

## THE SECOND ADVENT MANUEL, PAGES 33–59

BY APOLLOS HALE

### PROPHETIC PERIODS. THE SEVEN TIMES, OR 2520 YEARS

The first of the prophetic periods, which are considered as main pillars in the calculations of Mr. Miller, is found in Leviticus 26:18–28.

The objections urged against this are, 1. That it should not be considered a prophetic period at all. 2. If it be so considered,—as the seven times occur four times in the text,—it should be understood as a period of four times seven times. 3. Admitting it to express only one period of seven times, which, understood prophetically, would be 2520 years, why should the period begin B. C. 677?

1. Why consider the seven times of Leviticus a prophetic period? Answer. That is the first meaning we should think of attaching to the text. If the word times did not occur in other parts of the word of God, when chronological arrangements are spoken of, there would be some show of propriety in demanding the reasons for so understanding it in this case. But when we read of the seven times in the history of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel 4, in which case only one signification has ever been supposed; and of the time, times and half a time, repeatedly spoken of in the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments; and of the times of the Gentiles, Luke 21:21; and of the times of the restitution of all things, Acts 3:21; and of the dispensation of the fullness of times, Ephesians 1:10; and of the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall show, 1 Timothy 6:15, etc., etc., the text in Leviticus is at once recognized as one of a most numerous and important class. The text is a part of the last communication which “the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinia, (Leviticus 25:1; 27:34,) and was specially designed for the warning of the children of Israel,” when they should “come into the land which God gave them”—a portion of truth which brought before them, in a most impressive manner, conditionally, their future history as a nation.

And this, if any doubt might exist, would confirm the idea that the text was intended to be understood chronologically. “And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins.” “Then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins.” “And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins.” Leviticus 26:18, 24, 27, 28.

“But does not the text mean to express that God would punish them in measure according to perfect justice?” That is a truth which it could hardly be necessary to assert. None could doubt that his administration would be according to perfect justice; and to punish them seven times might be as perfectly just as to punish them for any other period.

If any class of expositors should be called upon to give special reasons, they should do it who understand the text in any other sense than its obvious, chronological sense. Besides Mr. Miller, we know the Reverend Mr. Duffield, and Mr. Campbell, and others in our country, understand the text to contain a prophetic period, which they all understand figuratively to be 2520 years—as it must be understood in the nature of the case. Among the European writers, Mr. Philip (I think that is the name) understands and applies the period exactly as Mr. Miller does. I refer to him because he could have no knowledge of Mr. Miller. (See *Morning Watch*—a rare work in this country.)

2. “If the seven times be understood as a prophetic period, does not the text contain four of those periods?” I may be excused for inserting a quotation, which shows at once the carelessness and “ignorance” upon questions which every man may decide who can read his Bible, which are so characteristic of many who fill the most important stations in the modern church. It is from the pen of the editor of the *Protestant Banner*, published in Philadelphia—a most efficient antagonist of nominal popery. The writer had made a display of his powers on that side of the question of “Millerism” so honorable at the present time, in which he had shown from “Mr. Miller’s own terms,” as he called them, that the seven times could not run out till “A. D. 9103,” and then adds,—“It will be in vain for any advocates of Millerism to evade this conclusion, from the premises which they assume; they dare not tell us that the seven times here spoken of are merely a repetition of the same period, because it is emphatically stated after each separate enumeration of the different judgments,—which are impending,—that they shall be punished seven times more, if they do not hearken.”

Such a Protestant would not, of course, claim that kind of infallibility which might correct the written word; and if the reader will turn to the verses under consideration, it will be seen the word “more” occurs but twice at all; only once when the seven times are employed in stating their prospect of continued punishment, which is the first time the period is named, (5: 18,) and once when the measure of their punishment is compared with their sins—the only clear case of such comparison, (5:21,) the second time the seven times are used. I am sorry that so many of our able opponents are; willing thus to expose such an utter want of every essential qualification for scriptural discussion, as to take such a position, and then “dare the advocates of Millerism” to take that view of a text which everyone, who is at all acquainted with the Bible, must see at once is the most consistent and obviously correct view of it,—“that the seven times here spoken of are merely a repetition of the same period,” with the exception, perhaps, of the second case referred to above. I have yet to see “the advocate of Millerism,” who is so ignorant of his Bible and so regardless of its contents, as to “dare” to make a statement like the above by the Reverend Mr. B—.

Surely, it can be no strange thing to suppose that God may have made “a repetition of the same” thing in the revelations he has given us of his designs and will, especially when the matter is one of such moment to the recipients of the revelation. God saw fit to make known to Pharaoh the seven years of famine by “a repetition” of dreams, which Joseph dared to tell the monarch were “one;” and, in explanation, adds—“And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice, it is because the thing is established of God, and God will shortly bring it to pass.” Genesis 12:32. In the predicted subjection of the Jews and other nations to the king of Babylon, we have “a repetition of the same period” four or five times by different prophets, (Isaiah 23:15–17; Jeremiah 25:11, 12,) and I do not know that it has ever been considered an evidence of any particular form of courage to suppose this “repetition” to speak of only one period of “seventy years.” So invincible were the prejudices of Peter, and so important was it that he should understand the truth in the case, that there was “a repetition of the same” thing, three times, Acts 10:9–16. John is remarkable for “a repetition of the same period”—the forty-two months, or its equivalents, are named five times, Revelation 11, 12, 13; and the one thousand years are named six times certainly, chapter 20; and yet I believe there are very few who suppose that the repetition, in each case, refers to more than one period.

The mystery of the seven times is, therefore, explained by the very natural and scriptural supposition of “a repetition of the same period.”

One important feature of this prophecy, however, appears to have been overlooked. The language implies, and the history of the Jews proves, that these predictions of national judgments were conditional; not merely in the sense that the conduct of the Jews would determine whether they should begin or not,—that is too plain to be mistaken, verses 14–18; but after they had been inflicted in part, and the different forms of the threatened punishment had begun, the remainder of it might have been suspended or remitted; for after the first threatening of the punishment, it says, verses 23, 24, “And IF ye will not be reformed by me by these things, but will walk contrary unto me; then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you YET seven times for your sins,”—implying that, after the judgments had begun, if they would hearken and do his commandments, he would not punish them to the full; but if not, then he would punish them yet seven times,—the full punishment of the first threatening shall be poured out upon them. So the prophets understood the subject, and in accordance with it they addressed their countrymen, until they finally rebelled by rejecting their Lord, and the wrath came upon them to the uttermost. Jeremiah 3:7–20; 4:1, 2; 7:5–7; 17:19–26; 22:1–4.

