Daniel? He told him the meaning of what he had seen in the vision with reference to the ram, the goat, the death of the great horn of the goat, the division of the goat kingdom into four parts, and the coming forth of the little horn, or king of fierce countenances, in the latter time of those four kingdoms, and that the little horn would persecute and destroy God's people. Those were the things that were to take place in fulfillment of the vision, and those things were to occur in the "end of the indignation," or at the appointed time. All of those four kingdoms had lost their independence before the cross of Christ, hence the time of the end mentioned had to be before the cross if these scriptures have a fair meaning at all, and who can deny that they do?

In the American Standard version we read, in the 26th verse, "shut thou up the vision; for it belongeth to many days to come." That is, shut up, or seal, the vision for there are many days as yet before it will be fulfilled.

THE NINTH CHAPTER NOT A PART OF THE EIGHTH

It is claimed that the ninth chapter is a continuation of the eighth, that the angel did not fully explain all of the vision of the eighth chapter but deferred the explanation of the 2300 days to a future date. See D. R. on the 26th and 27th verses. If this is true, how absurd it would seem for the angel to instruct Daniel to seal the vision, or shut it up, stating that the vision was for many days to come; that is, it would be fulfilled many days in the future, if it had to be opened again for further explanation. Note that this sealing instruction was not given until all of the essential points of the prophecy had been fully covered, and this before Daniel fainted and became sick.

If the reader will study the ninth chapter of Daniel, it will be seen that Daniel had been studying the prophecies of Jeremiah concerning the seventy years captivity, and as a result of this study, he became greatly agitated and went to the Lord in prayer to find out more about the prophecy, or vision of Jeremiah. Remember that Daniel and

his people were down in Babylon in captivity in fulfillment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, and that the seventy years were about expired. Naturally, Daniel would be concerned to know about their coming deliverance, especially, since he knew that God had promised deliverance in the same prophecy that foretold their captivity. Note: Although Babylon had been overthrown by Medo-Persia, the children of Israel were still captive.

As Daniel studied the book of Jeremiah, he found more than a prophecy of their deliverance, or their captivity and deliverance. He found that God had promised in that prophecy the coming of the Saviour, the new covenant dispensation, and the final setting up of the everlasting kingdom, and there was no doubt in Daniel's mind about the nearness of the fulfilment of some of those things, and naturally Daniel was concerned to know more about the meaning of what he had been reading.

Now let us notice some of the points of that prophecy, and of Daniel's prayer and see if there is anything to indicate that the angel came to give further instructions concerning the eighth chapter vision.

In the second verse of Daniel nine, it is recorded that Daniel "understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem."

As a result of what Daniel learned from Jeremiah, he turned his face unto the Lord God, "to seek by prayer and supplications, with fastings and sackcloth, and ashes." To seek what? Answer: Information concerning the things he had learned, or been reading about in Jer. Compare 1-3 Incl.

The reader is advised to take his Bible and read that wonderful prayer of Daniel and to take note of what he prayed about. Let us notice some of the points of his prayer and see whether or not they have any reference to the eighth chapter vision.

First, Daniel prayed and confessed that he and his people had sinned and committed iniquity, and rebelled, and refused to hearken unto the prophets that God had sent unto them, and that as a result of this, confusion of faces belonged unto them and that they had been driven into captivity "because of their trespass that they have transgressed against thee". V. 7. "Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us." Verse 11. Notice also similar statements in verses 12-15. Then notice Daniel's appeal to the Lord for deliverance and the restoration of their sanctuary and the holy city. Verse 16-19.

In connection with these verses, it should be observed that Daniel was praying concerning a PRESENT DESOLATION. That is, Jerusalem and the sanctuary was at the very time of Daniel's prayer, in a state of desolation. "I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury

be turned away from thy city Jerusalem." V. 16. "Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." V. 17.

