

## **TWO DESOLATIONS IN DANIEL EIGHT**

From J. N. Andrew's classic presentation on the Sanctuary we find Andrews identifying that the earth, the church, the Sanctuary and the land where the Sanctuary was located and the church lived—are four different entities in Bible prophecy!

## **THE SANCTUARY AND THE 2300 DAYS TWO DESOLATIONS IN DANIEL EIGHT**

**J. N. Andrews**

There 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 worshippers 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.