3. Why commence the seven times at the captivity of Manasseh, B. C. 677?

1. The prediction itself points to that event. The first form of their punishment stated in connection with the first mention of the period is,—“And I will break the pride of your power.” If their kingly form of civil government is here referred to, it was never “broken” until the captivity of Manasseh. Although it was the case, after the division of the Hebrews into the ten tribes and two tribes, that they were several times made tributary to foreigners, still one division remained independent while the other was subdued and tributary until his captivity; but at this period the ten tribes had lost their king, (2 Kings 17:1–18,) and as soon as Manasseh, the king of the remaining division, was carried into captivity, their “power,” as an independent people, was gone. Manasseh was the pride and the ruin of the Jews.

Again; the prediction specifies the particular sins on account of which this evil should befall them.

Some of these sins are as specifically charged upon Manasseh and the Jews as the direct cause of their calamity. Compare Leviticus 26:14, 18, 27, with 2 Kings 21:9–13; and Leviticus 26:1, 2, with 2 Kings 21:2–8; 2 Chronicles 33:2–11.

2. Those texts which speak of the instruments of Providence in effecting this judgment, all point to his captivity as the time for the commencement of the period. Compare Isaiah 10:5, 6, with 2 Kings 21:10–14; 2 Chronicles 33:10, 11; Nehemiah 9:32.

3. The sacred historians refer to Manasseh’s sins as the cause of their captivity and sufferings long after his captivity. 2 Kings 23:26, 27; 24:1–4; Jeremiah 15:1–7.

4. Although Manasseh was restored to his throne, and there were a few other kings of the Jewish nation after him, they have never been an independent people “from the day of the kings of Assyria unto this day.” Nehemiah 9:32. Nebuchadnezzar brought the kingdom, in its subjected form, to an end; when Babylon was conquered by Cyrus, the Jews passed under the power of the Medes and Persians; then under that of the Greeks; in the division of Greece, they were connected with Egypt; as a part of Egypt, were conquered by Syria; they prospered awhile under the Maccabees, and the protection of the Romans, who eventually “took away their place and nation.” Since the destruction of their city, they have been “wanderers among the nations,”—a hissing and a byword,—pitying none, pitied by none.

5. The prophets, who lived long before the captivity of Manasseh, point to that event as the time of the passing away of the Jewish independence, by connecting it with other events. One of them gives the date. Hosea, more than a hundred years before, had said,—“And the pride of Israel (the ten tribes) doth testify to his face: therefore shall Israel and Ephraim (the principal tribe of the ten) fall in their iniquity; Judah (the other division) shall also fall with them.” Hosea 5:5. Isaiah, in the year 742 B. C., according to date in the margin, had said,—“And within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken that it be not a people.” 7:8.

From 742 deduct 65 leaves B. C. 677,—the only date ever given, I believe, for the captivity of Manasseh.

For an explanation of the quotations from Hosea and Isaiah, and for the most authentic history of the period before us, we add the following HISTORY

Prideaux’s *Concordance*, volume 1, pages 149–(sic)131. “In the eleventh year of Manasseh, B. C. 688, died Tirhakah, king of Egypt, after he had reigned there eighteen years, who was the last of the Ethiopian kings that reigned in that country.

“The same year that this happened in Egypt, by the death of Tirhakah, the like happened in Babylon, by the death of Mesessimordacus. For, he leaving no son behind him to inherit the kingdom, an interregnum of anarchy and confusion followed there for eight years together, 5 of which Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, taking the advantage, seized Babylon, and, adding it to his former empire, thenceforth reigned over both for thirteen years; he is, in the canon of Ptolemy, called Assar-Adinus. And in the scriptures he is spoken of as king of Babylon and Assyria jointly together.

“In the 22nd year of Manasseh, B. C. 677, Esarhaddon, after he had now entered on the fourth year of his reign in Babylon, and fully settled his authority there, began to set his thoughts on the recovery of what had been lost to the empire of the Assyrians in Syria and Palestine, on the destruction of his father’s army in Judea, and on that doleful retreat which thereon he was forced to make from thence; and, being encouraged to this undertaking by the great augmentation of strength which he had acquired by adding Babylon and Chaldea to his former kingdom of Assyria, he prepared a great army, and marched into those parts, and again added them to the Assyrian empire. And then was accomplished the prophecy which was spoken by Isaiah, in the first year of Ahaz, against Samaria, that, within threescore and five years, Ephraim should be absolutely broken, so as to be from thenceforth no more a people. For this year, being exactly sixtyfive years from the first of Ahaz, Esarhaddon, after he had settled all affairs in Syria, marched into the land of Israel, and there taking captive all those who were the remains of the former captivity, (excepting only some few, who escaped his hands and continued still in the land,) carried them away into Babylon and Assyria; and, to prevent the land from becoming desolate, he brought others from Babylon, and Cutha, and from Avah, and Hamath, and Sepharvaim, to dwell in the cities of Samaria in their stead. And the ten tribes of Israel, which had separated from the house of David, were brought to a full and utter destruction, and never after recovered themselves again.

Esarhaddon, after he had thus possessed himself of the land of Israel, sent some of his princes, with parts of his army, into Judea, to reduce that country also under his subjection; who, having vanquished Manasseh in battle, and taking him, hid in a thicket of thorns, brought him prisoner to Esarhaddon, who bound him in fetters and carried him to Babylon.

Archbishop Usher, after referring to the above facts in the history of Egypt and Babylon, stated by Prideaux, in reference to the points in question, says:—"Year of the world 3327. Julian period 4037. Before Christ 677. This year also was fulfilled the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah, (chap. 7:8,) in the beginning of the reign of Ahaz, "Within sixty and five years, Ephraim shall be broken in pieces so that it shall be no more a people." For although the greatest part of them were carried away by Salmaneser 44 years before, and the kingdom utterly abolished, yet among them which were left there was some show of government. But now they left off to be any more a people by reason of the great multitude of foreigners which came to dwell there. New colonies or companies were sent out of Babel, Cuth, Hava, and Sepharvaim; and this was done by Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, as is easy to be understood, by the concession of the Cuthites, mentioned Ezra 4:2, 10.

"At which time, also, as it should seem, and in the same expedition, whereby these things were done in the land of Israel, some of the chief commanders of the Assyrian army made an inroad into Judea, and then took Manasseh the king, as he lay hid in a thicket; after binding him with chains of brass, carried him away to Babylon. Jacobus Capellus hath noted in his *Chronologies* that the Jews in Sedar Olam Rabba, and the Talmudists, cited by Rabbi Kimchi upon Ezra, chapter 4, do deliver, that Manasseh, 22<sup>nd</sup> year of his reign, was carried away captive into Babylon, and that he repented him of his sin thirtythree years before his death."—[*Usher's Annals of the World*, page 75. London, 1658. See also *Newton on Prophecy*, pages 98, 99. Rollin, B. 3 volume, chapter 2.]

From all the light we have upon the event to which this prophecy refers, and from which the seven times should commence, no other date could be named for the event—no other point for the starting—point, any more than we could fix upon any other date than 1776 for the date of American Independence.