The fact that Daniel was praying concerning a present state of desolation of the sanctuary, is proof positive that he was not thinking at all of the sanctuary of Dan. 8, for that vision, be it observed, pointed to a date far in the future, when the sanctuary was to be cast down. In other words, the eighth chapter indicated a sanctuary that was to be trampled or desecrated and destroyed, and in the ninth chapter, the prayer was concerning the sanctuary that was already destroyed, and which Daniel wanted to see rebuilt, and it should be noticed that it was in a destroyed condition when Daniel had the vision of the eighth chapter. This being true, what Daniel saw in the eighth chapter concerning the sanctuary was with reference to a sanctuary that was to be rebuilt, then later destroyed by the little horn; but the sanctuary of the ninth chapter which was then desolate, he wanted to see rebuilt. It does not matter that the sanctuary of the ninth chapter was to occupy the same position as that of the sanctuary of the eighth chapter, the thought in Dan. 8 is wholly with reference to a future destruction of the sanctuary and the thought of Daniel as recorded in Ch. 9 was with reference to the restoration of that which was lying desolate at the time of the prayer. These facts show conclusively that Daniel 8 deals with an entirely different subject to that of Daniel 9.

It was while Daniel was making this wonderful prayer that the angel Gabriel came in answer. "Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Verse 21. Note: The evening oblation was the evening sacrifice.

Because Daniel referred to Gabriel as the same being who had appeared to him in the vision at the beginning, or previously, is no evidence whatever that the ninth chapter has anything to do with the eighth. The statement of Daniel was simply one of identification and was equivalent to saying that the angel who came in answer to his prayer was the one who had formerly explained the vision of the eighth chapter, but there is absolutely no proof here that the angel had come to reopen the 8th chapter vision for further explanations.

What did this angel come to do for Daniel? "And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am now come to shew thee, therefore understand the matter and consider the vision." Verses 22, 23. These two verses show conclusively that it was in answer to what Daniel was praying about that the angel came, or "I am now come

to show thee", or to give understanding concerning the prophecy, or vision of Jeremiah, that Daniel had been reading, and was praying about, and wanted to know more about. This is so obvious, it seems almost unnecessary to comment upon it; however, we shall take a brief note of what the angel told Daniel and then notice some of the points of Jeremiah's prophecy that Daniel had been reading. First, it should be observed, the angel received instructions to come to Daniel at the very beginning of his prayer, and Daniel was not praying about anything mentioned in the eighth chapter vision, also, language could not be clearer to indicate that the thing the angel proposed to reveal to Daniel was with reference to the identical thing he was praying about.

Daniel was praying about the holy city, then desolate, which he knew would be restored, according to Jeremiah, and the first information recorded, as given by the angel, was, "seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city". Verse 24. Further, the angel said the city would be restored, or rebuilt, verse 25, and this too was one of the things Daniel was concerned about, and indicated in his prayer.

Our 1844 proponents make much over the word "determined" which occurs in the 24th verse in an effort to show that it means "cut off", from some time period, hence, they say, it must of necessity be cut off from the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, and being cut off at the beginning, they would fix the starting point of that period as having been at 457 B. C.

If we were to read this scripture without entertaining a biased opinion, or without trying to warp it to fit some "hub" doctrine, we would have no difficulty in understanding the meaning to be simply that, upon the Jews, God had determined, or decreed, a certain period of time beyond which they would no longer be recognized as His peculiar and special people, and that this period of time was said to be "seventy weeks" (Prophetic time, or 490 years) and that this period would begin at the time the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem should be given. The time "determined", therefore, was simply a portion of the duration of time which was assigned by God to finish the course of the Jews as his special people as mentioned above. See marginal reading on verse 24.

The place Daniel found in Jer. concerning the captivity, is Jer. 25, and on, and Jer. 25:11 gives the length of the captivity. Jer. 29:10 gives the promise of the return from captivity, and the verses following show a restoration of their wasted country promised. Jer. 31:31 and onward gives the new covenant promise which had to be sealed with the blood of Christ, and the time this was to be fulfilled was also revealed to Daniel by the angel, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity,

look at it for a moment. First, admission is made that the little horn came out of one of the four horns of the goat. This statement is then inadvertently denied immediately by saying that the little horn was Rome (page 175) when every school boy and girl that has studied the history of Rome knows that she did not and could not have come forth from the Macedonian kingdom.

The statement that the little horn "was then a separate power," existing separate from and distinct from any of the horns of the goat is a denial of the prophecy. The prophecy distinctly points out that the little horn had its beginning and growth in and from one of the four horns.