Having thus disposed of the difficulties; connected with this first and most important detailed prediction of the history of the Jews, so far as it relates to the prophetic period it contains, we will close our remarks by showing that it must terminate in 1843; and by referring to those texts which assure us that the coining of Christ, and the end of all things, in their present state, also come at its termination. God has explained a "time" to be a period of 360 days, (Revelation 12:6, 14.) In seven of those periods there are 2520 days, which, understood as years,—for they cannot be understood literally,—and commencing B. C. 677, end A. D. 1843.

360  
7  
2520  
677  
1843

The proofs that the end will come at the end of this period are found Daniel 7:1–7. Luke 7:24–27. See also remarks on the cleansing the sanctuary and last end of the indignation.

### **TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED DAYS**

The second of the prophetic periods, which are considered main pillars in Mr. Miller's calculations, is found Daniel 8:14.

The objections on this period are, 1. "It is not to be understood as years. 2. And if it be so understood, the cleansing of the sanctuary is not the end of the world. 3. There is no evidence that it begins with the seventy weeks. 4. If it does begin with the seventy weeks, we do not know with which of the several decrees it begins."

1. Should the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, be understood as years?

The difference of opinion which exists upon this question appears to arise from the use of the words “evening/morning,” which specify the portions of time enumerated, and which are translated days in the text, (2300 evenings and mornings, it is contended, make only half that number of whole days;) and, from the supposition that the question, in answer to which they are given, refers only to some particular pollution of the sanctuary which might occupy but a small portion of the time comprehended in the whole vision. That the marginal and original reading, evening/morning, is the Hebrew expression of the natural day, is admitted by the most respectable Hebrew scholars. Professor Stuart, as a witness, will not be suspected.

“On the whole, then, we must consider these 2300 evening/mornings as an expression of simple time, i. e., of so many days, reckoned in the Hebrew manner. So Gesenius, Rosenmueller, Havarniek, and others.”—*Hints*, page 100.

On the other point, whether the question and answer refer to a part of the vision or the whole of it, there seems to be less room for dispute.

In determining the true application of any particular portion of prophecy, we should refer, 1st, To the views of standard writers on the prophecies; and, 2nd, In a difficult case, we should make use of the following rule. It is quoted from Macknight, and may be found in Dr. Clarke’s notes on 2 Thessalonians 2. We regard it as a complete “counterfeit detector,” and have no doubt its value will be appreciated at the present time.

Rule.—“In every case where different interpretations of a prophecy have been given, the proper method of ascertaining meaning is, to compare the various events to which it is thought to relate, with the words of the prophecy; and to adopt that as the event intended which most exactly agrees, in all its parts, with the prophetic description.”

These criteria will commend themselves to every enlightened and candid mind.

The Jewish writers appear generally to have understood this and the other periods of Daniel as years.

“Rabbi Isaac Abarbanel proves that the days are to be interpreted as years, when shall be the days of our redemption, and so have explained them all our other interpreters.”—Political destiny of the earth,—*Preface*. Bishop Newton, who may be considered a host of himself, and whose works on the prophecies have been considered equal to any other for nearly a hundred years, expresses himself on the point before us as follows:—“The days, without doubt, are to be taken, agreeably to the style of Daniel in other places, not for natural, but for prophetic days or years; and as the question was asked not only how long the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the transgression of desolation continue, but also how long the vision shall last, so the answer is to be understood, and these two thousand and three hundred days denote the whole time from the beginning of the vision to the cleansing of the sanctuary”—*Newton on Prophecy*, page 259.

Fletcher, the devout and eloquent vicar of Madeley, in a letter on the prophecies, dated 1775, says,

“Chronologists may mistake a few years, but cannot err upon the whole, and as God is true and faithful, so it is manifest that the prophecy of 2300 years must, be fully accomplished in our days, or those of the next generation.” See also Dr. Clarke’s notes on Daniel 8:26.

We might fill a volume of similar quotations from the best and most able men who have ever lived; but we pass to “the words of the prophecy.”

The first thing attempted in the interpretation of this vision, is to show that it extends to “the end,” (verse 17,) the exact meaning of which is explained to be “the last end of the indignation,” (verse 19,) and, that “the vision,” and the time given in it, terminate together,—“at the time appointed the end shall be.” (verse 19.) All this was said by Gabriel before a word was said about the historical emblems of the vision—the ram, goat, etc.,—evidently implying that these points were the most important to be understood.

What, then, is “the time appointed?” It must be the time mentioned in “the vision;” for it was “the meaning” of “the vision” Daniel sought, (verse 15,)—it was the vision Gabriel was sent to “make” him “understand,” (verse 16,) and it was the vision Gabriel “came” to explain to him, (verse 17;) the time appointed, therefore, must be the time given in “the vision,” or Daniel’s prayer was answered with mocking, Gabriel forgot his commission, and directed his attention to something foreign from the matter to be attended to. No other time is given in the vision but the “2300 days,” (verse 44,) and that this was specially designed to be communicated to Daniel is evident from this fact: when the question was asked, “How long the vision!” though it does not appear to have been proposed by Daniel, the answer is addressed to him,—“And he said unto me,” etc.

This, then, is “the time appointed,” at the end of which “the vision” is to end,—“then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” “the last end of the indignation” come, and the power represented by the “little horn” “shall be broken without hand.”

It is sufficient to settle the question whether this period is to be understood literally or not, to know that 2300 days, literally, will not cover the history of the power which continued for the shortest time of any one in the vision—the “king” represented by “the great horn” of “the goat”—Alexander.

If anything more were needed, the fact that all who have attempted to apply it literally, have failed to do so, many of them confessing it unequivocally, puts it forever to rest. It must, therefore, be understood symbolically, as equal to 2300 years.

2. If the period is understood to be years, does the cleansing of the sanctuary bring us to the end of the world?

What are we to understand by the “cleansing the sanctuary!” To “understand” this correctly we must ascertain what is meant by “the sanctuary.” The word sanctuary is used by the inspired writers in the following significations. (1) It is the name of a particular part of the temple. Hebrews 9:2. (2) The different apartments of the temple. Jeremiah 51:51. (3) The temple itself. 1 Chronicles 22:19; 28:10 (4) Places of worship generally, true or false. Amos 7:9; Ezekiel 28:18; Daniel 7:11. (5) Heaven is called the sanctuary. Psalm 102:19. (6) The promised land. Exodus 15:17; Psalm 128:54; Isaiah 63:18. (7) The tabernacle of God in the heavenly state. Ezekiel 37:26, 28. These are the principal significations of the word sanctuary, in the word of God. According to which of these significations is the word to be understood in the text before us? I think the most obvious sense is that which points out the promised land; for it must be evident to everyone that the sanctuary here spoken of must be capable of being “trodden under foot,” and of being “cleansed,” and, as I think we shall see, of being cleansed at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the righteous dead. The text should also be understood in a sense that will harmonize with other cases in which the word is used by Daniel in particular, with the views of the other prophets, and the word of God generally.

The promised land, of which old Jerusalem was the metropolis, was given to Abraham, (Genesis 17:4–9,) and to his seed after him, for an everlasting possession, in a covenant established with Abraham, and to be established with his seed after him in their generations. And this seed are thus to possess it as a peculiar inheritance when the promise to Abraham that he should be the heir of the habitable earth (kosmou) shall be realized. There will be the “city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,” to which they have “looked” while “strangers and pilgrims on the earth.” There “the king shall be seen in his beauty,”—“upon the throne of David, to order and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever.” “For the Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation.” “this is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it.” Psalm 82:13, 14. “This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, the Lord will dwell in it forever.” Psalm 118:16. See also Exodus 15:17, 18; Isaiah 60:13; Ezekiel 37:24–28; Revelation 12:3.

On this territory the great battle is to be fought, which will make an end at once of the desolator and the desolations. “The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass: and as I have purposed, so shall it stand; that I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountain tread him under foot: then shall his yoke depart from off them, and his burden depart from off their shoulders. This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth; and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back!” Isaiah 14:24–27. See also 24:5–8; 31:4, 34:1–8; 63:1–4 ; Joel 3:9–16; Zechariah 14:3; Revelation 16:13–16; 19:11–21.

“Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” “and the host” of “the ransomed of the Lord,” delivered from the power of death and the grave, and their oppressors on earth, “shall return and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head.”

This cleansing is to take place at the last end of the indignation. A remark or two will show that this is to come, at the time of Christ’s coming to judge the world, to raise the righteous dead, and to enter upon his glorious and everlasting reign. If there were any doubt whether this indignation were God’s general indignation against a guilty world, or against the wicked and unworthy occupants of His “heritage”—the promised land,—it would make no difference as to the events which are to take place at the last end, or termination of it. In the most general sense it must bring the last manifestation of God’s wrath against sinners, and that we know will not be till “the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.”

But the indignation is evidently that which is so often spoken of by the prophets, which was poured out upon the covenant people of God on account of their sins; which first subjected them to the dominion of foreign masters, and afterwards removed them from the land of their fathers, to be fugitives among all nations. See Isaiah 5:5–7, 13; 10:5, 6; 42:24, 25; Jeremiah 7:17–34; 9:13–16; 44:2–6; Ezekiel 36:17–19; Daniel 9:7\_12, 16.

Now we have the clearest proof that this condition of “the sanctuary”—“the holy mountain,” which “the Lord hath chosen for his habitation, to dwell in it forever;” and which without doubt is to be the location of “the city of the great King,” “when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously,” “King over all the earth;” and which “the heirs” are “to possess as an everlasting inheritance,” together with “the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven,”—we have the clearest proof, I repeat, that this condition of the sanctuary is to terminate at the coming of Christ, and not till then. Daniel, in the 9th chapter, the appendix to the 8th, where he gives us the fate of “the city and sanctuary,” says “for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation.” And also 12:1–7, the accomplishment of the predicted “scattering of the power of the holy people”—in other words, the desolation, or “treading under foot,” of the inheritance—is the point at which the “wonders” stated in the preceding verses, are to “be finished.” What are “these wonders?”

1. “At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people.” Michael is one of the names which is applied to Jesus Christ. It means, “Who is like God?” To “stand up,” means, in this prophecy, to reign. 11:2–4. The first of these wonders, then, is the reign of Jesus Christ; which is always stated to commence with the destruction of all earthly kingdoms. See Daniel 7:9–14; Revelation 11:15–18. When “He whose right it is” to reign takes the throne, his kingdom will be “all the earth;” and “the throne” of every usurper shall be “cast down” Psalm 2; Zephaniah 3:8–18; Luke 19:11–27.

2. “And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.” There no other “time” in which the “deliverance” of “people” is to be determined by referring to “the book” but in the judgment scene. Daniel 7:10; Revelation 20:12, 15; 21:27. The second of these wonders is, therefore, the judgment scene, which brings “trouble” to the wicked and deliverance to the righteous.

3. “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” This a clear statement that the resurrection, particularly of the righteous, will take place when the predicted scattering of the holy people is “accomplished.” It takes place “at his (Christ’s) coming.” 1 Corinthians 15:23; 1 Thessalonians 4:14–17. We would remark upon this text, which has been supposed to be difficult to reconcile with the theory of two resurrections, a thousand years apart, that it certainly supposes an arrangement of the process which gives it a double character. And if the angel intended to have said that all would come forth at once, he could hardly have spoken as he has—“many of them,” etc.; but, them that sleep, or, all that sleep. The intention, evidently, is not to go into the details of the resurrection, as John has done, (Revelation 20,) but to state the fact so as to place the righteous dead “who are written in the book,” among them who are “delivered” at the time referred to, and yet so as not to clash with what was to be more fully communicated as to the order of the resurrection at a subsequent period. “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake”—and then, lest the “many” should be understood, as in some other cases, to include the whole, he immediately adds—“some” of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake “to everlasting life, and some” of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake “to shame and everlasting contempt.” The order is implied here. John tells how long a time shall intervene between the resurrections of the two classes. But if all were to rise at once, it must take place “at the time” here referred to. The third of “these wonders,” therefore, is the resurrection.

4. “And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever.” This can mean nothing less than the glorification of the righteous. Paul uses similar language in speaking on the same point. 1 Corinthians 15:41, 42. The Savior uses very similar language in his parable of the tares and wheat. Matthew 13:37–43. And he assures us that “at the end of this world” the righteous “shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.”

Now “all these wonders” are to “be finished,” “when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people.” The testimony of Christ, (Luke 21:24–27,) is equally clear, that the desolation of “the sanctuary, the holy mountain,” is to end at his coming to judge the world, and to reign forever. “And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun, etc. And then shall they see the son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.” Here the coming of Christ is intimately connected with the fulfillment of the times of the Gentiles, the period during which Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot. Of course the whole country follows the condition of its capital. It must continue in this condition till Christ comes. “And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me.” Isaiah 12:1. “Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, that her warfare, (appointed time, margin,) is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received at the Lord’s hand double for all her sins.” Isaiah 40:1. “For your shame you shall have double, and for confusions they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore in their land they shall possess the double; everlasting joy shall be unto them.” Isaiah 61:7. See also Isaiah 66:13–16.

By “the sanctuary,” then, I understand to be meant, “the place which the Lord made for himself to dwell in, the mountain of his inheritance,”—the land given to Abraham, “the land wherein he was a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession;” of which he received, during his life, according to the apostle, (Acts 7:5.) “none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on:” for it was the “place which he should after receive for an inheritance” Hebrews 11:8.

In this sense Daniel seems to have used the word in the 9th chapter, verse 17. He had just prayed, “O Lord, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain,” etc., and continues in this verse, “Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplication, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate.” Can “Thy (God’s) sanctuary” mean anything else here but “Jerusalem, thy holy mountain,” including the territory to which Moses applies the word the first time it occurs in the Bible? Exodus 15:17.