In connection with this last statement, we should pause to consider the meaning of "horn" as used in different parts of this prophecy. The horns of the ram were said, by the angel, to be the kings of Media and Persia, "The ram which thou sawest, that had the two horns, they are the kings of Media and Persia." A. S. V. The original word for king, as here used, is "melek" and means, king, counsellor, and refers to individual rulers and not kingdom. The same word is used to represent the great horn of the goat as the first king of Grecia, and again refers to an individual, and not a kingdom. Again, in the explanation of the little horn of Daniel 8, the word "melek" is used to designate the "king of fierce countenance", V. 20, and again refers to an individual ruler, and not a kingdom or nation. This word "melek" is translated hundreds of times in the scriptures, and refers to some individual ruler (king).

Now when we come to examine the interpretation of the four horns of the prophecy we find that those four horns did not refer to individual rulers, but to four kingdoms, or nations. See Daniel 8:22. The original word for "kingdoms" as used here is, "malekuth", and refers to a realm, empire, or kingdom. See Young's Analytical Concordance.

From the foregoing, it is readily seen that out of one of the four horn kingdoms a little horn, defined to be a counselor, ruler, or individual king, would come forth, and being a horn coming out of a horn, it would be something abnormal, indicating that this ruler did not belong there. This will be shown to be the case in connection with Antiochus.

There is no authority in scripture for concluding that the little horn of Daniel 8 represented a kingdom, but as pointed out, the scriptures do distinctly show that it represented one of the rulers.

It might be well to again remind the reader that the S. D. A. denomination does not claim any other power than Rome, in its various phases, to have fulfilled the whole of the 2300 days of Dan. 8. "Rome meets all the specifications of the prophecy. No other power does meet them. Hence Rome, and no other, is the power in question." D. R. 177, bottom of page. See also page 178 in the comments on verses 13, 14.

Before passing on to the next objection and its answer, we wish to call attention to a serious question in connection with this 2300 day fulfillment, ending in 1844, as claimed by Adventists:

It must be admitted that, if Rome fulfills the specifications, and the period extended to 1844, then something definite must have happened to Rome (the Papacy) in 1844 to mark the conclusion of her desolations, and thus to bring deliverance to the sanctuary and God's people, for remember, the prophecy, as indicated in the question of the 13th verse, clearly points out that the host would be trampled under foot during the whole course of the prophetic period, also, that the sanctuary would be trampled under foot for that period of time. This being true, What Happened to the Papacy in 1844 in any manner whatsoever to mark the end of her despotism?

Unless this question can be clearly and satisfactorily answered, what excuse can be given for continuing to support and preach this 1844 Sanctuary Doctrine?

Objection No. 2.

From the time that Seleucus made himself king over the Syrian portion of Alexander's empire, thus constituting the Syrian horn of the goat, until that country was conquered by the Romans, twenty-six kings ruled in succession over that territory. The eighth of these, in order, was Antiochus Epiphanes. Antiochus, then was simply one of the twenty-six kings who constituted the Syrian horn of the goat. He was, for the time being, that horn." D. R. 172.

Answer:

When the position is taken that each individual king constituted, for the time, the Syrian horn of the goat, the facts are again dodged, for we have just pointed out that the horns represented kingdoms, declared to be so by the angel, and they did not represent the individual rulers in any sense. The goat was Grecia, Alexander was a horn, ruler, that guided the destiny of Grecia, but he was not Grecia, or the goat. Likewise, the Syrian horn was a kingdom and the little horn was one of its rulers, but the ruler was not the kingdom.

Objection 3.

"If it were proper to apply the little horn to any one of these twenty-six Syrian kings, it should certainly be applied to the most powerful and illustrious of them all; but Antiochus Epiphanes did not by any means sustain this character." D. R. 174.

Answer.

Nothing is said in the prophecy about the most illustrious king fulfilling the specifications; the facts are that the opposite is indicated, as the little horn certainly was to be a vile person, and not an illustrious one. See Daniel 8:23. . . .

Objection 4.

In D. R., pg. 174, the idea is held out that inasmuch as the Romans had defeated the father of Antiochus, and that Antiochus had been