By the cleansing the sanctuary I understand to be meant, 1. Its purification from the wicked agents of its desolation, and, 2. The removal of the curse which is upon it, at the termination of its predicted desolation. Isaiah 1:27, 28; 40:13–17, 19.

It may be asked, perhaps, how can this particular land be possessed in the eternal state? Will it survive the conflagration? To what extent the geological and geographical features of the earth will be affected, when “changed,” or “melted” by the fire unto which it is reserved, we do not pretend to say. That it will exist in the same form in which it now exists, a globe, is evident from the fact that there is to be day and night, though “the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it;” (Revelation 7:15; 20:10;) and if it exist in its present form there must be the same diversities of latitude and longitude; and a portion of the new earth which corresponds with the latitude and longitude of the promised land in this old earth, may be selected for the location of the heavenly Jerusalem, “the city of the great King.”

But from the repeated assurances that “the land promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,” “the mountains of Israel,” “the holy mountain,” “Mount Zion,” etc. etc., are to be “possessed forever,” “stand forever,” “never to be removed,” etc., we may suppose that some of the present features of the earth will survive the conflagration.

It may be asked again, Will not the process of cleansing—“the great battle,” and “the burning flame,” etc., require a long time for its accomplishment? We cannot tell how long a time it will require to complete the work; it may be but a few days, it may be as many years as the Israelites were in conquering the Canaanites, after they entered the land—seven years; it may be more or less; but that it will be commenced suddenly, and by the personal interposition of the “King of kings and Lord of lords,” and that its commencement will be decisive upon the hopes of mankind, is clearly stated in the word of God. See Zephaniah 1:18; Isaiah 60:22; Luke 21:35; 1 Thessalonians 5:2, 3; 2 Thessalonians 1:7–10; Jude 14, 15.

The vision ends when the sanctuary is cleansed, (or justified, as the margin reads,) and the last end of the indignation comes, at the time appointed—the end of the 2300 days.

3. What reasons are there for supposing that the 2300 days, or years, of the 8th of Daniel, begin with the 70 weeks of the 9th?

1. It must be, in the nature of the case, that the matters contemplated in the 9th chapter are included in the 8th, just as a part of a thing must be included in the whole. The vision of the 8th surveys the whole field from Persia to the end; the 9th, though its special burden is the 70 weeks, also reaches “even to the consummation.”

2. But the nature of the view taken in both cases points out the special bearing of one upon the other. The vision of the 8th shows the particular relation of the kingdoms of this world to the church—“the host,” and her inheritance—“the sanctuary.” This, with what is said of the time, character and results of the mission and death of Messiah, is also the whole burden of the 9th.

3. The great question of interest to Daniel in the vision of the 8th, was, as we have seen, “How long the treading under foot of the sanctuary and the host” was to continue? It was this also which led him to the acts—“to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes”—which introduce the 9th, and which called forth the communications contained in it. Read chapters 9, verse 3 to the end.

4. From all the circumstances of the mission of Gabriel, as recorded in the 9th chapter, it is plain that Daniel labored under some mistake in the case.

“While he was speaking in prayer. Gabriel, being caused to fly swiftly, touched him and talked with him, and said unto him, O Daniel. I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.” And again, “I am come to show thee.” There must have been something that was not understood by Daniel, or Gabriel would not have been sent thus, on express, as it were, “to show” him about it. But what could have been Daniel’s mistake? It was not in supposing that the “70 years” predicted by “Jeremiah the prophet” had come nearly or quite to an end; no, that was understood. “I, Daniel, understood by books the number of the years.” verse 2. From Daniel’s prayer, and the course taken by Gabriel, the mistake seems to have been this: Daniel supposed that “to accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem” would make an end of her desolations. Mark the words as they fell from his lips in prayer. After confessing the sins of the “kings, princes, fathers and all the people of the land,” and that “the curse poured upon them” by “the Lord their God,” was “righteous”—being also a fulfillment of “his words,” he proceeds—“I beseech thee, 1. Let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain.” 2. “Open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name.” 3. “And cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord’s sake.” 4. “O Lord, hear, O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God.” Such importunity brought Gabriel from heaven,—not to tell him his prayer should be answered, but to show him that “the city and sanctuary” should be “destroyed,” and continue “desolate even until the consummation.” But why should Daniel make such a mistake? There does not appear to be anything in “the books” of Jeremiah, to which he refers, to warrant such an expectation. The most obvious reason which can be assigned is, that Daniel supposed that the vision of the 8th chapter, which brought to view the time when “the sanctuary should be cleansed, or justified,” run out at the same time with the 70 years of Jeremiah. This appears still further evident from the first attempt of Gabriel “to show” Daniel. “I am come forth to show thee; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.” How could he “give” him “skill and understanding,” and “show” him, by telling him to “consider the vision?” Daniel could not but see that the vision had not run out with the 70 years, and of course there was no reason to expect the sanctuary to be cleansed, for it was to be “trodden under foot” until the vision should end. “Consider the vision!” Daniel. Has the ram—the kings of Media and Persia, been conquered by the rough goat—the king of Grecia? Has Greece, after being a unit, been divided into “four kingdoms?” And have these been followed by a “king of fierce countenance,” who was to arise “in the latter time of their kingdom”—and who should “destroy wonderfully, and destroy the mighty and the holy people—stand up against the Prince of princes?” etc. Consider the vision! So far is it from having run out, that “70 weeks (sevens) of the vision are determined, or cut off, upon thy people, and thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, [fill up their iniquity by putting to death their Messiah, the event which shall] make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness, [and by this also] to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.”

Now the point to be settled is, what “vision” did Gabriel refer to? It must be evident to all that he refers to what is stated in the 9th chapter, or to some previous vision. This must be admitted, or Gabriel spoke nonsense. If what is said in connection with the 70 weeks may, with any propriety, be considered a vision, it is, to say the least of it, quite singular that Gabriel should call Daniel to “consider and understand” a vision before it had been given. In all other cases the vision is first unfolded, and then, after special prayer for its meaning, in most cases, the interpretation is given; but in this case, that uniform and natural order is departed from, unless some other vision besides that in the 9th chapter, (supposing it to be a vision,) is the one intended by Gabriel. Well, what other vision could it be? Why, the one speaking to Daniel in the 9th chapter is “the man Gabriel, whom he had seen in the vision at the beginning,” but we have no account of his being seen in any other vision than that of the 8th chapter, verse 16; and there he is commanded to make Daniel understand the vision.

Here, then, is the same messenger, Gabriel, seen in the previous vision. His work is the sum—to make Daniel “understand.” The manner of his address implies that he had come to finish up the work assigned him in that, vision—“to show” Daniel its commencement, the only point before omitted. The words declare it. “Consider the vision,” Daniel, to “understand the matter.”

And, to put the last query in the case to rest, he adds,—“Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks” = 69 weeks, “and he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week,” which added to the 69 make out the 70. This makes out “the matter” plain. The 70 weeks are made a part of the 2300 days, or years, by telling us they are to be “cut off” from the vision referred to; and being a part of that period, they fix its commencement. For the 70 weeks cannot be cut off from the 2300 days, unless they were included in that period; and if cut off, they must be cut off so many weeks from the beginning of the period; and if cut off from the beginning, they must commence together. And from what we are told was to be done in the 70 weeks, they must have terminated at the death of Christ; and this settles the question that they are to be understood to express in days the number of years intended. There being 490 days in 70 weeks, we have only to go back that number of years from the death of Christ and we are brought necessarily to the year 457 B. C. That year is the remarkable seventh year of Artaxerxes, when the ram did according to his will. That is the year in which the decree of Ezra vii. was issued; and when, according to the plain declaration of the vision,—the undoubted testimony of history,—and the evident connection of the 8th and 9th chapters of Daniel, the 2300 years commenced, and of course they terminate in 1843.

They make sure, “seal up,” the vision; and they demonstrate “the manner” in which the whole period is to be reckoned. If the weeks are weeks, or sevens, of years, the days are of course to be understood in a corresponding manner. And you can no more cut 70 weeks of years from 2300 days literally, than you can cut 7 times 70 yards of broadcloth from 2300 inches of broadcloth.

5. From all these reasons, drawn from the most general character of the prophecy to the most minute particulars of the subject of the two chapters, we are assured of such a connection as we have supposed between them.

Again; without such a connection, one of the portions of the prophecy could not be understood, though an express command to “make” it understood was given and the other is involved in the strangest difficulties.

We cannot therefore but regard the 9th chapter as a designed and indispensable appendix of the 8th chapter. As such, it gives the undoubted clue to the chronological period of the vision, both as to its commencement, and “the manner of time the spirit did signify” by that period. We also consider the exact fulfillment of the 70 weeks of the 9th chapter as a pledge, that the whole period, which reaches to the end, will be as exactly verified at the time appointed.

4. Admitting the 2300 years and seventy weeks begin together, can we tell at which of the decrees issued in favor of the Jews they began?

Such is the peculiar character of the prophecy of the seventy weeks, that one would suppose there could hardly be a doubt as to the time of their termination; and if a decree could be found which was issued four hundred and ninety years prior to their termination, it must follow that that is the decree referred to in the prophecy. Our views on this question are those of nearly or quite all the old evangelical writers upon the subject; and, as they cannot be suspected of any bias in favor of Millerism, they may settle the point for us.

“Many are the opinions concerning the beginning and end of these seventy weeks among chronologers. Some begin them in the first year of Cyrus, and end them in the nativity of Christ; others, from the second of Darius Nothus (successor to Artaxerxes,) and conclude them with the destruction of Jerusalem, by Titus Vespasian. Some make them commence from the 20th of Artaxerxes, and to conclude with the passion and death of Christ; and others will have them begin in the 20th year of Artaxerxes Mnemon, and end in the desolation of the city by the Romans. But many there are who, rejecting all these,—with best reason,—fix the beginning of them in the 7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and their conclusion in the death of Christ—in which termination most of the learned, both ancient and modern, agree. For if we seriously consider the account of time, and judge of it according to the best approved authors, the three former opinions will be found either to exceed or come short of the number. From the beginning of the Persian Empire to Christ’s nativity passed about 530 years. From the second of Darius Nothus, indeed, to the destruction of Jerusalem, near 490 years intervened; but concerning any edict made by that prince, there is not a word in scripture. From the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, to the death and passion of Christ, are found 476, or 477, which come too short by thirteen of the 490; and betwixt the 20th of Artaxerxes Mnemon and the destruction of Jerusalem, are found but about 450, which come far short of the account; as also the chronology of such as would fetch the rise of the 490 from the first of Darius Medus, and the second or sixth of Darius the son of Hystaspes.

“But if we reckon from this 7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, down by his successors in the Persian Empire the Ptolemics of Egypt, after that of Alexander the Great, and then by the Asmoncans or Jewish princes, till we come at length to Herod the Great, and so to Christ, the just number of 490 we shall find at his death, with such small difference as is pardonable to so many authors handling so many things. Or if we reckon the years of the Olympiads and the building of Rome, we shall find Christ to have died in the 490th year after the promulgation of this decree.”—[*Institution of General History*, volume 1., page 209; by Wm. Howell, LI. D., London, 1680. “See *Dr. Clarke’s notes, Horne’s Interlinear*. Volume 1, page 336; Volume 4, page 191. Also Note D, in the Diagram.]

## The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days

BY J. N. ANDREWS

### TWO DESOLATIONS IN DANIEL EIGHT

**T**here are two desolations in Daniel eight. This fact is made so plain by Josiah Litch that we present his words:

“*The daily sacrifice* is the present reading of the English text. But no such thing as sacrifice is found in the original. This is acknowledged on all hands. It is a gloss or construction put on it by the translators. The true reading is, *the daily and the transgression of desolation*, daily and transgression being connected together by *and*; the daily desolation and the transgression of desolation.

“They are two desolating powers, which were to desolate the sanctuary and the host.” *Prophetic Expositions*, volume 1, 127.

It is plain that the sanctuary and the host were to be trodden under foot by the daily and the transgression of desolation. The careful reading of verse thirteen settles this point. And this fact establishes another, viz.: that these two desolations are the two grand forms under which Satan has attempted to overthrow the worship and the cause of Jehovah. Mr. Miller’s remarks on the meaning of these two terms, and the course pursued by himself in ascertaining that meaning, is presented under the following head:

#### PAGANISM AND THE PAPACY

“I read on, and could find no other case in which it [the daily] was found, but in Daniel. I then [by the aid of a concordance] took those words which stood in connection with it, *take away*; he shall take away, *the daily*; *from the time the daily shall be taken away*, &c. I read on, and thought I should find no light on the text; finally, I came to 2 Thessalonians 2:7–8. ‘For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way, and then shall that wicked be revealed,’ &c. And when I had come to that text, oh! how clear and glorious the truth appeared! There it is! That is *the daily*! Well now, what does Paul mean by *he who now letteth*, or hindereth? By *the man of sin*, and the *wicked*, popery is meant. Well, what is it which hinders popery from being revealed? Why, it is paganism; well, then, *the daily* must mean paganism.” *Second Advent Manual*, 66.

It needs no argument to prove that the two grand forms of opposition, by which Satan has desolated the church and trod under foot the sanctuary of the living God, are none other than paganism and popery. It is also a clear point that the change from one of these desolations to the other did occur under the Roman power.

Paganism, from the days of the kings of Assyria, down to the period when it became so far modified that it took the name of popery, had been the daily (or, as Professor Whiting renders it, “the continual”) desolation, by which Satan had stood up against the cause of Jehovah. And, indeed, in its priests, its altars and its sacrifices, it bore resemblance to the Levitical form of Jehovah’s worship. When the Christian form of worship took the place of the Levitical, a change in Satan’s form of opposition, and counterfeit worship, became necessary, if he would successfully oppose the worship of the great God. And it is in the light of these facts that we are able to understand our Lord’s reference to the abomination of desolation in Matthew 24:15. It is evident that he there cites Daniel 9:26–27. Now, although we do not understand that paganism in the year 70 had given place to popery, we do understand that that same power which then appeared, modified somewhat in name and form, was the very power that should, as the abomination of desolation, wear out the saints of the Most High.

The language of Paul is to the point:

“For the mystery of iniquity [popery] doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” 2 Thessalonians 2:7–8.

That Paul refers to paganism and popery, none question. And here is direct proof that popery, the abomination of desolation, had in Paul’s day already begun to work. Nor was it a very great change of character when Satan transformed his counterfeit worship from paganism to popery.

The same temples, altars, incense, priests and worshipers were ready, with little change, to serve as the appendages of the papal abomination. The statute of Jupiter readily changed to that of Peter, the prince of the apostles; and the Pantheon, which had been the temple of all the gods, without difficulty became the sanctuary of all the saints. Thus the same abomination that desolated Jerusalem, in a degree changed and modified, became the wonderful desolater of the saints and martyrs of Jesus. And in its so-called temple of God, it set at naught and trod under foot the true temple of Jehovah, and he who is its minister, Jesus Christ. The change from paganism to popery is clearly shown in John’s view of the transfer of power from the dragon of Revelation twelve, to the beast of Revelation thirteen. And that they are essentially the same thing, is evident from the fact that both the dragon and the beast are represented with the seven heads; thus showing that, in a certain sense, either may be understood to cover the whole time. And in the same sense we understand that either abomination covers all the period.

Christ’s reference to the abomination of desolation (Matthew 24:15; Luke 21:20) is an absolute demonstration that Rome is the little horn of Daniel 8:9–12.

Having shown that there are two desolations, by which the sanctuary and the host are trodden down, we now notice the fact that there are two opposing Sanctuaries in Daniel eight.

To the careful reader this fact will at once appear. They are as follows:

First, the sanctuary of the daily desolation. Verse eleven and Daniel 11:31.

Second, the sanctuary which the daily and the transgression of desolation were to tread under foot. Verses thirteen and fourteen. The one is the sanctuary of Satan; the other is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts. The one is the dwelling place of "all the gods;" the other is the habitation of the only living and true God. If it be said that a sanctuary is never connected with heathen and idolatrous worship, we cite the direct testimony of the Bible.

Heathen Moab had a sanctuary. And that sanctuary was a place of prayer and worship for that heathen nation. Isaiah 16:12. The chapel erected by the king of Israel at Bethel, as a rival to the temple of God at Jerusalem (1 Kings 12:27, 31–33) was called his sanctuary. Amos 7:13, margin.

And the places in which idolatrous Israel (the ten tribes) worshiped, are called sanctuaries. Amos 7:9. The same is true of idolatrous Tyre. Ezekiel 28:18. Attention is called to the following from Apollos Hale:

"What can be meant by the *sanctuary* of paganism? Paganism, and error of every kind, have their sanctuaries as well as truth. These are the temples or asylums consecrated to their service. Some particular and renowned temple of paganism may, then, be supposed to be here spoken of. Which of its numerous distinguished temples may it be? One of the most magnificent specimens of classic architecture is called the Pantheon. The name signifies *the temple or asylum of all the gods*. The *place* of its location is Rome.

"The idols of the nations conquered by the Romans were sacredly deposited in some niche or apartment of this temple, and in many cases became objects of worship by the Romans themselves. Could we find a temple of paganism that was more strikingly 'his sanctuary'? Was Rome, the city or place of the Pantheon, *cast down* by the authority of the State? Read the following well-known and remarkable facts in history: 'The death of the last rival of Constantine had sealed the peace of the empire. Rome was once more the undisputed queen of nations. But, in the hour of elevation and splendor, she had been raised to the edge of a precipice. Her next step was to be downward and irrecoverable.

"The change of the government to Constantinople still perplexes the historian. Constantine abandoned Rome, the great citadel and throne of the Caesars, for an obscure corner of Thrace, and expended the remainder of his vigorous and ambitious life in the double toil of raising a colony into the capital of his empire, and degrading the capital into the feeble honors and humiliated strength of a colony". *Second Advent Manual*, 68.

And not only did Satan possess himself of a rival to the sanctuary of Jehovah in the period of pagan worship, but, throughout the Christian dispensation, has that arch fiend possessed a rival temple of God. 2 Thessalonians 2:4.

Thus much for the rival sanctuary of Satan. The sanctuary of God remains to be noticed at length. Connected with these two sanctuaries there are two hosts in Daniel 8:9–13.

#### **THERE ARE TWO HOSTS**

The one is the host that was given to the little horn against the daily, when it had filled its measure of transgression; and by the aid of this host, the little horn was able to cast down the truth. Verse twelve. This host is mentioned in Daniel 11:31.

By this host, the sanctuary of the daily desolation, and its services, were transferred to the transgression, or abomination of desolation. This host is the forces of Satan, and it is intimately associated with his sanctuary. The other host is “the host of heaven.” Verse ten. Michael is the Prince of this host. Daniel 10:21.

Against the Prince of this host, the little horn stands up. Verses eleven and twenty-five. (Professor Whiting remarks that in the original, “Prince of the host” occurs in Joshua 5:14) None dispute that the host, of whom Michael (Christ) is Prince, is the church of the living God. Daniel 12:1. This host, the true church, is fitly represented by a green olive tree. Jeremiah 11:15–17. And when some of the branches (members of the Jewish church) were broken off through unbelief, others were grafted in from the Gentiles, and thus the host continues to exist. Romans 11:17–20. This host, or church, is the worshipers of God, and is intimately connected with his sanctuary. That sanctuary we are now prepared to consider.

What is the Sanctuary of God?

Before answering this question, we present the definition of the word sanctuary: “A holy place”, Walker. “A sacred place”, Webster. “A holy or sanctified place a dwelling place of the Most High”, Cruden. A dwelling place for God. Exodus 25:8. Thus much for the meaning of the word. We now inquire respecting its application.

Is the earth the sanctuary? To this question we answer emphatically: It is not. And if we are requested to prove a negative, we offer the following reasons:

1. The word sanctuary is used 145 times in the Bible, and it is not in a single instance applied to the earth. Hence there is no authority for this view, except that of man.

2. Every one knows that the earth is neither a dwelling place of God, nor yet a holy, or sacred place.

Those, therefore, who affirm that it is the sanctuary of God, should know better than to make such a statement.

3. In almost every instance in which the word sanctuary occurs in the Bible (and the exceptions nearly all refer to Satan's rival sanctuary) it refers directly to another definite object which God calls his sanctuary. Hence, those who teach that the earth is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts, contradict his positive testimony a hundred times repeated. For the benefit of those who think that the earth will become the sanctuary after it has been cleansed by fire, we add that God does not even then call it his sanctuary, but simply "the place" of its location. Isaiah 60:13; Ezekiel 37:26–28; Revelation 21:1–3. The earth, then, is not the sanctuary, but merely the place where it will be located hereafter.

Is the church the sanctuary? We answer: It is not. The following reasons in support of this answer are to the point:

1. The Bible never calls the church the sanctuary.

2. In a great number of texts, God has called another object his sanctuary, and has uniformly associated the church with that object, as the worshipers; and that sanctuary itself, as the place of that worship, or toward which their prayer was directed. Psalm 20:2; 28:2, margin; 29:2, margin; 63:2; 68:24; 73:17; 134:2; 150:1; 5:7.

3. The following inference is all that we have ever seen urged in favor of this view. God has many times called the tabernacle or temple, which are the patterns of the true, his sanctuary. And because that the church is spiritually called the temple of God, some have supposed that they were at liberty to call the church the sanctuary.

4. But there is one text that some may urge. It is this: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language; Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion." Psalm 114:1–2.

But, at most, this would only prove that one of the twelve tribes was the sanctuary, and that the whole church was not. But if the fact be remembered, that God chose Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 6:6), which was in Judah (Joshua 15:63; Judges 1:8; Zechariah 1:12; Ezra 1:3), as the place of his sanctuary (1 Chronicles 28:9–10; 2 Chronicles 3:1), we think the following from another psalm will fully explain the connection between Judah and the sanctuary of God, and show that Judah was the tribe with which God designed to locate his habitation: “But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. And he built his sanctuary like high palaces [see 1 Chronicles 29:1], like the earth which he hath established forever.” Psalm 78:68–69. 5. But if a single text could be adduced to prove that the church is called a sanctuary, the following plain fact would prove beyond controversy that it is not the sanctuary of Daniel 8:13–14. The church is represented in Daniel 8:13, by the word “host.” This none will deny. “To give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot.” Then the church and the sanctuary are two things. The church is the host or worshipers; the sanctuary is the place of that worship, or the place toward which it is directed.

Is the land of Canaan the sanctuary? Of the 145 times in which the word sanctuary occurs in the Bible, only two or three texts have been urged, with any degree of confidence, as referring to the land of Canaan. Yet, strangely enough, men have claimed that the supposed meaning of these two or three texts ought to determine the signification of the word in Daniel 8:13–14, against the plain testimony of more than a hundred texts! For none can deny that in almost every instance in which the word does occur, it refers directly to the typical tabernacle, or else to the true, of which that was but the figure or pattern.

But we now inquire whether the two or three texts in question do actually apply the word sanctuary to the land of Canaan. They read as follows:

“Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in the sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established.” Exodus 15:17.

“And he led them on safely, so that they feared not; but the sea overwhelmed their enemies. And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased.’ ‘And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever.” Psalm 78:53–54, 69.

The first of these texts, it will be noticed, is taken from the song of Moses, after the passage of the Red Sea. It is a prediction of what God would do for Israel. The second text was written about five hundred years after the song of Moses. What Moses utters as a prediction, the psalmist records as a matter of history. Hence the psalm is an inspired commentary on the song of Moses. If the first text be read without the other, the idea might be gathered that the mountain was the sanctuary, though it does not directly state this. Even as one might get the idea that the tribe of Judah was Mount Zion, were they to read only the expression, “but chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved” (Psalm 78:68), and omit those texts which inform us that Mount Zion was the city of David, a part of Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:6–7), and was located in Judah, as one of its cities. Ezra 1:3; Psalm 69:35.

But if the second text be read in connection with the first, it destroys the possibility of such an inference. The psalmist states that the mountain of the inheritance was the border of the sanctuary. And that God, after driving out the heathen before his people, proceeded to build his sanctuary like high palaces. See 1 Chronicles 29:1. 1.

The land of Canaan was the mountain of the inheritance. Exodus 15:17. 2. That mountain of the border of the sanctuary. Psalm 78:54. 3. In that border God built his sanctuary. Psalm 78:69. 4. In that sanctuary God dwelt. Psalm 74:7; Exodus 25:8. 5. In that border the people dwelt. Psalm 78:54–55. These facts demonstrate that the same Spirit moved both those “holy men of old.”

These texts perfectly harmonize, not only with each other, but with the entire testimony of the Bible, respecting the sanctuary. If the reader still persists in confounding the sanctuary with its border, the land of Canaan, we request him to listen while a king of Judah points out the distinction:

“Art not thou our God, who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend forever? And they dwelt therein, and have built thee a sanctuary therein for thy name, saying, If, when evil cometh upon us, as the sword, judgment, or pestilence, or famine, we stand before this house, and in thy presence (for thy name is in this house), and cry unto thee in our affliction, then thou wilt hear and help.” 2 Chronicles 20:7–9.

This language is a perfect parallel to that of Psalm 78:54–55, 69. In the clearest manner it points out the distinction between the land of Canaan and the sanctuary which was built therein; and it does clearly teach that that sanctuary was the house erected as the habitation of God.

But there is another text by which some attempt to prove that Canaan is the sanctuary. “The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary.” Isaiah 63:18. No one offers this as direct testimony. As it is only an inference, a few words are all that is needed.

1. When the people of God’s holiness were driven out of the land of Canaan (as here predicted by the prophet, who uses the past tense for the future), not only were they dispossessed of their inheritance, but the sanctuary of God, built in that land, was laid in ruins. This is plainly stated in 2 Chronicles 36:17–20.

2. The next chapter testifies that the prophet had a view of the destruction of God’s sanctuary, as stated in the text quoted from 2 Chronicles. This explains the whole matter. Isaiah 64:10–11; Psalm 74:3, 7; 79:1.

A fourth text may occur to some minds as conclusive proof that Canaan is the sanctuary. We present it, as it is the only remaining one that has ever been urged in support of this view.

“The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious.” Isaiah 60:13.

This text needs little comment. The place of God’s sanctuary, we fully admit, is the land of Canaan, or the new earth, for Isaiah refers to the glorified state. And as God has promised to set his sanctuary in that place (Ezekiel 37:25–28), the meaning of the text is perfectly plain. But if any still assert that the place of the sanctuary is the sanctuary itself, let them notice that the same text calls the same “place” the place of the Lord’s feet; and hence the same principle would make the land of Canaan the feet of the Lord! The view that Canaan is the sanctuary is too absurd to need further notice. And even were it a sanctuary, it would not even then be the sanctuary of Daniel; for the prophet had his eye upon the habitation of God. Daniel nine. Canaan was only the place of God’s sanctuary or habitation.

We have found that the earth is not the sanctuary, but simply the territory where it will finally be located; that the church is not the sanctuary, but simply the worshipers connected with the sanctuary; and that the land of Canaan is not the sanctuary, but that it is the place where the typical sanctuary was located. J. N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days*, 33–45.

